

# Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each element of the assignment.

## Candidate 1

### Title: Drug misuse in Scotland

#### Introduction

In lines 1-2 of the introduction the candidate is awarded **1 framing KU mark** for the statistic '1,172 people dying due to drug misuse in 2023 alone.'

In line 4 the candidate was awarded a further **1 framing KU mark** for 'Scotland averaged 277 drugs deaths....95 deaths per million people'. The candidate then goes on to discuss Glasgow City drug death statistics and a further **1 framing KU mark** is awarded.

In lines 9-13 of the introduction the candidate provides information on crime and the fact that '81% of arrestees who used heroin and/or crack at least once a week saying they had committed a similar crime in the prior 12 months' this is awarded **1 framing KU mark**. This information is a UK statistic but was considered relevant to discussion of drug misuse in Scotland.

The last four lines of the introduction are awarded **1 framing KU mark** for the statistic 'nearly 600 babies being born addicted to a form of drug'.

The candidate then starts to discuss their first solution.

#### Option 1: drug legalisation

The candidate calls option 1 'drug legalisation' but it was felt this may have been a typing error and should have read as 'legislation'.

In lines 1-3, the candidate opens by discussing 'safe and legal consumption' and that 'This is a recently proposed idea to Scotland as it is following some of the biggest European countries in doing so.' This is awarded no marks at this point, but a similar point is made later in the paragraph and this is credited.

In lines 3-7, the candidate discusses Source A and the '408 legal consumption beds' however this information is incorrect and is awarded no marks. The candidate attempts to analyse this information, but no marks are awarded for lines 7-10.

The candidate then goes on to discuss legal consumption and is awarded **1 KU mark (in support of analysis)** for lines 10-13 of the section from, 'This idea of legal consumption...' to 'illness and even death.' The candidate then goes onto discuss Source B but no credit worthy attempt is made to analyse this information and **no marks** are awarded.

In lines 15- 16, the candidate is awarded **1 KU mark (in support of analysis)** for 'As of the start of January...first legal consumption room in whole of the UK'.

A further **1 KU mark (in support of analysis)** is awarded for lines 16-18, 'This is obviously to tackle the fact...highest statistics of drug misuse throughout Europe.' (the mark awarded in the introduction was about Scotland not Glasgow).

The line at the bottom of the page which continues on to the second line of page 2 is awarded **1 KU mark (in support of analysis)** for 'Many countries...on the users.'

The remainder of the paragraph mentions the inability to judge success as it is too soon and discusses 'stigma'. No marks were awarded for this section as it failed to add to the argument, was confused and perhaps slightly irrelevant.

### **Option 2: education and youth programmes**

The candidate starts to discuss their second option. They refer to Source D and **1 analysis mark** is awarded for the analysis in lines 5-7 of this section 'This can be a massive way of being able to...social and youth culture'.

The candidate then goes on to discuss Source E and **1 analysis mark** is awarded for the analysis in lines 11-13, 'This can greatly support those families...live with the problem'.

The candidate continues their discussion of community addiction services, and **1 analysis mark** is awarded for the analysis in lines 17-20, 'These programs can be effective...parents and caregivers.'

The candidate continues discussing this in lines 20-24, 'However, children do sometimes struggle...take in this knowledge' and a further **1 analysis mark** is awarded.

A further **1 analysis mark** is awarded for the last five lines of this paragraph from, 'On top of this' to 'they are willing to go to change their habits.'

### **Option 3: user support**

The candidate begins by discussing the right drug support and discusses Source C in lines 1-5 of this section. **1 analysis mark** is awarded for the analysis of Source C.

In lines 5-7, 'This shows us that a lot of people...as soon as possible'. A further **1 analysis mark** is awarded from lines 7-10 of this section 'However after a drug rehabilitation referral...from this intervention.'

The remainder of the paragraph is not worthy of any more marks as it is a repeat of previous information.

### **Evaluation of sources**

The candidate evaluates Source B and is awarded two evaluation marks. **1 evaluation mark** for 'One of my sources used was a article...more bias to this opinion,'. **1 evaluation mark** is awarded for the second part of the sentence, 'as well as this the source was uploaded... could be un accurate.'

The candidate has reached the maximum evaluation marks but would have been awarded another evaluation mark for discussion of Source C.

### **Conclusion**

The candidate again confused rehabilitation beds with drug consumption rooms. No marks are awarded for the conclusion section.

The candidate was awarded the following structure marks:

- **1 mark** for headings and sections
- **1 mark** for referencing and use of background knowledge

**Overall, the candidate was awarded 20 out of 30 marks for their assignment:**

A: Knowledge and understanding: 9 marks

B: Analysing and synthesising: 7 marks

C: Source evaluation: 2 marks

D: Structure: 2 marks

E: Reaching a decision: 0 marks

## Candidate 2

### Title: Scottish Governance

#### Framing the issue

In lines 3 and 4 from 'The Scottish' to 'in their manifesto', the candidate was awarded **1 framing KU mark** for knowledge of SNP formation and their main policy focus.

In lines 5 to 7, from 'In 2014' to 'independently governed' the candidate was awarded **1 framing KU mark** for reference to outcome of Scottish Independence referendum.

In lines 7 to 11, the candidate was awarded **1 framing KU mark** for reference to the 2024 survey which showed an increase in support for Independence - 'increase in support over the decade'.

In lines 11 to 16, a further **1 framing KU mark** was awarded for candidate reference to 'there are only two main political parties in Scotland that are pro-independence, SNP and The Greens'.

In the last five lines of this section a final **1 framing KU mark** was awarded for knowledge of alternative options for Scottish Governance and the potential consequences of some of these options.

The candidate lists the options to be considered and states their recommendation. This is not awarded any marks specifically at this stage but may contribute to structure marks later.

#### Option 1: Scotland should be independent

The candidate was awarded **1 analysis mark** for their reference to Source 5 with appropriate analysis, specifically the last four lines of first paragraph, 'This shows...eventually make their own.'

The candidate was awarded a further **1 analysis mark** for their reference to Source 4 with appropriate analysis - 'This highlights that Scotland being a part of the UK clearly...trading relationships.'

In the third paragraph the candidate was awarded a further **1 analysis mark** for analysis of Source 2 that states, 'if Scotland were to become independent, they could still...trade and imports'.

In the fourth paragraph the candidate was awarded **1 knowledge mark (in support of analysis)** for comment about reasons for the 'growing increase' in support for independence due to the Brexit decision and the size of England.

### **Option 2: Devo-max**

**1 KU mark (in support of analysis)** was awarded in the first paragraph of this section. Specifically, from 'Scotland would be given economic independence' to the end of the paragraph 'still a part of the UK'.

In the second paragraph of this section, the candidate was awarded **2 KU marks (in support of analysis)** for knowledge of the parameters of 'fiscal autonomy' and the limits of devo-max. The first mark was awarded from the start of the paragraph down to 'British Parliament' on line 4. The second mark was credited to the remainder of the paragraph.

In the third paragraph, the candidate was awarded **1 analysis mark** for analysis of source seven, particularly, the potential downsides of devo-max, 'still be issues involving the Scottish...governed' (lines 3-5 of the paragraph). The remainder of the paragraph gained no credit as it was confused about which powers the Scottish Parliament could gain through devo-max.

In the final paragraph, **1 KU mark (in support of analysis)** was awarded for the impact of Brexit on Scotland and the consequence of Brexit on relations between Scotland and England, from 'detrimental effect' to 'major constitutional issues'.

Over the page, in the final paragraph of this section the candidate was awarded **1 analysis mark** for discussing information in Source 10, specifically, 'Scotland benefits from being part of a larger UK economic strength' that 'highlights a significant benefit of Scotland not having full independence'. This information probably came from Source 9 rather than Source 10 but the candidate was not penalised for this slight error.

### Option 3: Revoke devolution and re-join a central UK government

In the Option 3 section, the candidate was awarded **1 analysis mark** for Source 11 analysis, particularly, 'This suggests that rather than enhancing democracy...being handed to SNP' in the fourth last line. The paragraph also gained **1 KU mark (in support of analysis)** for reference to Westminster seeing periods of one-party domination since 2010.

In the next paragraph that begins 'YouGov conducted...', the candidate references a recent You Gov poll about Scottish views on devolution. This was not on the research sheet and should be considered as knowledge and not analysis. The candidate was awarded **1 KU mark (in support of analysis)** for reference to 63% of Scots wanting to keep devolution.

The candidate then references and comments on Source 12 and a further **1 analysis mark** was awarded for reference to the relatively small number (16,000) signing a petition and therefore a lack of support for this option (last four lines of this paragraph).

At the end of this section, in the final paragraph, the candidate references SoSource 3 which is their own survey. They attempt to analyse the consequence of a 98% rejection of any proposal to revoke the Scottish Parliament and make an analytical point about lack of public support and how this policy would have a negative impact on a party's support if they were to back this alternative to devolution. **1 analysis mark** awarded.

Knowledge (in support of analysis) is capped at 5 marks.

### Evaluating sources

In the evaluating sources section, the candidate was awarded **1 source evaluation mark** for reference to the news article Source 1 - the political preferences of the author and how this makes it 'bias'.

The candidate was also awarded **1 source evaluation mark** for discussing how the lack of a large sample size has led to the source not having 'fair representation'.

## Conclusion

The candidate was awarded **1 decision/conclusion mark** for saying that Option 1 is the best option because Scotland would be a 'strong independent country' due to strong fishing and oil.

A further **1 decision/conclusion mark** was awarded for saying that Independence would allow 'Scottish people to fully exploit...natural resources which would benefit the population greatly'.

A further **1 decision/conclusion mark** was given for rejecting Option 3 as it doesn't fully, 'allow Scottish People to be governed how they would like to be'

The candidate was awarded the following structure marks:

- **1 mark** for headings and sections
- **1 mark** for report style
- **1 mark** for referencing and use of background knowledge
- **1 mark** for consistency, coherence and logic of argument

**Overall, the candidate was awarded 27 out of 30 marks for their assignment:**

A: Knowledge and understanding: 10 marks

B: Analysing and synthesising: 8 marks

C: Source evaluation: 2 marks

D: Structure: 4 marks

E: Reaching a decision: 3 marks

## Candidate 3

### **Title: The government need to do more to reduce overcrowding in prisons in Scotland**

#### **Introduction**

In lines 1 and 2 of the introduction, from 'In 2024' to 'away with crime', **1 framing KU mark** was awarded. Although the assertion made in the sentence is a little simplistic, the statistic is accurate and conveys the point.

In lines 2-4 from 'Also Scotland's' until '100,000 population', **1 framing KU mark** was awarded.

In lines 4-6, from 'Also Scotland' until '445 prisoners', **1 framing KU mark** was awarded.

In lines 6-7, from 'Scotland has invested' until 'crime figures', no marks were awarded as this is inaccurate.

In lines 7-9, from 'Also it Costs' until 'taxpayers money', **1 framing KU mark** was awarded.

**Recommendation 1** – (although not stated in the evidence heading, we discover later that this option is to build more prisons.)

In lines 1-3 of this section, from 'My first' until 'when completed', **1 framing KU mark** was awarded.

In lines 3-5, from 'Also HMP Barlinnie' until 'over capacity', **1 KU mark (in support of analysis)** was awarded.

In lines 5-7, from 'Also from my survey' until 'sample size', No marks were awarded as no creditworthy analysis took place and there was no explanation of why 13 is not reliable.

In lines 7-10, from 'Building more prisons' until 'reoffending rates fall', no marks were awarded as this was slightly repetitive of the mark awarded in lines 3-5 of the paragraph.

In lines 10-12, from 'However building' until 'actually available', no marks were awarded as the response is confused.

### **Recommendation 2 - introduce more community based sentencing**

In lines 1-4 of this section, from 'My second' until 'electronic tagging', 1 framing KU mark could have been awarded however, the candidate has already reached the maximum 5 marks.

