

## **GCSE**

### **Citizenship Studies**

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J269**

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

### **OCR Report to Centres June 2016**

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 2016

## **CONTENTS**

### **General Certificate of Secondary Education**

#### **Citizenship (J269)**

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

#### **Citizenship (J029)**

## **OCR REPORT TO CENTRES**

<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
OCR Report to Centres June 2016	1
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:

It was pleasing to see the commitment that most candidates had to their campaigns 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. The assessment record form showing the breakdown of marks for taking action should also be included.

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 – rather 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 and a wide range of themes have been used.

# A342/02 Citizenship – Identity, Democracy and Justice

## General Comments:

Marks awarded to candidates ranged from 40 to 0 with some outstanding work seen at the top level. Most candidates demonstrated the knowledge and understanding necessary for worthwhile achievement in the examination. Candidates who had been prepared well for the exam were able to excel.

As in previous years, candidates showed good knowledge of their own legal rights in court (question 15). The majority understood the role of political parties and the reasons why people become members (question 11). Most also had a confident understanding of ‘traditions’, ‘culture’, ‘values’ and ‘identity’ in the context of question 17. Most candidates were also able to show a basic understanding why many businesses support EU membership (question 14) but many found it difficult to develop their reasoning. The vast majority were able to identify a human right that would not apply in a dictatorship (question 8) and one feature of a place with low levels of community cohesion (question 10). On the multiple choice questions (1-5), most candidates showed that they understood the role of the Crown Prosecution Service (question 1), the relationship between a government and Parliament (question 2), the meaning of the term ‘asylum seeker’ (question 4) and knowledge of International Humanitarian Law (question 5).

Candidates were far less confident in their knowledge and understanding of the rights of a witness (question 15). Relatively few were able to identify a decision-making body of the EU (question 6) and many lacked specific knowledge about the advantages of using *Citizens Advice* (question 7) or about specific legal restrictions on press freedom (question 9). Most candidates were unable to identify a civil servant as ‘a professional administrator employed by the Government’ (question 3).

The majority of candidates were able to interpret the stimulus material for questions 12 and 13. Many selected also selected information appropriately from this stimulus to support their response to question 14.

As in previous years, some candidates employed a range of interesting and suitable examples to support their points, especially in relation to question 17. Here there were many original responses some of which drew upon relevant personal experience. Some candidates continue to have difficulty supporting their points with evidence and examples from their studies, relying on rather vague generalisations to gain some credit.

Almost all candidates made a personal response to the viewpoint in question 17. Most also gave clear and valid reasons for their conclusions.

## Comments on Individual Questions:

### Questions 1-5

The multiple choice questions are differentiated and therefore some are more challenging than others. As anticipated, questions 3 and 5 proved to be far more difficult than questions 1, 2 and 4 this year. As in past years, some candidates used a process of elimination, narrowing down their choice by first crossing out inappropriate options. This again was clearly a helpful process for those who used it.

Q1. This proved to be a straightforward question. A very significant majority of candidates identified the main role of the Crown Prosecution Service as being ‘to decide whether or not to take a case to court’.

Q2. This question asked candidates to find the most appropriate description of the relationship between a government and Parliament. Over seventy percent of responses chose the correct

option – ‘The Government proposes new laws to Parliament’. The majority of incorrect responses suggested that either ‘The Government elects Parliament’ or ‘Parliament elects the Government’.

Q3. Most candidates failed to select ‘civil servant’ as the best term to fit the description ‘A professional administrator employed by the Government’. Popular incorrect choices were ‘Member of Parliament’ or ‘Local councillor’.

Q4. A very significant majority (almost eighty percent) of candidates knew that an asylum seeker is someone ‘looking for refuge’ but many chose the incorrect option – ‘a person wanting to work or study in the United Kingdom’.

Q5. A small majority of candidates selected ‘International Humanitarian Law’ as the term best suited to the description ‘a set of rules that aims to protect people’s rights in times of war’. ‘The Universal Declaration of Human Rights’ was a popular incorrect choice.

### Questions 6 to 10

These questions enable candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding across a broad swathe of specification content. Questions 6-10 are differentiated in a similar way to questions 1 – 5. All questions are worth one mark and use 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 "It's free" would be an adequate response to question 7.

Q6. This question proved difficult for most candidates. Only a minority were able to identify the European Parliament, Commission, Council or Court as examples of decision-making bodies in the European Union. Some candidates who gave examples of decision-making bodies with an exclusively UK remit may have misread this question and thought they were being asked to identify a decision-making body in the UK rather than in the EU. Nevertheless there were many ill-informed responses which included ‘David Cameron’, ‘the Queen’ and even ‘OFSTED’.

Q7. Just over half the candidates were able to identify one specific advantage of using services provided by the Citizens Advice Bureau or Citizens Advice. Acceptable responses included references to the quality of the service, reliability, confidentiality, expertise, trust, impartiality, easy availability, signposting to other services and, of course, the absence of charges. Tautologies such as “you get advice” were not accepted. Some candidates appeared to be unfamiliar with this important free advice service even though it is cited in the specification as an example of legal advice and support.

Q8. Over eighty percent of candidates were able to correctly identify a human right that may not exist in a dictatorship. Most candidates used the ‘right to vote’ or ‘freedom of speech’ as correct examples. Others referred correctly to ‘freedom of religion’ or ‘freedom of movement’. Incorrect responses included rights to education, work and health care which are not necessarily consequential to particular political systems.

Q9. This proved to be a challenging question for many candidates. Less than half provided an appropriate response. Many thought incorrectly that the media are legally prevented from offending anyone or that they have a legal obligation to avoid bias. The majority of correct responses included references to laws on privacy, libel, racial hatred or national security.

Q10. The vast majority of candidates understood the term ‘community cohesion’ and were able to give a valid example of what might be seen in a place with low levels. Popular correct responses included crime, vandalism, violence, racism, various forms of discrimination and people being afraid to leave home. A small but significant minority cited ethnic homogeneity or poverty, neither of which are necessarily features of areas with low levels of community cohesion.

### Question 11

This question differentiated particularly well between candidates.

Examiners expected candidates to identify two political parties. The overwhelming majority were able to do so. Most mentioned Labour or the Conservatives but UKIP and the Green Party also featured frequently in candidates’ responses.

Most candidates either showed understanding of political parties' role or were able to give a simple explanation of why people become members. Such straightforward explanations included 'to make a difference' or 'because they agree with what the party stands for'. As long as candidates also gave a valid example of at least one political party, this was sufficient for two marks.

Seventy percent of candidates were able to develop their explanations in more detail and to give two examples of political parties. Many mentioned at least two reasons why people might join a political party. Good responses referred to debate, campaigning and representation, often using key terms such as 'manifesto', 'councillor', 'representative' and 'delegate'. These candidates were usually rewarded with full marks as long as their response was sufficiently thorough.

### **Question 12**

Seventy percent of candidates interpreted the statistical diagram correctly by suggesting that most exports from the UK go to countries in the European Union. A significant minority analysed the diagram with insufficient care, noticed that Switzerland had experienced the greatest increase in UK exports between 2010 and 2014, and assumed incorrectly that this meant that 'most exports go to Switzerland'. This type of mistake helps to underline the importance of candidates reading the title of a statistical diagram and the description of each set of data it contains.

### **Question 13**

This question also generated a high proportion of correct responses (over seventy percent). Most candidates suggested correctly that a government could provide the best support to exporting businesses by producing statistics identifying the products exported to each country in the table.

### **Question 14**

Examiners expected candidates to do well on this question given that the exam took place during the early stages of the 2016 EU referendum campaign. In the event, only just over twenty percent of candidates were able to write thorough explanations to show why 'many businesses support UK membership of the EU'. Such thorough responses made specific references to the absence of tariffs, free trade or the 'single market' and to the particular business advantages of free movement of labour. Some particularly well-informed responses also made positive references to EU grants for research and development, product standardisation as well as to more general issues of confidence, trust and cooperation.

Most candidates were able to show some understanding that the EU had trade advantages for UK businesses but found it difficult to be more specific. Candidates were able to gain full marks only if they responded fully to the question's requirements by going beyond 'trade advantages' in their explanation.

