

Candidate identifier	<b>A crocheted creation</b>			
Criterion	A	B	C	TOTAL/MAXIMUM
Level awarded/maximum	<b>7/8</b>	<b>6/8</b>	<b>4/8</b>	<b>17/24</b>

<b>Criterion A: Planning</b>	<b><i>Explanatory commentary: Referencing the task-specific clarification, what in this work characterizes it as limited, adequate, substantial, or excellent?</i></b>		<b>Level by Strand</b>
<b>Strand i:</b> state a learning goal for the project and explain how a personal interest led to that goal.	The learning goal is clearly stated: to learn to crochet in the round. The connection to personal interest is described and reasons for this learning goal are briefly mentioned (required to fulfil the command term <b>explain</b> ). Examples are “learning new stitches or methods expands your creative possibilities” and “this topic has piqued my interest because it provides a chance for me to de-stress. I’m also fascinated by the usage of fabrics and the creation of works of art”. More fully explained reasons for how or why the personal interest led to this learning goal is required for the highest mark.		<b>7</b>
<b>Strand ii:</b> state an intended product and develop appropriate success criteria for the product.	The intended product is stated: creating an amigurumi toy, designed and crocheted by the student. There are multiple criteria which are further detailed in the column “Details”. The column “Research and justification” serves well for proving the chosen criteria as appropriate.		<b>8</b>
<b>Strand iii:</b> present a clear, detailed plan for achieving the product and its associated success criteria.	The plan indicates all criteria to be connected to the steps in the plan. The plan appeared to allow the achievement of all criteria other than function. When looking at the content of the descriptor for <b>function</b> in the success criteria, this was not fully mapped out in the plan.		<b>7</b>
<b>Overall criterion level</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>What aspects of the work made it difficult to arrive at a level? How did you compensate in ‘best fit’?</b>  n/a	

<b>Criterion B: Applying skills</b>	<b><i>Explanatory commentary: Referencing the task-specific clarification, what in this work characterizes it as limited, adequate, substantial, or excellent?</i></b>		<b>Level by Strand</b>
<b>Strand i:</b> explain how the ATL skill(s) was/were applied to help achieve their learning goal.	A description of how research skills were applied to reach the learning goal is presented. However, this is brief (being close to an outline) and includes few details. The claims are supported by several pieces of evidence. The last paragraph is an attempt at an explanation, but it is too vague to clearly reach the command term.  So a best-fit approach has been applied, considering there was a description (required for level 5–6), although brief. Claims were supported with evidence (required for level 7–8).		<b>6</b>

<p><b>Strand ii:</b> explain how the ATL skill(s) was/were applied to help achieve their product.</p>	<p>A description of how creative thinking skills were applied to achieve the product is presented. However, not all of this account was related to creative thinking. There is some evidence, but this is just referenced to, rather than supporting claims of how creative thinking was applied.</p> <p>There is an attempt to explain, but this does not manage to provide reasons or causes (required for fulfilling command term <b>explain</b>) for how applying the described ATL skill helped achieve the product.</p>	<p><b>6</b></p>	
<p><b>Overall criterion level</b></p>	<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b>What aspects of the work made it difficult to arrive at a level? How did you compensate in 'best fit'?</b></p> <p>In this example, URLs have been included to indicate specific resources used, but note that URLs and hyperlinks cannot be opened by an examiner.</p>	
<p><b>Criterion C: Reflecting</b></p>		<p><b><i>Explanatory commentary: Referencing the task-specific clarification, what in this work characterizes it as limited, adequate, substantial, or excellent?</i></b></p>	<p><b>Level by Strand</b></p>
<p><b>Strand i:</b> explain the impact of the project on themselves or their learning.</p>	<p>The explanation provides little about the impact the project had on the student or their learning. There is mention of what was learned, but this is more a repetition in that they have learned to crochet in the round. The impact is unclear. The parts, including a specific impact of completing the project, are outlined.</p>	<p><b>4</b></p>	
<p><b>Strand ii:</b> evaluate the product based on the success criteria.</p>	<p>The product has been evaluated: areas of strength and areas of development for all criteria have been given. However, this is only partially supported with examples, which are not detailed, and there is no evidence. The third criterion has not been evaluated; only someone else's opinion has been stated. For the fourth criterion, the evaluation was very weak. In general, each criterion was only briefly addressed when attempting to evaluate.</p>	<p><b>5</b></p>	
<p><b>Overall criterion level</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>What aspects of the work made it difficult to arrive at a level? How did you compensate in 'best fit'?</b></p> <p>Strand levels for criterion C are 4 and 5. Normally the overall criterion level would be awarded the higher level (5). However, if the higher strand level is particularly weak, the lower level will be the best fit as an overall level, which is the case in this work where Cii was a weak 5.</p>	