



**General Certificate of Education (A-level) Applied  
June 2011**

**Health and Social Care**

**HC16**

**(Specification  
8621/8623/8626/8627/8629)**

**Unit 16: Early Years Education**

***Report on the Examination***

---

Further copies of this Report on **the Examination** are available from: [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

**Copyright**

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334).  
Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX.

## **Unit 16: Early Years Education June 2011**

It was pleasing that the standard of work presented generally followed the order of the assessment criteria closely in order to present well-ordered evidence. It is important that all of the evidence presented relates to the two topics and the selected age range throughout the report.

Throughout the report, candidates should demonstrate an understanding of how children learn and how techniques and strategies are used to enable them to learn effectively.

The evidence presented should be wholly relevant to the selected topics and the selected age range.

Candidates should research relevant techniques and strategies for enabling learning and commonly used to deliver the topics.

Higher-ability candidates provided detailed and consistently applied evidence, demonstrating thorough research into techniques and strategies for enabling learning. Formal and informal assessments were considered in depth.

Mid-range to lower-ability candidates at times attempted to apply the information gathered consistently, but did include some information not directly related to the age range or topics selected.

Some candidates decided on the techniques and/or strategies they would use before researching them and selecting the most appropriate for the topic and age selected. It is important that appropriate research is carried out before starting.

Relevant assessment methods were investigated and higher-ability candidates demonstrated clear understanding of their relevance in assessing progress relating to both topics. Assessment was often considered in general by less able candidates.

Higher-ability candidates presented detailed and imaginative plans which appeared highly likely to achieve aims. These were explicit and enabled the reader to visualise the learning experience throughout. Some candidates provided photographs of children's work which enhanced this section of the portfolios.

Some of the plans, though detailed, would benefit from a more `reader-friendly` layout. A lesson proforma/overview would improve this section.

Less-able candidates presented learning plans which stated aims and were age-appropriate. However, they lacked detail to envisage the whole learning experience and also lacked clarity.

Candidates should provide evidence of 2 learning plans, one for each topic.

Any draft plans could be included in the appendix.

It is important that realistic learning plans are included; some candidates included written evidence about the activities but did not include actual plans.

Higher-ability candidates evaluated the learning plans in depth and considered the effectiveness of the learning that would have taken place.

Most candidates sampled appeared to have had the opportunity to carry out the `learning experience` and this provided more in-depth evaluations. Peer assessment sheets and teacher feedback were utilised well in this section.

Relevant learning theories were well applied to the topics by more able candidates and were used to justify the design of the learning plans.

Work explored how effective the strategies selected had been in the learning plans. Also they considered how other strategies could have been used as an alternative approach to learning

Candidates stated specific examples of techniques used, why selected and considered how effective they were overall.

The evaluations linked back to the stated aims and the chosen age range.

Mid-range and less-able candidates' evaluations lacked some detail. Due to weak learning plans, evaluations were sometimes superficial. However, the work did consider whether the learning aims had been met. Strategies and techniques selected were sometimes evaluated, but not in any depth.

Less-able candidates included generic evidence on learning theories with very limited application.

Most candidates presented evidence of thorough research into the 2 chosen topic areas together with sources for relevant techniques and theory.

Candidates mainly referenced them in the correct form, analysed their effectiveness and explained how they were used.

### **Grade boundaries**

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the AQA website at [www.aqa.org.uk/over/stat.html](http://www.aqa.org.uk/over/stat.html)