

Examiners' Report

January 2010

Principal Learning

Society, Health and Development Level 2 Controlled Assessments

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 Diploma Line on 0844 576 0028, 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/>

January 2010

Publications Code DP023003

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

Contents

1.	Level 2 Introduction	4
2.	Level 2 Unit 1 Report	6
3.	Level 2 Unit 2 Report	8
4.	Level 2 Unit 3 Report	10
5.	Level 2 Unit 5 Report	12
6.	Level 2 Unit 6 Report	14
7.	Level 2 Unit 7 Report	17
8.	Level 2 Unit 8 Report	19
9.	Level 2 Unit 9 Report	21
10.	Statistics	23

Principal Learning Society, Health and Development

Level 2 Introduction

The judgement of the moderators and examiners is that many centres have shown improvements from the June 2009 series as they have better addressed the requirements of the qualification.

It is still early days for trends to have been established, however it is already evident that the pattern continues towards improved achievement and this reflects the improvements in teaching and preparation in line with guidance delivered at the Edexcel run training events. It is highly recommended that centres take advantage of these opportunities throughout the academic year.

The Board of moderators and examiners once again exercised great care to ensure that standards were comparable across the full range of units for Level 2, and that the moderated marks were based solely on the Mark Bands within the Marking Grids and the guidance for allocating marks provided.

Many centres, using the Candidate Record Sheets for internally assessed units provided by Edexcel, provided evidence as required to allow the assessment criteria to be effectively applied and moderated. However, some centres continue to use alternative formats and sometimes completely miss some of the assessment evidence requirements, especially Marking Grid B in relevant units, and vital learner information e.g. centre number and name, candidate number and name, marks awarded and final/total mark awarded. It is also evident that whilst some centres have applied and used a consistent and effective system for the annotation of scripts, some centres are still not completing this well, and some not at all. A consistent and accurate system of annotation is essential for accuracy of marking and internal moderation and centres are encouraged to embrace this in the future.

Centres should revisit the specification, the teachers' guide and the website for the example assessment materials, schemes of work, assignment briefs and record sheets to be used, and use these to inform their teaching, learning and assessment strategies.

A number of centres have done well. Contributing factors include:

- Plenty of contextualised and applied learning opportunities relevant to some or all of the four sectors under investigation
- Effective partnership/collaborative work with local organisations and employers from across the four sectors
- Effective communication and collaboration across the consortium partners and members
- Effective internal quality assurance system (standardisation and moderation)

With regards to the delivery model used centres are strongly advised to use the templates provided and to ensure that all sections and insertions are completed. At least one key member of the programme team should be encouraged to attend the nearest Edexcel feedback and/or training event (see the Edexcel website for a list of events available and booking details).

Notice should be taken of Annexe E and the information contained within about controlled assessment. It is evident that some centres have embedded this within

their planning and practice for this assessment series; however the majority of centres are still not adhering to this as yet. You are advised to read Annexe E and take its contents into consideration in the future.

Centres are advised to access and read their E9 moderator feedback reports for each of their individual units submitted for external moderation for this January 2010 series, these reports are specific to their own centre and performance and will greatly contribute to their future planning and improvement.

Many centres deserve great praise for coming to terms with the demands of this qualification. If the advice and guidance provided above and within the following unit reports can help consolidate the good practice already evident and help other centres to improve their provision to match that of the best centres, we can look forward to an even stronger performance in this coming 2010 summer June series

Level 2 unit 1 Principles, Values and Personal Development

General Comments

Most centres took a sensible and ordered approach to the unit. Learners were encouraged to address each Outcome individually, although there were some examples of integration of evidence for related Outcomes. This was a constructive approach and produced some good quality work from learners. The case studies provided by Edexcel were used by the majority of centres to facilitate focused responses from learners, and this was largely successful.

Learning Outcome 1

This requires learners to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of some of the important concepts within the line of learning. Specifically this included the following terms: diversity, equality, culture and belief systems, individuality, rights, choice, privacy, independence, dignity, respect and partnership.

Work for this outcome consisted mainly of outlines/descriptions of the terms required. Where learners had included examples to illustrate their work, this helped to move the marks into the mid range. Work showing more in depth understanding through explanations would help learners to achieve marks in the higher band.

Learning Outcome 2

The promotion of equality and diversity within the sectors is well done overall, but the majority of learners failed to address these across the sectors. Where cross sector working has been included in the work, higher marks were awarded. Success in this outcome was dependent on all four sectors being addressed and linked, and learners showing evidence of this were able to access marks in the higher range.

Learning Outcome 3

This outcome required learners to explain the meaning of inappropriate behaviour, and was generally addressed using a variety of examples. The majority of work only showed outlines of inappropriate behaviour with some attempts made at descriptions and thus achieving marks in the mid range. The requirement to suggest how inappropriate behaviour can be challenged was the weakest part of this task, but those learners who attempted this, using examples, sometimes generated by case studies or practical experiences produced work worthy of higher band marks.

Learning Outcome 4

Learners in the majority of centres produced a grid in response to this outcome which requires them to identify legislation, codes of practice, policies and procedures to support an individual's rights, and provide a framework to maintain and improve the quality of practice. There were some good attempts to demonstrate understanding of legislation, codes of practice, policies etc, but the majority of work did not go on to show how these can provide a framework to improve the quality of practice. Where marks in the highest band were awarded, learners had included a full range of relevant information for each section through the effective use of research, and demonstrated their understanding of application after discussions with employees from the different sectors. Learners had then been able to suggest basic outlines of frameworks for developing practice.

Learning Outcome 5

Overall, the work presented covered the range of mark bands, some learners having made good attempts to explain the relevance of their own values, knowledge and skills in relation to the job descriptions they have reviewed, and others producing an outline only. Some learners also failed to relate their knowledge, skills and values to the job descriptions chosen. Generally, marks within the higher bands were awarded where evidence of reflection was evident within the work.

Learning Outcome 6

Most learners have made a good attempt to describe reflective practice, with some examples included. Learners on the whole demonstrated an understanding of reflective practice and the need for CPD across the sectors. Widening the scope of their research would help learners to investigate a variety of other options that are available for staff within the sectors in order to keep up to date, and this would enable them to achieve marks within the higher mark bands.

Learning Outcome 7

There was some good work here from learners, most of whom were able to successfully identify a range of sources of information, including academic literature, internet sites, journals, articles and magazines etc, relating to professional development for workers in all four sectors. Where learners had been given the opportunity to interview a range of different professionals to find out and report on how they keep up to date, marks in the higher mark band were achieved.

Level 2 unit 2 Working Together and Communicating

General comments

The unit covers four topics: communication, recording and reporting, partnership and teamwork. Most learners had the opportunity of relating these topics to the four sectors to be studied; health, social care, community justice and children and young people. Many centres had created their own tasks in order to address the Learning Outcomes and so utilise the potential of their local sectors and resources. More direction could have been provided within the tasks to enable learners to cover all aspects of each Learning Outcome, such as a step-by-step approach to guide the learners through all the requirements of each outcome.

Learning Outcome 1

Most centres investigated the use of different methods of communication but some centres did not relate these to different settings. Often, learners did not plan carefully their investigations to allow a range of methods to be covered. In some cases, there was a lack of evidence of an investigation having taken place. Learners provided evidence of potential barriers to communication but more comments would be welcome of how these could be overcome or minimised. The learners may find the range of communication methods listed in the Unit specifications a useful guide when studying this Learning Outcome.

Learning Outcome 2

Some interactions were not thoroughly planned. For instance, an impromptu chat with another member of the peer group is not a satisfactory interaction. There needs to be greater awareness of the need for interactions to show different methods of communication for different purposes and situations. Also, learners should identify any potential improvements. Where situations were planned carefully, there were some interesting and purposeful work undertaken. For instance, one learner undertook a totally non-verbal interaction with children ensuring they sat quietly during a nursery circle time. The learner had planned the non-verbal interactions carefully that were to be employed and this proved to be a very successful interaction.

The observation records completed by the assessors for Learning Outcome 2, mark grid B provided in most cases little evidence to justify the marks awarded. These records should show clearly why the mark has been awarded within the Mark Band selected.

Learning Outcome 3

Most learners considered the importance of recording but did not comment on reporting. There was poor coverage of inherent risks and difficulties in sharing information. Learners often chose settings which were very similar and, therefore, the range they considered was limited. Hence, they did not have the potential for providing good examples of different arrangements.

Learning Outcome 4

There was some mature coverage of the need for security, confidentiality and accuracy of information. However, many responses were only at Mark Band 1.

