Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2015

Pearson Edexcel GCSE
in Citizenship Studies (5CS04/01)

Unit 4:Citizenship Campaign

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Introduction

5CS04 is now an established section of the full course, and Unit 4 has stabilised in terms of grade boundaries. The entry for the full course has increased and there is an ever-growing range of issues that are investigated and used as a basis for a campaign. The overall standard was good and, in some cases, very good and even excellent. Many candidates wrote with a genuine enthusiasm and passion for their campaign and demonstrated a real, and deserved, sense of achievement.
Quality of written communication, which is part of the assessment criteria in Section 3, was a challenge for some candidates but the overall standard was at least satisfactory and sometimes demonstrated both accuracy and a degree of fluency.

Centre Administration

All moderators reported that the quality of administration continues to vary significantly from centre to centre. However, many centres did complete this efficiently. Undue delays, and not good use of moderator time, occur when the packaging is either so good it can't easily be opened or so poor that papers could easily have slipped out or were very disorganised, without any clips on candidate's work, coupled with the omissions from the 'What to send the Moderators' list. Good practice occurred when this list was included and checked in the boxes. This list is available on
www.edexcel.com

The most common administrative problems that arose included:

Candidate Record Form

- Centres should include a (downloadable) Candidate Record Form for each candidate.

- Candidates should complete their centre name, centre number and candidate number on the form

- Candidates should provide a brief description of the campaign and their own role on the Candidate Record Form if they worked in a group.

- Candidates and teachers must sign the updated form to verify that it is the candidate's own work and for permission to use their work for training purposes. This front cover includes the candidate and Teacher declaration and the Authentication form, and if used, centres do not have to send the old 'authentication form'.

<u>OPTEMS/Edexcel Online printouts</u>

- Marks on the Candidate Record Form of individual candidate response forms sometimes differed from marks recorded on either the OPTEMS or Edexcel Online printouts, or sometimes not transferred accurately from the candidate's work it is important that these match, and if the Moderator sends as E6 to inform the centre, then it must be actioned immediately as this could cause problems or delays in the external moderation process or at awarding stage.

- Marks on the OPTEMS were sometimes unreadable, or not even recorded; moderators need to be able to know what mark has been awarded by the centre-both the ellipse and the mark column need to be completed accurately for each candidate.

- '0', rather than 'X', was shown on the OPTEMS for candidates who were absent or withdrawn. Zero ('0') should only be used for candidates who have submitted work that is judged to be worth no marks by centres.

It is the centre's responsibility to check that all administration is completed accurately and that the correct sample is sent to the external moderator in good time, and no later than May 15th.

It was noted that a number of centres had fallen short of these requirements, as well as the following which all moderators reported as centre inadequacies. Any of the following could cause undue delay in the external moderating process and, if no response is taken to requests for missing/incorrect marks of candidate's work, then the results may be delayed, and that is clearly not ideal for candidates who will need them, possibly for University requirements.

Samples

- All Candidate Record Forms should be checked that all information has been entered for ease of identification and use by the Moderator when completing their administration, and by Edexcel at a later stage.
- All totals should be checked as it is rather more difficult to make the appropriate changes at a later date.
- Centres should include a replacement piece of work for and absent or withdrawn asterisked candidates so to that the correct sample size is still sent to the moderator.
- Centres must include the work of the highest and lowest scoring candidate as part of the sample even if these were not part of the sample selected (indicated by an asterisk on the OPTEMS). External moderation cannot be undertaken until the work of these candidates has been received. If the Moderator has sent an E6, action should be taken immediately.
- The Controlled Assessments need to be checked that all work from each candidate is submitted-it may be that the candidate's evidence is not labelled or is not sent with the work. Submission of evidence is part of the task.

Choice of tasks

Centres are reminded that the controlled assessment task chosen for Unit 4 must not be from the same range and content area as the task chosen for the Unit 2 controlled assessment. However, the task can be chosen from any of the other 9 range and content areas that make up the specification.

