

Principal Examiner's Report Summer 2010

GCE

GCE Health & Social Care (6944) Unit 7 - Meeting Individual Needs

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Summer 2010

Publications Code UA023465

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

General Comments

This paper consisted of three unrelated questions, each of which totalled to 30 marks. The paper covered the specification accurately and relevantly. The format of the paper has remained unchanged from previous series. Each question commenced with a case study scenario which provided a generic setting for the questions asked. Questions were structured in such a way that straightforward recall knowledge questions were asked at the beginning and then more complex extended writing questions were asked at the end. The mark scheme was tiered to provide access to all calibre of candidate therefore making the paper fair and equitable. Consequently, the paper has discriminated well amongst candidates.

In general, the paper was well received by the majority of candidates and the key strengths were:

- Candidates were well prepared for this paper. It would seem that centres have used past papers as a means of preparation and this has worked well
- Level of knowledge and understanding was good and has improved from previous series
- Ability to accurately interpret question stems and provide an accurate and relevant answer has also improved
- Quality of written communication has improved
- More candidates are attempting to provide coherent, structured and accurate answers to those questions which require extended writing.

However there are still some weaknesses in candidates work, such as:

- Candidates knowledge of quality issues requires further work
- Gaps in responses still appearing particularly where extended writing was being asked
- Ability to keep responses relevant was badly done in some cases
- Tendency of some candidates to write 'all they know' rather than tailor their response still pre-dominates.

Question 1

This question focused on a social worker and the children she comes in contact with. Part (a) was accurately answered by the majority of candidates who could relevantly recall two stages in the care plan process. Part (b) was a synoptic question which required candidates to explain the importance of a stable environment on the children's development. Once again the majority of candidates provided concise, relevant and accurate responses. Part (c) was a familiar question on multi-disciplinary practice which was accurately answered with many candidates achieving between 4-6 marks. Part (d) required some extended writing and it is worth pointing out that whilst the majority of candidates attempted a response it was clear that their understanding of why legislation is introduced varied from good to very poor, in the latter case candidates gave very generic, vague and badly constructed responses and this was reflected in the marks (mark band 1). Those candidates who provided more accurate responses such as protecting children's welfare etc achieved mark band 2, very few achieved mark band 3 as there was little argument or discussion in the response.

Part (f) was once again required an extended writing response on the voluntary sector. Responses can be divided into two types - those that wrote all they knew about national or local voluntary organisations without structuring the response to

the question stem and thus achieved mark band 1 marks or those that did attempt to structure a relevant and coherent response and achieved mark band 2 or 3 marks.

Question 2

This question focused on organisation, their type and how they are organised. Part (a) was accurately answered by the majority of candidates. Part (b) which focused on confidentiality and the consequences of it being breached was also accurately answered and it was good to see that candidates had a sound knowledge of this important concept. Part (c) was poorly answered with many candidates repeating the same response to multi-disciplinary working which is not the same as networking. Part (d) asked candidates to examine the importance of advocacy and many candidates provided a good sound response with many achieving mark band 2/3 marks. Part (e) asked candidates to examine the importance of team working. Responses were disappointing as many responses only provided an explanation of team working and some generic benefits but there was a lack of discussion about their value and importance in promoting a quality service.

Question 3

This question focused on the quality mechanisms organisations put in place to enhance the overall quality of the organisation. Historically this question is poorly answered, however, this year it was marginally better. Part (a) asked for a definition of a translator which was well answered and it is good to see that candidates could differentiate between a translator and an advocate. Part (b) required candidates to explain the importance of providing feedback which was accurately answered and well received by the majority of candidates which many used vocationally relevant language such as feeling empowered. Part (c) led on from part (b) and asked candidates to examine the role of a complaints procedure; once again this was well answered reflecting a good level of preparation by centres. Part (d) asked candidates to examine the process of review within organisations, many candidates provided generic responses but their level of analysis was weak. Part (e) asked candidates to analyse the importance of organisations such as the GSCC in promoting quality, this posed great difficulties for the majority of candidates. At this point many candidates either ran out of steam or gave up. Responses were generic and it would seem that many repeated old mark scheme answers with many providing bullet point answers, this should be discouraged.

Grade Boundaries

Internally assessed units

6944: Meeting Individual Needs

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	90	61	55	49	43	38
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Notes

Maximum Mark (Raw): the mark corresponding to the sum total of the marks shown on the mark scheme.

Boundary mark: the minimum mark required by a candidate to qualify for a given grade.

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code UA023465 Summer 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH