

ELC

English

Entry Level Certificate **R392**

OCR Report to Centres June 2017

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 2017

CONTENTS

Entry Level Certificate

English (R392)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
Entry Level Certificate R392	4

Entry Level Certificate R392

General Comments:

Centres entered candidates with a wide-range of abilities from those who were highly capable in all components of the qualification to those who found Speaking and Listening, Reading or Writing difficult at Band 1. There was good evidence that many candidates were motivated and engaged in the written and spoken tasks. Clearly, teachers had selected topics that suited the candidates' interests, which allowed them to achieve well at their individual level.

Teachers' assessment judgements were generally accurate and marks had been correctly adjusted where support had been given to the candidates.

Administration was satisfactory, although some Centres did not submit the Moderator's copy of the IMS1 with the candidates' work, which meant that the Moderators had to act to obtain this form. This caused unnecessary delay in the moderation process. The assessments were mainly sent in a well-organised way.

Overall, the Internal Assessment Forms were well-completed with a good level of detail. Teachers recorded the level of independent work completed and teacher support that had taken place in each of the components. Teachers were generally good at stating where marks had been adjusted due to the amount of support the candidates had received. Teachers wrote useful comments and many also submitted Speaking and Listening / Writing mark schemes with highlighted phrases/sentences to justify their assessment decisions. This was extremely helpful to the moderation process.

Most Centres included Speaking and Listening recordings, which are the main pieces of evidence for this component of this qualification. In a very small number of cases, Centres needed to be reminded to send in the recordings. This caused some delay in the moderation process. The recordings were generally very clear and many candidates introduced themselves or were introduced by their teacher. This is essential and is very good practice.

Where candidates had complete a writing task by word processing, teachers had also included evidence of the candidate's handwriting to demonstrate the candidate's ability in that area.

Most Centres entered candidates for postal moderation. However, some Centres opted to enter for OCR Repository moderation.

Comments on Individual Components:

Speaking and Listening

Teachers were generally very good at choosing subjects that corresponded to the candidates' interests. This created good opportunities for candidates to demonstrate their speaking and listening skills in the two required tasks – 'A Role-Play' and 'A Discussion'.

There was some good evidence of challenging topics used for role-plays, such as: 'An interview with a football manager', 'A complaint about service in a restaurant', 'Asking a relative to help with plans for a party' etc. Well-chosen topics such as these really motivated and enthused candidates and allowed them to achieve Band 3 marks. In quite a few cases, 'Ordering food' was chosen for the task, which is fine for lower level candidates but can limit opportunities to demonstrate the full range of skills in this area.

Many of the discussion topics were appropriately challenging and varied. For example, 'Planning an event to say goodbye to a friend moving to Australia', 'Skills and qualities needed in employment', 'What I like or don't like about my school' etc. These allowed the candidates to engage well and display their spoken language abilities.

The teachers' assessment judgements were good and marks were very rarely adjusted by the Moderators. Many candidates spoke with a degree of fluency using a few detailed sentences at a time and achieved Band 3 marks in both tasks. Candidates who achieved Band 2 or lower mainly spoke using short sentences, made simple contributions and often needed prompting by the teacher to expand on what they were saying.

Reading

The reading tasks in this series were the same tasks used in previous years. Centres made use of all the six tasks, rather than using one task for all their candidates. This allowed candidates to be assessed on a text that interested them the most.

The marking was generally correct, with teachers marking according to the mark schemes.

Writing

As with the Speaking and Listening component, teachers were very good at choosing topics that matched the candidates' interests and created good opportunities for candidates to demonstrate their writing skills in the two required assignments – 'Informative writing and 'Imaginative writing'.

Informative writing topics included:

'A complaint about the council's bin collection service'

'Work experience diary'

'Why we should explore space'

'Why we should abolish school uniform'

'Social Media – A blessing or a curse?'

Imaginative writing topics included:

'Describing a setting'

'My nightmare'

'Space travel'

'The spooky house'

Many candidates wrote fluently and in a sensible order. Complaint letters, work experience diaries and articles allowed candidates to write convincingly, which is probably due to the engaging subject matter chosen by teachers. This was very similar for the imaginative pieces. Teachers are becoming increasingly good at choosing topics that engage the candidates. Planning techniques, used prior to writing, also allowed the learners to best demonstrate their capabilities in their written work.

Assessment was mainly sound, with teachers awarding Band 1-3 correctly. As with June 2016, a small number of centres could have been slightly more generous in their marking, but only by one or two marks.

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 2017