Learning Outcome 5

Most learners completed appropriately three records from various sources but often a signature was missing when a record required one. Many learners did not progress onto referring to the importance of recording the included information.

Learning Outcome 6

The knowledge and understanding of partnerships was weak. Most learners could state the meaning of partnerships but could not then give appropriate examples of both statutory and non-statutory partnerships. The importance of working in partnerships to provide effective services was often poorly covered.

Learning Outcome 7

A variety of events was planned but most involved fundraising. There was a mixed range of competencies displayed for planning these events. Most plans were implemented but often the reflection of their own and others' roles was limited.

The observation records written by assessors for Learning Outcome 7, mark grid B marks were, once again, weak and provided little detail to justify the marks awarded.

Assessors need to complete observation records for Learning Outcome 2, mark grid B and Learning Outcome 7, mark grid B more fully so it is clear why the marks have been awarded within the Mark Bands selected.

There were many inaccuracies in applying the marking criteria. Generally, where this happened, the marks awarded were placed in too high a Mark Band. The marking was often inconsistent. Centres, mainly due to the quality of the work, did not award many of their learners the top marks in Mark Band 3. It is recommended that more extensive internal moderation should take place.

Level 2 Unit 3 Safeguarding and Protecting Individuals

General comments

There is much variation on learner performance for Unit 3 across different centres. Some centres used Edexcel's fit for purpose assignment briefs where the learning outcomes are put into different tasks. Some centres produced their own assignment briefs for their learners in which all included in this sample covered all seven learning outcomes through a variety of different tasks.

The practical element of this unit was to carry out a risk assessment, ideally this would have been carried out on the learners work related experience within one of the four sectors, however often learners carried out a risk assessment in their own school or college rather than in an appropriate organisation - there is room for improvement here and this has been suggested in the centres E9 moderator feedback reports for future development and planning.

Also, many learners did not progress to present a persuasive case for action in their evidence, there might be some action plans but they were often a mere identification and with no persuasive text.

References to the different research methods used during their investigation were not always completed well. This was often very implicit rather than explicit within the learners work. Some learners showed through their investigation that they do not actually know the difference between primary and secondary methods - this is a lost opportunity.

Legislation was not always accurate, and in general learners are not clear as to what a code of practice is. Often learners did not use examples for learning outcome 2 (as requested) so they did not often get awarded a mark in Mark Band 3. If learners were unable to be involved within a work place from within one of the four sectors while completing this unit learning outcome 3 would be weak - it was obvious from the samples submitted this series where learners were or were not involved within a work based learning experience for this learning outcome.

The learning outcomes regarding emergencies and infection tended to be covered well and it was evident that learners very much enjoyed these learning outcomes - assessors need to make sure they complete observation records / witness statements accurately - many centres asked learners to present their evidence for these two learning outcomes in the form of a power point / presentation or booklet which were then not included in the learners evidence for moderation, evidence would be in the form of an observation record (which is totally acceptable and encouraged) however where the record was not completed accurately by the assessor, the evidence for moderation was not always valid or of any use.

Learning Outcome 1

This Learning Outcome was completed by many of the learners designing and carrying out a questionnaire and report on health and safety. The majority of learners provided outlines and basic descriptions for this Learning Outcome in the report. Very few learners provided explanatory accounts.

Learning Outcome 2

Mostly learners used a table to complete to provide evidence for Learning Outcome 2 rather than a report on legislation as requested in the assignment brief, and a medium by which learners would be able to provide a description so that they could be assessed in Mark Band 3. Most learners in most centres evidenced very basic identifications and/or outlines.

Learning Outcome 3

Learners were to focus on policies and procedures in two settings. On the whole the learners' evidence was predominantly outlined with some descriptions rather than any explanations.

Learning Outcome 4

This Learning Outcome was quite prescriptive and, whilst initially the evidence suggested that learners outlined/described a range of emergencies and how to deal with them, some of the information appeared to have been copied and not referenced by learners themselves in a lot of centres.

In some centres learners may well have been more descriptive/explanatory in their verbal presentation alongside their PowerPoint presentation but this was not evidenced by the teacher. A number of learners from one centre evidenced exactly the same information (sometimes word for word) as the rest of their peers in the class.

There was little application to the learners' work place experiences or any contextualised or applied learning opportunities.

