Examiners' Report June 2009

Society, Health and Development
Level 3

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 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/

Contents

Principal Learning Society Health and Development

Level 3 Introduction

The first full series of the Level 3 Principal Learning in Society, Health and Development took place in June 2009. The Examiners were pleased with the response from centres to the challenges brought about by entering their learners for these examinations after only one year of study. As centres are no doubt aware, the recommendation is that the Principal Learning is delivered over two years. However, there was much that was encouraging about the submissions which were seen by the team of examiners and moderators.

Internally Assessed Units (Units 3, 4, 5 and 6)
The Moderators were especially pleased that centres were alert to the demands made by the administrative requirements associated with the internally assessed units. There were no serious errors of administration and our work was made much more manageable by the careful completion of Candidate Record Sheets, by the accurate calculation and submission of marks, by the often excellent annotation of internally assessed units and, finally, by the accuracy which Centre Assessors achieved in their awarding of marks. The Moderators hope that in future series, more learners will agree to their work being used for training purposes by ticking the relevant box on the Candidate Record Sheet.

This is not to underplay the contribution made by learners themselves in terms of the high quality attained in the presentation of their work. Many had responded with enthusiasm to the demands and this is most commendable. Most learners chose to follow the order suggested by the Learning Outcomes and, through the appropriate use of sub-headings, clearly indicated where the individual sections could be found. The Examiners were pleased that some learners developed individual approaches to these units and that these were usually successful and, in some work, particularly so. In future series, the Moderators would like more learners to demonstrate such confidence.

Whilst this was the first series, the Moderators note that not all learners included introductions, conclusions and bibliographies in their submissions. Future learners are strongly recommended to do so. The Moderators also point out that it would be entirely appropriate for learners to support any claims which they might make with well-chosen empirical evidence, for example in the form of statistics or reports. It is hoped that Course Tutors will encourage their learners to adopt this approach to research. The Moderators will reward work which is properly referenced and which shows clear familiarity with the recognised ways to write the sort of reports which are required by the specification.

The Moderators also expect to see learners use the pagination facility. Some portfolios were submitted with pages in the wrong order and where these did not have page numbers, the work of the examiners became unnecessarily complicated. Most portfolios were appropriately bound and submitted in folders. Some were not. The Moderators were sometimes surprised that spell checking had not been accurately applied. Learners should ensure that their final submissions do not contain such errors.

Learners need only submit the final version of their work. The Moderators do not need draft versions and the accompanying review sheets from the Course Tutor. It is also not necessary to submit copies of completed questionnaires. One will suffice, with a brief summary of the findings. Further savings on photocopying can be made if learners do not submit downloaded pages from websites which they have printed off. Such sources should be properly referenced in the text.

Externally Assessed Units (Units 1 and 2)

The external units were a challenge for many learners and the Examiners were concerned at the standard of grammar, punctuation and spelling. Course Tutors are strongly advised to give their learners as much support as possible in these aspects of examination technique. Generally, understanding of technical vocabulary such as 'clinical performance', 'appraisal', 'mortality rates', and 'mentoring' was poor. Learners are also advised to attempt all questions as they may gain marks which cannot be awarded if nothing is written. Learners need to look carefully at the wording of questions and should avoid writing in their answers statements which are taken from the case study.

The questions focus on day-to-day practice across the four sectors. Well-publicised and often controversial cases are obviously useful for evaluative purposes, but these distract from everyday practice. The specification is primarily concerned with the latter and learners are advised to bear this in mind when answering questions.

The comments above regarding the use of empirical evidence also apply here.

Level 3 Unit 1 The Sectors in Context

General comments
The responses of more-able learners were well-informed and were relevant to the content of the case study. The Examiners are pleased to note that the provision of a wide range of case study material appears to be standard practice in many centres. This enables learners to apply appropriate knowledge to the given situation. In the responses of less-able learners, these tended to be more generalised and were not well-thought out. Learners should more carefully attempt to address the requirements of the question and apply their knowledge. Most learners completed the paper and (encouragingly) there were relatively few timing and rubric problems.

Question 1
The question was well-answered and learners managed to focus their responses on the case study where required.

(a) (i) Most learners identified appropriate voluntary sector organisations which were appropriate to meet the needs of the subjects within the case study.

