

**Business: Graded Unit 2 (F8LE 35)**

**Grade A Project Investigation**

**Final Mark – 74%**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PLANNING STAGE** | **Marks**  **Awarded** | **Marks**  **Available** |
| Developing a Brief | **13** | 18 |
| Acceptable Activity Log submitted (Must be yes to proceed) | **Yes** | Yes |
| Devising a Plan | **5** | 6 |
| **Total mark for the Planning Stage** | **18** | 24 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **DEVELOPING STAGE** | **Marks** | **Marks Available** |
| Developing the Report | **29** | 40 |
| Activity Log | **6** | 6 |
| Presentation | **5** | 6 |
| **Total mark for the Developing Stage** | **40** | 52 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **EVALUATING STAGE** | **Marks** | **Marks Available** |
| Evaluation | **16** | 24 |
| **Total mark for the Evaluating Stage** | **16** | 24 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **TOTAL MARKS** | **74** | 100 |

Assessment checklists

**Stage 1: Planning (Maximum possible mark 24) Marks Awarded 18/24**

**Developing a Brief**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Minimum evidence requirements** | **Minimum**  **Mark**  **Required \*** | **Maximum**  **Mark Available\*\*** | **Marks**  **Awarded** | **Criteria met for additional mark(s)\*\*** |
| 1. Initial personal assessment of the candidate’s skills | 1 | 3 | **3** | Criterion 1: +2 |
| 1. An appropriate title of the project | 1 | 1 | **1** |  |
| 1. Statement of the issue to be investigated. This should cover how it involves meeting the needs of customers and who the relevant customers are | 1 | 2 | **2** | Criterion 2: +1 |
| 1. Aims and objectives of the project | 1 | 2 | **2** | Criterion 3: +1 |
| 1. Reasons for the choice of issue which must be directly related to a topic or topics covered as part of the group award | 1 | 3 | **1** |  |
| 1. Justification for the choice of business or businesses involved | 1 | 2 | **2** | Criterion 2: +1 |
| 1. Explanation of the range of primary and secondary sources of information which will be used for the investigation and justification for the choice of each source | 1 | 2 | **1** |  |
| 1. Explanation of the how the investigation will be conducted with justification for the choice of methods used | 1 | 3 | **1** |  |
| **Total** | 9\* | 24 | **13** |  |

\*Candidates must secure at least one mark for each of the minimum evidence requirements, plus one additional mark.

\*\* Additional marks up to the maximum mark available may be awarded on the basis of the following criteria:

1. A detailed and realistic assessment of the candidates skills **+2 Marks**
2. The strength of reasoning for the choice of the issue and its links with the course **+2 Marks**
3. Clear objectives which are specific, realistic, measurable, achievable and time bound **+1 Mark**
4. The range and variety of sources of information chosen
5. The extent to which sources of information selected have been justified
6. The extent to which the methodology is apposite and well-chosen
7. The clarity and logical strength of justifications given for the choice of methods
8. The coherence with which the assessment criteria are linked to the topic(s) in the HND Business

**Devising a Plan**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Minimum evidence requirements** | **Minimum**  **Mark**  **Required \*** | **Maximum**  **Mark Available\*\*** | **Marks**  **Awarded** | **Criteria met for additional mark(s)\*\*** |
| 1. Negotiated dates for the planning, development and evaluation of the project | 1 | 1 | **1** |  |
| 1. Interim and final timescales and dates for conducting the investigation, which should be related to the objectives of the investigation | 1 | 4 | **3** | Criterion 3: +1  Criterion 4: +1 |
| 1. Identification of the resources (including time) required to carry out the investigation | 1 | 1 | **1** |  |
| **Total** | 3 | 6 | **5** |  |

\*Candidates must secure at least one mark for each of the minimum evidence requirements.

\*\* Additional marks up to the maximum mark available may be awarded on the basis of the following criteria:

1. The coherence with which the timescales are related to the objectives of the investigation
2. The extent to which the plan demonstrates the links between the three parts of the investigation
3. The extent to which the timescales are realistic and achievable **+1 Mark**
4. The way in which the plan takes account of the methodology proposed in the brief **+1 Mark**

**Activity Log**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Minimum evidence requirements** | **Minimum Mark Required** | **Acceptable log submitted** |
| Producing a log of activities carried out by the candidate. The log must include activities undertaken, resources used and time allocated. | No marks are allocated in the Planning Stage, but a log including activities undertaken, resources used and time allocated **must** be submitted. | Log submitted and acceptable |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PLANNING STAGE** | **Marks** |
| Developing a Brief | **13** |
| Acceptable Activity Log submitted (Must be yes to proceed) | **Yes** |
| Devising a Plan | **5** |
| **Total mark for the Planning Stage** | **18** |

Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory Comments

**Satisfactory 18/24**

The comment column can be used to highlight any re-assessment that may be needed.

Overall comments:

**A really good start with some good analysis. The analysis of personal skills is particularly good. Some strong justifications for choices given. Plan is detailed and realistic.**

**Stage 1: Planning**

**Developing a Brief**

Possible marks: 18 **Marks Awarded: 13**

**Minimum Requirements: 9 marks –** *Candidates must achieve at least 1 mark for each of the minimum evidence requirements plus 1 additional mark.*

**Initial personal skills assessment**

A good level of self-awareness is shown. There is evidence of reflection on both strengths and weaknesses. The assessment is sufficiently detailed, reflective and realistic for 2 additional marks – *3 marks awarded*.

**Project title**

Title is relevant although wording is a bit awkward – *1 mark awarded*

**Statement of issue to be investigated (including how it involves meeting the needs of customers and who the relevant customers are)**

Statement of issue has been clearly explained with customers identified. Explicit links have been made to course units from both HNC and HND. A clear focus and genuine interest in the issue has been demonstrated – *2 marks awarded.*

**Objectives of the project**

Clear and meaningful objectives have been set which allow for an impartial assessment of the issue under investigation – *2 marks awarded.*

**Reasons for choice of issue directly related to a topic or topics covered as part of the Group Award**

Strong reasons given but the linkage made to Units from the course such as Marketing and Economics is rather limited and lacks detail. It would be better to explain in more detail how concepts from these units would be used – *1 mark awarded*.

**Justification for choice of business or businesses involved**

The choice of business has been justified in terms of both personal and professional interest in the product, the performance of the business and its impact on the local economy. The justifications made are both relevant and valid – *2 marks awarded*.

