
GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH

9239/03

Paper 3 Team Project: Presentation and Reflective Paper

March 2019

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 35

Published

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the March 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **7** printed pages.

PUBLISHED**Generic Marking Principles**

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

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.

Presentation: Marking criteria

Level	Marks	Indicative descriptors
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.

Level	Marks	Indicative descriptors
1	1–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.
0	0	No creditworthy material has been submitted.

Reflective Paper: Marking criteria

Level	Marks	Indicative descriptors
5	9–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.