AQA

Foundation and Higher
Project Qualifications

7991 and 7992
Report on the Examination

7991 and 7992
January 2019

Version: 1.0

The entry for both levels of the Project qualification was broadly similar to that for January 2018. As with previous series, a significant proportion of the entry comprised students on courses below Key Stage 4. It was pleasing to note that for entries of these younger students, there was a clear recognition by centres that the standard of work expected was that of students at the completion of a GCSE course at the end of Year 11. Pleasingly, there was little evidence of students being entered for an inappropriate level of the Project qualification and, therefore, failing to achieve the marks necessary for a pass and, hence, not receiving an award.

In the great majority of cases centres submitted marks promptly via e-submissions, and in many cases, in advance of the 10 January deadline. In a few cases, however, centres delayed submitting the required sample of their Projects until after 10 January. It is always helpful to the moderating team if samples of work can be submitted as soon as marks are entered in e-subs. It was pleasing to note that, where a number of supervisors had been involved in the marking of projects, clear evidence for the internal moderation of marking was submitted with some centres providing very detailed commentaries explaining the reasons for changes to marks. Marking was, in a majority of cases, accurate and adjustments to centre marks were not required. Centres that provided full and detailed comments on the Record of Marks sheets aided the moderation process. It is of concern that in a small number of cases, comments on these sheets were cursory, offering little if any justification for the marks awarded. Where adjustments to marks were seen to be necessary it was often the case that just a single project in the sample, often the highest scoring project, was marked over-generously and this necessitated the inspection of further projects and an adjustment to the centre marking. Where marks have been adjusted centres are strongly advised to attend the AQA standardisation meetings to ensure that the assessment criteria are understood and applied correctly in future submissions.

Few artefact based projects were seen in the January series, but of those that were most evidenced a sound understanding that these projects must be research based. It was of concern that the submissions from one centre consisted of student produced 'booklets' that did not evidence a clear sense of 'audience' and were broadly descriptive in nature.

Moderators continue to be encouraged by the sound use, by most students, of the Production Log with entries that were both detailed and reflective. It is encouraging to note that the moderation team saw very few examples of the use of centre-devised 'diaries', the use of which tends to encourage students to merely list 'what they have done' and discourage them from effectively capturing their 'learning journey'. It was often the case that differences in students' overall performance was mostly influenced by how effectively they had used the Production Log. As in previous series, it remains the case that Level 1 Foundation students generally made a less full use of their logs and centres might better support these students by ensuring that they understand the importance of this document. Often Level 1 Foundation students provided only a single sentence entry for each heading on the different log pages, or completed the logs in handwritten form often greatly limiting the amount of detail that could be recorded. In general, well-organised students were those who not only used the Production Log effectively, but also evidenced a range and variety of sources being employed and with careful referencing of these. The moderation team noted that students should be encouraged to develop a stronger sense of 'audience', or readership, and failing to do this miss the opportunity to reflect on how well they have communicated their findings to their chosen audience.

Moderators continued to be encouraged by the evidence of a robust project approval process in most centres. Students had clearly been encouraged to evidence that they had considered a number of potentially useful sources at the Initial Ideas stage, and this contributed to the viability of the proposed project. There was sound evidence in many of the projects seen, of an effective use

of Conditional Approval for student titles, and this could be seen to support successful project outcomes.

The moderation team were encouraged by the quality of many of the projects seen. Students' enthusiasm for their chosen topics was frequently apparent and supervisors did an excellent job in encouraging and supporting that enthusiasm.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the Results Statistics page of the AQA Website.

Converting Marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) marks by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator