GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH
Component 3 Team Project: Presentation and Reflective Paper
SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

MAXIMUM MARK: 35
Team Project: Presentation and Reflective Paper

AO1: Research, analysis and evaluation – 20  AO2: Reflection – 5  AO3: Communication and collaboration – 10

Information:

- Each candidate submits two pieces of work: Presentation and Reflective Paper. Each is marked using the appropriate marking grid. The marks for the two must be added together to give a total mark out of 35.
- The running time for the Presentation must not exceed 8 minutes. Examiners will not credit material after the 8-minute limit. The presentation is marked out of 25 and assesses the candidate’s ability to research, analyse and evaluate (AO1) and communicate their findings (AO3).
- The Reflective Paper must not exceed 800 words. Examiners will not credit material after the 800-word limit. The Reflective Paper is marked out of 10 and assesses the candidate’s ability to reflect on their collaborative experience (AO2 and AO3).
- The marking criteria are presented within five different levels.
- Examiners will use the full mark range and look for the ‘best fit’, not a ‘perfect fit’, taking a holistic approach.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Indicative descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5     | 21–25 | - The presentation **clearly defines** an issue which arises from **detailed and varied** research.  
- The candidate’s perspective is **sharply differentiated** from alternative team or research perspectives.  
- The presentation is **logically** structured and **coherently** argued with **clear** lines of reasoning and **well-supported** judgements.  
- The candidate’s conclusion is **based logically** on the evidence and reasoning presented and proposes an **effective and innovative** solution to the issue.  
- **Appropriate** presentational methods are used **creatively and fully effectively** to communicate the candidate’s arguments and ideas to the audience. |
| 4     | 16–20 | - The presentation **defines** an issue which arises from **detailed** research.  
- The candidate’s perspective is **differentiated** from alternative team or research perspectives.  
- The presentation is **well-structured** and **well-argued** with **some** lines of reasoning and **some well-supported** judgements.  
- The candidate’s conclusion is **based** on the evidence and reasoning presented and proposes an **effective** solution to the issue.  
- **Appropriate** presentational methods are used **effectively and with some creativity** to communicate the candidate’s arguments and ideas to the audience. |
| 3     | 11–15 | - The presentation **goes some way towards defining** an issue which arises from **some** research.  
- The candidate’s perspective shows **some differentiation** from alternative team or research perspectives.  
- The presentation has **some** structure and contains **some well-argued** points, **some** lines of reasoning and **some** supported judgements.  
- The candidate’s conclusion is **mostly** based on the evidence and reasoning presented and **proposes** a solution to the issue.  
- Presentational methods are used with **some effectiveness** to communicate the candidate’s arguments and ideas to the audience. |
| 2     | 6–10  | - The presentation **attempts to define** an issue and **some** research has been done.  
- The candidate’s perspective **lacks clear differentiation** from alternative team or research perspectives.  
- The presentation has **some** structure and contains **some argued points**, **some** lines of reasoning and **some** supported judgements.  
- The candidate’s conclusion is **partly** based on the evidence or reasoning presented and **begins to develop** a solution to the issue.  
- Presentational methods are used, but **may lack effectiveness** in communicating the candidate’s arguments and ideas to the audience. |
| 1     | 1–5   | - The presentation **does not clearly define** an issue and **lacks** research.  
- The candidate’s perspective is limited and lacks differentiation from alternative team or research perspectives.  
- The presentation **lacks** structure and makes arguments which are **limited**, with **limited** lines of reasoning and judgements which **lack** support.  
- The candidate’s conclusion is **limited** and **lacks** evidence or reasoning. It provides a **limited** solution to the issue.  
- There is **limited** use of presentational methods, and they **lack effectiveness** in communicating the candidate’s arguments and ideas to the audience. |
<p>| 0     | 0     | No creditworthy material has been submitted. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Indicative descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5     | 9–10  | - The candidate engages in a **probing and critical** evaluation of their own practice in working with others to identify a local problem and explore possible solutions.  
- The candidate reflects **fully** on how their personal standpoint and scope for future research have been affected by alternative team and research perspectives. |
| 4     | 7–8   | - The candidate engages in **some effective** evaluation of their own practice in working with others to identify a local problem and explore possible solutions.  
- The candidate undertakes **some clear** reflection on how their personal standpoint and scope for future research have been affected by alternative team and research perspectives. |
| 3     | 5–6   | - The candidate evaluates **to some extent** their own practice in working with others to identify a local problem and explore possible solutions.  
- The candidate undertakes **some** reflection on how their personal standpoint and scope for further research have been affected by alternative team or research perspectives. |
| 2     | 3–4   | - The candidate **attempts** to evaluate their own practice in identifying a local problem and exploring possible solutions, but **may lack** consideration of their work with others.  
- The candidate **attempts** to reflect on their personal viewpoint or scope for further research, but **may lack** a consideration of alternative team or research perspectives. |
| 1     | 1–2   | - The candidate shows **limited** evaluation of their own practice and **lacks** consideration of their work with others.  
- The candidate shows **limited** reflection on their personal viewpoint and scope for further research and **lacks** any consideration of alternative team or research perspectives. |
| 0     | 0     | No creditworthy material has been submitted. |