The task must be clearly identifiable as a citizenship task rather than something which is closer to PSHE, religious education or politics. This was not always the case and the candidates concerned found some parts of the response form very difficult to complete because there simply wasn't enough citizenship in the task they had chosen. Most of these types of campaign were simply awareness-raising campaigns (similar to Unit 2); they did not seek to change anything except what fellow students thought or knew about an issue. In terms of marks, this often meant that candidates could not access the full range of marks and centres should give advice to students about choice of task. The task must be clearly recognisable as a 'campaign'. This did not always happen, particularly if fundraising was involved. Fundraising in itself needs to be related explicitly to a campaign – which some candidates managed to do very effectively. If in doubt about whether a task will be appropriate, centres are advised to use Edexcel's 'Ask the Expert' service for advice and guidance from the Principal Moderator.

Many different campaign issues were used, taking full advantage of the flexibility offered in the controlled assessment units. Commonly used, and appropriate campaign tasks in summer 2015, were similar to those used in previous years. These included: The most common were – lowering the voting age (possibly inspired by the election), bullying (including cyberbullying) and need of local Youth clubs.

Others included:
- environmental issues such as improving recycling, greater sustainability and better recycling facilities;
- fair trade/sustainability and child labour;
- campaigning about youth crime – guns and knives; student voice;
- child labour; child soldiers; child trafficking; sweatshops
- protecting rights of particular groups;
- promoting greater ethnic diversity/ campaigning against racism in sport.

Unusual campaign choices, but effectively completed, were on the issue of fracking and Dementia and mental health. A very effective campaign was conducted on 'Stranger Danger' with action for a drama performance.

It is important to note that, whereas the media is one of the nine range and content areas of the specification difficulties might arise if the task does not relate clearly to Citizenship. For example, campaigns linking the media with rights to privacy or political issues might work well but campaigns linking the media with fashion, beauty or size zero are unlikely to have the same degree of success.

Assessment Objectives being tested in the different sections of the task form:

AO1: Recall, selection and communication of knowledge and understanding of citizenship concepts, issues and technology.

AO2: Application of skills, knowledge and understanding when planning, taking and evaluating citizenship actions.

AO3: Analysis and evaluation of issues and evidence including different viewpoints to construct reasoned arguments and drawing of conclusions.

Centres should seek to ensure that, as far as possible, candidates should have appropriate preparation in some key skills related to the assessment objectives.

These include:
a) planning and research
b) setting campaign objectives
c) identifying campaign methods
d) engaging with people in a position of power and authority
e) seeking the views of others
f) analysis
g) gathering and using different forms of evidence
h) evaluation

Evidence

Providing evidence should not be a problem for candidates (there is no maximum but it should be appropriate, and identifying the individual candidate's participation in the group campaign). Most moderators reported that there was a lack of evidence of communication with a person in power, and in Section 2b, the task form was left blank and some pieces of evidence inserted at the back. There needs to be a list of evidence for 2b and annotation to show how this evidence supports the campaign and the personal input in the group work from the candidate.

However:
• Evidence needed to be more selective. Often there was too much included in bulky appendices to be effective. (One or two questionnaires is sufficient) Moderators do not need to see all the material downloaded. A list of websites visited is sufficient, with the main ones annotated as to how they was useful.

• The best place for evidence is often at the end of each section, with the main focus on Section 2 of the response form.

• It is acceptable to place all evidence in an appendix at the end but these needs to be **clearly labelled and cross-referenced** to the section concerned.

There were a number of candidates who did not submit sufficient evidence to support their work, or did not use it to explain their involvement, action, or communication.

Centre-based citizenship

Some centres support citizenship on a whole school basis and this is sometimes a range of activities supervised by a number of staff. Candidates are raising awareness of citizenship issues by peer teaching successfully. But this should not be the main point of the campaign. There were also a number of successful charity and fund raising activities, which were a credit to the students. However, it should be clear as to why the fund-raiser was undertaken, and the evaluation could focus on how, as in such cases, participation in citizenship activities has made a difference.
Centres where there was only one citizenship teacher, or the teacher was not a specialist, often found the unit most difficult, and assessment of the candidate's work required more familiarity than their experience afforded. If possible, there should be another teacher/exams officer who can check through the actual marks and recording of marks to alleviate the possibility of errors.

Use of the task response form

Centres need to be reminded that use of the task response form is **compulsory** but students should feel free to use additional pages if they run out of space in a particular section. Additional sheets should always be clearly labelled. This year moderators reported many instances where the task forms were not used and continuation pages were not inserted in the appropriate section and some were not identifiable. On the other hand, there were some very good, positive campaigns described on the task form and deserve a mention-a good indication of good teaching and learning in a positive, encouraging way.