Learning Outcome 5

Many learners produced a leaflet on infection control. This was covered quite well but little work was seen beyond Mark Band 2. More explanations with examples (e.g. case studies and stories from the media about infections and how they can be prevented) could be included to gain marks in Mark Band 3 in the future. Again, as in Learning Outcome 4 much of the work seen for this Learning Outcome was very prescriptive and appeared to be very much directed by the teacher eg. a table to complete where everyone in the class is using the same information, therefore much of the work evidenced by the learners was similar as their peers and in some cases exactly the same, word for word.

There was little application to the learners' work place experiences or any contextualised or applied learning opportunities.

Learning Outcome 6

Many centres encouraged their learners to present their information about the role of risk assessment with good examples of learners having carried out a real risk assessment. It was pleasing to see learners attempting to put forward a persuasive case for action/ improvements, although this was the weakest part of the evidence.

Learning Outcome 7

Learning outcome 7 was covered quite well, however more was often completed (and to a higher level) regarding how to recognise the signs that an individual may be at risk of harm or abuse compared to the section on establishing and maintaining a trusting relationship with individuals - this was often covered in a very basic way and often learners did not refer to the four sectors or any work settings / case studies which is a great shame and missed opportunity.

Level 2 Unit 5 Needs and Preferences

General comments

Some centres used Edexcel's fit for purpose assignment briefs where the learning outcomes are put into different tasks. Some centres produced their own assignment briefs for their learners in which all included in this sample covered all seven learning outcomes through a variety of different tasks.

The practical element of this unit was to carry out an investigation, collecting and collating information that relates to addressing the needs of individuals. Ideally this would be carried out on the learners work related experience within one of the four sectors, but the learners are being requested to investigate **three** different individuals with differing needs and the likelihood of this being available for the learners throughout their whole two year diploma course, is questionable it would very much depend on how the course was designed and planned before the start - there is room for improvement here and this has been suggested in the centres E9 moderator feedback reports for future development and planning.

When looking into interventions (Learning Outcome 6) the majority of learners covered the three individuals under investigation, but failed to refer to the needs of the local community. Because it states 'where relevant' the needs of the local community - even when it would have been relevant many learners did not include any reference to the needs of the local community and so reduced the opportunity to be marked in Mark Band 3.

The majority of learners in this sample produced three individual case studies based on their three individuals - a case study approach is a good one to adopt, however the evidence presented by some learners was very 'prescriptive' and not that much different between the three individuals despite the individual needs, choices and preferences for the three individuals being very different.

Many of the individuals were not real people from the learners work place setting but from case studies given to the learners by the teacher - it would be good to see the inclusion of at least one individual from a real life situation (ideally from the learners work place experience) rather than all of the three coming from the same case studies - also it was often the case that the whole class would have to use the same three individuals for their investigation with no personal choice. Quite ironic seeing as the unit is all about the importance of ensuring the needs and preferences of individuals are taken into consideration.

Learning Outcome 1

This Learning Outcome was generally completed well by the learners, on the whole fully introducing the three individuals under investigation and showing a clear understanding of their needs referring to Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. Learning Outcome 1 was mainly evidenced by a mixture of identifications and outlines with some learners including descriptions, which successfully gained them marks in Mark Band 3. For Learning Outcome 1 many learners did not cover all the needs as set out in the specification, this was especially true about spiritual needs - this was generally covered in less detail - if at all.

Learning Outcome 2

Mostly learners outlined and described for this Learning Outcome rather than just identifying, which was encouraging and pleasing to see. Learning Outcome 2 was often covered insufficiently because many learners failed to 'taking into account different perspectives' as requested.

Learning Outcome 3

Learners were to show they understand the importance of working with individuals and their significant others. Learners who got a good mark for this Learning Outcome looked at the needs of the individuals separately. Many showed an understanding but their evidence was not necessarily on the individuals but all of them as a whole.

Learning Outcome 4

This Learning Outcome asked for learners to understand how the role of assessment informs planning, implementation and reviews when addressing the needs of individuals. For the majority of centres evidence across the three case studies was mostly descriptive; more explanations on how the outcomes were addressed for the three individuals would have helped gain higher marks.

Learning Outcome 5

References to the different information sources used to inform assessments used during their investigation (Learning Outcome 5) were not always completed well. This was often very implicit rather than explicit within the learners work. Some learners showed through their investigation that they do not actually know what is meant by information sources - this is a lost opportunity.

The majority of learners provided evidence on information sources used by practitioners for assessment for each of the individuals described within the case studies. On the whole learners evidenced more of an outline; more description for this Learning Outcome would have attracted marks into Mark Band 3.

Learning Outcome 6

This Learning Outcome required learners to identify at least one intervention for each of the three individuals. On the whole this was accomplished, however learners then went on to mainly outline or describe (rather than explain) how the intervention suggested is designed to meet the needs of the needs of the individual and/or the community.

Learning Outcome 7

This Learning Outcome was mainly evidenced 'implicitly' throughout the three case studies as a whole. That is, there was only a very small individual section for Learning Outcome 7 outlining/describing the research methods used in the learners' investigation to collect and collate information with regards to addressing the needs of the three individuals. However, throughout the three case studies, there was evidence that learners had actually carried out the three investigations into addressing the needs of the individuals. There was however little evidence of explanations to be awarded a mark in Mark Band 3 by many learners for this series.

Level 2 unit 6 Antisocial and Offending Behaviour

General Comments

Unit 6 is both a very interesting unit, with the potential to engage and motivate learners as well as being also very demanding and challenging, covering a wide range of issues and asking a considerable amount from both learners and the centres delivering it.

One of the biggest challenges of the unit is the contrast between the reduced Guided Learning Hours allocated and the broad demands of the specifications. Where these demands were successfully resolved, centres submitted work, which was of high quality and demonstrated mature insight into the criminal justice sector and its application. It is pleasing to note that many centres are now working with the various aspects of the criminal justice sector within their local area and that this is enhancing the learning experience for their learners.

Learning Outcome 1

The majority of learners successfully identified the various elements of the Justice System, although this did not always reflect the breadth and scope of the sector. For example, the focus tended to be on the police and courts system, whilst the role of local authorities and the probation service was sometimes omitted. Some centres included a case study, which detailed the passage of the offender through the various stages of the justice system, through to prison or Youth Offending Institutions and probation. This is an appropriate method of ensuring that the learner is aware of the role of the various services within the justice sector and can apply their knowledge.

Many learners included a chart outlining the overall structure of the justice sector; this successfully demonstrated knowledge of the overall structure of the justice sector but could have included more detail and links between the various services. The Learning Outcome demands that learners plan and carry out an investigation, in general there was very little evidence provided that an investigation had been carried out. Evidence of a plan of an investigation plus references would fulfil the requirements of the specification.

Learning Outcome 2

Learners are required to know different patterns of anti-social and offending behaviour and the factors affecting the likelihood of offending and re-offending.

Many learners did not demonstrate that they understood the difference between anti-social and offending behaviour and hence could not fulfil the criteria by outlining different patterns of both. On occasions, learners successfully put forward a variety of explanations to explain the likelihood of offending/re-offending, which revealed some insight. Some learners linked offending/anti-social behaviour to poor education and the inability to improve their situation, whereas others linked it to the use of drugs and alcohol

Learners explained the different patterns which affected social and offending behaviour less well, patterns could have included: geographical areas, between genders, among young people and prolific young offenders. On occasions, there was an attempt to discuss patterns of behaviour and the likelihood of offending/ re-offending together. This tended to hinder the learner in demonstrating full knowledge of both. Learners tended to focus on anti-social behaviour and street

level crime, such as graffiti, where possible, they should be encouraged to consider a wider range of offending behaviour.

Learning Outcome 3

The overwhelming majority of learners cited examples of the different sanctions, which can be imposed as an alternative to a court appearance. Some learners provided original explanations and linked the penalties to anti-social behaviour and as a consequence were awarded Mark Band 3. However, on many occasions, examples were taken directly from sources, particularly textbooks, which could not be accepted as the learners' own work. It is important that in such instances learner work is referenced as proof of authenticity.

Learning Outcome 4

Almost all learners conducted primary research in the form of questionnaires. Well-planned surveys enabled learners to develop further understanding of the consequences of anti-social/offending behaviour both on themselves and on others.

Almost all learners developed a questionnaire, which included both qualitative and quantitative data, however, it was not always apparent that learners could differentiate between the two. Centres need to ensure that learners can provide evidence to demonstrate understanding of the two types of data.