Candidates were asked to support their answer by using evidence from the document and their studies. Those that failed to add weight to their response in this way were limited to one mark. Nevertheless, most candidates were able to support their response with some relevant information from the stimulus document. Many good responses did so extensively by mentioning the volume of exports to particular EU countries and noting the increase in exporting between 2010 and 2014. These were in the minority, however, and it will be important for future candidates to develop the skills necessary to support their narratives with specific references to examples or evidence.

Most of those candidates who ran out of space for their response asked an invigilator for a continuation sheet in order to extend their answer and develop their points. Unfortunately a significant minority of those candidates with limited skills of concision seemed to 'stop' after running out of answer space on the main question paper. Such candidates often wrote too little 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, there were still a small number of candidates who did not answer both parts of these questions, omitting to describe either Beatrice's rights in court (Question 15) or Mark's rights as a witness (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 choice than those who adopted a more limited focus. Consequently candidates with the broader focus tended to gain higher marks.

While most candidates were able to identify the correct option for question 15, a significant minority thought that 'all criminal cases go through a magistrates' court' without realising that youth courts are branches of magistrates' courts. Few candidates mentioned that county courts deal with civil rather than criminal cases, while others argued incorrectly that young people would never need to attend either magistrates' or county courts. A minority of well-informed candidates pointed out that minors would need to attend a magistrate's court if they had acted with an adult to commit a crime but that this did not apply in the scenario provided.

Examiners accepted a range of examples to illustrate Beatrice's rights in court. The most popular examples included references to legal support or the support of parents, the right to a fair trial, the presumption of innocence and the right to a defence. A significant minority of candidates mentioned Beatrice's rights on arrest rather than in court and so found it difficult to construct a thorough response to the question.

Examiners were looking for either a thorough description of Beatrice's rights in court 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 Beatrice's rights, 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 Beatrice's rights in court incorporating a reference to, for example, the presumption of innocence and the right to legal representation 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 some repeated the same point in different terms. They received no additional credit for being repetitive.

Candidates tended to achieve higher marks on question 15 than on question 16. Candidates were less confident about describing Mark's rights as a witness than Beatrice's rights in court. While nearly half of candidates achieved full marks on question 15, only a third did so on question 16.

While the majority of candidates stated that the police should contact Mark's parents before interviewing him, few explained their choice apart from mentioning his age. Relatively few candidates explained why they had not chosen the other two options but those that did so tended to achieve high marks overall.

There was widespread uncertainty about witness's rights. Some candidates wrote instead about Mark's responsibilities as a witness by mentioning the importance of being truthful or cooperating with the police. It was not possible for these candidates to receive credit for such comments. Good responses included relevant witness rights such as being able to seek legal advice, adult support, declining to answer questions, signing a statement and being able to withdraw a statement. Vague references were made to 'privacy', 'anonymity' and 'witness protection' but these often lacked conviction. Some candidates unfortunately described rights relating to stop, search and arrest rather than witness rights.

### Question 17

Examiners intended that candidates should demonstrate a sound knowledge and understanding of the complex nature of identity in a multi-cultural and multi-faith society.

Most candidates showed confidence in responding to the question and wrote expansively but sometimes without sufficient focus or evidence.

The majority of candidates were able to differentiate between ‘traditions’, ‘culture’ and ‘values’ but some conflated ‘traditions’ and ‘culture’. Where this happened, responses tended to lack clarity and specificity. Many candidates had learned to identify the five British values and were keen to show off their knowledge even though they were often less diligent at applying this knowledge to the question of identity. Almost invariably, candidates were able to give examples of British traditions but these were usually somewhat stereotypical – ‘fish and chips’, ‘roast dinner’s and even ‘Sunday church attendance’. Candidates often gave good examples of diverse traditions from other cultures. Most of these examples related to religious festivals. There were very few examples of cultural traditions that might clash with British values such as attitudes to women or treatment of animals.

Most candidates were able to use evidence to reject the viewpoint that British citizens share the same culture and traditions. Some of the best responses included reference to long-standing cultural differences between English, Welsh, Scottish and Irish residents of the UK in addition to a commentary on the impact of more recent immigration on cultural diversity.

Many responses thoughtfully considered the matter of values separately, suggesting that members of different cultural groups often share British values. Such responses almost invariably achieved more than half marks.

Good responses to this question addressed both parts of the viewpoint to reach a reasoned conclusion and, in doing so, acknowledged the complexity of the issues involved. Candidates achieved high marks through the extensive use of valid examples, sometimes from their own life experience, and by understanding both the complex nature of identity and the significance of British values for many UK citizens.

As in previous years some candidates laboured under the misapprehension that a strident assertion of their own view, unsupported by examples or evidence, would be sufficient to impress the examiners. On the other hand, there were some refreshingly original responses to question 17 this year. These included commentaries on threats to consensus on British values, and on the problems caused by discrimination and racism.

This question differentiated well between candidates. As in previous years, 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.

## A343 Citizenship rights and responsibilities

### General Comments:

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. This year there were two additional sheets of answer paper in the back of the question paper.

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 continued to be effective and the paper will remain structured in this way.

### Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No.

#### 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.

#### Questions 1a and 1b

There was the occasional (expected) confusion between "employer" and "employee" here, and sometimes between a right and a responsibility. Quite a lot of the responses to (b), in particular, did not mention a legal right. The rights had to be specific to an "employer" and not just a general right of any worker in the business.

#### Questions 2a and 2b

For (a) the most popular answer given by candidates was that a patent meant your invention could not be copied. The examples given in response to (b) were generally correct.

#### Questions 3a and 3b

Where candidates understood the meaning of the term social responsibility, they usually answered both parts well. Occasionally, the response related to a business being irresponsible.

#### Questions 4a and 4b

Mostly candidates answered these questions well, although some candidates often described a tax (and sometimes confused a tax with a fine). Occasionally, more general taxes were offered as answers. These two questions were linked and candidates were required to give an example of how the tax they had named in 4a would make people more environmentally responsible.

#### Questions 5a and 5b

Part (a) was usually answered well, although sometimes repetitively. Quite a few candidates hadn't read the question carefully and answered (b) as if it was still asking about non-democratic countries. Both of these questions were worth 2 marks. Candidates need to be prepared to write two different answers without prompts (i) and (ii) etc in the answer section.

### **Question 6**

Most candidates identified at least one source of professional advice (usually CAB or a solicitor) and therefore were able to score at least one mark. However, even where two were identified, the candidate quite frequently simply described what they did rather than giving advantages of using professional support. (Sometimes the description did include an advantage.) It was possible to gain full marks with a concise response.

### **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**

This question was answered correctly by most candidates. Incorrect answers did not give a responsibility clearly linked to education.

### **Question 7c**

Candidates were able to draw on their own experience of methods of safeguarding at their school to give two different answers to this question.

### **Question 8a**

Candidates often stated an objective of the CQC, rather than quoting an example from further down the document of how they go about achieving this. (Others simply quoted back two of the paragraph headings.) 'Using document.....' means that candidates are only awarded the marks if their answers came directly from the document.

### **Question 8b**

This question was answered well, with "It's free" being by far the most common response. Again, this was often answered correctly (although some candidates just quoted a - usually inappropriate - phrase from Document 2).

### **Question 8c**

Good reasons were generally offered in part (c), although there was a tendency for the 'public' reason to be a mirror image of the 'government' reason (e.g. "The government needs public services to be regulated so that the service is safe for people to use. The public needs public services to be regulated so that they will feel safe."). Candidates frequently failed to think beyond the Health Service so were unable to gain full marks.

### **Question 9a**

This question was almost always answered correctly. 'Using document.....' candidates are only awarded the mark if their answer comes directly from the document.

### **Question 9b**

There were many examples that candidates could use but they had to make the link between reducing poverty and developing countries. A pressure group trying to reduce homelessness in the United Kingdom would not count.

### **Question 9c**

Although a comprehension type question, candidates had to understand the document to be able to answer it correctly. 'Using document.....' candidates are only awarded the mark if their answer comes directly from the document.

**Question 9d**

Candidates appeared well prepared to address this longer question and followed the rubric to their advantage (to some extent). There were some good answers to part (d), though occasionally let down by the lack of examples.

## A344 Citizenship identity democracy and justice

### General Comments:

This unit has two elements, 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 assessment record form should also be submitted.

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 2017 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 A03 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 covering a wide range of themes.

**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](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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 2016

