



CCEA Level 1 Award in Preparation for Adult Life (QCF)
CCEA Level 2 Award in Preparation for Adult Life (QCF)
CCEA Level 1 Certificate in Preparation for Adult Life (QCF)
CCEA Level 2 Certificate in Preparation for Adult Life (QCF)

(Summer Series) 2015

Principal Moderator's Report

preparation
for adult
life

(Level 1 and Level 2 Award)
(Level 1 and Level 2 Certs)

Foreword

This booklet outlines the performance of candidates in all aspects of CCEA's Level 1 and 2 Awards and Level 1 and 2 Certificates in Preparation for Adult Life (QCF) for this series.

CCEA hopes that the Chief Examiner's and/or Principal Moderator's report(s) will be viewed as a helpful and constructive medium to further support teachers and the learning process.

This booklet forms part of the suite of support materials for the specification. Further materials are available from the specification's microsite on our website at www.ccea.org.uk.

Contents

Principal Moderator Report	3
Contact details	9

LEVEL 1 AND 2 AWARDS AND LEVEL 1 AND 2 CERTIFICATES IN PREPARATION FOR ADULT LIFE (QCF)

Principal Moderator's Report

Preparation for Adult Life Level 1 Award and Certificate

Candidate Record Sheet

In General

Units were received on time from centres and most centres had used the new candidate record sheets for each unit. Tracking booklets are no longer required for this qualification. It should be noted that an individual Candidate Record Sheet must be provided for *each unit submitted for moderation and must be signed by both the teacher and candidate*. The Candidate Record Sheet is available on the Preparation for Adult Life microsite.

Internal Standardisation

A separate declaration of internal standardisation (TAC2) form must accompany each unit sent for moderation. It was noted in this moderation process that some centres failed to submit any evidence of internal standardisation. It is advised as good practice that centres carry out internal standardisation in order to ascertain standards of units.

Annotation

In the majority of centres teacher annotation was evident and appropriate. In centres where no annotation was evident units were returned to the centre as moderation could not take place. It is essential that centres mark and annotate work which should be clear and constructive. Annotation should refer to the relevant assessment criteria and evidence.

Evidence

It is essential to check that specifications for Level 1 match the evidence require for the unit as some submissions followed Level 1 specification and were entered for Level 2 and vice versa.

It should be noted when submitting evidence involving a witness statement or photographic material there should be a full explanation as to *how* the evidence meets the assessment criteria. Photographs must be clear and show the work of the individual candidate and how this meets the assessment criteria claimed.

Units should be submitted in clear plastic folders. PowerPoints, if submitted, should be printed with PowerPoint notes. Centres should be aware of the differences between the evidence requirements for Level 1 and Level 2.

Level 1 Comments

For the Summer 2015 series the overall majority of the work submitted for moderation had appropriate evidence to meet the assessment criteria for each unit in Level 1. There were significant entries for both the Award (6 units) and the Certificate (13 units). Teachers are to be commended for the high quality of work produced by the majority of centres.

For future submissions particular attention needs to be given to the following:

Unit 1: Diversity and Social Inclusion

This unit was generally well presented at Level 1 and schools should be commended on the evidence presented for moderation. In assessment criteria 1.2 and 2.2 it is necessary to give examples for all three contexts: local, national and global. It has been noted by the Moderation Team that assessment criteria 2.1 social inclusion was well evidenced in work presented for moderation.

Unit 2: Democracy and Democratic Participation

Generally this unit was evidenced in detail and showed candidates' understanding and knowledge of the key democratic institutions within this unit. Assessment criteria 2.3 requires candidates to evidence how democratic institutions promote *each of the three* areas given inclusion, justice and democracy. Some centres presented information for this assessment criterion incorporating the three separate areas into one example. For future submissions it must be noted that three separate areas must be evidenced.

Unit 3: Human Rights and Social Responsibility

In the majority of centres learning outcomes 1 and 2 were met and very well laid out. Assessment criteria 3.1 was again met and clearly stated. For assessment criteria 3.2 some candidates failed to complete this criteria in some cases evidence was not linked to the organisation in assessment criteria 3.1, therefore the Learning Outcome could not be awarded.

Unit 4: Equality and Social Justice

Assessment criteria 1.1 and 1.2 were very clear and well laid out by most candidates. Assessment criteria 1.3 requires *both* inequality and injustice to be evidenced through individuals, groups and society. In most candidates' work this was evidenced, however some centres completed just two of the stated areas. Assessment criteria 2.1 displayed clear evidence by candidates. Assessment criteria 2.2 required two reasons for people being excluded from society on the basis of poverty – most candidates presented two reasons but some only presented one reason, and where this was the case the Learning Outcome could not be awarded. Assessment criteria 3.1 was well evidenced by candidates.

Unit 5: Preparation for Work

This unit was generally well evidenced by candidates. In Assessment criteria 1.1 some candidates failed to list two achievements and the Learning Outcome therefore could not be awarded. Achievements do not have to be academic achievements. In assessment criteria 1.2 candidates are required to have printed evidence to correspond to candidate's investigation; – a list of jobs is not sufficient evidence for this criterion. Some candidates presented evidence which was not relevant to assessment criteria.

Unit 6: Business in the Community

This unit was well evidenced by most candidates. There was a good variety of evidence for this unit including local community involvement. Evidence for assessment criteria 3.2 requires a comparison between social enterprise and a private enterprise given *two ways*. Some candidates failed to make both comparisons or compared social enterprise to public services which was inappropriate and the Learning Outcome therefore could not be awarded.

Unit 7: Effective Working Practice

Most candidates provided evidence which met the standards for this unit. It should be noted for future submissions that in assessment criteria 3.1 Health and Safety rights are distinctly different to other rights required for evidence in assessment criteria 3.2. Learning Outcome 4 showed the candidates understanding and knowledge of stress.

Unit 8: Globalisation and the Labour Market

This unit was dealt with very well by the majority of all centres. It was good to see such a vast array of teaching and learning strategies, enabling candidates to access the assessment criteria. In assessment criteria 3.2 it is necessary to identify *two* new or growth sectors and to give a reason for the growth of *each*. Some candidates failed to give reasons for the growth of each sector and the Learning Outcome therefore could not be awarded.

Unit 9: Self-Development

Most candidates presented evidence that met the standard for this unit. However, some candidates failed to provide appropriate evidence for assessment criteria 1.1 which requires evidence of *both* an internal and external factor and to state the impact *of both*. Candidates should ensure that the factors they choose are correctly identified as internal or external.

Assessment criteria 2.1 was relatively well evidenced in this series; candidates referred to emotions and how these effect behaviour and self management.

Assessment criteria 3.1 and assessment criteria 4.1 are separate criteria and should be addressed and referenced as such. Challenges are not necessarily the same as high and low risk behaviours, and should be clarified and evidenced separately.

Unit 10: Roles and Responsibilities of Parents

Most candidates presented evidence which met the required standard. Assessment criteria 3.1 should address all *four* impact areas for *both* teenage pregnancy and parenthood on the individual, family and society. This requires evidence for all four impacts linked to the separate three areas of individual, family and society.

Unit 11: Healthy Relationships

This unit was generally very evidenced by the majority of centres. Candidates should be aware that Assessment criteria 1.1 and 3.1 should be addressed and referenced individually.

Unit 12: Maintaining Health and Well-Being

Most candidates had a variety of evidence to meet the standards for this unit. In Assessment criteria 1.1 candidates should ensure that they reference *all 5* areas of health and well being. Several candidates defined these areas of health rather than assessing their own personal health and therefore did not meet the evidence requirements. In Assessment criteria 1.3 candidates

should reference one consequence *for each of the five areas listed*. In Assessment criteria 3.2 all three areas must be evidenced.

Unit 13: Effective Financial Management

The majority of candidates met the Assessment criteria for this unit. Assessment criteria 2.1 must address *both areas* of overspending and not repaying money owed which are two distinctly different consequences.

Preparation for Adult Life Level 2 Award and Certificate

General Comments

For the Summer 2015 series a significant majority of the work submitted for moderation had appropriate evidence to meet the assessment criteria for each unit in Level 2. There was a vast increase in entries for both the Award (6 units) and the Certificate (13 units). Teachers are to be commended for the high quality of work produced by the majority of centres.

The majority of centres submitted a range of evidence to substantiate the assessment criteria for the units. This reflects a high level of commitment of teachers on the behalf of centres involved.

It must be emphasised that Level 2 evidence is different to Level 1. Level 2 requires more extended responses giving descriptions or explanations. Explanations/descriptions *must be in sentences and provide sufficient detail so that the assessment criteria can be evidenced*. For most assessment criteria lists are *not appropriate* for this level. Bullet points can be submitted with extended answers. In addition Level 2 submissions require responses which are the candidates own reflection. In a minority of centres work submitted was very similar in some units.

For future submissions particular attention needs to be given to the following:

Unit 1: Diversity and Social Inclusion

This unit was generally well presented at Level 2 and schools should be commended on the evidence presented for moderation. In assessment criteria 1.3, 2.1 and 2.2 it is necessary to give full explanations for *all three contexts local, national and global*. Candidates must deal clearly and separately with the local, national and global contexts in order to meet the criteria where this is not the case the Learning Outcome could not be awarded. Assessment criteria 2.1, social inclusion, was well evidenced in work presented for moderation. In Assessment criteria 3.1 some centres used the same organisation with very similar descriptions this is discouraged.

Unit 2: Democracy and Democratic Participation

This unit was not sufficiently evidenced by all centres. Assessment criteria 1.3, and 2.1 must explain *three contexts: local national and global*. Assessment criteria 2.3 and 2.4 requires candidates to explain how democratic institutions promotes and benefits each of the three areas: *inclusion, justice and democracy*. Some centres presented information for this assessment criterion incorporating the three separate areas into one example. For future submissions it must be noted that *three separate areas* must be evidenced.

Unit 3: Human Rights and Social Responsibility

Some centres met all the assessment criteria for this unit. Most centres were able to identify in this unit but answers were not extended to include descriptions or explanations as required by assessment criteria 1.1, 1.3 and 1.4 and therefore the Learning Outcome could not be awarded. In assessment criteria 2.2 all *three contexts* of a society are required to be addressed separately. Learning Outcome 3 was well addressed by centres.

Unit 4: Equality and Social Justice

The majority of candidates met the requirements for this unit. Assessment criteria 1.1 and 1.2 were very clear and well laid out by most candidates. Assessment criteria 1.1 requires candidates to clearly distinguish between being treated equally and being treated fairly. For assessment criteria 1.2 candidates are required to evidence how *both* impact on *individuals, groups and society*. Assessment criteria 2.1 was well evidenced. Assessment criteria 2.2 requires *two* issues for *two* contexts: local and global. In Assessment criteria 3.1 candidates must address *both* social inequality and social injustice.

Unit 5: Preparation for Work

This unit was poorly evidenced by a significant number of centres. Centres must be aware that skills, qualities and achievements must be described and related to the candidate. Achievements do not have to be academic achievements. Some candidates failed to *describe* skills, rather a list was provided – this is not appropriate evidence for Level 2. In assessment criteria 1.2 candidates are required to have printed evidence to correspond to candidate's investigation – it is not enough to simply list a variety of jobs. In assessment criteria 1.3 *three* options must be *chosen and described* then narrowed down to two options in assessment criteria 2.1. Some candidates presented evidence which was not relevant to assessment criteria 2.1. Assessment criteria 2.2 and 2.3 require extended responses to show candidates understanding – bullet points do not provide sufficient evidence.