Surveys tended to be carried out within the local area; ideally respondents should be included from different backgrounds, from the local area. Surveys completed within the centre itself, did not provide learners with the information required to fully consider the effects of crime and behaviour on themselves and others. Likewise, surveys conducted within the centre, tended to disadvantage learners, as they did not have the relevant

Data was in general, very well presented, in the form of pie-charts and graphs, however, there tended to be a lack of evaluation of the results of the survey which prevented learners from achieving Mark Band 3. Where group work is used, it is important to provide full documentation of the input of each learner to the final outcome.

Learning Outcome 5

The learning outcome demands that learners can demonstrate understanding of the impact of crime on victims and witnesses and their needs for protection, respect, recognition, information and confidentiality. On many occasions, not all of these criteria were addressed. Many learners for example, only included victims, but not witnesses, in other instances, learners did not provide coverage of all the needs and were selective as to which ones for example, confidentiality and respect, which they covered.

Learning Outcome 6

Performance within this Learning Outcome tends to be dependant on the success of the learner's survey in Learning Outcome 4, as this provides the basis for learners to suggest a range of possibilities to reduce crime within the local area, as they were aware of the crime and disorder which was apparent within their own geographical area. Where learners were aware of their own area and the types of crime and disorder within that area, they were able to provide ways in which crime and disorder could be reduced within a community and as a consequence demonstrate insight.

Learning Outcome 7

Once again some learners managed to demonstrate insight and developed the knowledge gained from their own survey and managed to generate ideas to reduce crime and disorder within their own area. In such instances the Learning Outcome was completed with enthusiasm and some original work was evidenced. Alternatively, where the survey had been conducted within the centre, learners failed to be able to generate and explain ideas to reduce crime in within their own areas.

Level 2 unit 7 Supporting Children and Young People

General Comments

This is a challenging unit in respect of both the amount of information it demands and the diverse areas, which it attempts to cover. The first four Learning Outcomes were covered in detail, conversely, Learning Outcome 5, in particular, tended to lack the appropriate information to enable learners to aim for the higher mark bands. Some centres used case studies to cover all the learning outcomes. In general this tended to prevent learners from providing all the appropriate information to fully meet all the Learning Outcomes and centres are advised to complete every learning outcome separately to provide learners with the opportunity to provide full coverage, albeit case studies can be very useful and appropriate.

Learning Outcome 1

The information required to meet this learning outcome is quite voluminous and centres attempted to approach it by either using tables or by using two case studies, one for the child and the other for the young person. Both methods are appropriate but both are problematic in the respect that they do not always enable the learner to provide appropriate coverage of the learning outcome. Where case studies were used, there was a tendency not to cover all the development stages and include normal ranges of development and milestones. Whereas, where learners used tables, the information provided tended to be little more than descriptive, which meant that learners could not achieve Mark Band 3. Ideally, centres provided coverage using a table with additional explanation. Centres in general, provided coverage of development in all the PIESL.

Learning Outcome 2

Centres used various approaches to demonstrate that learners could recognise signs that could indicate that development may differ from agreed norms. Some of the approaches used were unscientific, for example, observing a child complete an action and this did not always enable the learner to demonstrate how the development differed from agreed norms. It is advisable for centres to attempt to use scientific measurements, which would enable learners to make comparisons with agreed norms.

Learning Outcome 3

The aim of Learning Outcome 3 is to ensure that learners are able to develop understanding of the importance of positive experience and the need for realistic adult expectations in the learning and development of both children and young people. Centres did not always ensure that their learners provided full coverage of experience in relation to both the child and young person, as the Learning Outcome demands, but rather only provided coverage of the child. Many learners did provide examples, which were appropriate to the age group being covered and demonstrated some insight.

Learning Outcome 4

Some learners provided original examples of how changes in the life of a child or young person's life can affect their behaviour. Many examples were drawn from either personal experience or work placement, with some centres using case studies. Both methods of coverage are highly appropriate providing there is adequate

demonstration of how these changes affect the behaviour of either the child or young person.

Learning Outcome 5

Learning Outcome 5 is Social Policy based and allows for discussion of Government Policy whilst additionally providing a framework for Learning Outcome 6. The Every Child Matters Policy provides extensive coverage of the provision of children's services and integrated services. Coverage of this Learning Outcome is still extremely weak. Some centres are providing a diagram of the services, which lacks references and is without further explanation. Learners need to provide additional explanation to any diagrams to provide evidence of their knowledge of the broad overall structure of the children's workforce. Some centres included detail of the Victoria Climbié case, whilst this is certainly one of the instigators of the ECM policy, it does not provide a vehicle to demonstrate any explanations relating to the children's workforce and as such, should not be included.

Learning Outcome 6

The learning outcome requires knowledge of how those working with children and young people can support their development and well being in conjunction with their families and carers, hence there focus should be placed on how workers can help support development, appropriate examples can be taken from the content of the unit section as stated within the specifications. There is still a lack of demonstration of how workers within the sectors can also work with the families and carers as well as with children and young people. It was pleasing to note that some learners demonstrated insight by applying appropriate support in relation to the age of the child and young person.

Learning Outcome 7

In general coverage was poor. Some learners provided activities such as caring for a baby and as a consequence could not provide appropriate explanation of how the activity supported areas of development. Whereas others, simply listed activities, without any reference to how they supported the development of children and young people. Ideally the learner is required to devise an activity, which supports at least one area of development for both a child and young person. More than one activity can be provided to cover both age groups, however, there is no need for learners to spend many hours devising activities and as a consequence failing to demonstrate in any detail how the activity supports areas of development. Group work was sometimes evident. Centres are required to ensure that the individual learner's contribution is clearly documented. It is appropriate to use detailed witness statements as evidence that activities have been carried out by the learner.

Level 2 unit 8 Patient-Centred Health

General Comments

This is an internally assessed 30 Guided Learning Hours unit. Learners are required to know normal baselines for health and their measurements, be able to use simple measures for their own health baseline, know common conditions that can affect individuals throughout the life cycle and how they are treated, whilst also understanding the potential impact on families and carers as well as the individual.

Learning Outcome 1

All learners identified the normal baselines for health and how they are measured. Some learners had a tendency to cut and paste class handouts or Internet sources, without reference, to provide details of these baselines. This prevented attainment in the higher mark bands.

Learning Outcome 2

The majority of learners were able to use simple measures to give their own baseline measurements. Generally learners linked the evidence to Learning Outcome 1 and hence were able to make comparisons to their own health baselines and the norms as stated in Learning Outcome 1. This was done fairly well by some learners, however, in many cases, further demonstration of knowledge was required to warrant the work being regarded as explanatory to engage Mark Band 3.

Learning Outcome 3

In most cases learners chose three highly appropriate common conditions, which could be carried through to enable learners to provide comprehensive evidence of how the conditions were treated. The more able learners both investigated how treatment changed as the condition progressed. Not all learners applied the conditions to the lifecycle and hence did not meet the full requirements of the learning objectives. Centres may encourage learners to find their own examples of appropriate conditions, providing there is enough information available on how they affect the individual through the lifecycle and treatment methods through the stages of the condition.

Learning Outcome 4

Generally learners were able to demonstrate understanding of a range of common conditions on the well being of individuals, their families and carers. Many learners used the same conditions, which they had investigated in Learning Outcome 3. There is a need in this Learning Outcome to also discuss the effects that the condition has on family and carers as well as the individual.

Learning Outcome 5

As a rule, learners chose one of the conditions which they had covered in the previous Learning Outcomes and mapped a patient care pathway for the condition. Learners who provided the information in the form of a flowchart or an actual map of a road did not provide the required level of information for the work to be graded above mark band one, as the depth of work, on all occasions, could not be classified above the level of outline. It is essential that centres use an appropriate method to provide evidence, which enables learners to provide descriptive and explanatory accounts.

Learning Outcome 6

In general learners provided appropriate health care practitioners who were involved in their chosen care pathway. However, detail was once again brief and whilst learners almost always provided accounts of three practitioners, the depth of detail did not meet the requirements for classification as either descriptive or explanatory, to warrant award of the higher bands.

Learning Outcome 7

Some learners are still providing evidence by a diagram to meet the learning outcome, which lacks detail. The focus should be on public organisations, private organisations and voluntary organisations and how they support the patient centred approach. Whilst there is evidence of coverage of the methods of service delivery, there is little demonstration of the overall structure and how the types of services work together. As a general point, further focus needs to be placed on how the structure supports the patient centred approach. There was increasing evidence that learners were becoming aware of the role of the Department of Health and NICE and it is suggested that further investigation of the NHS Improvement Plan would enhance learners' knowledge of the content of this Learning Outcome.