The 'writing up' of the response sheets can be done by hand or they can be word processed. Timing may have been an issue for some students. Although three hours of 'writing up time' is allowed, the final section (Section 3) in some cases tended to be quite brief. It was observed that some candidates offered freely the view that they had not been given sufficient time to complete their tasks. However, there were some excellent campaigns begun and completed in the allocated time, at least, according to the candidate's plan they had worked towards. As this task accounts for a considerable percentage of the final examination grade, centres should keep to the allotted time and offer a catch up to anyone who for genuine reasons could not complete it at the given time.

Annotation of the response sheets by centre staff, though not compulsory, was often quite detailed, making it clear to the external moderator why particular marks were awarded - Such annotations are always helpful, and this highlights good practice.

Candidate Performance

A number of candidates found it difficult to understand the language pertaining to their response requirements: objectives, outcomes and impact. Those who received some guidance from teachers were able to follow through the campaign in a more structured manner and answer the questions with a sharper focus.

Section 1: Development of a campaign strategy (10 AO2 marks; 5 AO3 marks)
In 1(a) where the candidate was able to choose their issue, the responses described how, or explained why, a particular campaign issue was chosen in a more succinct manner than those who were given a topic to work on. A large majority were able to identify some clear objectives and went on to show how these objectives would address citizenship issues. However, those who chose issues more closely related to PSHE found this more difficult and the difficulty re-appeared during the evaluation stage in Section 3, especially if the only action was a fund-raising activity.

Most candidates found 1(b) relatively straightforward, often making clear connections between the campaign methods they had chosen and ways in which the methods would help to achieve outcomes.

The requirements of 1(c) were not always sufficiently developed to show time management AND management of resources. 'A brief plan of campaign' should be more than just week 1, I will …, week 2 … etc. Sometimes the plans were just too brief; they can be presented in tabulated form. Diagrammatic plans were often the simplest and most effective way of conveying the information required. However, just to attach a pre-written plan (often prepared by the group), is insufficient. The Centre Assessor may like to refer to the GCSE Citizenship page of the Edexcel website does offer helpful examples of planning covering different levels of achievement.

The planning response 1c, should be written in the future tense-it should be a plan to work to, not a report on what was done. The later was very common this year, and did not fulfil the marking criteria. Therefore the planning, 'brief plan' in the directive, was interpreted widely from being four or five class decisions to spider grams from a group, leading to detailed steps for each member. Many did not address the consideration of time (weekly/per lesson) and even fewer considered the resources required to complete the campaign.

Section 2: Participate in the campaign (AO2 20 marks)
In 2(a), the right choice of campaign task was crucial and, as in Section 1, those who had chosen more PSHE-related themes found it difficult to relate them to ways in which citizenship issues were addressed. Others did not describe their **own** participation in a campaign in sufficient detail.

In 2(b) the highest marks were awarded to those candidates who did exactly as the framework suggested. They included appropriate evidence which showed how objectives might have been met; how there was communication with others – including influencing "those in a position of power"; the views of others on the campaign and strategy. Evidence was used selectively and the significance of the evidence was explained. This is very much the route to take for success in 2(b).

Choice of people to contact and interview varied from most appropriate people to those who would only be able to give a view, not move the campaign forward in any way.

Others found the communication with appropriate people whose views they could analysis and negotiate with quite a challenge. It was not always clear who contacted these people and who did the negotiating in the group work. This is where evidence is required to personalise the campaign. However, the more able candidates were able to liaise with people of power over specific things they wanted to change, which then provided a platform for level four answers in Section 3.

Weaker candidates either had little evidence or attached lots of evidence, usually incorporated in a bulky appendix, mostly without explanation, and not always clearly labelled. This then required interpretation and, in some cases, sorting into some sort of coherent order. In most of these cases the evidence did not support their actions. As in previous years, the most common area of weakness tended to be in Section 2(b). Moderators reported that some candidates did little or nothing to interpret and utilise the evidence they had gathered. Indeed, the page for 2b) was left blank. In the most extreme cases, candidates did no more than list the evidence they had gathered. Neither did they contact or find out the views from People of Power and analyse the views held by different people. Where this is the case, the marks must reflect the candidate's lack of response.