Unit 6: Business in the Community

There was a good variety of evidence for this unit including local community involvement. In Assessment criteria 2.2 some centres focused on one business and candidates responses were very similar. Centres should note that two separate businesses *must be* investigated: *one local and one global*. A minority of centres chose just one business and this does not meet the requirements for this unit. In some centres social enterprise was misinterpreted, Assessment 3.1 a local council is not a social enterprise. Evidence for assessment criteria 3.2 requires a comparison between social enterprise and a private enterprise, candidates are required to explain differences between social and private enterprise. Some candidates failed to make both comparisons or compared social enterprise to public services or local councils which are not social enterprises or private sector and therefore the Learning Outcome could not be awarded.

Unit 7: Effective Working Practice

Most candidates provided evidence which met the standards for this unit. It was good to see such a vast array of teaching and learning strategies, enabling candidates to access the assessment criteria. It should be noted for future submissions that in assessment criteria 3.1 Health and Safety rights are distinctly different to other rights required for evidence in assessment criteria 3.2. Learning Outcome 4 showed the candidates understanding and knowledge of stress.

Unit 8: Globalisation and the Labour Market

This unit was dealt with very well by the majority of all centres. In assessment criteria 3.2 it is necessary to identify a range of new or growth sectors and to fully explain in detail the reason for the growth of each. Some candidates failed to explain reasons for their growth and therefore the Learning Outcome could not be awarded.

Unit 9: Self-Development

Most candidates presented evidence that met the criteria for this unit. However, some candidates failed to correctly evidence assessment criteria 1.1 which requires evidence of internal and external factors and to explain the impact of *both* on their own self-development. Assessment criteria 2.1 was relatively well done in this series; candidates explained how emotions and how these have a positive effect on self management. Assessment criteria 3.2 is linked to 3.1 by giving descriptions of how to manage a challenging situation.

Unit 10: Roles and Responsibilities of Parents

Most candidates presented evidence which met with the required standard for this unit. However for future submissions it should be noted that assessment criteria 1.1 and 1.2 should not *only identify but also describe in detail* challenges of both families and parents. Assessment criteria 3.1 should address all *four* impact areas for *both* teenage pregnancy and parenthood on the *individual, family and society*. This requires evidence for *all four impacts* linked to the separate *three areas* of individual, family and society with full explanations.

Unit 11: Healthy Relationships

This unit was generally very well done by the majority of centres. Assessment criteria 1.1 and assessment criteria 3.1 should be addressed and explained *individually*. Assessment criteria 5.1 candidates must evidence *both* assessment criteria within this Learning Outcome. Explanations must be in sentences and have sufficient detail to meet the assessment criteria for this unit.

Unit 12: Maintaining Health and Well-Being

Most candidates submitted a variety of evidence to meet the standards for this unit. In assessment criteria 1.1 candidates should ensure that they reference *all 5 areas* of health and well being. Several candidates defined these areas of health rather than assessing their own personal health. In assessment criteria 1.3 candidates should fully explain consequences *for each of the five areas listed*. In assessment criteria 2.2 *both* opportunities *and* challenges must be described. In assessment criteria 3.2 all *three areas* must be evidenced.

Unit 13: Effective Financial Management

This unit was well evidenced by the majority of candidates. For future submissions it must be noted that for assessment criteria 1.1 a personal budget is required – this can be real or fictional or developed from a case study. Assessment criteria 3.1 *must* address *both areas of overspending and not repaying money* owed which are two distinctly different consequences and link these to *both* the individual and the family. Some candidates produced a mind map which, without explanations, did not meet this assessment criterion. In assessment criteria 5.2 it is essential to choose a savings scheme based on the findings in assessment criteria 5.1 and to give reasons for the choice. Some candidates failed to give reasons for their choice and the Learning Outcome therefore could not be awarded.

Contact details

The following information provides contact details for key staff members:

- Specification Support Officer: Nola Fitzsimons
(telephone: (028) 9026 1200, extension: 2235, email: nfitzsimons@ccea.org.uk)
- Officer with Subject Responsibility: Dr Elaine Horner
(telephone: (028) 9026 1200, extension: 2197, email: ehorner@ccea.org.uk)