Level 2 unit 9 The Social Model of Disability

General Comments

This is a 30 guided learning hour unit. The quantity of work submitted for the Controlled Assessment should reflect this time limit. Very few centres set their own scenarios. Most of the work seen was in the form of an extended essay covering, to varying degrees, the Learning Outcomes.

Learning Outcome 1

When learners investigated the Social Model of Disability, especially through the experience of role-playing being a person with additional needs, awareness of the relevance of this Model was raised. However, this experience was often not applied to addressing the Learning Outcomes in any depth and much of their work was of outline quality. Centres need to encourage learners to study not only the 19th century history of the approach to disability but, also, to be aware of the important developments in the 20th century. A range of outlines or descriptions were provided of the social Model's aims and objectives. Often learners combined the requirements of Learning Outcome 1 and Learning Outcome 2 within their responses

Learning Outcome 2

Learners considered, to varying degrees of depth, what is meant by the Social Model of Disability and why it is important in addressing discrimination. More consideration could be made of how the Social Model supports independence and choice. There needed to be greater clarity about how this Social Model differs from the Medical Model of Disability. Generally, descriptions and explanations were not developed sufficiently to achieve the high marks with Mark Bands 2 and 3.

Learning Outcome 3

Many learners were able to discuss generally how the Social Model of Disability influences the development of support, service provision and the environment. However, responses could be stronger if learners considered some of the issues listed in the specifications for this Learning Outcome.

Learning Outcome 4

Most learners provided appropriate evidence of how potential environmental barriers might be overcome. Less attention was paid to other less visually obvious potential barriers including education, attitudes, emotions towards disabilities and language and how these particular barriers could be overcome.

Learning Outcome 5

Nearly all learners were able to quote one piece of key legislation but many of the samples included more than one piece of legislation. Only one piece of legislation is required. Hence, those learners who spent part of their limited assessment time considering more than one piece, would have been better using this time to produce a more in depth consideration of the chosen key legislation and, therefore, most probably, gaining higher marks. Little consideration was made of the resulting policy from the legislation chosen which would support the Social Model of Disability. Few learners paid attention to the role of ethics.

Learning Outcome 6

Most learners had clearly benefited from studying this Unit. This was evident in their responses to Learning Outcome 6. There were some very detailed and sincere, personal reflections on how the learners' own values and attitudes had been affected

by their studies. Also, these reflections considered their personal and social responsibility towards others but often in less detail.

Learners should be encouraged to use a variety of resources when investigating the Social Model of Disability and not to rely solely on the textbook. Many of the centres did not apply the marking criteria accurately, especially for Learning Outcomes 1 and 2. Marking tended to be a little generous.

Statistics

Level 2 Unit 1 Principles, Values and Personal Development

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C
Raw boundary mark	60	52	42	33	24
Points Score	10	8	6	4	2

Level 2 Unit 2 Working Together and Communicating

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C
Raw boundary mark	60	53	43	33	24
Points Score	10	8	6	4	2

Level 2 Unit 3 Safeguarding and Protecting Individuals

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C
Raw boundary mark	60	52	42	33	24
Points Score	10	8	6	4	2

Level 2 Unit 5 Needs and Preferences

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C
Raw boundary mark	60	52	42	33	24
Points Score	10	8	6	4	2

Level 2 Unit 6 Antisocial Behaviour and Offending Behaviour

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C
Raw boundary mark	60	52	43	34	25
Points Score	5	4	3	2	1

Level 2 Unit 7 Supporting Children and Young People

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C
Raw boundary mark	60	52	42	33	24
Points Score	5	4	3	2	1

Level 2 Unit 8 Patient-Centred Health

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C
Raw boundary mark	60	52	42	33	24
Points Score	5	4	3	2	1

Level 2 Unit 9 The Social Model of Disability

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C
Raw boundary mark	60	52	42	33	24
Points Score	5	4	3	2	1

Notes

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

Raw boundary mark: the minimum mark required by a learner to qualify for a given grade.

Please note: *Principal Learning qualifications are new qualifications, and grade boundaries for Controlled Assessment units should not be considered as stable. These grade boundaries may differ from series to series.*

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 DP023003 January 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