**Explanation of the range of primary and secondary sources of information which will be used for the investigation and justification for the choice of each source**

Primary and secondary sources have been identified and explained. A good range of sources have been identified but explanations could be more detailed. Minimum justification has been given – *1 mark awarded*.

**Explanation of how the investigation will be conducted with justification for the choice of methods used**

The methods chosen provide a good balance of primary and secondary research methods appropriate to the project. An awareness of the need for different perspectives is shown but explanations lack detail such as limitations of the methods chosen and survey sample size – *1 mark awarded*.

**Additional Marks for Project Brief**

2 additional marks were awarded for the personal skills assessment. These were awarded for the quality of the reflection and for the detail of the analysis. An honest and critical appraisal of personal skills has been given along with explanation of how they may impact on the project.

1 additional mark has been awarded for the statement of the issue to be investigated as this provides a clear focus for the project.

1 additional mark has been awarded for the clarity of the objectives which provide a logical framework for the investigation.

1 additional mark has been awarded for the justification for the choice of business. An awareness of the importance of the company’s strategic approach is shown. This is a crucial element of the investigation and shows that this has been carefully considered.

**Overall**

The brief provides a firm basis for the investigation and shows a level of effort worthy of 5 additional marks – **13 marks awarded***.*

**Devising a Plan**

Possible marks: 6 **Marks Awarded: 5**

**Minimum Requirements: 3 marks –***Candidates must achieve at least 1 mark for each of the minimum evidence requirements.*

**Negotiated dates for the planning, development and evaluation of the project**

The plan covers the three stages of the project and takes into account the deadlines for each stage as agreed with the assessor – *1 mark awarded.*

**Interim and final timescales and dates for conducting the investigation**

Timescales relate to the project objectives coherently and take into account both interim and final timescales. The plan is detailed with a carefully considered breakdown of tasks. The timescales set are realistic and take into account the proposed methodology. A further mark would have been awarded if the tasks had been more comprehensive. There were some obvious omissions – *3 marks awarded*.

**Identification of the resources (including time) required to carry out the investigation**

The project has been broken down into sufficiently detailed tasks. Time and resources have been identified for each task. Resources are, at times, quite basic - *1 mark awarded*.

**Additional Marks for the Plan**

**The extent to which the timescales are realistic and achievable**

**The way in which the plan takes account of the methodology proposed in the brief**

2 additional marks have been awarded relating to the detail with which the plan has been put together. Timescales for each task have been carefully considered and are both realistic and achievable. The plan also takes account of the proposed methodology. The plan has been broken down into a suitable level of detail and the tasks have been arranged in a logical order.

**Overall**

A comprehensive plan has been produced demonstrating a logical approach to project planning. The level of detail is worthy of 2 additional marks – **5 marks awarded**.

Assessment checklists

Stage 2: Developing (Maximum possible mark 52) Marks awarded 40/52

**Developing the Report**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Minimum evidence requirements** | **Minimum**  **Mark**  **Required \*** | **Maximum**  **Mark Available\*\*** | **Marks**  **Awarded** | **Criteria met for additional mark(s)\*\*** |
| 1. Detailed explanation of how the issue affects the organisation or organisations chosen. The explanation should be justified by explicit reference to the data collected and to concepts covered as in the mandatory Units of the Group Award. The explanation should be consistent with objectives at the planning stage. | 5 | 10 | **8** | Criterion 1: +1  Criterion 2: +1  Criterion 4: +1 |
| 1. Analysis of the primary and secondary sources of information and data collected | 5 | 10 | **6** | Criterion 5: +1 |
| 1. Assessment of the implications of these effects for the chosen organisation or organisations should be analysed in relation to the organisation(s), the business environment and the impact upon customers and should make reference to concepts and topics studied within the mandatory section of the Group Award | 6 | 12 | **8** | Criterion 3: +1  Criterion 6: +1 |
| 1. Statement of the conclusions drawn from the investigation and any appropriate recommendations to be made to the organisation(s). These should be explicitly related to the issues being investigated and the needs of customers | 4 | 8 | **7** | Criterion 7: +1  Criterion 8: +1  Criterion 9: +1 |
| **Total** | 20 | 40 | **29** |  |

\*Candidates must secure at least the minimum mark for each of the minimum evidence requirements.

\*\* Additional marks up to the maximum mark available may be awarded on the basis of the following criteria:

1. The extent to which the report makes explicit links to the brief and the plan of the investigation **+1 Mark**
2. The extent to which it is highly focused on the objectives of the investigation **+1 Mark**
3. The extent to which points made are justified with reference to concepts studied in the HND Business **+1 Mark**
4. The extent to which the justification of points is logical and well thought out **+1 Mark**
5. The careful and apposite selection of information to justify points made **+1 Mark**
6. The strength and validity of points made to justify statements in the report **+1 Mark**
7. How well the conclusions follow from the assessment **+1 Mark**
8. How closely the conclusions are explicitly linked to the assessments **+1 Mark**
9. The extent to which the conclusions are realistic and well thought through **+1 Mark**
10. The coherence with which the report is linked to the topic(s) in the HND Business

**Activity Log**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Minimum evidence requirements** | **Minimum**  **Mark**  **Required \*** | **Maximum**  **Mark Available\*\*** | **Marks**  **Awarded** | **Criteria met for additional mark(s)\*\*** |
| Planning Stage  Producing a log of activities carried out by the candidate. The log must include activities undertaken, resources used and time allocated. | 1 or 2 | 3 | **3** | Criterion: Detail and Reflection +1 |
| Development Stage  Producing a log of activities carried out by the candidate. The log must include activities undertaken, resources used and time allocated. | 1 or 2 | 3 | **3** | Criterion: Detail and Reflection +2 |
| **Total** | 3 | 6 | **6** |  |

\*Candidates must secure at least one mark in each of the two stages, and a minimum of three marks in total.

\*\*Additional marks up to the maximum mark available may be awarded on the basis of detail regarding activities undertaken, resources used and time allocated, and where reflection has been recorded.

**Presentation**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Minimum evidence requirements** | **Minimum**  **Mark**  **Required \*** | **Maximum**  **Mark Available\*\*** | **Marks**  **Awarded** | **Criteria met for additional mark(s)\*\*** |
| Candidates must present their investigation in a format suitable for a business report and which must include:   * A contents page * A summary of findings * Acknowledgements * References and a bibliography | 3 | 6 | **5** | Criterion 1: +1  Criterion 3: +1 |
| **Total** | 3 | 6 | **5** |  |

\*Candidates must secure at least the minimum mark for each of the minimum evidence requirements.

\*\*Additional marks up to the maximum mark available may be awarded on the basis of the following criteria:

1. The extent to which it is well structured and uses language of a high standard **+1Mark**
2. Its accuracy and its technical content
3. The way in which it makes use of appendices, diagrams, charts, etc to present information **+1Mark**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Developing Stage** | **Marks** |
| **Developing the Report** | **29** |
| **Activity Log** | **6** |
| **Presentation** | **5** |
| **Total mark for the Developing Stage** | **40** |

Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory Comments

**Satisfactory 40/52**

The comment column can be used to highlight any re-assessment that may be needed.

Overall comments:

**You have brought the information together well and have made good use of research findings and course concepts to back up your points.**

**Developing the Report**

Possible Marks: 40 **Marks Awarded: 29**

**Minimum Requirements – 20 marks**

**Detailed explanation of how the issue affects the organisation or organisations chosen. The explanation should be justified by explicit reference to the data collected and to concepts covered as in the mandatory units of the Group Award. The explanation should be consistent with objectives at the planning stage.**

The candidate has tended to jump right in without giving an overall introduction to this stage. However course concepts have been used well to give a theoretical basis for the claims made. The candidate has also made good use of research findings in evaluating the marketing strategy of the business. There is a lack of research on the economic impact of the business which has skewed the overall focus of the project – *8 marks awarded.*

**Analysis of the primary and secondary sources of information and data collected.**

The candidate has made good use of the research findings to inform the project and has provided strong and valid justifications for the claims made – *6 marks awarded.*

**Assessment of the implications of these effects for the chosen organisation or organisations should be analysed in relation to the organisation(s), the business environment and the impact upon customers and should make reference to concepts and topics studied within the mandatory section of the Group Award.**

The candidate makes reference to the implications of the effects of the issue under investigation by evaluating the organisation’s marketing strategy in relation to good practice in marketing and marketing models. The issue was analysed from the perspective of the organisation, existing customers, potential customers and other organisations. Again it would have been better to ensure that the claims regarding the effect on the local economy had more of a research basis – *8 marks awarded.*

**Statement of the conclusions drawn from the investigation and any appropriate recommendations to be made to the organisation(s). These should be explicitly related to the issues being investigated and the needs of the customers.**

The candidate has given reasoned and logical conclusions with justifications based on research findings. The candidate has put forward several recommendations which are appropriate for the business in question and relate to the needs of both the business and its customers. The conclusion makes no mention of the organisation’s marketing mix which was considered in some detail in the report – *7 marks awarded.*

**Additional Marks for Developing the Report**

The development stage of this project was worthy of 9 additional. It is well structured with lots of detail. There is explicit reference to two mandatory units from the Group Award.

The report was in keeping with the objectives and plan set out in the planning stage of the project. Evaluations made good use of HND course concepts and explicit and coherent links were made to these. The claims made were based on research findings and were justified well. The conclusions arrived at were meaningful and based on the candidate’s assessment of the situation. The recommendations suggested were well thought out and followed logically from the candidate’s assessment.

**Overall – 29 marks awarded**

**Activity Log**

Possible Marks: 6 **Marks Awarded: 6**

**Minimum Requirements: 3 marks –** *For the activity log candidates must secure at least 1 mark for each of the two stages, and a minimum of 3 marks in total. Additional marks up to the maximum of 3 marks for each stage may be awarded on the basis of detail regarding activities undertaken, resources used and time allocated, and where reflection has been recorded.*

**Produce a log of activities carried out by the candidate. The log must include activities undertaken, resources used and time allocated.**

The candidate has provided a detailed activity log covering all three stages of the project. The log records the time spent, resources used and reflective comments. The log shows evidence of both evaluation and reflection. The reflection carried out gives a meaningful insight into the candidate’s thought processes as well as the activities undertaken. The three basic marks were gained with three additional marks awarded - *6 marks awarded*.

**Additional marks for the Activity Log**

**Detail and Reflection**

3 Additional marks have been awarded for the reflection evident throughout the log, the honest and relevant appraisal of events and the self-awareness shown

**Overall – 6 marks awarded**

**Presentation**

Possible Marks: 6 **Marks Awarded: 5**

**Minimum Requirements: 3 marks –** *Candidates must secure at least 3 marks by meeting each of the minimum evidence requirements.*

Candidates must present their investigation in a format suitable for a business report and which must include:

* A contents page
* A summary of findings
* Acknowledgements
* References and a bibliography

The project contains all of the requirements to gain the minimum of three marks and two additional marks were awarded – *5 marks awarded*.

**Additional Marks for Presentation**

**The way in which it makes use of appendices, diagrams, charts, etc to present information**

The project has been well presented with effective use made of appendices, diagrams and charts to illustrate findings – 1 mark awarded.

**The structure and standard of language used**

The candidate uses a fairly mature and business-like style of writing – 1 mark awarded.

**Overall – 5 marks awarded**

Assessment checklists

Stage 3: Evaluating (Maximum Possible 24 marks) Marks awarded 16/24

**Evaluating Stage**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Minimum evidence requirements** | **Minimum**  **Mark**  **Required \*** | **Marks**  **Awarded** | **Criteria met for additional mark(s)\*\*** |
| 1. A brief outline of the investigation | 1 | **1** |  |
| 1. Assessment of the extent to which each of the original objectives of the investigation have been met. This should include reference to any modifications made during the course of the investigation and their importance and to any alternative courses of action considered but rejected. Throughout, the assessment should be supported with credible reasons. | 2 | **3** | Criterion 2: +1 |
| 1. Commentary on aspects of the planning and developing stages which worked effectively and why and/or aspects of the planning and development stages which did not work as effectively as expected. Three separate aspects should be covered - one for the planning brief, one for the plan and one for the development report | 2 | **2** |  |
| 1. Assessment of the reliability and validity of the primary and secondary sources of information | 1 | **2** | Criterion 4: +1 |
| 1. Assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the report of the investigation. This should be supported by credible reasons and cover at least one strength and at least one weakness | 2 | **2** |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Recommendations for future investigations. These should be based on items above and must relate to the personal development of the candidate (e.g. in terms of the further development of skills used in this investigation) and aspects of the process or product of the investigation (e.g. with respect to setting timescales, gathering information or possible future investigations). It should be clear from the recommendations that the candidate has reflected on what happened and has drawn conclusions from this reflection | 2 | **3** | Criterion 7: +1 |
| 1. Assessment of new skills and knowledge gained during the process of the investigation | 2 | **3** | Criterion 10: +1 |
| **Total marks awarded** | 12 | **16** |  |

\*Candidates must secure at least the minimum mark for each of the minimum evidence requirements.

\*\*Up to the maximum of 12 additional marks may be awarded on the basis of the following criteria:

1. The extent to which the evaluation demonstrates clear and explicit links between the three stages of the investigation
2. The extent to which it is highly focused on the objectives of the investigation **+ 1 Mark**
3. The extent to which it makes accurate and apposite reference to relevant concepts studied in the HND Business
4. The strength and validity of the points made to justify statements **+ 1 Mark**
5. The extent to which the justification of points is logical, credible and well thought out
6. The extent to which reflection is considered and careful and relates explicitly to the candidate’s experience during the investigation
7. How well the recommendations follow from the candidate’s reflection and how well the report explicitly draws a connection between reflection and recommendation **+ 1 Mark**
8. The extent to which recommendations are realistic
9. The extent to which the evaluation as a whole is logical and directly related to the investigation carried out by the candidate
10. The extent to which the assessment of new skills and knowledge gained during the process of the investigation is reflective and evaluative **+ 1 Mark**

Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory Comments

**Satisfactory 16/24**

The comment column can be used to highlight any re-assessment that may be needed.

Overall comments:

**The evaluation is of a high standard. It is well structured and reflective providing a clear insight in the strengths and limitations of the project.**

**Evaluation**

Possible Marks: 24 **Marks Awarded: 16**

**Minimum Requirements: 12 marks**

**A brief outline of the investigation**

A brief outline of the project has been provided which effectively summarises the purpose, strategy and main conclusions of the project – *1 mark awarded*.

**Assessment of the extent to which each of the original objectives of the investigation have been met. This should include reference to any modifications made during the course of the investigation and their importance and to any alternative courses of action considered but rejected. Throughout, the assessment should be supported with credible reasons.**

The candidate has provided a systematic assessment of the extent to which each of the objectives identified in the brief have been met. This includes reasons for adopting alternative courses of action and gains the minimum of 2 mark splus 1 additional mark – *3 marks awarded*.

**Commentary on aspects of the planning and developing stages which worked effectively and why and/or aspects of the planning and development stages which did not work as effectively as expected. Three separate aspects should be covered - one for the planning brief, one for the plan and one for the development report**

The brief, plan and development have all been considered in terms of whether or not they were effective and worked well or not. Alterations to the original plan were justified and the limitations of the research findings were identified - *2 marks awarded*.

**Assessment of the reliability and validity of the primary and secondary sources of information**

The assessment was detailed but there was a tendency for the candidate to describe at times rather than assess. There was evidence of reflection on the limitations of the sources of information used. The minimum mark was awarded plus one additional mark for the detail within the assessment and the reflection on limitations - *2 marks awarded*.

**Assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the report of the investigation. This should be supported by credible reasons and cover at least one strength and at least one weakness**

The candidate has provided a brief but realistic appraisal of some of the strengths and weaknesses of the report. A more detailed and incisive appraisal would be required to gain additional marks - *2 marks awarded*.

**Recommendations for future investigations. These should be based on items above and must relate to the personal development of the candidate (e.g. in terms of the further development of skills used in this investigation) and aspects of the process or product of the investigation (e.g. with respect to setting timescales, gathering information or possible future investigations). It should be clear from the recommendations that the candidate has reflected on what happened and has drawn conclusions from this reflection**

The candidate has put forward clear recommendations on what they might do differently in a future project. The recommendations are in line with reflections and this helps contribute towards an extra mark so 2 marks are awarded plus 1 additional mark – *3 marks awarded*.

**Assessment of new skills and knowledge gained during the process of the investigation**

A detailed assessment of new skills has been provided with evidence of reflection and evaluation. 2 marks awarded plus 1 additional mark – *3 marks awarded*.

**Additional marks for Evaluation**

**The extent to which the evaluation is highly focused on the objectives of the investigation**

The evaluation of objectives is systematic and highly focused – 1 additional mark.

**The strength and validity of the points made to justify statements**

The points made are relevant and valid with strong justifications provided – 1 additional mark.

**The extent to which reflection is considered and careful and relates explicitly to the candidate’s experience during the investigation**

Reflective comments are well-founded and give a clear insight into the candidate’s experience during the investigation – 1 additional mark.

**The extent to which the assessment of new skills and knowledge gained during the process of the investigation is reflective and evaluative.**

The assessment of new skills and knowledge gained is reflective and shows a high level of self-awareness – 1 additional mark.

**Overall – 16 Marks awarded**

**OVERALL MARK FOR THE PROJECT INVESTIGATION**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PLANNING STAGE** | **Marks**  **Awarded** | **Marks**  **Available** |
| Developing a Brief | **13** | 18 |
| Acceptable Activity Log submitted (Must be yes to proceed) | **Yes** | Yes |
| Devising a Plan | **5** | 6 |
| **Total mark for the Planning Stage** | **18** | 24 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **DEVELOPING STAGE** | **Marks Awarded** | **Marks Available** |
| Developing the Report | **29** | 40 |
| Activity Log | **6** | 6 |
| Presentation | **5** | 6 |
| **Total mark for the Developing Stage** | **40** | 52 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **EVALUATING STAGE** | **Marks** | **Marks Available** |
| Evaluation | **16** | 24 |
| **Total mark for the Evaluating Stage** | **16** | 24 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **TOTAL MARKS** | **74** | 100 |

Grade C Project Investigation

Final Mark 55%

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PLANNING STAGE** | **Mark Awarded** | **Mark Available** |
| Developing a Brief | **9** | 18 |
| Acceptable Activity Log submitted (Must be yes to proceed) | **Yes** | Yes |
| Devising a Plan | **4** | 6 |
| **Total mark for the Planning Stage** | **13** | 24 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **DEVELOPING STAGE** | **Marks Available** | **Marks Available** |
| Developing the Report | **20** | 40 |
| Activity Log | **4** | 6 |
| Presentation | **4** | 6 |
| **Total mark for the Developing Stage** | **28** | 52 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **EVALUATING STAGE** | **Marks Awarded** | **Marks Available** |
| Evaluation | **14** | 24 |
| **Total mark for the Evaluating Stage** | **14** | 24 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **TOTAL MARKS** | **55** | 100 |

Assessment checklists

**Stage 1: Planning (Maximum possible mark 24) Marks Awarded 13/24**

**Developing a Brief**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Minimum evidence requirements** | **Minimum**  **Mark**  **Required \*** | **Maximum**  **Mark Available\*\*** | **Marks**  **Awarded** | **Criteria met for additional mark(s)\*\*** |
| 1. Initial personal assessment of the candidate’s skills | 1 | 3 | **2** | Criterion 1: +1 |
| 1. An appropriate title of the project | 1 | 1 | **1** |  |
| 1. Statement of the issue to be investigated. This should cover how it involves meeting the needs of customers and who the relevant customers are | 1 | 2 | **1** |  |
| 1. Aims and objectives of the project | 1 | 2 | **1** |  |
| 1. Reasons for the choice of issue which must be directly related to a topic or topics covered as part of the group award | 1 | 3 | **1** |  |
| 1. Justification for the choice of business or businesses involved | 1 | 2 | **1** |  |
| 1. Explanation of the range of primary and secondary sources of information which will be used for the investigation and justification for the choice of each source | 1 | 2 | **1** |  |
| 1. Explanation of the how the investigation will be conducted with justification for the choice of methods used | 1 | 3 | **1** |  |
| **Total marks awarded** | 9\* | 24 | **9** |  |

\*Candidates must secure at least one mark for each of the minimum evidence requirements, plus one additional mark.

\*\* Additional marks up to the maximum mark available may be awarded on the basis of the following criteria:

1. A detailed and realistic assessment of the candidates skills **+1 Mark**
2. The strength of reasoning for the choice of the issue and its links with the course
3. Clear objectives which are specific, realistic, measurable, achievable and time bound
4. The range and variety of sources of information chosen
5. The extent to which sources of information selected have been justified
6. The extent to which the methodology is apposite and well-chosen
7. The clarity and logical strength of justifications given for the choice of methods
8. The coherence with which the assessment criteria are linked to the topic(s) in the HND Business

**Devising a Plan**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Minimum evidence requirements** | **Minimum**  **Mark**  **Required \*** | **Maximum**  **Mark Available\*\*** | **Marks**  **Awarded** | **Criteria met for additional mark(s)\*\*** |
| 1. Negotiated dates for the planning, development and evaluation of the project | 1 | 1 | **1** |  |
| 1. Interim and final timescales and dates for conducting the investigation, which should be related to the objectives of the investigation | 1 | 4 | **2** | Criterion 3: +1 |
| 1. Identification of the resources (including time) required to carry out the investigation | 1 | 1 | **1** |  |
| **Total marks awarded** | 3 | 6 | **4** |  |

\*Candidates must secure at least one mark for each of the minimum evidence requirements.

\*\* Additional marks up to the maximum mark available may be awarded on the basis of the following criteria:

1. The coherence with which the timescales are related to the objectives of the investigation
2. The extent to which the plan demonstrates the links between the three parts of the investigation
3. The extent to which the timescales are realistic and achievable **+1 Mark**
4. The way in which the plan takes account of the methodology proposed in the brief

**Activity Log**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Minimum evidence requirements** | **Minimum Mark Required** | **Acceptable log submitted** |
| Producing a log of activities carried out by the candidate. The log must include activities undertaken, resources used and time allocated. | No marks are allocated in the Planning Stage, but a log including activities undertaken, resources used and time allocated **must** be submitted. | Log submitted and acceptable |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Planning Stage** | **Marks** |
| **Developing a Brief** | **9** |
| **Acceptable Activity Log submitted (Must be yes to proceed)** | **Yes** |
| **Devising a Plan** | **4** |
| **Total mark for the Planning Stage** | **13** |

Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory Comments

**Satisfactory 13/24**

The comment column can be used to highlight any re-assessment that may be needed.

Overall comments:

**You have made a reasonable start here. There is a good depth of analysis in your personal skills assessment. You could have been more specific in your objectives. You should also try to go into more detail when giving reasons, and strengthen the links to the course.**

**Stage 1: Planning**

**Developing a Brief**

Possible marks: 18 **Marks Awarded: 9**

**Minimum Requirements: 9 Marks –** *Candidates must achieve at least 1 mark for each of the minimum evidence requirements plus 1 additional mark*.

**Initial personal assessment of the candidate’s skills**

The personal assessment of the candidate’s skills is both reasoned and balanced. The style is reflective and considers both strengths and weaknesses. The assessment is solid but it drifts away at points into possible areas where support might be given. This is a difficult area to mark, but the detail and realistic assessment of the candidates personal skills combined with their reflective comments merited the basic mark plus an additional mark – *2 marks awarded*.

**An appropriate title of the project**

The title is appropriate and relevant - *1 mark awarded*.

**Statement of the issue to be investigated (This should cover how it involves meeting the needs of customers and who the relevant customers are)**

The statement is clear but fails to identify that it is the ‘sales’ training programme that is under scrutiny. The statement does clearly identify the customers’ i.e. internal customers, and also makes reference to assessing the impact of the new scheme on external customers. The statement lacks clarity – *1 mark awarded*.

**Aims and objectives of the project**

An advantage that the candidate has is the simplicity of the project which is in essence a compare and contrast exercise. The objectives are realistic, logical and meaningful, but they lack a certain precision and are likely to lead to a subjective assessment of the situation. As a result the basic mark has been gained – *1 mark awarded.*

**Reasons for the choice of issue which must be directly related to a topic or topics covered as part of the group award**

The reasons for the choice of issue are very brief and limited. There is however a degree of overlap between this section and the statement of the issue and the justification sections. The linkage to the course is weak and very brief but has been

attempted, and the candidate has stated what they are doing and why, but this is mainly contained within the statement of the issue section. The candidate has linked the project to one of the core units and made links with two optional units. It is essential that the candidate links the project to one or more units within the mandatory section of the HND and the linkage is weak. The candidate has not really been specific in linking to theory/concepts but does make reference to using a theory from Managing People and Organisations. On reflection this might have been an area where the candidate was asked to strengthen and expand their response. This is a matter of judgement and it was decided that across the content of the brief there was sufficient evidence to justify a single mark – *1 mark awarded*.

**Justification for the choice of business or businesses involved**

The argument for the choice of business is justified in terms of convenient access to information about the company, and also in that the company is appropriate in terms of its products and size. The argument is brief and basic and is not always relevant. The company history is interesting and informative and has a place, but there could be a stronger emphasis on the personal selling nature of the business and how in terms of the project topic it makes Avon an ideal choice – *1 mark awarded*.

**Explanation of the range of primary and secondary sources of information which will be used for the investigation and justification for the choice of each source**

The primary research methodology involves conducting a single interview and a questionnaire survey of undefined size. There is a lack of appreciation of the relative weakness of the information that might be gained and also the scope for bias in the information obtained. The secondary sources of information are also credible but are again restricted and produced by the company. The overall explanation and justification has a slightly naïve air which whilst being a subjective viewpoint does contribute towards a feeling that the candidate is unaware of the pros and cons of the information they will gain and use – *1 mark awarded*.

**Explanation of the how the investigation will be conducted with justification for the choice of methods used**

This section has been incorporated with the previous section, and this may well be a common approach adopted by candidates, particularly by those that are likely to gain a basic pass mark. The methodology is simple and there is a lack of detail and appreciation of the limitations of the approaches suggested. The explanation is lacking in terms of considered thought and justification, but it is a genuine attempt at providing a framework that will allow for information to be gathered - *1 mark awarded*.

**Additional marks for Project Brief**

**A detailed and realistic assessment of the candidate’s skills**

The candidate has given an open, honest and reflective appraisal of their personal skills, and merits an additional mark beyond the minimum mark. It must be noted that a candidate must gain a minimum of one additional mark in addition to all of the basic marks to pass the brief - *1 additional mark awarded*.

**Overall**

Whilst the overall project is relatively simple and appealing, the brief lacks substance. The personal skills assessment is good, but the following sections of the brief require more thought, greater clarity and expansion. The overall feeling having studied the brief is that the 9 marks awarded is justified, although it would have been justifiable to have asked for some additional work to be undertaken - **9 marks awarded.**

**Devising a Plan**

Possible marks: 6 **Marks Awarded: 4**

**Minimum Requirements: 3 marks**

**Negotiated dates for the planning, development and evaluation of the project**

The candidate worked through and completed the project in accordance with the deadlines negotiated with the assessor. The candidate discussed the project with the assessor and sought guidance regarding the projects time constraints - *1 mark awarded*.

**Interim and final timescales and dates for conducting the investigation, which should be related to the objectives of the investigation**

The plan has been created using the task entry sheet in Microsoft Project and covers all three stages of the project. There is considerable detail in the plan breaking the project down into 76 tasks (including summary tasks), and an identification of a possible duration against each task identified. It is difficult to place a set time on each task and whilst there is a lot of detail some of the durations are lengthy. As a result the plan has been awarded an additional mark beyond the minimum requirement, but greater information about the tasks and more realistic times for some of the tasks would have earned further marks - *2 marks awarded*.

**Identification of the resources (including time) required to carry out the investigation**

The candidate has identified some resources such as class notes and a book etc within the brief. In the plan there is a clear identification of resources against each of the tasks within the project. The resources will often be quite basic such as PC, book etc - *1 mark awarded*.

**Additional marks for the Plan**

**The extent to which the timescales are realistic and achievable**

**The way in which the plan takes account of the methodology proposed in the brief**

Two additional marks have been awarded and these were gained for the extent to which the timescales are realistic and achievable, and the way in which the plan takes account of the methodology proposed in the brief. It is difficult to be specific in selecting the criteria against which the additional marks are awarded for the plan. In this case the plan contains a lot of detail in terms of the number of tasks, which were organised in a logical order and the timescales were generally realistic. In short some thought had been put into what had to be done in relation to the proposals and methodology set out in the brief, and a reasoned assessment of how long the tasks would be likely to take had been made - 1 additional mark awarded.

**Overall**

The plan is quite good in terms of the task detail and times. The resourcing is rather limited, but this is often going to be the case in a basic business investigation, where there is unlikely to be the need for anything out of the ordinary in resourcing terms. The use of Microsoft Project again is a sign that effort and an organised approach have been applied in the planning of the project. It must be recognised that the use of project management software will not guarantee that the resulting plan is good, nor is its use a prerequisite in producing a good plan. In this instance the plan is worthy of an additional mark - **4 marks awarded**.

Assessment checklists

Stage 2: Developing (Maximum possible mark 52) Marks awarded 40/52

**Developing the Report**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Minimum evidence requirements** | **Minimum**  **Mark**  **Required \*** | **Maximum**  **Mark Available\*\*** | **Marks**  **Awarded** | **Criteria met for additional mark(s)\*\*** |
| 1. Detailed explanation of how the issue affects the organisation or organisations chosen. The explanation should be justified by explicit reference to the data collected and to concepts covered as in the mandatory Units of the Group Award. The explanation should be consistent with objectives at the planning stage. | 5 | 10 | **5** |  |
| 1. Analysis of the primary and secondary sources of information and data collected | 5 | 10 | **5** |  |
| 1. Assessment of the implications of these effects for the chosen organisation or organisations should be analysed in relation to the organisation(s), the business environment and the impact upon customers and should make reference to concepts and topics studied within the mandatory section of the Group Award | 6 | 12 | **6** |  |
| 1. Statement of the conclusions drawn from the investigation and any appropriate recommendations to be made to the organisation(s). These should be explicitly related to the issues being investigated and the needs of customers | 4 | 8 | **4** |  |
| **Total marks awarded** | 20 | 40 | **20** |  |

\*Candidates must secure at least the minimum mark for each of the minimum evidence requirements.

\*\* Additional marks up to the maximum mark available may be awarded on the basis of the following criteria:

1. The extent to which the report makes explicit links to the brief and the plan of the investigation
2. The extent to which it is highly focused on the objectives of the investigation
3. The extent to which points made are justified with reference to concepts studied in the HND Business
4. The extent to which the justification of points is logical and well thought out
5. The careful and apposite selection of information to justify points made
6. The strength and validity of points made to justify statements in the report
7. How well the conclusions follow from the assessment
8. How closely the conclusions are explicitly linked to the assessments
9. The extent to which the conclusions are realistic and well thought through
10. The coherence with which the report is linked to the topic(s) in the HND Business

**Activity Log**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Minimum evidence requirements** | **Minimum**  **Mark**  **Required \*** | **Maximum**  **Mark Available\*\*** | **Marks**  **Awarded** | **Criteria met for additional mark(s)\*\*** |
| Planning Stage  Producing a log of activities carried out by the candidate. The log must include activities undertaken, resources used and time allocated. | 1 or 2 | 3 | **2** |  |
| Development Stage  Producing a log of activities carried out by the candidate. The log must include activities undertaken, resources used and time allocated. | 1 or 2 | 3 | **2** | Criterion: Detail and Reflection +1 |
| **Total marks awarded** | 3 | 6 | **4** |  |

\*Candidates must secure at least one mark in each of the two stages, and a minimum of three marks in total.

\*\*Additional marks up to the maximum mark available may be awarded on the basis of detail regarding activities undertaken, resources used and time allocated, and where reflection has been recorded.

**Presentation**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Minimum evidence requirements** | **Minimum**  **Mark**  **Required \*** | **Maximum**  **Mark Available\*\*** | **Marks**  **Awarded** | **Criteria met for additional mark(s)\*\*** |
| Candidates must present their investigation in a format suitable for a business report and which must include:   * A contents page * A summary of findings * Acknowledgements * References and a bibliography | 3 | 6 | **4** | Criterion 3: +1 |
| **Total marks awarded** |  |  | **4** |  |

\*Candidates must secure at least the minimum mark for each of the minimum evidence requirements.

\*\*Additional marks up to the maximum mark available may be awarded on the basis of the following criteria:

1. The extent to which it is well structured and uses language of a high standard
2. Its accuracy and its technical content
3. The way in which it makes use of appendices, diagrams, charts, etc to present information **+1Mark**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Developing Stage** | **Marks** |
| **Developing the Report** | **20** |
| **Activity Log** | **4** |
| **Presentation** | **4** |
| **Total mark for the Developing Stage** | **28** |

Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory Comments

**Satisfactory 14/24**

The comment column can be used to highlight any re-assessment that may be needed.

Overall comments:

**You have made a good attempt at bringing the information together. A clearer explanation of the content of the sales training programme would have been beneficial. Also stronger linkage to the concepts and theory in the course would also have strengthened the project, in particular links to the mandatory Units.**

**Developing the Report**

Possible Marks: 40 **Marks Awarded: 28**

**Minimum Requirements: 26 marks**

**Detailed explanation of how the issue affects the organisation or organisations chosen. The explanation should be justified by explicit reference to the data collected and to concepts covered as in the mandatory Units of the Group Award. The explanation should be consistent with objectives at the planning stage.**

The introduction is a little confusing and it is difficult to assess whether the new sales training programme has been already created or if it is still work in progress. The historical narrative is interesting but could have given greater prominence to the importance of personal selling to highlight the crucial role of the sales training programme to the company. The link to concepts is weak - *5 marks awarded*.

**Analysis of the primary and secondary sources of information and data collected**

Some background information on the current sales training programme and the training document would have been beneficial at this point, rather than after the SWOT analysis section. The personal appraisal of the programme and the training document are useful, but could endanger the results of the questionnaire that follows on after the SWOT section. The questionnaire results are positive and the question that comes to mind is, why change it if it is working so well? The need for change section answers this, but it is unclear where the information came from. The interview gives a valuable insight into the two programmes, but it is based upon one person’s opinion - *5 marks awarded*.

**Assessment of the implications of these effects for the chosen organisation or organisations should be analysed in relation to the organisation(s), the business environment and the impact upon customers and should make reference to concepts and topics studied within the mandatory section of the Group Award**

There is an evaluation of the existing programme and the new sales training programme. Reference is made to the implications throughout the development stage of the project. A greater focus could have been placed upon stressing the importance of the sales training programme, this would have helped to highlight the possible implications of having a better sales training programme - *6 marks awarded*.

**Statement of the conclusions drawn from the investigation and any appropriate recommendations to be made to the organisation(s). These should be explicitly related to the issues being investigated and the needs of customers**

The candidate produces a reasoned and balanced set of conclusions and recommendations. It is difficult to assess how much of the conclusion section is based upon Avon’s own review of the programmes as opposed to the candidate’s own research. The candidate has arrived at some of the conclusions and recommendations based upon their own investigations - *4 marks awarded*.

**Additional marks for Developing the Report**

No additional marks were awarded for the first four evidence requirements.

**Overall – 20 marks awarded**

**Activity Log**

Possible Marks: 6 **Marks Awarded: 4**

**Minimum Requirements: 3 marks –** *For the activity log candidates must secure at least 1 mark for each of the two stages, and a minimum of 3 marks in total. Additional marks up to the maximum of 3 marks for each stage may be awarded on the basis of detail regarding activities undertaken, resources used and time allocated, and where reflection has been recorded.*

**Producing a log of activities carried out by the candidate. The log must include activities undertaken, resources used and time allocated.**

The candidate has provided an activity log on a week by week basis covering all three stages of the project. The log records the time spent, resources used and a mainly descriptive but fairly detailed account of what activity took place. The three basic marks were gained and an additional mark was awarded - *4 marks awarded*.

**Additional marks for the Activity Log**

**Detail and Reflection**

An additional mark has been awarded for the reflection that was contained in some of the comments and the level of detail in the log - 1 mark awarded.

**Overall – 4 marks awarded**

**Presentation**

Possible Marks: 6 **Marks Awarded: 4**

**Minimum Requirements: 3 marks -** *Candidates must secure at least 3 marks by meeting each of the minimum evidence requirements.*

Candidates must present their investigation in a format suitable for a business report and which must include:

* A contents page
* A summary of findings
* Acknowledgements
* References and a bibliography

The project contains all of the requirements to gain the minimum of three marks and an additional mark was awarded - *4 marks awarded*.

**Additional marks**

**The way in which it makes use of appendices, diagrams, charts, etc to present information**

Overall the project has been well presented and an additional mark was awarded for the content of the appendices - 1 mark awarded.

**Overall – 4 marks awarded**

**Developing Stage**

The development stage is a little disjointed at the start and confused and the structure is difficult to match against that suggested. There is no explicit reference to mandatory Units, but there are a limited number of explicit references to concepts and latterly the ‘four level’ model. There could be some doubt as to whether the project is tackling an area covered by a mandatory Unit. It is unclear how much the project is a reiteration of Avon’s own findings, but the project is an honest attempt at investigating a business issue. The activity log is quite detailed and contains some reflection, and the overall presentation is solid and it was felt merited a modest recognition **– 28 marks awarded**.

Assessment checklists

Stage 3: Evaluating (Maximum Possible 24 marks) Marks Awarded 14/24

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Minimum evidence requirements** | **Minimum**  **Mark**  **Required \*** | **Marks**  **Awarded** | **Criteria met for additional mark(s)\*\*** |
| 1. A brief outline of the investigation | 1 | **1** |  |
| 1. Assessment of the extent to which each of the original objectives of the investigation have been met. This should include reference to any modifications made during the course of the investigation and their importance and to any alternative courses of action considered but rejected. Throughout, the assessment should be supported with credible reasons. | 2 | **4** | Criterion 4: +1  Criterion 6: +1  These additional marks are not awarded for any specific part of the evaluation |
| 1. Commentary on aspects of the planning and developing stages which worked effectively and why and/or aspects of the planning and development stages which did not work as effectively as expected. Three separate aspects should be covered - one for the planning brief, one for the plan and one for the development report | 2 | **2** |  |
| 1. Assessment of the reliability and validity of the primary and secondary sources of information | 1 | **1** |  |
| 1. Assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the report of the investigation. This should be supported by credible reasons and cover at least one strength and at least one weakness | 2 | **2** |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Recommendations for future investigations. These should be based on items above and must relate to the personal development of the candidate (e.g. in terms of the further development of skills used in this investigation) and aspects of the process or product of the investigation (e.g. with respect to setting timescales, gathering information or possible future investigations). It should be clear from the recommendations that the candidate has reflected on what happened and has drawn conclusions from this reflection | 2 | **2** |  |
| 1. Assessment of new skills and knowledge gained during the process of the investigation | 2 | **2** |  |
| **Total marks awarded** | 12 | **14** |  |

\*Candidates must secure at least the minimum mark for each of the minimum evidence requirements.

\*\*Up to the maximum of 12 additional marks may be awarded on the basis of the following criteria:

1. The extent to which the evaluation demonstrates clear and explicit links between the three stages of the investigation
2. The extent to which it is highly focused on the objectives of the investigation
3. The extent to which it makes accurate and apposite reference to relevant concepts studied in the HND Business
4. The strength and validity of the points made to justify statements **+ 1 Mark**
5. The extent to which the justification of points is logical, credible and well thought out
6. The extent to which reflection is considered and careful and relates explicitly to the candidate’s experience during the investigation **+ 1 Mark**
7. How well the recommendations follow from the candidate’s reflection and how well the report explicitly draws a connection between reflection and recommendation
8. The extent to which recommendations are realistic
9. The extent to which the evaluation as a whole is logical and directly related to the investigation carried out by the candidate
10. The extent to which the assessment of new skills and knowledge gained during the process of the investigation is reflective and evaluative

Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory Comments

**Satisfactory 14/24**

The comment column can be used to highlight any re-assessment that may be needed.

Overall comments:

**Overall a considered evaluation with some reflection. A more thorough evaluation would have been welcomed, but a good attempt nevertheless.**

**Evaluation**

Possible Marks: 24 **Marks Awarded: 14**

**Minimum Requirements: 12 marks**

**A brief outline of the investigation**

A brief outline of the project has been provided that provides a description of the project - *1 mark awarded*.

**Assessment of the extent to which each of the original objectives of the investigation have been met. This should include reference to any modifications made during the course of the investigation and their importance and to any alternative courses of action considered but rejected. Throughout, the assessment should be supported with credible reasons.**

The candidate has assessed the extent to which each of the objectives identified in the brief have been met. The candidate has made a reasoned assessment and therefore gains the basic marks - 2 marks awarded. An additional 2 marks have been recorded against this section on the checklist, and a rationale is provided under the heading of ‘additional marks’ below – *4 marks awarded*.

**Commentary on aspects of the planning and developing stages which worked effectively and why and/or aspects of the planning and development stages which did not work as effectively as expected. Three separate aspects should be covered - one for the planning brief, one for the plan and one for the development report**

The brief, plan and development have all been considered in terms of whether or not they were effective and all worked well or not. A degree of consideration was evident in recognising that some aspects may have been more effective if tackled differently - *2 marks awarded*.

**Assessment of the reliability and validity of the primary and secondary sources of information**

Both primary and secondary sources of information were assessed in terms of reliability and validity. The assessment was basic and failed to recognise the weakness in having a single interview, but there was recognition that there could be problems with some of the secondary information - *1 mark awarded*.

**Assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the report of the investigation. This should be supported by credible reasons and cover at least one strength and at least one weakness**

The candidate has made a fair but basic appraisal of some of the strengths and weaknesses of the report, but greater depth would be required to gain additional marks - *2 marks awarded*.

**Recommendations for future investigations. These should be based on items above and must relate to the personal development of the candidate (e.g. in terms of the further development of skills used in this investigation) and aspects of the process or product of the investigation (e.g. with respect to setting timescales, gathering information or possible future investigations). It should be clear from the recommendations that the candidate has reflected on what happened and has drawn conclusions from this reflection**

The candidate has made a reasoned set of recommendations on what they might do differently in a future project - *2 marks awarded*.

**Assessment of new skills and knowledge gained during the process of the investigation**

A fair assessment of five new skills has been made and the basic marks have been awarded. Again this section helps contribute towards the additional marks awarded - *2 marks awarded*.

**Additional marks for the Evaluation**

The additional marks awarded are not tied to one specific section of the evaluation. Evidence for the criteria can be found at different points in the evaluation, for example in the assessment of objectives, and in other sections. A balanced view was taken that sufficient evidence exists at various points in the evaluation to justify the awarding of the two additional marks. It was also judged that on the basis of the evaluation as a whole, it would not have been appropriate to award further marks for these criteria.

**The strength and validity of the points made to justify statements**

The candidate has throughout the evaluation given consideration to what they have achieve in the project and has tried to complete each part of the evaluation in a reasoned manner - 1 mark awarded.

**The extent to which reflection is considered and careful and relates explicitly to the candidate’s experience during the investigation**

There is evidence of the candidate making reflective comment which provides an element of considered thought to the evaluation, and this is rewarded with an additional mark - 1 mark awarded.

**Overall**

The evaluation is structured and contains some good reflection and consideration of what worked well, and how the candidate might conduct a future investigation. Overall the evaluation was felt to be above the minimum that was required – **14 marks awarded**.

**OVERALL MARK FOR THE PROJECT INVESTIGATION**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PLANNING STAGE** | **Mark Awarded** | **Mark Available** |
| Developing a Brief | **9** | 18 |
| Acceptable Activity Log submitted (Must be yes to proceed) | **Yes** | Yes |
| Devising a Plan | **4** | 6 |
| **Total mark for the Planning Stage** | **13** | 24 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **DEVELOPING STAGE** | **Marks Available** | **Marks Available** |
| Developing the Report | **20** | 40 |
| Activity Log | **4** | 6 |
| Presentation | **4** | 6 |
| **Total mark for the Developing Stage** | **28** | 52 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **EVALUATING STAGE** | **Marks Awarded** | **Marks Available** |
| Evaluation | **14** | 24 |
| **Total mark for the Evaluating Stage** | **14** | 24 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **TOTAL MARKS** | **55** | 100 |