Another important point to note, especially in Section 2, is the need for all students to make clear their individual role in the campaign. Though they are not required to do so, most candidates work in groups. The 'we' aspect of their work offers one perspective but it is more important, to demonstrate the 'I' aspect of the work as well. The Witness Testimony Form was under-used and could have provided invaluable evidence.
It is not good practice to send one folder as evidence for the whole group-candidates clearly can't write well and refer to it to support their campaign in any meaningful way where this is the case.

Section 3: Evaluation of the outcome of campaign actions (5 AO1marks; 10 AO3 marks) AND Quality of Written Communication

A number of candidates mentioned the lack of time to complete the campaign, or the task form. This inevitably will have an impact on their overall assessment of this section. Some candidates were unable to comment on the impact of their campaign for a variety of reasons, and their responses were rather brief. Centres can support the candidates to develop the skill of evaluation so that they can evaluate their action, evidence and outcomes more fully.

The following comments were noted during the external moderation:

In 3(a) lower scoring answers described campaign outcomes or tried to evaluate the role of individuals. Higher scoring answers focused on explaining why things had gone to plan – or not. Some objectives were too ambitious, but they gave it their best efforts. They should also be assessing their individual participation.

Section 3(b) took candidates back to the beginning of their work. Those who had not set very clear objectives found that they could only write in general terms and gained few marks. Those who had established clear objectives were able to write, sometimes in detail, about whether or not objectives were met and there were high marks for clear and convincing explanations. It is quite acceptable to present this information in tabulated form. Although there must be sufficient writing to assess the quality of written communication.

In 3(c), it was encouraging to read that most candidates did feel that their campaign had made a positive impact, even if this was – inevitably in most cases – rather small scale. The marking criteria does give the requirement to make reference to 'the wider world'. Many interpreted this as the underlying reason for using social media as it reaches people world-wide. Candidates, themselves, again wrote very positively about their own feelings at the end of the campaign.

Applying the assessment criteria

As with administration, the accuracy of the application of the assessment criteria varied considerably from centre to centre. Most centres, particularly those which had gained experienced from the beginning back in 2011, were very accurate and this was reassuring especially now that this qualification is now well established as a GCSE subject. A few were too severe on their candidates and rather more inaccurate and inconsistent, and very generous. There is an Enhanced Controlled Assessment Booklet to help with the application of this marking criteria for the Controlled Assessment. Please visit www.edexcel.com for these support documents.

If more than one teacher is involved, it is essential that centres show that a robust system of internal moderation has been used. This was not always the case and, if even only one teacher of several is not marking to a common standard, the consequences on final centre marks can be very significant. It is essential that the second marker initials the work so that the external moderator is aware that the requirement of internal moderation has been fulfilled. Good practice was observed where a grid showing original assessor's marks and dates and another assessor's marks, dates and initials was included at the beginning of the candidate's submission. Usually, the best way to achieve accuracy is to read the assessment criteria in conjunction with the requirements of the response sheet and then to find a level where the descriptors best fit the work of the candidate. A mark within the level can then be determined.

It is emphasised that exemplars of Unit 4 work, with moderator commentaries, are available for centres on the GCSE Citizenship section of the Edexcel website. Online training and support courses will also take place during the academic year, and centre staff are advised to consult the training section of the Edexcel website for further information.

Difficulties encountered by external moderators.

To bring to your attention the problems that external moderators regularly encounter, please note the following:

The need for individual participation to be discussed and evidenced. Many just wrote about the group, using 'We' and not personalising the campaign in any way. Disorganised folders/unidentifiable sections/evidence. Many incomplete front covers which delays the external moderation procedure as the candidate number is very important-for identification.

Use of worksheets with no candidate response on the task form. These could be notes, but not used as a replacement for the actual task form. In any event, these would have been completed in class and not under controlled conditions.

Looking to the Future

This was the second year that the course requires the Controlled Assessments for Unit 2 and Unit 4 to be submitted at the end of the course. Therefore Centres need to be mindful of the choice of issue that it is chosen from a different range and content area as described in the Specification in order to meet the requirements for the examination. The Specification has been updated to include the new National Curriculum Framework set out in the Government Guidelines.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:
http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx