



Moderators' Report/ Principal Moderator Feedback

January 2019

Pearson Edexcel GCSE
Extended Projects Qualification
in Performance (P304) Paper 01

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for all papers can be found on the website at:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

January 2019

Publications Code P304_01_1901_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

P304 Artefact - January 2019

Student Performance

The January series entries were slightly up on previous years, but this remains a smaller cohort.

Overall students presented individualised projects linked to their very varied skills, interests and future plans. Many portfolios were assessed and moderated at the higher end of the range. This series there were examples of absolutely outstanding work, particularly highly sophisticated architecture, tech and engineering projects that developed and refined innovative new products for a clearly identified target market. These had been informed by professional practice, and /or work experience /consultation with industry professionals.

At this top end, the work was outstanding in both ambition and realisation. There was evidence of mature higher-level research and critical thinking skills as well as sophisticated design and manufacturing skills. The ability to genuinely innovate and an emerging appreciation of professional practice were also demonstrated.

Suitability of work submitted

Most centres recognised the need to support learners to develop proposals that necessitated a clear research phase. The majority of work sampled reflected the Guided Learning Hours of the qualification.

On the whole students submitted appropriate proposals and evidence for the Artefact unit. Titles could sometimes be more focused and refined. Some centres are still phrasing the project title as a research question, rather than developing a tight design or commission brief as required for the unit. Highly refined initial briefs offered learners the greatest opportunity. Where consideration was given to specifics such a style, medium, influence, purpose, materials, genre, user-group etc. learners were able to plan, research, develop and evaluate with all these in mind. Examples of more successful initial titles/design briefs include:

- 'Urban Gods' – a commission by Marvel to create an original comic story for readers aged 12 and over
- To design and engineer an app that allows young 'hangry' customers on the streets near busy restaurants to be able to test which restaurant is currently operating the quickest

Some cohorts suggested a centre-led approach to research that tended to be less successful. In these cases, all students included a primary research survey. These met lower band criteria, as they were often to a small sample of peers, with less rigorous evaluation of the findings.

More students are presenting Literary Reviews. These are not an essential requirement for the unit and sometimes suggested a more task-based approach to the project. Stronger responses documented an organic and evolving primary and secondary research process that took place throughout an iterative design and development period.

Some of the most effective supporting materials were less formal in their presentation, but still structured. They were in the most appropriate form for the artefact outcome (e.g. annotated sketchbooks or design portfolios). This type of evidence tended to provide better on-going evidence of the creative journey toward the realisation of the artefact than more retrospective accounts. Centres should be confident to reward this type of evidence when it meets the assessment criteria.

Some students recognised the validity of documenting relevant primary research including the development of technical skills and research into existing similar products/designs. Occasionally individuals did not appreciate the technical skills required to realise an appropriate Level 3 artefact and/or the time and support needed to develop these skills.

Most centres now provide good photographic evidence. Online links to artefacts occasionally did not work. It is helpful if these are provided on media storage devices, rather than written on the supporting materials, so the link can be quickly copied and pasted by the moderator

A single group project was moderated this series. Individual students within the group demonstrated good practice, with very clearly delineated personal roles and responsibilities. Their evidence for assessment was also clearly the work of the individual, rather than the group

Assessment Evidence

AO1 was more frequently over-rewarded. Better assessment considered the full range of marks in the top band. Some centres have reacted positively to previous feedback and presented very detailed time planning; however, timescales and resources continue to be the areas lacking detail on the Project Proposal Form. Some students were over-rewarded for generic lists of actions and resources. Sometimes planning documentation appeared to have been completed retrospectively, rather than really being used to manage and monitor the project's progress. More cursory Activity Logs were over-rewarded.

AO2 was less frequently over-rewarded this series. The strongest submissions provided extensive and detailed evidence that *'a wide range of different types of possible materials and techniques have been thoroughly investigated'*. This tended to be particularly effectively evidenced by less formal supporting materials (e.g. annotated sketchbooks or design portfolios). Research was occasionally 'narrower' than the 'wide-ranging' assessment suggested, with briefer bibliographies and the timescales allotted revealing the shortcomings of the research. Some students omitted a bibliography even though this is a criterion in all mark bands. Centres seemed better able to distinguish between band 2 and band 3 evidence this series. However, more linear, rather than synthesised research was sometimes placed erroneously in the top band. Where true stakeholders became involved, as primary sources, their input was pivotal and students made very productive use of this resource. This could be encouraged further.

There was sometimes leniency in the assessment of AO3 around the band 2/3 border when overall band 2 was 'best fit'. Shorter development and realisation phases did not reflect the increased weighting allotted to this objective. At the top end, a very high level of technical skill

was demonstrated. A small minority of centres again provided far more evidence of the research phase. This led to some leniency in the assessment of criteria related to the development and refinement of the artefact. High-mark submissions across the entry were able to demonstrate the Mark Band 3 criteria *'the artefact is highly successful at fulfilling the original brief'* as a result of their initial design brief being specific and focused. Lower in the range, the success and refinement of more straightforward artefacts was sometimes over-stated by centre assessors.

AO4 was generally accurately assessed. Where there was leniency against AO4, centre assessors could consider the full range of marks in the top band. Students were sometimes awarded full marks when the Oral Presentation Record Form comments suggested that lower in the band would be more appropriate. At the top end, high-level review and insight was embedded throughout the portfolio. Generally, students again submitted more detailed summative reviews that gave them opportunity to access a fuller range of marks. The requirement to demonstrate high level of insight and assessment of how well they managed at all stages of the project was most often over-rewarded

Centre Performance

Most centres were accurate or slightly lenient in their assessment of P304. There was very occasional inconsistency marking this series. There was also clear evidence of internal standardisation processes in many centres. A small minority of centres had not standardised assessment across the team of assessors marking the unit.

In the minority of centres that assessed leniently, there tended to be a lack of evidence of the development process and perhaps less recognition of the increased weighting given to AO3. At the top end, there was a tendency to award very high band 3 marks, when a wider range could be considered. A task-based approach to the project was over-rewarded. Lower in the range more straightforward research and development producing less refined artefacts was over-rewarded.

Some centres appear to be applying a tick-list, rather than 'best fit' approach to marking and when this happened assessment could be lenient/inconsistent. Where there was slight leniency centres tended not to consider the full range of marks within a band, marking towards the top of the range and perhaps not fully appreciating that when all criteria are met the mark is placed in the middle of the band.

The majority of centres linked their teacher assessor comments to the language of the assessment criteria on the Candidate Record Sheet. More detailed and specific annotation of portfolio evidence, referencing the assessment objective and band placement is encouraged. On the whole marks were recorded and entered accurately this series.

Centres are commended for continuing to support the very wide-ranging interests of enthused students.

