



Pearson



Mark grid

BTEC Level 3 National in Animal  
Management  
Unit 3: Animal Welfare and Ethics  
(31646H)



**Animal Management**

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications website at <http://qualifications.pearson.com/en/home.html> for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at <http://qualifications.pearson.com/en/contact-us.html>

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson. Their contact details can be found on this link: <http://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-for-you/teachers.html>

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at <https://www.edexcelonline.com>  
You will need an Edexcel Online username and password to access this service.

### **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your learners at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Publications Code 31646H\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

# Unit 3: Animal Welfare and Ethics - Mark grid

---

## General Marking Guidance

- All learners must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first learner in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark grids should be applied positively. Learners must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark grid not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- All marks on the mark grid should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark grid are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the learner's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark grid.
- Where judgment is required, mark grid will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark grid to a learner's response, a senior examiner should be consulted.

## Specific Marking guidance

---

The marking grids have been designed to assess learner work holistically. Rows within the grids identify the assessment focus/outcome being targeted. When using a levels-based mark grid, the 'best fit' approach should be used.

- Examiners should first make a holistic judgement on which band most closely matches the learner response and place it within that band. Learners will be placed in the band that best describes their answer.
- The mark awarded within the band will be decided based on the quality of the answer in response to the assessment focus/outcome and will be modified according to how securely all bullet points are displayed at that band.
- Marks will be awarded towards the top or bottom of that band depending on how they have evidenced each of the descriptor bullet points.

### Activity 1 – Appraisal report

Assessment focus	Band 0	Band 1	Band 2	Band 3	Band 4
Appraisal of animal welfare issues/factors based on information provided	<b>0</b> No rewardable material	<b>1-5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generic statements or isolated elements of knowledge and understanding</li> <li>• Welfare issues/factors identified link to some of the welfare needs and are supported by occasionally relevant examples.</li> <li>• Limited lines of reasoning evident in support of the welfare issues/factors identified which address either strengths or weaknesses</li> <li>• A limited attempt to link issues/factors to relevant welfare legislation/policy</li> <li>• A limited approach to scaling/ranking the issues/factors in terms of their impact is evident.</li> </ul>	<b>6-10</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates generally accurate knowledge and understanding</li> <li>• Welfare issues/factors identified link to all welfare needs supported by a few relevant examples.</li> <li>• Occasional lines of reasoning evident in support of the welfare issues/factors identified which address both strengths and weaknesses although there may be some imbalance</li> <li>• Partially developed linkage of issues/factors to relevant welfare legislation/policy</li> <li>• An adequate approach to scaling/ranking the issues/factors in terms of their impact is evident.</li> </ul>	<b>11-15</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding</li> <li>• Welfare issues/factors identified link to all welfare needs supported by some relevant examples.</li> <li>• Lines of reasoning evident in support of the welfare issues/factors identified which address both strengths and weaknesses with a reasonable balance</li> <li>• Developed linkage of issues/factors to relevant welfare legislation/policy</li> <li>• An effective approach to scaling/ranking the issues/factors in terms of their impact is evident.</li> </ul>	<b>16-20</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate and thorough knowledge and understanding</li> <li>• Welfare issues/factors identified clearly link to all welfare needs through the sustained use of relevant examples.</li> <li>• Comprehensive lines of reasoning evident in support of the welfare issues/factors identified which address both strengths and weaknesses in a balanced way</li> <li>• Comprehensive linkage of issues/factors to relevant welfare legislation/policy</li> <li>• A comprehensive approach to scaling/ranking the issues/factors in terms of their impact is evident.</li> </ul>

### Activity 2 – Evaluation of evidence provided

<b>Assessment focus</b>	<b>Band 0</b>	<b>Band 1</b>	<b>Band 2</b>	<b>Band 3</b>	<b>Band 4</b>
Additional information necessary to complete the appraisal	<b>0</b>	<b>1-2</b>	<b>3-5</b>	<b>6-8</b>	<b>9-10</b>
	No rewardable material	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited evaluation of the suitability of the information</li> <li>• Additional information identified is of limited relevance and would only partially improve the appraisal</li> <li>• Limited lines of reasoning evident in support of either the evaluation or additional information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A partially developed evaluation of the suitability of the information</li> <li>• Additional information identified is generally relevant and would adequately improve the appraisal</li> <li>• Occasional lines of reasoning evident in support of both the evaluation and additional information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A developed evaluation of the suitability of the information</li> <li>• Additional information identified is relevant and would effectively improve the appraisal</li> <li>• Lines of reasoning mostly evident in support of both the evaluation and additional information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A comprehensive evaluation of the suitability of the information</li> <li>• Additional information identified is consistently relevant and would considerably improve the appraisal</li> <li>• Comprehensive lines of reasoning evident in support of both the evaluation and additional information</li> </ul>

**Activity 3 – Action plan in response to issues identified**

<b>Assessment focus</b>	<b>Band 0</b>	<b>Band 1</b>	<b>Band 2</b>	<b>Band 3</b>	<b>Band 4</b>
Action plan in response to welfare factors/issues identified	<b>0</b>	<b>1-2</b>	<b>3-5</b>	<b>6-8</b>	<b>9-10</b>
	No rewardable material	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggested actions are limited in terms of addressing the issues/factors identified</li> <li>• Limited lines of reasoning evident in support of the actions</li> <li>• Actions are listed without an attempt to prioritise</li> <li>• Limited attempt to apply realistic timescales to the actions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggested actions are adequate in terms of addressing the issues/factors identified</li> <li>• Occasional lines of reasoning evident in support of the actions</li> <li>• Actions are listed with an attempt to prioritise</li> <li>• Adequately applies realistic timescales to the actions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggested actions are good in terms of addressing the issues/factors identified</li> <li>• Lines of reasoning evident in support of the actions</li> <li>• Effectively prioritises most actions identified</li> <li>• Effectively applies realistic timescales to the actions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggested actions are comprehensive in terms of addressing the issues/factors identified</li> <li>• Comprehensive lines of reasoning evident in support of the actions</li> <li>• Comprehensively prioritises all actions identified</li> <li>• Comprehensively applies realistic timescales to the actions</li> </ul>

### Activity 4 – Ethical issues

Assessment focus	Band 0	Band 1	Band 2	Band 3	Band 4
Exploration /discussion of ethical issues on basis of information provided	<b>0</b>	<b>1-5</b>	<b>6-10</b>	<b>11-15</b>	<b>16-20</b>
	No rewardable material	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generic statements or isolated elements of knowledge and understanding, with many irrelevant issues</li> <li>• Only one viewpoint is considered</li> <li>• Lines of reasoning are unsupported or unclear, with serious logical flaws in the arguments put forward</li> <li>• There is a lack of structure to the response with little use of appropriate terminology</li> <li>• Displays a superficial discussion leading a superficial judgement rarely supported through the application of relevant evidence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates generally accurate knowledge and understanding of ethical issues relevant to the scenario with some lapses supported by occasional examples</li> <li>• Two contrasting viewpoints are explored with some consideration of how they are interrelated</li> <li>• Some occasional linkages present so that lines of reasoning are partially supported though following the argument may sometimes be difficult.</li> <li>• There is a clear structure to the response and appropriate terminology is used</li> <li>• Displays a partially developed discussion leading to a judgement occasionally supported through the application of relevant evidence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of ethical issues relevant to the scenario supported by some examples</li> <li>• Several viewpoints are explored with some consideration of how they are interrelated</li> <li>• Linkages present so that lines of reasoning are supported and clear.</li> <li>• There is an effective structure to the response and consistent terminology is generally used</li> <li>• Displays developed discussion leading to a judgement supported through the application of relevant evidence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate and thorough knowledge and understanding of the ethical issues relevant to the scenario supported by sustained examples</li> <li>• Several viewpoints are explored with sustained consideration of how they are interrelated</li> <li>• Comprehensive linkages evidenced so that lines of reasoning are well supported, clear and concise.</li> <li>• There is a clear and logical structure to the response with thorough use of appropriate terminology</li> <li>• Displays a comprehensive discussion culminating in a judgement that is fully supported throughout by sustained application of relevant evidence</li> </ul>

