



Pearson
Edexcel

Moderators' Report/ Principal Moderator Feedback

June 2022

Pearson Edexcel Extended Projects Qualification
in Artefact (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>

June 2022

Publications Code P304_01_2206_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

Student Performance

We continue to see many high marks. This is perhaps because of experienced centres and very dedicated learners pursuing projects linked to their personal passions and progression plans. As with the Jan 22 series, there were examples of very technically accomplished and refined projects completed over lockdowns. Learners dedicated additional time beyond the requirements of the qualification.

There were again few examples of very low marks. In general, the learners that are entered plane, researched, developed and produced an artefact.

The unit is accessible to learners of differing ability and large and small cohorts included a wide range of marks.

Suitability of work submitted

Most centres supported learners to develop proposals that necessitated a clear research phase. Most of the work sampled reflected the Guided Learning Hours of the qualification.

On the whole learners submitted appropriate proposals and evidence for the Artefact unit. There were a few instances of learners not defining and focusing on an artefact outcome from the outset. Sometimes the planning and the structure of the supporting materials were better suited to a Dissertation outcome. In these instances, less effective evidence was presented in the form of an essay/dissertation/literature review with the later addition of an artefact. This could be because centres are modelling a response for a Dissertation as part of the taught course. Therefore, centres are advised to ensure they guide learners to produce appropriate evidence for the demands of the Artefact unit.

Generally, learners developed a suitable initial design brief and/or specification as opposed to a question as their starting point/project title. This enabled them to focus effectively on the design and production of their artefact. There was a tendency for those who focused their work on a question to focus disproportionately on an issue, problem or theme rather than the research and methods required to develop and produce an artefact.

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. students were able to plan, research, develop and evaluate with all these in mind. Examples of more successful initial titles/design briefs included:

- Design and build a remote-controlled boat which is both extremely stable as well as efficient in very choppy water.

- Apply classical chess theoretical research to create a human level monster chess algorithm
- Design and create a children's book (target audience of 2-5 years old) that can be used by parents to explain the process of what having cancer is like inside a hospital environment to their children who have cancer. Include the diagnoses and treatment procedures they will encounter.
- 'Here Comes the Next Wave'. A pop art piece based on mental health to be displayed within a LSA exhibition

Most centres included the required Project Proposal Form and Activity Logs on the Pearson pro-formas.

Stronger responses often 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.

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). Centres should be confident to reward this type of evidence when it meets the assessment criteria. Detailed Activity/Production Logs also often provided evidence for all objectives.

The switch to electronic evidence, seemed to impact on the quality of the evidence of the final artefact. There were multiple instances of centres not initially submitting evidence of the final artefact or only providing poor quality black and white images that did not necessarily show the artefact being used/displayed as intended. It is good practice to include filmed evidence of the artefact in use, where appropriate. Some centres made good use of PowerPoint to include images from the design portfolios in their supporting materials. A filmed 'walk and talk through' of the design portfolio also provided effective evidence.

Most centres recognised the need to provide evidence of both presentation skills and review. Occasionally Oral Presentation Record Forms were not included or fully completed with mark band placement and commentary.

Assessment Evidence

AO1

Some Project Proposals were very detailed, with all sections on the form completed fully. Proposals were particularly effective when they included a detailed breakdown of the activities that would be completed with the time allocated to each section clearly

identified. Some plans were very brief and this provided weaker evidence for AO1. Activity Logs that provided stronger evidence for AO1 when they were detailed, reflective and included commentary of how the process was managed. When AO1 was over-rewarded initial proposals and time planning were less focused than the mark suggested. Sometimes titles had not developed from initial vaguer questions into refined briefs. Better assessment considered the full range of marks in the top band. Where there was slight lenience it was also often due to more limited and narrative records of activities.

AO2

There were examples of excellent research being conducted and used effectively. In these examples, candidates had used a wide range of sources to produce an analysis of the different alternatives that could be considered before starting design or production. The initial research included existing products, the issue to be addressed or the needs of the client, different equipment or materials and different techniques that could be used. On-going research also informed the iterative design and development process. In some examples where evidence was less strong, learners decided on the details of how their artefact would be produced and then conducted their research to provide 'evidence for the examiner'.

AO2 research was sometimes 'narrower' than the 'wide-ranging' assessment suggested. Literary reviews tended to not meet the assessment demands of the unit as well as reviews or records of (all) research. The evidence seemed to sit in isolation or links to the proposed outcome were not clearly identified. Sometimes there was over-evidencing of AO2, to the detriment of time spent on the development and realisation of the Artefact (AO3). This most often happened when the project had been initially conceived as a Dissertation.

Some learners did not reference consistently within their work or produce a bibliography which provided less evidence for AO2, as the bibliography is part of the marking criteria in all mark bands.

AO3

At the top end students demonstrated a high level of technical skill and produced very successful outcomes. There was evidence of genuine innovation as students created new artworks, designs and products.

A significant number of centres presented very brief if any supporting materials. This led to more significant lenience in the assessment of criteria related to the learners' understanding of the development process and consideration of alternatives. Learners sometimes erroneously presented background research essays into the theme of their project, rather than a narrative of the creative development process.

There was sometimes lenience in the assessment of AO3 when shorter development and realisation phases did not reflect the increased weighting allotted to this objective. There was less recognition of the necessity for learners to undertake a multistage development process and interrogate initial designs and drafts, before refining the outcome through test pieces or prototypes.

Some centres appear to be over-rewarding the outcome. This was particularly the case when there was less evidence of the process presented in the supporting materials. The quality of the outcome was also sometimes over-rewarded.

AO4

Oral Presentation Records and copies of the presentation slides were usually included. Most centres considered the quality of review and the learners' presentation skills in the overall mark. Where there was slight leniency against AO4, centre assessors could often better consider the full range of marks in the top band. The quality of review tended to be over-rewarded.

At the top end, high-level review and insight was embedded throughout the portfolio. More detailed written summative review tended to enable learners to demonstrate the top band criteria. When the summative review was briefer and assessor comments suggested there was more evidence in the presentation, this could have been more robustly demonstrated through the inclusion of speakers notes/scripts or a recording.

Centre Performance

Most centres were accurate or slightly lenient in their assessment of P304. Many centres appear very experienced and confident with the assessment process and applying the marking criteria to a wide range of work.

There were very occasional instances of inconsistency. Centres that had been inconsistent in their assessment also tended to have not effectively internally standardised across the team of assessors. However, there was generally clear evidence of internal moderation processes.

AO3 was most likely to be leniently assessed, and when the content and outcome reflected band 2 rather than band 3.

Centres are encouraged to ensure they access their E9 report, as this will enable them to address any issues and guard against the upward creep of marks.

The Learner Work Transfer System was used by most for the first time. Centres are advised to double check that the uploaded electronic evidence includes all items listed as Project Contents on the Candidate Record Sheet. The following issues were quite common and should be addressed:

- documents not fully scanned and so pages omitted
- Candidate Record Sheets not submitted
- an excessive number of individual documents per learner, with photographs of individual pages of evidence, rather than a single PDF or film of visual evidence.

Some centres did not upload a complete sample, including the work of the highest and lowest marked student. There was varied practice in the labelling of electronic documents and centres are advised to ensure they read the guidance.

Most centres linked their teacher assessor comments to the language of the assessment criteria on the Candidate Record Sheet as required, rather than providing personal qualitative judgments.

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

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom