

Projects

Higher

OCR Level 2 Higher Project **H855**

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

Projects

Level 2 Higher (H855)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

| Content | Page |
|-----------------------------|-------------|
| H855 Level 2 Higher Project | 4 |

H855 Level 2 Higher Project

General Comments:

There was a wide range of topics chosen by candidates this year, and the evidence for their choices was generally good. Many candidates had selected a number of possible topics and then provided an explanation of advantages and disadvantages for these. There is still a concern about centres where completion of the Project is linked to another subject area. While this is allowed, there must be evidence that the candidates have been allowed to choose something outside this subject area.

Most candidates had done primary research as well as using secondary material, although there was a strong reliance on Survey Monkey. A number of questionnaires and surveys were poorly constructed, and lacked profiling questions. This would have allowed candidates to judge how representative their survey participants were and would have mitigated against the 'distance' an online survey has. There was also an increased use of interviews (sometimes using Skype) and email.

It was also encouraging to see the lengths that some candidates taken to hunt down secondary material beyond the internet. Some very complex material had been used and synthesised by the more able candidates.

There was some excellent use of project management techniques and tools, such as Gantt charts, which resulted in a clear focus on the process, but there are still candidates who focus too strongly on content/topic. There is still a misconception on the part of candidates and supervisors that the project was an "essay" or "coursework" and these resulting projects often have insufficient evidence to support marks in the highest mark band, particularly for AO3.

Some centres had helpfully annotated Unit Recording Sheets to show where evidence for the assessment objectives could be found, and made useful comments which indicated how and why marks had been awarded. Without these, it is difficult for moderators to see the rationale behind the marking. It is also recommended that the supervisors annotate the actual projects.

Project Progression Records had generally been well used, and the use of the electronic version was of benefit to candidates who had used this to record their reflections and next steps. Some centres encouraged the use of a reflective diary or project log, which provided excellent evidence for AO3 and AO4. It should be noted that the PPR is not a substitute for a timeline, which should show the dates by which the candidate reasonably expects to have completed all stages of the project.

Evaluation skills improve year on year. Many candidates commented on how well they had planned and managed the process, and a number also carried out a skills audit which allowed them to explain which skills they felt had been enhanced by undertaking the project. It would have been helpful if candidates had also evaluated the strengths and weaknesses of their research methods. Evaluation of sources should go beyond usefulness, and it was pleasing to see some interrogation of secondary sources for reliability and bias.

Comments on Individual Questions:

N/A

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

