

# Teacher Standardisation

Spring 2018

**L3 Extended Project Qualification (7993)**

---

Commentaries

EXTENDED PROJECT (7993)						MODERATOR DECISION RECORD FORM				AQA 	
Candidate No  Project 1	Admin: X if missing					Marks				TITLE - if <b>artefact</b> , indicate ; if <b>group project</b> , indicate: <i>To what extent does the use of ultra – thin models in the media cause eating disorders in young women?</i>	Refer?
	CDS	CRF	App	Pres	Rep	Cen	Mod	Diff +/-	TL		
<b>AO1 [10] MANAGE:</b> Evidence of appropriate <b>aims</b> , detailed Project <b>plan</b> & evidence of <b>monitoring</b> <b>7-10:</b> Clear evidence <b>4-6:</b> Some evidence <b>1-3:</b> Limited/little evidence						9	9			<p>Topic identified and justified in RII. Outline plan of study proposed. Supervisor suggested that academic research on the topic would be difficult to find; the work should be narrowed down to one in which academic sources are available. This led to links between super-thin models and eating disorders. CP included an outline list of sources but nothing on approach to the work. Constructive PPB/C. PR identified the need to separate peer-reviewed academic sources from media sources to investigate where there was clear cause and effect. Student still at the stage of considering how to proceed, but working plan emerging from widespread reading. Monitoring in MPR had a qualitative dimension leading to a more definite aim to examine whether thin models caused eating disorders or exacerbated existing problems. Focus changed from size zero to 'ultra-thin'. Final title and plan to completion agreed. Further qualitative monitoring in PPR; research has moved on significantly, but clarity was hampered by conflicting research findings. Supervisor advised that all sources used be evaluated for relevance to the revised topic. This topic took considerable time to formulate, given the mass of studies around the general area and the need to extract sources that were academically credible. Whilst these were still conflicting, arrival at a balance of opinion was possible. She got there in the end, with intelligent supervisor support. A lesser student would have taken the easy option to accept the conventional wisdom that media reporting of thin models caused eating disorders. Detailed planning for presentation, log generally used well.</p>	
<b>AO2 [10] USE RESOURCES:</b> Evidence of <b>detailed research</b> , with <b>critical analysis</b> & <b>application of it</b> <b>7-10:</b> Clear evidence <b>4-6:</b> Some evidence <b>1-3:</b> Limited/little evidence						7	8			<p>Very detailed bibliography of books, journals and websites. No recorded evaluation, a pretty crucial omission for this topic, but the student quoted media sources largely in the initial scene setting and concentrated on academic sources for the body of the report. Meticulous referencing to the report using footnotes. Critical analysis was not easy, given the two firmly entrenched views, but the student persevered to reach a defensible conclusion. Certainly, top band and sufficient evidence to go higher than the centre mark. A well-used human resource was her friend who helped her to access academic articles. Sensibly decided to steer clear of interview research.</p>	

<p><b>AO3 [20] DEVELOP &amp; REALISE:</b> <i>Appropriate decision making &gt; acceptable implementation. Evidence of appropriate changes. Communication of findings.</i></p> <p><b>14-20:</b> <i>Clear evidence &amp; high standard of outcome</i>  <b>7-13:</b> <i>Some evidence &amp; acceptable standard of outcome</i>  <b>1-6:</b> <i>Limited standard of outcome – little evidence of changes</i></p>	17	17			<p>Decisions recorded in the log enabled appropriate information and data to be collected and analysed. The media-driven assertion that use of thin models caused eating disorders in young women and girls was reviewed and dispelled as too simplistic. An extended review of academic sources, medical, psychological or sociological, revealed evidence that whilst publicity on thin models could influence eating disorders, this was largely through interaction with other existing issues. The main change was to examine cause and effect in detail rather than accepting conventional wisdom on the cause of eating disorders. The report was very detailed and it was sometimes not easy to follow the thread of the argument. However, the various threads were drawn together well in the final few sections. The report would have benefited, perhaps, from section headings to enhance ease of reading and communication of the research undertaken and the conclusions drawn. Clearly meets all the top band criteria, has synthesised research findings well. No reason to disagree centre mark.</p>
<p><b>AO4 [10] REVIEW:</b> <i>Evaluation of strengths and weaknesses. Consistent relevance &amp; conclusion based on sound evidence and judgement.</i></p> <p><b>7-10:</b> <i>Clear evidence &amp; judgement</i>  <b>4-6:</b> <i>Some evidence &amp; judgement</i>  <b>1-3:</b> <i>Limited/little evidence &amp; judgement</i></p>	7	9			<p>Summary and reflection was very long and partially commentary on how the work was conducted; this was valid given the vast range of articles available on the topic. The reflective sections identified the skills developed and how they might be of use in future, the strengths of the work but not any weaknesses. The student clearly benefited greatly from the experience. Presentation was delightfully brief and included both topic and process. Effective oral communication with good audience interaction (PRB). Answers to questions showed an understanding of the work, but the questions did not provide many opportunities to enhance her evidence. Material was relevant both to the wider debate on the topic and to the more rigorous study of the evidence undertaken in this work. The conclusion that thin models in the media can contribute to but do not cause eating disorders was based firmly on evidence considered.</p>
<p><b>[See Specification for full descriptors] TOTAL [50]</b></p>	40	43	+/-		<p><b>[Any further comments – incl. notes for feedback?]</b></p>
<p><b>TL's name/comments:</b></p>					

EXTENDED PROJECT (7993)						MODERATOR DECISION RECORD FORM				AQA 	
Candidate No  Project 2	Admin: X if missing					Marks				TITLE - if <b>artefact</b> , indicate ; if <b>group project</b> , indicate: <i>Can learning an additional language affect a child's development?</i>	Refer?
	CDS	CRF	App	Pres	Rep	Cen	Mod	Diff +/-	TL		
<b>AO1 [10] MANAGE: Evidence of appropriate aims, detailed Project plan &amp; evidence of monitoring</b> <b>7-10: Clear evidence</b> <b>4-6: Some evidence</b> <b>1-3: Limited/little evidence</b>						4	4			<p>RII shows an interest in languages, with emphasis on bilingualism in the context of the influence on learning. RII does not, however, show much evidence of rigour in evaluating how the study might develop or of what might be included. CP is not detailed; 'Google, titles of books and the internet' does not suggest that much thought was applied to intended research and little evidence provided to suggest what the intended 5000-word report might include. The initial title is a closed question. PPB/C suggest that the supervisor and centre coordinator had significant concerns about the lack of information provided by the student; conditions of approval might have been more detailed and prescriptive, to guide the student in developing her chosen topic. Planning review did not suggest conditions of approval had been met. MPR lacked detail, but did suggest some monitoring of progress had taken place. Primary research introduced, the purpose of which was not specified. PPR is similarly lacking in detail. The topic was identified, albeit without much evidence of development, and some evidence of monitoring was evident; <b>just</b> scrapes into the middle band.</p>	
<b>AO2 [10] USE RESOURCES: Evidence of detailed research, with critical analysis &amp; application of it</b> <b>7-10: Clear evidence</b> <b>4-6: Some evidence</b> <b>1-3: Limited/little evidence</b>						4	4			<p>19-item bibliography does not use any standard format, e.g., 'Study by Peal and Lambert (1962)'. No documented evidence of evaluation of sources. Some referencing to the report, but somewhat lacking in cohesion. Evidence of analysis of material acquired was not strong; the report suggested inclusion of material from all sources consulted, irrespective of their relevance. Some attempts were made to make links to theories of the psychology of child development and of language acquisition. Primary data collected via questionnaire from 20 respondents. Again, <b>just</b> middle band.</p>	
<b>AO3 [20] DEVELOP &amp; REALISE: Appropriate decision making &gt; acceptable implementation. Evidence of appropriate changes. Communication of findings.</b> <b>14-20: Clear evidence &amp; high standard of outcome</b> <b>7-13: Some evidence &amp; acceptable standard of outcome</b> <b>1-6: Limited standard of outcome – little evidence of changes</b>						10	9			<p>Evidence of coherent decision-making was not strong; information and data acquisition appeared to have an element of randomness to it. The report included rather dated information on the psychology of child development, articles on language teaching, learning and acquisition, some of them highly opinionated, and attempts to relate a government-devised curriculum to the need to develop linguistic skills. The questionnaire was poorly devised and not piloted. The sample had inbuilt bias, as acknowledged by the student. The results of the analysis of responses did contribute to answering the question, but there was evidence that the student had a strong opinion on the answer before undertaking the work. It was difficult to detect changes because</p>	

				of the paucity of the original plan. Some attempts at synthesis were evident, but these were negated by the format of the report, which introduced individual studies in an apparently random fashion. The sections on learning difficulties did not contribute to the main theme.
<b>AO4 [10] REVIEW: Evaluation of <i>strengths and weaknesses</i>. Consistent <i>relevance &amp; conclusion</i> based on <i>sound evidence and judgement</i>.</b> <b>7-10: Clear evidence &amp; judgement</b> <b>4-6: Some evidence &amp; judgement</b> <b>1-3: Limited/little evidence &amp; judgement</b>	6	5		<p>The reflection indicates the value of the work to the student's intended career as a teacher of languages. However, it is doubtful whether she acquired 'the correct knowledge of how to undertake secondary research and apply it'. There was also little evidence of having 'learnt how to reference using the Harvard referencing style'. Some evidence of thought relating to strengths and weaknesses is seen in the presentation, which reviews the process used, but does not include the conclusion reached. Clear oral communication (PRB), but very little evidence produced of Q&amp;A, which could have been used to explore the student's approach to the topic and the validity of the conclusion reached. Materials not always relevant (See AO3) or well structured. A conclusion was reached but 'it would appear that' does not suggest that the student was wholly convinced by the work. The paragraph on the importance of language acquisition was not part of the conclusion and should have appeared earlier in the report. Middle band but insufficient evidence to reach centre mark.</p>
<b>[See Specification for full descriptors] TOTAL [50]</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>22</b>		<p><b>[Any further comments – incl. notes for feedback?]</b>  The candidate acquired some benefit from the work, but this benefit would have been enhanced by a more rigorous approach throughout; the supervisor should have identified this lack of rigour at the start of the project.</p>
<b>TL's name/comments:</b>				

EXTENDED PROJECT (7993)						MODERATOR DECISION RECORD FORM				AQA 	
Candidate No  Project 3	Admin: X if missing					Marks				TITLE - if artefact, indicate ; if group project, indicate: <i>To what extent can the pay gap between male and female actors in mainstream Hollywood roles be eliminated in the next 10 years?</i>	Refer?
	CDS	CRF	App	Pres	Rep	Cen	Mod	Diff +/-	TL		
<b>AO1 [10] MANAGE: Evidence of appropriate aims, detailed Project plan &amp; evidence of monitoring</b> 7-10: Clear evidence 4-6: Some evidence 1-3: Limited/little evidence						5	5			<p>Topic identified in RII, but without justification of the choice. Brief description of the intended method of study and of a time-based plan. Rather too much on the format of the report, which has little relevance at this early stage. Title in CP is an assertion; detail provided is minimal. Part B more about supervision than the proposal. Part C possibly completed after completion of the project; the proposal was, therefore, apparently, unapproved. Title revised in PR, accompanied by a very brief outline plan. Quantitative monitoring only of progress in MPR. 'To what extent' added to the title; why was not addressed. This results in a speculative title. Somewhat prescriptive supervisor advice. More detail on the focus of the work provided. PPR asserted that the project followed the revised plan, but without further justification. The topic and aim were identified, but evidence of planning and monitoring was not strong. Centre mark shows sound grasp of the standard.</p>	
<b>AO2 [10] USE RESOURCES: Evidence of detailed research, with critical analysis &amp; application of it</b> 7-10: Clear evidence 4-6: Some evidence 1-3: Limited/little evidence						6	6			<p>No bibliography, but the 19 references were shown as footnotes. No documented evaluation of sources but this was mentioned in the reflection; all except 2 were articles from news media – the 2 were a study from the Journal of Management Enquiry and a website that appeared to propagate the views of the head of the organisation owning the site. Very few of these sources appear to have been subjected to much scrutiny to differentiate between established fact and personal opinions. Low level analyses only, much of it from feminist viewpoints. Research was certainly undertaken and the set of sources had some fitness for purpose, but needed more detail and criticality to reach the top band.</p>	
<b>AO3 [20] DEVELOP &amp; REALISE: Appropriate decision making &gt; acceptable implementation. Evidence of appropriate changes. Communication of findings.</b> 14-20: Clear evidence & high standard of outcome 7-13: Some evidence & acceptable standard of outcome 1-6: Limited standard of outcome – little evidence of changes						11	12			<p>Decision-making was not well documented in the log. Information and data on the gender pay gap in the film industry were acquired and partially analysed. Some proposed indicators of net worth of actors, producers and directors were proposed but not applied. Some possible solutions were suggested; these attempted to relate practices in other industries to those in film. These were most unlikely to be successful since the film industry is not subjected to the disciplines placed on industry and commerce. The conclusion recognised that the gender pay gap was universally being redressed very slowly, and that the gap in the film industry would only be reduced with the help of men. The suggestion was that little would be achieved within the 10 year</p>	

				period specified, so that the extent would be very small. Changes in detail of content only made. The sectionalised structure of the report helped communication, but hindered a synoptic approach to the work. The candidate made a good attempt at formulating the problem, providing evidence of its existence and suggesting how it might be solved, offering perhaps too much of her own opinion; it would have been improved by researching the topic more thoroughly in advance, thus enabling a more systematic approach to it.
<b>AO4 [10] REVIEW: Evaluation of <i>strengths and weaknesses</i>. Consistent <i>relevance &amp; conclusion</i> based on <i>sound evidence and judgement</i>. 7-10: Clear evidence &amp; judgement 4-6: Some evidence &amp; judgement 1-3: Limited/little evidence &amp; judgement</b>	4	4		The reflection outlines own learning and identifies process skills developed. However, not all the claims made were supported by evidence elsewhere in the work, e.g., checking the reliability of websites. Strengths and weaknesses were identified as were the utility of the skills developed in future studies. There was evidence that the candidate had benefited from the experience and would do a better job next time. Presentation was largely content based, but with some evaluation of the extent of achievement of the aim. Supervisor comments on the quality of oral communication were somewhat contradictory; 'enabled the audience to follow the process' but 'little direct engagement'. Q&A added little assessment evidence. Material was relevant and structured appropriately to review the topic but less so to the address the question set. The rather weak and speculative conclusion was evidence-based and suggested the development of a more realistic view of the universality of the gender pay gap.
<b>[See Specification for full descriptors] TOTAL [50]</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>+/-</b>	<b>[Any further comments – incl. notes for feedback?]</b>
<b>TL's name/comments:</b>				It is possible that better advice could have resulted in a less insular investigation recognising the film industry is subject to similar disciplines as are many other industries despite payment of vast amounts to some individuals.  Centre marking, however, was accurate. It is clear from CC comments that very little supervision took place, due to illness. 'Supervisor had to work furiously to generate questions as he had not had rehearsal time!!'

EXTENDED PROJECT (7993)						MODERATOR DECISION RECORD FORM				AQA 	
Candidate No  Project 4	Admin: X if missing					Marks				TITLE - if artefact, indicate ; if group project, indicate: <i>To what extent do genetic factors contribute to a propensity towards addiction in humans?</i>	Refer?
	CDS	CRF	App	Pres	Rep	Cen	Mod	Diff +/-	TL		
<b>AO1 [10] MANAGE: Evidence of appropriate aims, detailed Project plan &amp; evidence of monitoring</b> 7-10: Clear evidence 4-6: Some evidence 1-3: Limited/little evidence						9	9			Clear identification of the topic and aim in RII, together with a quite detailed outline of the proposed method of study. Justified the use of 'to what extent' in the title. Brief but informative CP. Detailed working plan in PR. Measures to ensure reliability of sources discussed. Qualitative monitoring in MPR. Final title and plan to completion agreed. Quantitative monitoring in PPR. A well-managed project, no reason to disagree centre mark.	
<b>AO2 [10] USE RESOURCES: Evidence of detailed research, with critical analysis &amp; application of it</b> 7-10: Clear evidence 4-6: Some evidence 1-3: Limited/little evidence						10	10			Extensive bibliography. Some discussion of source evaluation in log and 'evaluation of sources'; there is no doubt that careful consideration of reliability was given. Precise referencing to the report and clear critical approach throughout. Nothing more could be expected of this student.	
<b>AO3 [20] DEVELOP &amp; REALISE: Appropriate decision making &gt; acceptable implementation. Evidence of appropriate changes. Communication of findings.</b> 14-20: Clear evidence & high standard of outcome 7-13: Some evidence & acceptable standard of outcome 1-6: Limited standard of outcome – little evidence of changes						17	18			The plan was implemented and the aim achieved. Decisions made and documented in the log produced information and data from a range of authoritative sources, which were analysed critically to develop the thesis. Evidence of genetic links to addiction was examined in depth, as were social and environmental influences. Critical analyses enabled the 'extent' to be evaluated. Changes made recorded in the log. Excellent synthesis throughout. The report was readable by a non-specialist, but inevitably descriptive in places. Very clearly top band; substantial additional evidence places the mark well up the band.	
<b>AO4 [10] REVIEW: Evaluation of strengths and weaknesses. Consistent relevance &amp; conclusion based on sound evidence and judgement.</b> 7-10: Clear evidence & judgement 4-6: Some evidence & judgement 1-3: Limited/little evidence & judgement						9	9			Detailed and rigorous reflection on own learning and process, identifying skills developed, strengths and weaknesses. Presentation content-based only. Materials relevant and well-structured. The conclusion is firmly based on the evidence discussed and, unusually, does relate to 'the extent'.	
<b>[See Specification for full descriptors] TOTAL [50]</b>						45	46	+/-		<i>[Any further comments – incl. notes for feedback?]</i>	

TL's name/comments:

Clear A\* material. A very well implemented project, involving consideration of leading edge scientific and psychological research.  
However, Presentation Part B was short on legibility.

EXTENDED PROJECT (7993)						MODERATOR DECISION RECORD FORM					
Candidate No  Project 5	Admin: X if missing					Marks				TITLE - if artefact, indicate ; if group project, indicate: <i>Should energy drinks (such as Red Bull) be subject to more regulation? Should they be treated like an ordinary drink, like alcohol or like a class A Drug?</i>	Refer?
	CDS	CRF	App	Pres	Rep	Cen	Mod	Diff +/-	TL		
<b>AO1 [10] MANAGE: Evidence of appropriate aims, detailed Project plan &amp; evidence of monitoring</b> <b>7-10: Clear evidence</b> <b>4-6: Some evidence</b> <b>1-3: Limited/little evidence</b>						7	8			<p>Topic chosen from a range of possibilities in RII. Very constructive advice from supervisor. Two initial sources identified, albeit from the Daily Mail. Outline plan of issues to be researched. CP has minimal detail. Good advice in PPC, but dated 5/5/17. Outline research plan in PR, but time allocations unrealistic; research frequently throws up surprises! Detailed commentary on research findings in MPR and decisions made on how to proceed. Rather too much focus on the report; the pre-determined structure appears to be leading the research. Final title agreed. Further evidence of monitoring in PPR. Found that the plan for the report needed to be revised to accommodate the thrust of the topic and the word guidance. The student encountered many problems, some of his own making, but was able to solve them, aided by very constructive supervision. The topic was identified clearly and the aim emerged from the research findings. The plan had detail and developed through monitoring of progress. A well-planned presentation. Clearly top band and just enough evidence to take this to 8</p>	
<b>AO2 [10] USE RESOURCES: Evidence of detailed research, with critical analysis &amp; application of it</b> <b>7-10: Clear evidence</b> <b>4-6: Some evidence</b> <b>1-3: Limited/little evidence</b>						7	7			<p>23 item bibliography. No documented evaluation although a recognition of Pubmed reliability is given; most sources used were clearly from authoritative organisations. Indeed, the information and data acquired show that the headlines in the Daily Mail identified in RII vastly exaggerate the dangers of energy drinks. Good evidence of analysis of some very complex information and data, much of it contradictory. Good attempts to relate consumption of energy drinks to physiological processes. Not fully referenced but just makes top band.</p>	
<b>AO3 [20] DEVELOP &amp; REALISE: Appropriate decision making &gt; acceptable implementation. Evidence of appropriate changes. Communication of findings.</b> <b>14-20: Clear evidence &amp; high standard of outcome</b> <b>7-13: Some evidence &amp; acceptable standard of outcome</b> <b>1-6: Limited standard of outcome – little evidence of changes</b>						15	15			<p>Decision-making process recorded in the log. Information and data were acquired from a range of medically- and regulatory-based organisations, in addition to that from the makers of Red Bull. Data was analysed to assess the legal category into which energy drinks fit best. This was consistent with the final plan. The plan did develop throughout the work; changes made were recorded and justified in the log. The report made more sense on the second reading than the first; the rather staccato style and the highly technical nature of the text being quite difficult to assimilate, as noted by the centre. There was much synthesis between the components of energy drinks, their effects and physiological and legal processes. A few cases where decisions were perhaps not very sensible, e.g, the inclusion of Libertarianism. A firm conclusion was reached on the</p>	

				legal category into which energy drinks should be placed; this was arrived at by consideration of a large amount of scientific information and data, but is not one adopted vey widely throughout the world. Clearly meets top band criteria. Centre mark agreed.
<b>AO4 [10] REVIEW: Evaluation of <i>strengths and weaknesses</i>. Consistent <i>relevance &amp; conclusion</i> based on <i>sound evidence and judgement</i>.</b> <b>7-10: Clear evidence &amp; judgement</b> <b>4-6: Some evidence &amp; judgement</b> <b>1-3: Limited/little evidence &amp; judgement</b>	7	7		Reflection on the product shows the process through which the final topic was identified and developed from the much larger study that had been originally envisaged. The AQA word guidance forced the student to undertake a credible scientific investigation from one which might have been a broad and probably superficial investigation. The range of skills developed and the strengths and weaknesses of the work were identified. The student clearly benefited greatly from the experience and would do better next time. The presentation was largely text-based, covering both product and process. Effective oral communication (PRB). Material was relevant; the structure was appropriate to the topic, but could have been written better to make it more easily readable. The conclusion was clearly drawn from the evidence reviewed, despite only one country currently agreeing with it. Top band mark supported by the submitted evidence.
<b>[See Specification for full descriptors] TOTAL [50]</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>+/-</b>	<b>[Any further comments – incl. notes for feedback?]</b>
<b>TL's name/comments:</b>				

EXTENDED PROJECT (7993)						MODERATOR DECISION RECORD FORM				AQA 	
Candidate No  Project 6	Admin: X if missing					Marks				TITLE - if <b>artefact</b> , indicate ; if <b>group project</b> , indicate: <i>Which UK – EU relationship should we adopt post – Brexit?</i>	Refer?
	CDS	CRF	App	Pres	Rep	Cen	Mod	Diff +/-	TL		
<b>AO1 [10] MANAGE: Evidence of appropriate aims, detailed Project plan &amp; evidence of monitoring</b> 7-10: Clear evidence 4-6: Some evidence 1-3: Limited/little evidence						10	10			<p>Topic identified in RII and detailed plan for study formulated and modified following detailed supervisor advice. Brief but perceptive CP. Supportive and constructive PPB/C. PR recorded that base research had been completed, but that the student will 'continue to follow political developments related to the UK's withdrawal from the EU in order to add additional depth to my project'. Timeframe and plan for the report to be developed. Supervisor comments very detailed but largely logistical. Research to be continued during development of the work to allow for the 'constantly changing political circumstances'. Qualitative monitoring in MPR; title change to allow consideration of issues of withdrawal other than trade. Final title and plan for completion agreed. Further qualitative monitoring in PPR, otherwise logistical issues only. This student clearly planned and monitored his work rigorously aided by very constructive but never directive supervision. Excellent project management. Nothing more could be expected of this student.</p>	
<b>AO2 [10] USE RESOURCES: Evidence of detailed research, with critical analysis &amp; application of it</b> 7-10: Clear evidence 4-6: Some evidence 1-3: Limited/little evidence						10	10			<p>Detailed bibliography of reports, books and websites of news media and analytical organisations. No recorded evaluation of sources, but clearly chose only authoritative sources to support development of the work. Actively seeks out opposing opinions, is very aware of bias in media. Extensive and clear referencing to the report. A highly critical approach used throughout the work, with clear links made to the various economic and social models of UK performance.</p>	
<b>AO3 [20] DEVELOP &amp; REALISE: Appropriate decision making &gt; acceptable implementation. Evidence of appropriate changes. Communication of findings.</b> 14-20: Clear evidence & high standard of outcome 7-13: Some evidence & acceptable standard of outcome 1-6: Limited standard of outcome – little evidence of changes						20	20			<p>Clear and documented decision-making throughout the log and report. Information and data relating to the 3 chosen models for future UK relationships acquired and analysed thoroughly and critically. A scoring model was used to rate each model in terms of mandate, economic suitability, free movement and plausibility and thus select the model most advantageous to the UK. This approach could be criticised, but is a positive attempt to analyse future UK – EU relationships and is at least as good as other analyses being promoted by the various interested parties. Change to title made to extend the analyses beyond trade. The format of the report was appropriate to illustrate and communicate the consequences to the UK of adopting each of the 3 types of relationship after leaving the EU. However, it does stress that each relationship is subject to negotiations and might not be possible to arrange. Highly</p>	

				synthetic throughout. The numbering system concluded that the Swiss model was most appropriate, albeit posing problems for UK business and commerce in the future.
<b>AO4 [10] REVIEW: Evaluation of <i>strengths and weaknesses</i>. Consistent <i>relevance &amp; conclusion</i> based on <i>sound evidence and judgement</i>.</b> <b>7-10: Clear evidence &amp; judgement</b> <b>4-6: Some evidence &amp; judgement</b> <b>1-3: Limited/little evidence &amp; judgement</b>	10	10		Very detailed and rigorous reflection on own learning and process, identifying skills developed, strengths and weaknesses. It also identifies the extreme difficulties in making valid predictions of future consequences, (which appear not to have been considered by those carrying out negotiations). Well-planned and illustrated presentation on product and process. Fluent and effective oral communication (PRB). The student clearly showed a deep understanding of the issues in response to questions; it is a pity that Q&A was not documented in full. Materials were highly relevant and well structured and communicated. The conclusion came clearly from the evidence considered and the scoring method adopted; the student clearly understood that each model was based on a set on indicators which are subject to change which may, in turn, change the conclusion.
<b>[See Specification for full descriptors] TOTAL [50]</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>+/-</b>	<b>[Any further comments – incl. notes for feedback?]</b>
<b>TL's name/comments:</b>				<b>A very mature and rigorous analysis.</b>