Report

Interpret feedback without overstating the findings

Full exam-style C2 Proficiency Part 2 report task. Original independent practice, not an official exam paper.

The careers director at your university requests a report on a recent alumni mentoring pilot. Evaluate its benefits and limitations and recommend how the university should proceed. Regular attendees praised individual advice, but only regular attendees supplied feedback. Students on work placements reported difficulty attending the fixed meeting times. The university has resources for a limited second pilot before deciding whether to expand the scheme. Base your report on these findings; do not invent survey figures. Write 280-320 words.

Write 280-320 words.

Write your response on separate paper before studying the model below.

One possible response

Alumni mentoring pilot: evaluation and next steps

Purpose and evidence

This report evaluates the recent mentoring pilot and recommends how a second trial could inform a decision on expansion. The available feedback comes from regular attendees, with additional comments about scheduling from students on placements. It therefore provides useful but incomplete evidence of the scheme's effectiveness.

Benefits and limitations

Regular participants valued advice tailored to their individual circumstances. This suggests that personal contact with alumni offers something beyond general careers information: an opportunity to explore a particular concern in detail. Retaining this individual focus should be a priority in any further trial.

However, favourable responses cannot establish that the programme met the needs of the wider student body. Students who stopped attending, or never attended, are absent from the formal feedback. Their experience might alter our assessment substantially. Fixed meeting times also appear to have restricted participation by students on placements. Increasing the number of identical sessions would not necessarily remove that barrier.

Recommended second pilot

The university should test a limited range of alternative appointments, including some remote meetings, while preserving individual mentoring. Before allocating places, it should invite brief comments from previous non-attenders about both practical obstacles and the relevance of the offer. This would help distinguish a scheduling problem from a lack of perceived benefit.

Evaluation should record who participates, whether appointments remain accessible and what specific decisions the advice helps students make. Collecting feedback from those who withdraw would reduce the present imbalance. Mentors should also report the time required, since a model valued by students may still be difficult to sustain.

Conclusion

Immediate expansion would be premature. A focused second pilot would address the known access problem and test whether the apparent benefits extend beyond regular attendees. The director would then have a firmer basis for deciding what to expand, for whom and at what practical cost.

This is an original model, not an official marked script. Other approaches can also meet the task.

Understand the task and model

Task, reader and evidence

Write a formal report to the careers director. Evaluate benefits and limitations, then recommend a feasible second pilot. The supplied findings establish appreciation among regular attendees and an access problem for students on placements. They do not establish a percentage satisfaction rate, employment outcomes or universal demand.

Plan and document structure

The purpose section defines the evidence. Benefits and limitations separates what the responses suggest from what they cannot prove. Recommendations then address the gaps, followed by a clear decision. Informative headings help a director locate findings and actions quickly; headings alone do not replace a connected argument.

Content: proportionate inference

"This suggests" appropriately qualifies the benefit inferred from individual advice. "Their experience might alter our assessment" acknowledges missing participants without inventing their opinions. The model does not call the pilot a failure because the evidence is incomplete; it says expansion would be premature.

Recommendations linked to findings

Alternative appointments respond to fixed-time access barriers. Comments from non-attenders and people who withdraw address the selective feedback. Mentor workload adds a relevant practical criterion for the next pilot rather than claiming workload was a proven problem in the first. Each recommendation either addresses known evidence or proposes collecting necessary evidence.

Assessment dimensions in practice

Content covers evaluation and next steps. Communicative Achievement comes from an objective, decision-oriented register. Organisation follows evidence -> limitation -> action. Language uses measured claims such as "not necessarily" and "may still be difficult to sustain"; these qualifications sharpen the judgement instead of weakening it indiscriminately.

Pitfalls and alternatives

Avoid inventing statistics or equating regular attendance with success for everyone. Do not recommend unlimited expansion when resources allow only a limited pilot. Other feasible appointment arrangements can work; explain the barrier they address and how success will be assessed.

Check your own response

- Have I identified who supplied the feedback?
- Have I distinguished a supported benefit from an unproven wider claim?
- Do my recommendations address scheduling and missing feedback?
- Is the next step feasible within a limited pilot?
- Are headings and register suitable for the careers director?
- Is the whole report within 280-320 words?