

GCSE

Citizenship Studies

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J269**

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course) **J029**

OCR Report to Centres June 2015

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this report.

© OCR 2015

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Citizenship (J269)

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course)

Citizenship (J029)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
A341 Citizenship – Rights and responsibilities	4
A342/02 Citizenship – Identity, Democracy and Justice	6
A343 Citizenship rights and responsibilities	11
A344 Citizenship identity democracy and justice	14

A341 Citizenship – Rights and responsibilities

General Comments:

This was the sixth time that candidates have been able to submit work for this unit, It was pleasing to see the commitment that most candidates had to their work and there was real evidence that they are becoming active citizens.

Centres are allowed to submit work for postal moderation (A341/02) or via the OCR repository (A341/01) where work is uploaded to OCR and then downloaded by the moderator. Care should be taken to ensure that the correct code is used. The administration of the moderation process for both methods uses a more automated system known as Moderation Manager. All paperwork is now automatically generated by this system and emailed to a designated email address within each Centre. It is vital that OCR has the most relevant email address as some teachers were telling their moderator that they had not received sample requests etc. The Centre Authentication Form (CCS160) is still required and needs to be sent with the sample of controlled assessment to the moderator. Failure to do this could mean that results are delayed.

An email is automatically generated and sent to the centre requesting the sample of controlled assessment for moderation. It is vital that the centre checks the details of the moderator on this email to ensure that the work is sent to the correct person.

Each piece of work needs to have the Citizenship coversheet (CCS/A341) on it where the breakdown of marks is recorded. The candidate proposal form also needs to be completed and sent with the work to the moderator. An updated version of this and the task booklet is available via Interchange.

This unit is a campaign to try to get something changed. It is not an awareness raising or a money raising exercise. The campaign needs to address one of the themes of this unit on human rights. The campaign needs to be targeted at key decision makers for example, the senior leadership team in the school, board of governors, local community leaders, business people, councillors or the local MP. Year 7 pupils are not key decision makers. Their names could be added to a petition that is presented to a member of the board of governors but they should not be the main focus of the campaign. Students sitting on the school council, however, are key decision makers and a campaign can be targeted towards them.

The work for this unit is broken down into three parts. The first part is an evaluation of issues and evidence. Candidates have 10 hours (in groups) to research the issue they are going to be campaigning about. This work is to be completed before the campaign takes place. Research is to be shared amongst all group members. The work has to be completed in a group. Candidates then have three hours under controlled conditions to write-up their evaluation individually. This is a requirement of the specification. Some centres were awarding marks for these assessment objectives when there was no evidence of the work - just evidence of some research. It is not necessary to send copies of all the research completed by candidates but some evidence of preparatory work is useful. If a questionnaire has been sent out, one copy of it with a tally chart of results or graphs showing the results is sufficient evidence.

This piece of work was generally completed well by most candidates and assessed with reasonable accuracy. Candidates are allowed up to three hours to complete their written work. Not allowing them this amount of time will limit the amount of marks they are able to achieve.

Throughout the work the candidate needs to complete a log/diary of what they have done or are doing. Evidence of planning is also required. The second part of this unit assesses their skills at taking action rather than their ability to write about it after the event. Supporting evidence for taking action would be the working documents used in the campaign. Photographs, posters, Powerpoint slides, DVDs are all good examples of evidence. A witness statement / observation sheet completed by the decision maker is a very good way of evidencing part of the taking action section. This evidence must be put together by the individual candidate – it is their portfolio of evidence. Providing a memory stick containing unnamed images of the whole cohort cannot count towards individual's marks. It shows that a campaign took place but no more than that. Any images must be linked to specific candidates or a campaign group.

A teacher summary sheet - the Assessment Record Form has been produced and is available on the OCR website this must be used and submitted along with the evidence for taking action. There needs to be sufficient evidence to justify the marks awarded. In some cases only the teacher mark and a simple comment were included and 16 marks were awarded. This is clearly not enough evidence.

The final part of this unit is a written evaluation of the success of the campaign. This is completed individually under controlled conditions lasting for one hour. This was completed correctly by most Centres and on the whole assessed accurately.

The main issues which arose with the work submitted this session were:

1. There was insufficient evidence to justify the marks awarded for taking action.
2. The work was not a campaign to try to bring about a change, it was to raise awareness or to raise money.
3. The campaign was not targeted at key decision makers, fellow pupils were the audience.
4. The evaluation of issues and evidence was not completed. Marks were awarded for evidence of some research.

The specification has a detailed section on this unit and OCR has also produced a guide to controlled assessment which can be found on the website. Both of these documents need to be read when planning the work for this unit. An exemplar piece of work for this unit is also available on the OCR website.

In conclusion, some excellent work has been seen this session. There have been a wide range of themes used, these include:

Reduced bus fare for students

Fair trade.

Can we have a school council?

Introducing a new item of clothing to the approved school uniform

Introducing a cyber bullying policy

Campaign to local shopkeepers to stop using plastic bags.

Improving road safety outside our school.

Campaign to change various aspects of school rules.

Can Year 11 have better study facilities in school?

How can the school reduce its energy bill?

Stop smoking in cars with child passengers.

Reduce cost of gym membership for under 18s.

Improving safety on local walkway.

How can we get the school to apply for wind turbine funding?

A342/02 Citizenship – Identity, Democracy and Justice

General Comments:

Report on the work of the candidates

Marks awarded to candidates ranged from 40 to 0 with some outstanding work seen at the top level. However only a minority of candidates demonstrated the range of knowledge and understanding necessary to achieve well across the whole paper.

Candidates were particularly knowledgeable about their own legal rights (question 16) and in their identification of rights that might conflict (question 11). They also had a confident understanding of 'equal opportunity' and 'personal freedom' in the context of question 17. The vast majority also understood the reasons why politicians take notice of the media (question 14), and were able to identify an international organisation protecting human rights (question 7) and a main religious group in the United Kingdom (UK) (question 8). Using their choice of options in the multiple choice questions, most candidates showed that they understood the reason many UK citizens have a complex sense of identity (question 1), the nature of a political party (question 2) and the role of a solicitor (question 3).

Candidates were far less confident in their understanding of: the 'rule of law' and responsibilities of the police (questions 17 and 15); the ways in which citizens can use the media to influence the decision-making process (question 14); the particular importance of pressure groups in a democracy (question 6); the particular ways in which citizens can actively support the justice system (question 9) and a Member of Parliament's specific responsibilities (question 10). The majority of candidates were unclear about the definition of the term 'referendum' (question 4) and surprisingly few were able to recognise the Commonwealth as a group of, "developed and developing countries that have historical ties to the UK".

Candidates found the stimulus material for questions 12 and 13 more difficult to interpret than in previous years.

As in previous years, some candidates employed a range of interesting and suitable examples to support their points, especially in relation to questions 11, 14 and 17. A minority of candidates found it far more difficult to support their points with evidence and examples from their studies, relying on rather vague generalisations to gain some marks.

Almost all candidates made a personal response to the viewpoint in question 17. Many also gave clear and valid reasons for their conclusions. Other candidates thought it sufficient to make an assertion strongly but without clear reasoning. Such candidates were unable to achieve the higher levels of response described in the mark scheme.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Questions 1-5

The multiple choice questions are differentiated and therefore some are harder than others. As anticipated, questions 4 and 5 proved to be far more challenging than questions 1, 2 and 3 this year. As in past years, some candidates used a process of elimination in which they crossed off alternatives that were definitely wrong so as to narrow down their choice. This was clearly a helpful process to those who used it.

- Q1. This proved to be a straightforward question. A very significant majority of candidates identified family members' mixed cultural and religious backgrounds as the main reason why UK citizens may have a complex sense of identity.
- Q2. This question asked candidates to define the term 'political party'. It was answered correctly by an overwhelming majority of candidates who correctly identified a "group of people with similar ideas who campaign in elections" as the most appropriate option.
- Q3. Most candidates knew that solicitors "provide legal advice and support" but a minority suggested incorrectly that solicitors "make judgements on applications for legal aid".
- Q4. Relatively few candidates linked the term 'referendum' with the correct definition – "a vote on a single issue in which all citizens can take part". Many suggested incorrectly that the term 'referendum' describes a process by which laws are referred back to the courts or a type of democracy found mainly in the European Union (EU).
- Q5. Many candidates also had difficulty with this question. The term 'Commonwealth' should have been linked with the description, "developed and developing countries that have historical ties to the UK". Two of the other options – the EU, the United Nations (UN) – were chosen incorrectly by many.

Questions 6 to 10

These questions enable candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the specification's content. These questions are differentiated in a similar way to questions 1 – 5. All questions were worth one mark and used the command word "state". For this type of question, candidates are required only to give short answers rather than to write full sentences. For example, the short phrase "jury service" would be an adequate response to question 9.

- Q6. This question was answered well on the whole but a significant minority of candidates offered vague responses such as "helping people" or tautologies such as "applying pressure" neither of which could be given credit. Examiners were expecting candidates to give specific reasons why pressure groups are important in a democracy. Acceptable responses included references to: giving people a voice; challenging government; informing the public or politicians; and campaigning for change. The best responses used concepts such as accountability, representation and challenge.
- Q7. The vast majority of candidates clearly recognised the term 'human rights' in this question and most were able to identify an international organisation that protects human rights. Suitable popular responses included the United Nations and Amnesty International. A minority of candidates identified organisations without an international dimension to their work, such as ChildLine, while others gave examples of legislation, such as the Human Rights Act, or of international declarations rather than organisations.
- Q8. Most candidates used the appropriate examples of Christians or Muslims to identify a main religious group in the UK. Examiners were flexible in giving credit to candidates who mentioned other main religious groups including recognisable denominations, sects and organisations.

- Q9. This proved to be a challenging question for many candidates. Examiners credited only those responses that gave specific examples of citizens' active support for the justice system. 'Obeying the law' and 'voting' were both popular responses but Examiners judged them to be too vague in the context of the question. Popular valid responses included: jury service; acting as a witness; reporting crime and applying to be a magistrate.
- Q10. This proved to be one of the most challenging of the five short-answer questions. As with question 9, many of the responses were insufficiently specific. These vague responses included: 'obeying the law'; 'being honest'; and 'making decisions'. Examiners accepted responses that showed some understanding of a Member of Parliament's role. Of these correct responses, 'representing constituents', 'debating laws' and 'checking on the government' were among the more popular.

Question 11

Examiners expected candidates to show an understanding of the term 'people's rights'. The overwhelming majority of candidates were able to do this and to give two examples of such rights. The question asked candidates to explain why rights sometimes conflict with each other. Candidates often found this more difficult. Examiners gave additional credit to candidates who described rights where there is a clear potential for conflict. The right to personal freedom and the right to security were judged to be suitable examples in this context. Further credit was given to those candidates who explained why such conflict might exist. Candidates often developed their responses with examples. Many described conflicts between freedom of speech and the right to be free of discrimination while others linked their answers to recent controversies over media freedom and privacy. Some of the most convincing answers explored the potential conflict between privacy and security in the context of recent police action on terrorism. Some of the most sophisticated answers came from candidates who knew that rights can be withheld by governments or religious organisations and understood some of the justifications offered for such action. This question differentiated well between candidates. Candidates usually performed better if they used the bullet points to help structure a response while, at the same time, checking that they were addressing the substantive question.

Questions 12 and 13

- Q12. Proved to be challenging for many candidates. The exam took place shortly after the general Election. This encouraged many candidates to assume incorrectly that the second of two stimulus diagrams was an opinion poll showing a decline in support for the Conservative Party. Such candidates then went on to choose one of the distractors in this multiple choice question rather than the appropriate option. This type of mistake helps to underline the importance of reading the title of a statistical diagram as well considering the data it contains.
- Q13. Also turned out to be challenging for many. Examiners had expected candidates to realise that finding out more about the reasons for opposition to the HS2 rail project would enable a government to understand how best to increase support for the project. As it turned out many candidates felt the best course of action for a government wanting to increase support for HS2 was to continue surveys every six months or to ask MPs to pass on the views of their constituents.

Question 14

Examiners expected candidates to draw on their experiences of campaigning to state two ways in which citizens can use the media to influence the decision-making process. Examiners then expected candidates to explain why politicians take notice of the media when making their decisions.

Relatively few candidates mentioned two specific ways in which citizens can make use of the media when campaigning. Those that did so correctly used examples such as blogs, e-petitions and, quite surprisingly, letters to a newspaper. Others made the valid point that that protests can be 'newsworthy' and so come to the attention of decision-makers. Many candidates were insufficiently specific in this context and so missed out on the highest marks.

Most candidates were more confident at explaining why politicians take notice of the media when making decisions. The most popular explanations mentioned the importance of taking account of different opinions or listening to the general public's view. Less convincing explanations included references to politicians' fear of scandal or concern over press opposition. Such comments were often coloured by candidates' recent experience of the 2015 general election campaign. Examiners gave particular credit to those candidates who were able to draw upon their understanding of the democratic process to explain that politicians rely on public support and so must take note of public opinion and media coverage.

