



PROJECT QUALIFICATIONS LEVELS 1 AND 2

7991 and 7992
Report on the Examination

7991 and 7992
January 2017

Version: Final

Further copies of this Report are available from aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2017 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

The entry for both levels of the Project qualification showed an increase compared with January 2016, with a wider range of marks being seen. It was pleasing to note the very high quality of many entries at both Levels 1 and 2. There were, however, a number of entries at Level 2 where it would have been more appropriate for centres to have considered a Level 1 entry.

In the great majority of cases centres submitted marks promptly via e-submissions, and in many cases, in advance of the January 10th deadline. Work was presented in an appropriate format with virtually no unwieldy ring-binders being used, and with the separate parts of the project outcome – the log, written report and presentation – being clearly indicated. This facilitated moderation and centres are congratulated on their efficiency. There were no instances of the Centre Declaration Sheet not being enclosed with the sample of work.

There was evidence that centres entering candidates this series had a much better understanding of the role of the supervisor in ensuring that candidates appreciated the importance of the AQA production log. Many more production logs provided full and detailed evidence of the candidates' project journey. It was encouraging to note the absence of 'alternative' centre-created 'diaries' that added little useful information but frequently persuaded candidates to use the AQA log less fully. It was often the case that differences in candidates' overall performance was mostly influenced by how effectively they had used the production log.

It was especially encouraging to see candidates evidencing their consideration of a number of potentially useful sources at the Initial Ideas stage. Checking that there were potentially useful sources available contributed to the viability of the proposed project and more successful centres had built this into their practice.

It is worth re-iterating previous advice that those centres that allow candidates the time to make a considered choice of project title, with appropriate aims and objectives, and then challenge them to consider how they propose to carry their project forward are the ones where candidates generally perform best.

In a few centres, there seemed to be a misunderstanding regarding the purpose of the mid-project review. This should mark the completion, by the candidate, of the research phase of their project and an agreement as to the final title and nature of the outcome. Once this formal agreement has been reached, then the candidate should move on to the production phase of their project. In a few cases, candidates seem to have been encouraged to start planning and drafting their report prior to the mid-project review. This is not appropriate. In a further case, a candidate, in the light of their research, made substantial changes to their working title moving them well beyond the approved title. In this case, the candidate should have been required to complete a new Proposal part A and for this to be considered by the supervisor and then the centre coordinator.

Most projects seen provided clear evidence for supervisors recording how candidates had been able to respond to questions asked of them in their presentations. The presentation 'question and answer' session offers the candidate a final opportunity to fully evidence their project journey.

Moderators saw few artefact-based projects this series, but where these were submitted, it was clear that centres had understood the need for the artefact to be research-based, and for the accompanying, shorter, report to underpin the artefact, and not merely describe 'what had been done' to complete the artefact.

Moderators were concerned that the evidence requirements for group projects seem not to have been understood in the few instances that these projects were submitted. Candidates must submit their own evidence of their contribution to the group project, with entries in their production logs

clearly indicating their unique contribution, and with an individual report. Where these evidence requirements are not met it is impossible for the moderator to discern the unique ‘input’ of a particular candidate and, hence, to apply the assessment objectives.

Most candidates had made use of the revised log, with only a few ‘old’ logs being seen, and these by candidates who had commenced their projects prior to the introduction of the revised log. It was pleasing to note that, in these cases, the revisions incorporated in this document removed some of the uncertainties sometimes experienced with the previous version of the document – candidates had a clearer understanding of the purpose of the different review meetings and who was to record the outcome of these.

In a few centres, candidates had been encouraged to use both primary and secondary research methods without giving sufficient thought as to the suitability of this approach. In these cases, the primary methods involved giving, untested questionnaires to a small group of people, their rationale for their selection not being stated. Whilst it is entirely appropriate for candidates to be introduced to a range of research methods in the taught skills programme, it is for the candidate to select from these, those which are appropriate to their particular project. Centres should not raise expectations that all students must use a stated range. This ‘blanket’ approach has the potential to diminish the marks awardable for both AO2 Use resources and AO3 Develop & realise.

There was no clear pattern in adjustments made to centre marking, except in so far as marks were sometimes awarded at the top of a particular mark band where the evidence submitted did not support this. Statements from supervisors asserting that candidates had performed at a particular level, but without evidence to support this are not appropriate. Where marks have been adjusted centres are strongly advised to attend the AQA standardisation meetings to ensure that the assessment criteria are used correctly for future submissions.

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](#)