In lines 4-5, from 'Also electronic' until 'prison sentence', **1 KU mark (in support of analysis)** was awarded.

In lines 5-7, from 'Also a large' until 'to prison', no marks were awarded as the comment is vague and not quantified in any way.

In lines 7-10, from 'Community based sentencing' until 'rates further', **1 KU mark (in support of analysis)** was awarded. Credit was given for the comment about how money saved could be reinvested, reducing crime rates in the future.

In lines 10-12, from 'However building more' until 'with crime', no marks were awarded as the comment on 'light punishment' was too vague.

### **Recommendation 3 - introduce a mandatory prison sentence of 2 years**

This option is confused as a 'mandatory' sentence of two years would increase overcrowding. The candidate possibly means that they are proposing to abolish sentences of less than two years, however, they do not state this or attempt to explain this at any point. Therefore, no marks were awarded for this section.

### **Evaluation of sources**

In Lines 1-3, from 'Source a' until 'the information', **1 evaluation mark** is awarded

In lines 3-5, from 'Also the source' until 'more accurate', **1 evaluation mark** is awarded. As the date of the source is May 2024, potentially only weeks before the candidate may have started their research, the mark was awarded.

The rest of the section was not awarded any marks.

## **Conclusion**

In lines 1-7 of the conclusion, from 'In evaluation' until 'to be reduced', no marks were awarded as the option suggested (mandatory two year sentence) would not decrease but rather increase prison overcrowding

In lines 7-10, from 'Reasons why' until 'actually reducing crime', **1 decision/conclusion mark** was awarded for the reason why Option 1 was rejected.

In lines 10-14, from 'Reasons why' until 'back fines', **1 decision/conclusion mark** was awarded for the reason why Option 2 was rejected.

The candidate was awarded the following structure marks:

- **1 mark** for headings and sections
- **1 mark** for report style

**Overall, the candidate was awarded 14 out of 30 marks for their assignment:**

A: Knowledge and understanding: 8 marks

B: Analysing and synthesising: 0 marks

C: Source evaluation: 2 marks

D: Structure: 2 marks

E: Reaching a decision: 2 marks

# Candidate 4

## Title: Poor housing conditions

### Introduction

From 'Poor housing' on line 1 down to 'infestation etc' in line 5, **1 framing KU mark** was awarded.

In line 5 from, 'as of 2022-23' down to 'damp problems' on line 9, **1 framing KU mark** was awarded.

In paragraph 2 which starts 'poor housing conditions' down to 'mental health problems' at the end of the paragraph, **2 framing KU marks** were awarded. The candidate then introduces their three solutions starting on line 23 to 27.

### Solution 1: Argument for investing in more social housing

**1 analysis mark** was awarded from, 'this may suggest' in line 2 of the next page, down to 'houses listed on the market', at end of line 5 as this constituted research by CEBR previously mentioned and included on the candidate's research sheet.

In paragraph 2, **1 analysis mark** was awarded for the reference to, and analysis of, Source 1 - starting on line 4 of the paragraph, 'this suggests' down to 'NHS resources and services' at the end of the paragraph.

In paragraph 3, the candidate again analyses Source 1, **1 analysis mark** was awarded for the last three and a half lines of the paragraph.

At the bottom of the page the candidate starts to look at arguments against investing in more social housing. No marks were awarded for the first paragraph of the section.

In the second paragraph starting 'this suggests that in order' down to the end of the paragraph, **1 analysis mark** was awarded for the analysis of Source 2.

The candidate does not attempt to look at solution 2 or solution 3.

The candidate does not attempt source evaluation.

The candidate does not attempt a recommendation.

The candidate was awarded the following structure marks:

- **1 mark** for headings and sections
- **1 mark** for referencing and use of background knowledge

**Overall, the candidate was awarded 10 out of 30 marks for their assignment:**

A: Knowledge and understanding: 4 marks

B: Analysing and synthesising: 4 marks

C: Source evaluation: 0 mark

D: Structure: 2 marks

E: Reaching a decision: 0 mark