Some candidates interpreted this question differently. In the light of their general election experience, a significant minority of candidates described how the media can influence people's voting behaviour. Such descriptions were rarely well-developed but examiners gave such responses credit where possible. As with question 11, candidates tended to achieve well when they focused on the substantive question but were also guided by the bullet points.

Most of those candidates who ran out of space for their answer used a continuation sheet from their invigilator to extend their response and develop their points. Unfortunately a significant minority of candidates seemed to 'stop' after running out of answer space on the main question paper. Such candidates often wrote too little on one of the aspects of the question to be credited with the marks that their level of knowledge and understanding may have deserved.

Questions 15 and 16

As in previous years, almost all candidates attempted these questions and most showed a reasonable understanding of aspects of the law as they related to the cases described. Nearly all candidates were able to differentiate successfully between rights and responsibilities. Unfortunately, a significant minority of candidates did not answer both parts of these questions by omitting to describe either Sandra's responsibilities (Question 15) or George's rights (Question 16). This capped their mark at a maximum of two out of four.

Some candidates explained their choice of option and also explained why they had not chosen the other options. These candidates almost always developed better explanations for their decision than those who adopted a more limited focus. Consequently the candidates with a broader focus tended to gain higher marks.

While most candidates were able to identify the correct option for question 15, a significant minority thought incorrectly either that the police always need a warrant to enter a property or that domestic violence is not a matter for the police. Almost all candidates who chose the correct option were able to explain that the police have a duty to protect people from harm and a right to intervene if there are reasonable grounds to believe that someone is being assaulted.

Examiners accepted a range of examples to illustrate Sandra's responsibilities as a police officer. The most popular examples included: upholding the law; protecting human life and treating people with respect. Examiners were looking for either a thorough description of Sandra's responsibilities or a thorough explanation of the correct option choice. If these were linked to either a sound explanation of the correct choice of option or a sound description of

Sandra's responsibilities, then full marks were awarded. The examiners' test of 'thoroughness' was a candidate's use of two distinct and separate points. So a description of Sandra's responsibilities incorporating a reference to, say, protecting people from harm and treating them with respect, would qualify as a 'thorough' description. A description incorporating only one of these examples was regarded as 'sound'. Some candidates found it difficult to make distinct points and tended to repeat the same point in different terms. They received no additional credit for being repetitive.

Almost all candidates stated correctly that George would be arrested for taking a car without consent and then crashing it (question 16). The overwhelming majority of candidates explained that the scenario described two forms of criminal behaviour and that these were matters for the police.

Most candidates showed a good knowledge of the rights to which arrested citizens are entitled. Rights mentioned most often included: legal representation; release after 24 hours in normal circumstances or the right to silence. A significant minority of candidates failed to realise that George's age meant that he didn't have the right for a parent or other responsible adult to support him following arrest. Examiners used the same tests for 'thoroughness' and 'soundness' as described above for question 15.

Question 17

Examiners intended that candidates should demonstrate a sound knowledge and understanding of the British values identified by the specification i.e. the rule of law, personal freedom, equal opportunity, tolerance and respect for diversity, and representative democracy. The first three of these values were mentioned in the question's stimulus. This stimulus also introduced the viewpoint that the rule of law is more important than personal freedom, equal opportunity or the other British values.

Most candidates showed a sufficient understanding of personal freedom, equal opportunity or both to make at least a limited attempt to respond to the viewpoint. However many candidates attempted to do this without showing an understanding that the law applies equally to everyone. Consequently their evaluation could be only partial at best and their achievement was capped at level 2.

Relatively few candidates introduced the two values from the specification omitted from the stimulus. Those that did mention either tolerance and respect for diversity or equal opportunity usually gained marks within level 4 as long as they also understood the rule of law. Some candidates substituted British traditions and institutions for values by mentioning the significance of fish and chips, the Royal family or the Grand National horse race. No credit was given for such examples.

Examiners were also expecting candidates to evaluate the viewpoint and to give valid reasons for their conclusions. Many candidates found this challenging and some offered a powerful assertion of their own view instead, unsupported by examples or evidence. This was not credited.

The best candidate responses always included a reasoned, and often very thoughtful, consideration of the viewpoint exploring interconnections between the values prior to reaching a valid and convincing conclusion. Such responses often included examples of how 'British values' can be said to promote community cohesion and patriotism. High achieving candidates invariably understood the rule of law, and its implications for citizens' respect for the law and their faith in the justice system. A small minority of candidates chose to question the extent to which the rule of law really does apply across the UK. These candidates gained credit for their answers as long as they responded evaluatively to the viewpoint, supported their points with evidence or examples and considered the significance of other British values.

As in previous years, candidates who used the bullet points to help structure their answer produced more worthwhile responses than those who did not.

A343 Citizenship rights and responsibilities

General Comments:

This was the fifth sitting of the A343 Citizenship paper. This paper constitutes 20% of the marks for the full course.

Marks awarded to candidates ranged from 40 to 0 with some very good work seen at the top level. Again there were few candidates who did not attempt most questions. Candidates appeared better prepared than last year with plenty of evidence that candidates had been well prepared across the whole breadth of the syllabus. As last year, candidates appeared to have used their time wisely with very few running out of time for the final question.

Most candidates answered the stimulus questions well and were able to interpret the information sufficiently to score better on the second half of the paper. Although some marks were achievable through comprehension, only an understanding of the topics examined allowed candidates to achieve the top level.

From June 2015 the number of marks available for the longer questions altered. Question 6 was worth 4 marks, question 8c 6 marks and question 9d 8 marks. This has been effective and the paper will continue to be structured this way.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Questions 1 – 5

The short questions are differentiated and therefore some are harder than others. There was evidence that candidates were better prepared for these questions with most candidates providing sufficient explanation to make their meaning clear. Few candidates wasted time on extended answers.

Question 1a

Mostly answered well, although with a few examples of "attend school".

Question 1b

Again, most answers correct - although with quite a few unqualified references to "teaching students". This question was more difficult than 1a as it was asking for a legal rather than a moral responsibility.

Question 2a and 2b

Most candidates gained both marks here as they were able to give two different ways to save energy that were linked to home and school.

Question 3a

NUT was popular, followed by Unison, with a few more obscure (but correct) examples. A significant minority of candidates thought this question was to do with free/fair trade.

Question 3b

Most candidates gave a reasonable specific answer, although a fair proportion of answers were too vague.

Question 4a

Although specific examples of relevant Acts of Parliament were rare, many candidates gained credit through references to "Minimum Wage", "Working Time", Health & Safety etc. However, some referred to legislation that was not specifically related to the workplace.

Question 4b

More general answers were accepted for this question and as a result, most candidates gained a mark here. However, it wasn't always clear (even where an answer was 'correct') that the candidate had really distinguished between "employers" and "employees".

Question 5a

A significant number of candidates thought this question related solely to public transport. Even where the candidate did not make this mistake this attracted some very poor (often single-word) responses.

Question 5b

Few candidates answered this question correctly. There was quite a lot of repetition and reference to bus timetables.

Question 6

Most candidates were able to gain credit on this question, They appeared well prepared to address a longer question and followed the rubric to their advantage (to some extent). Successful candidates were able to use their examples to support their answer rather than just state them. It was possible to gain full marks with a concise response. There was some repetition around the idea of financial support (sponsoring/funding).

Question 7a

The vast majority of candidates were able to use document 1 correctly. When the question asks 'Using document.....' candidates are only awarded the mark if their answer comes directly from the document.

Questions 7b

Some candidates misunderstood this question as asking about benefits to the producers, whilst others quoted phrases about the co-operative's historical involvement with Fairtrade which didn't illustrate an "advantage". Generally answered satisfactorily though. The document can be used for inspiration but as the question did not say 'Using document 1' candidates were free to give their own ideas.

Question 7c

Few candidates gained both marks here, with limited references to reducing trade barriers/tariffs. A mark was generally gained through reference to advertising or increasing awareness.

Question 8a

The question did not ask for examples of social media but ways in which it had been used. Some candidates just stated Facebook and Twitter as their answer. However, many candidates gained both marks here by using the document as required by the question.

Question 8b

Again, this was often answered correctly (although some candidates just quoted a - usually inappropriate - phrase from Document 2).

Question 8c

This was a challenging question as candidates had to understand types of media and ways the media can be used to bring about political change. It was a clear differentiator on this paper as many answers talked in general about change in citizen's opinion rather than political change.

Following the rubric of the question assisted candidates in accessing the higher levels of the mark scheme as they were prompted to explain (rather than just describe) and use examples.

Question 9a

This question was almost always answered correctly (if sometimes at unnecessary length).

Question 9b

The phrase "other than inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment" was frequently ignored, whilst some students gave a response that was something that the ECHR would encourage.

Question 9c

Although a comprehension type question, candidates had to understand the document to be able to answer it correctly.

Question 9d

Candidates appeared well prepared to address this longer question and followed the rubric to their advantage (to some extent). A lot of spurious rights were mentioned in answers to this question. Often, other ways to punish people were stated but not described. Most candidates managed to explain why victims of crime may feel supported by whole-life sentences, while most offered some sort of evaluation. Again, the lack of "specific and accurate" examples often limited an otherwise good response to 5 marks.

A344 Citizenship identity democracy and justice

General Comments:

This was the fifth time that candidates have been able to submit work for this unit - A344 The Citizenship Enquiry and Practical Citizenship Action. It was pleasing to see the commitment that most candidates had to their work and there was real evidence that they are becoming active citizens.

Centres are allowed to submit work for postal moderation (A344/02) or via the OCR repository (A344/01) where work is uploaded to OCR and then downloaded by the moderator. Care should be taken to ensure that the correct code is used. The administration of the moderation process for both methods uses a more automated system known as Moderation Manager. All paperwork is now automatically generated by this system and emailed to a designated email address within each Centre. It is vital that OCR has the most relevant email address as some teachers were telling their moderator that they had not received sample requests etc. The Centre Authentication Form (CCS160) is still required and needs to be sent with the sample of controlled assessment to the moderator. Failure to do this could mean that results are delayed.

An email is automatically generated and sent to the centre requesting the sample of controlled assessment for moderation. It is vital that the centre checks the details of the moderator on this email to ensure that the work is sent to the correct person.

Each piece of work needs to have the Citizenship coversheet (CCS/A344) on it where the breakdown of marks is recorded. The candidate proposal form also needs to be completed and sent with the work to the moderator.

The work for this unit is broken down into three parts. The first part is the Citizenship Enquiry. Please note that this is changed every year. The source book for June 2016 is now available via Interchange. Candidates have 10 hours (in groups) to research the issue covered in the enquiry. This involves using the sources in the source book and from elsewhere. Candidates then have two hours under controlled conditions to address one of the three viewpoints. In order to reach Level 3 on AO3 there must be some analysis of evidence drawn from the source book and elsewhere. Annotating where candidates have used their own evidence in their work greatly helps the moderator to agree these marks.

This piece of work was generally completed well by most candidates and assessed with reasonable accuracy. Candidates are allowed up to two hours to complete their written work. Not allowing them this amount of time will limit the amount of marks they are able to achieve.

This unit requires candidates to undertake some practical citizenship action. It is not a campaign, this is work for A341. Candidates can use the same theme for both pieces of controlled assessment. For example they could campaign to include work to enable a greater understanding of people with disabilities into the PSHE curriculum. If they were successful in their campaign they could undertake the actual work for their action in A344.

Throughout the practical citizenship action, candidates need to complete a log/diary of what they have done or are doing. Some evidence of planning is also required. The second part of this unit assesses their skills at taking action rather than their ability to write about it after the event. Supporting evidence for taking action would be the working documents used in the practical citizenship action. Photographs, posters, Powerpoint slides, DVDs are all good examples of evidence. A witness statement/ observation sheet completed by a participant is a very good way of evidencing part of the taking action section.

This evidence must be put together by the individual candidate – it is their portfolio of evidence. Providing a memory stick containing unnamed images of the whole cohort cannot count towards

individual's marks. It shows that practical action took place but no more than that. Any images must be linked to specific candidates or a group.

A teacher summary sheet - the Assessment Record Form has been produced and is available on the OCR website. This must be included along with the evidence for taking action. There needs to be sufficient evidence to justify the marks awarded. In some cases only the teacher mark and a simple comment were included and 16 marks were awarded. This is clearly not enough evidence.

The final part of this unit is a written evaluation of the success of the practical citizenship action. This is completed individually under controlled conditions lasting for one hour. This was completed correctly by most Centres and on the whole assessed accurately.

The main issues which arose with the work submitted this session were:

1. Candidates must use their own evidence as well as the source book to reach level 3 AO3.
2. This is practical citizenship action and not a campaign.
3. There was insufficient evidence to justify the marks awarded for taking action.

The specification has a detailed section on this unit and OCR has also produced a guide to controlled assessment which can be found on the website. Both of these documents need to be read when planning the work for this unit. An exemplar piece of work is also available via the website.

In conclusion, some excellent work has been seen this session. There have been a wide range of themes used, these include:

Coaching sessions for boys in netball and girls in football
International evening
Food sampling day
Event to change perceptions of people with disabilities
Old people's party
IT sessions for older people run by students
School display to promote intergenerational respect

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2015

