PROJECTS

Moderators' report

EXTENDED PROJECT

H857
For first teaching in 2017

H857/01/02 Summer 2019 series

Version 1

Contents

Would you prefer a Word version?

Did you know that you can save this pdf as a Word file using Acrobat Professional?

Simply click on **File** > **Save As Other . . .** and select **Microsoft Word**

(If you have opened this PDF in your browser you will need to save it first. Simply right click anywhere on the page and select *Save as . . .* to save the PDF. Then open the PDF in Acrobat Professional.)

If you do not have access to Acrobat Professional there are a number of **free** applications available that will also convert PDF to Word (search for *pdf to word* converter).

We value your feedback

We'd like to know your view on the resources we produce. By clicking on the icon above you will help us to ensure that our resources work for you.

Introduction

Our Moderators' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on centres' assessment of moderated work, based on what has been observed by our moderation team. These reports include a general commentary of accuracy of internal assessment judgements; identify good practice in relation to evidence collation and presentation and comments on the quality of centre assessment decisions against individual Learning Objectives. This report also highlights areas where requirements have been misinterpreted and provides guidance to centre assessors on requirements for accessing higher mark bands. Where appropriate, the report will also signpost to other sources of information that centre assessors will find helpful.

OCR completes moderation of centre-assessed work in order to quality assure the internal assessment judgements made by assessors within a centre. Where OCR cannot confirm the centre's marks, we may adjust them in order to align them to the national standard. Any adjustments to centre marks are detailed on the Moderation Adjustments report, which can be downloaded from Interchange when results are issued. Centres should also refer to their individual centre report provided after moderation has been completed. In combination, these centre-specific documents and this overall report should help to support centres' internal assessment and moderation practice for future series.

General overview

The June 2019 series was the third submission under the H857 specification, and the changes to the qualification are now well established amongst centres.

The majority of submissions are still by post, and submissions via the OCR Repository are still very much a small minority. Most centres submitted their samples on time and in a well-ordered manner. There is certainly a reduction in the use of large ring binders for submissions which is a welcome development, as they do not fare well in the postal system.

There is generally excellent use of the URS form, and increasing numbers of markers are completing these electronically which aids legibility. There is still a small minority of URS sheets which contain scant information, and in some cases the writing is illegible. This can make it very difficult to justify the centre's marking.

The use of internal moderation within centres is certainly on the increase and this is a welcome development, as it generally increases accuracy and consistency of marking. There have however been a significant number of projects where the final mark on the URS has not matched that on the OCR system, and it has then been necessary to contact the centre to check which mark was intended. After internal moderation, it would be helpful if the URS could be annotated with the final mark agreed internally, and that this is the mark entered onto the OCR system.

Most common causes of centres not passing

Insufficient or no time limited forward planning included in a project. For the highest marks, the plan needs to be sophisticated and updated with progress.

No reflective diary or log.

Insufficient research cited for a dissertation project, three or four sources are insufficient.

Inappropriate use of questionnaires where there is little or no benefit to the project in carrying out a questionnaire. Surveys and questionnaires can be highly effective, but only if they are targeted appropriately and results properly analysed.

A dissertation which does not seek to break new ground and is simply "a history of" or "an account of"

A dissertation, or artefact, which is highly successful and skilled, but has no additional evidence for planning, and management and no evidence of evaluation.

Presentations that do not involve discussion of the process, only the outcome.

No ongoing evaluation is carried out.

Common misconceptions

"Primary research must be included to gain high marks", this is not the case providing that a sufficiently large range of sources is used, evaluated and properly cited. In some cases, it is not appropriate or possible to do primary research.

"Artefact projects are second best", not the case providing that the production of the artefact represents a substantial skill development for the particular student, and providing that appropriate planning, research, and evaluation are evidenced. Some of the most successful projects are artefact based.

"Artefact based projects must be underpinned by academic research". Also not the case, it depends on the artefact, but research could include "how to" videos on YouTube, blogs, seeking expert advice/opinion, trial and error experimentation such as making a prototype, market surveys.

"A mid-project review constitutes on-going evaluation". A mid-project review will contribute to on-going evaluation, but on-going evaluation must be from beginning to end, and be embedded in the process. This is best evidenced in a log or diary (which can be paper based, online or in a blog, or a video diary).

Avoiding potential malpractice

Under no circumstances must written feedback be given to a candidate by a teacher or mentor during the process of the project's production. "Marking" draft essays by a teacher is not allowed.

All sources of information, pictures, diagrams, etc., which are not the student's own work must be referenced.

Helpful resources

H857 specification and exemplar Projects can be found at
https://www.ocr.org.uk/qualifications/projects/extended-project-h857/

Free MOOC at https://www.futurelearn.com/courses/epq-success (not OCR Specific)

Many universities support EPQ through their outreach teams, support with research techniques, academic writing, and access to libraries are often possible.

Additional comments

The Extended Project Qualification has once again delivered a range of high quality projects, from which their creators have developed impressive skills. It is increasingly being seen by candidates as an excellent preparation for University or the workplace, and many candidates cite the relevance of the skills they have developed for the next stage of their lives.

Supporting you

For further details of this qualification please visit the subject webpage.

Review of results

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our review of results services. For full information about the options available visit the OCR website. If university places are at stake you may wish to consider priority service 2 reviews of marking which have an earlier deadline to ensure your reviews are processed in time for university applications.

CPD Training

Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear exam feedback directly from a senior assessor or drop in to an online Q&A session.

Please find details for all our courses on the relevant subject page on our website.

www.ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

OCR Customer Support Centre

General qualifications
Telephone 01223 553998
Facsimile 01223 552627
Email general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

OCR is part of Cambridge Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge. *For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored.*