(ii) Most learners provided descriptions of the ways in which the voluntary sector could provide assistance to enable individuals to remain independent. The response need not have been isolated to the voluntary sector organisation which was cited in (i). Learners who addressed the question this way tended to be limited by the nature of the organisation which they described. It was pleasing to note that the overwhelming majority of learners provided responses which showed how independence could be maintained. Some responses were not developed, which meant that learners only achieved four marks out of the possible six.

(iii)-(iv) The majority of learners correctly identified a statutory sector provision and were able to describe the function of statutory provision within the sectors. Answers were varied which demonstrated good coverage of all the sectors by centres.

(b) More-able learners discussed how the use of research could ensure that sectors work together effectively to meet the needs of service users. They provided responses such as 'deploy services', 'identify current trends' and 'provide targets' etc, and these were usually described to some extent. However, at the lower end of the range, the responses were weak and did not always focus on the sectors working together but on research with regard to the individual service user's conditions.

(c) Learners focussed their responses on the difference in funding between the statutory and non-statutory sectors. Disappointingly, many of the responses were weak and did not differentiate between the voluntary sector and private non-statutory provision. There was a lack of insight displayed as to how funding affected services provision. For example, how the private sector is concerned with profit and its consequences or in the case of the voluntary sector, the lack of finance to provide training and regular services.

Question 2

(a) (i)-(ii). Almost all learners provided a definition of the term 'service user' to gain the maximum of two marks. In contrast, learners did not always provide an example of service provision but merely defined it and hence were unable to attain the remaining marks.

(b) (i) Learners were not always certain about what is defined as 'local services'. Many answers were vague, suggesting, for example, counselling. A small minority did not apply to the subject of the case study and hence provided incorrect responses such as childcare. Some learners included self-help groups, such as Alcoholics Anonymous, which are not categorised as services.

(ii) Overall responses were weak, with some learners not understanding what national services entailed. A common response was the police. Learners and Course Tutors are advised that Constabularies are regional organisations (the Metropolitan Police being one example). In contrast, the Prison Service is seen as national.

(c) Learners responded well and produced well thought out answers which identified the personal skills and qualities which were appropriate to meet the needs of Carl, the subject of the case study. The Examiners are pleased to note that this demonstrated that centres were ensuring that learners could apply their knowledge to different scenarios and client groups.

(d) The Examiners were not satisfied with the responses to this particular question. Learners in this instance had a wide choice of appropriate legislation from which to choose, including the Mental Capacity Act (2005), the National Health Services Act (2006), the Care Standards Act (2000) and the Human Rights Act (1998). Even where appropriate legislation was cited, discussion of it was extremely limited in most cases. A very small minority of learners gained more than four or five marks on this question, whereas the overwhelming majority of responses were seen as basic and lacking application and knowledge.

Question 3

This question was the least popular and there were indications within the responses that learners were not fully knowledgeable with regard to Learning Outcomes 4 and 5 in the specification.

(a) Only a small minority correctly cited birth to nineteen as the age range covered by 'Every Child Matters'. Centres need to ensure that learners are familiar with the client groups which policies such as 'Every Child Matters' are designed to cover.

(b) The question was not as well done as would have been expected. This was due to learners not being appropriately familiar with 'Every Child Matters' policy areas. Many responses did not provide a description of the policy area which was to be covered, for example Early Years, Education and Employment.

(c) The response to this question was on the whole pleasing with a substantial number of learners gaining full marks. Conversely, it was most apparent that some centres had not covered this area of the specification; hence their learners could not provide appropriate and accurate responses.

(d) Responses were weak and some learners stated incorrectly that the local MP was at local authority level, as opposed to national level. Learners did not fully examine the relationship between local and national government in relation to funding. The relationship between local and national government is currently an area which Course Tutors need to provide more direction for their learners.

(e) This was the least popular question on the paper. Apart from a few exceptions, the overwhelming majority of learners were unaware of the implementation of national policies by local government. Many learners attempted to provide responses from the question which indicated that they had no previous knowledge of the subject area. Others tended to describe the needs of the child in relation to care. Centres need to focus on how government polices are put into operation at local level to safeguard service users.

Level 3 Unit 2 Principles and Values in Practice

Question 1(a)
Most learners could offer a general definition of the term and locate this within a particular sector. Some appropriate examples were included. An example from one of the sectors might be health inequality as the result of a possible 'postcode lottery'. Whilst some learners thought income/wealth determined whether treatment is given to patients, this is clearly not in the spirit of NHS provision. Evidence does suggest that certain groups are more able to gain access to health services because of higher levels of education and a greater familiarity with the system but this argument was not made by any learner.

The Examiners were concerned that a number of learners asserted that 'equality means to treat everyone equally'. Such responses were unable to gain the available marks. Learners are advised that the Examiners are looking for alternative words to explain those which are identified in such questions. The mark scheme gives a number of possible ways of defining this term and learners are advised to take note of these.

Question 1(b)
Most learners were able to briefly define the concept of diversity and were able to gain further marks with appropriate examples, even though many of these were simplistic. Some notion of a multi-cultural society or a polarised society (in terms of age, income, educational attainment etc) would have been much better.

Question 1(c)
The Examiners remind Course Tutors and learners that this question was also on the Sample Assessment Material, where a clear definition and very good examples for all sectors were identified.

Most learners could offer a definition but when suggesting an example there was little more than guesswork. Many learners used the example of doctors/nurses being racist, but offered no evidence. A King's Fund Report in 2001 (simply obtained by doing an internet search on doctors/racism) reveals, for instance, that ethnic minority doctors experience discrimination; that they are more likely to work in deprived areas and less likely than white colleagues to become hospital consultants. The following may be of use to learners:

http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/health/1394655.stm.
http://www.kingsfund.org.uk/applications/site_search/?term=racism+in+medicine&searchreferer_id=2&submit.x=21&submit.y=10

Alternatively learners could have pointed out that following a parliamentary investigation in 2000, doctors themselves were accused of institutional racism. Such examples avoid the trend of unsubstantiated generalisation and constitute the sort of good practice which the Examiners will be most happy to reward. Other dimensions to the debate about discrimination could focus on whether the refusal of medical professionals to carry out operations on smokers or the obese constitutes discrimination; or that patients themselves sometimes refuse to be treated by medical professionals from different races. The best answer to this question also happened to be the simplest. The definition of discrimination as 'putting prejudice into practice' showed what some learners are capable of.

Question 2(a)
Most learners offered a definition of the term. The mark scheme indicates how the four marks could be attained.

Question 2(b)

There was some misunderstanding of term 'victims'. Some learners thought this meant those suffering from, for example, Parkinson's disease. In future, questions about this issue will refer to 'victims of crime' to avoid any confusion. The Examiners remind Course Tutors that Learning Outcome 6 refers specifically to victims but it is also implicit in Learning Outcomes 2, 3, 5 and 7. Learners should therefore be familiar with how policies protect and promote their rights and responsibilities. Contrary to popular belief, Youth Offending Teams do not help victims of crime. In terms of awareness of how victims of crime are supported, there were few suggestions beyond 'talking' to individuals or groups. The mark scheme makes clear the sorts of answers that the Examiners were looking for. Finally, few learners were able to distinguish between the roles of counsellors, as opposed to councillors.

The following may be of use to learners:

http://www.victimsupport.org.uk/vs_england_wales/services/victim_services.php

Question 3(a)

Whilst in Question 4(a) many learners chose Disability Discrimination legislation (1995/2005), the Examiners regret to report that there were no answers to this question that contained an appropriate definition of Learning Disability. The only notion of disability displayed was that there are people who need to use wheelchairs. Learning Disability (LD) and Physical Disability were conflated in the minds of learners. Most definitions centred on the fact that those with LD had difficulty learning or doing things for themselves. These would have been rewarded had they been prefaced with some notion of mental impairment or similar. In contrast, all learners were able to give an example of LD. Few could spell dyslexia. Of those who used dyslexia as an example, most suggested (and were rewarded for saying) that it means 'difficulty with reading and writing'. Whilst this is a symptom, clear and accessible explanations can be found at http://www.dyslexia.uk.com/page30.html or http://www.bdadyslexia.org.uk/about-dyslexia/faqs.html. Learners should be familiar with the accepted definition of such terminology. Note that LD is not illiteracy. The Examiners are aware that definitions of LD vary (Mencap, for example, has a different approach to the British Institute of Learning Disability and does not recognise dyslexia as a symptom of LD) but no learners displayed familiarity with either agenda. Some thought that LD and mental illness were the same thing. Course Tutors may find it helpful to refer to http://www.bild.org.uk/05faqs.htm#factsheets which gives clear explanations of the definitions and causes of LD. This site contains a wealth of factual information about LD which will help learners to avoid making unnecessary and erroneous claims. Another source of information is http://www.mencap.org.uk/landing.asp?id=1683, where learners can not only find out reliable information but can also take part in an interactive quiz to show what they know about the condition itself. The Examiners hope that learners will find these recommendations useful and accessible.

Question 3(b)

Few learners noticed that David had a severe LD and there were some interesting suggestions about how David might be occupied during his hospital stay. The definition in the mark scheme stresses that LD is only one aspect of an individual's life. This was not generally realised by learners.

There was little familiarity with the role of a care manager, to whom many assigned tasks which would normally be carried out by nursing or ancillary staff in hospitals. Many learners said that David's care manager would talk to him to reinforce notions of empowerment, independence and to minimise any stress he might feel in an unfamiliar situation, indicating again that they had not noted that David lives with severe LD and, whilst he might be aware of such notions, there were other priorities. Care managers are usually social workers and they often work across the four sectors. Because this is so, learners are advised that they need to have knowledge of what such key workers actually do.

Question 4(a)

This question was a straightforward re-wording of Learning Outcome 7. A range of legislation was referred to and some learners explained effects in a good level of detail, although the dates of legislation were often inaccurate. Some learners referred to 'The Discrimination Act'. Such answers did not gain marks as the Examiners were unable to ascertain to which aspect of discrimination the response referred. Some answers offered an explanation without reference to any specific legislation. Again, the Examiners were unable to award marks. A significant number of learners did not attempt this question.

Whilst learners are not required to have an in-depth knowledge of all aspects of a piece of legislation, they are required to know its key features and be able to say how these have been implemented. Once again, less-able learners who chose to write about Disability Discrimination Legislation seemed only to know that workplaces now have to have ramps, whilst those who wrote about the Data Protection Act (1998) seemed focussed on the idea of locked cabinets. This is an area where claims made by learners could be supported by empirical evidence.

Question 4(b)

Material from Question 4(a) was often repeated here. Evidence of improvements/ failings (which learners could have referred to in coursework units) was scant. This question and Question 4(a) were deliberately broad in scope to enable learners to draw on their work in other units, especially Units 3 and 4.

The Examiners were most pleased to note that one learner thought that the introduction of the Diploma improved the practice of teachers. This is something which Course Tutors might like to discuss with their learners. They could, of course, find out from workers in any of the four sectors (whom they will encounter on work experience) whether changes in legislation/organisational policies/codes of practice have improved what they do and how they do it.

Question 5(a)

The idea of 'community' is embedded in Learning Outcomes 3 and 5 and is clearly relevant to Learning Outcome 7 (organisational policies and procedures). Despite this, few were familiar with what Community Youth workers do. Information about the roles of Community Youth Workers can be found through the following links:

http://careersadvice.direct.gov.uk/helpwithyourcareer/jobprofiles/JobProfile?code=949470269&jobprofileid=300&jobprofilename=Youth%20and%20Community%20Worker
http://www.connexions-direct.com/Jobs4u/index.cfm?pid=63&catalogueContentID=665

The Mark Scheme also has an outline of what their role entails. Learners should note that Community Youth Workers are not able to recommend, or carry out, punishment.

Question 5(b)
Good responses overall.

Question 5(c)
Good responses overall, with the focus on facilities rather than services.

Question 6(a)
The Examiners remind Course Tutors and learners that this question was also on the Sample Assessment Material, where a clear definition and very good examples for all sectors were identified. Not many learners were able to show what could prompt a public enquiry. Contrary to a number of responses seen, there has not been a public enquiry about levels of teenage pregnancy. Some learners did not read the instructions in the question carefully and referred to the Bristol Inquiry as their example. The reasons for carrying out a public inquiry are very specific. The Examiners strongly recommend that learners are aware of them.

Question 6(b)
This question was a further opportunity for learners to input their knowledge from other units (namely Unit 4 Communication and Partnership Working) and the Examiners were very pleased that many did so - there were some effective responses here. However, the question was about professionals failing to communicate with *each other*, rather than with service users. Some learners seem to think that doctors simply do not communicate with nurses because they do not share the same status. The Examiners have found no evidence that this is the case. And whilst the medical records of some patients are inaccurate due to failings on the part of GPs and/or nurses, this is not widespread.

Question 6(c)
No learners were able to fully answer this question. Most answers repeated material from the extracts and learners are advised that they should avoid writing in their answers statements which are taken from the case study. Whilst the question tested learners' knowledge of the practice of individuals working in the NHS, the recommendations themselves (safety, monitoring, appraisal, standards and openness) apply in each of the four sectors and were embedded in Learning Outcomes 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7. For example, the recommendation about safety relates to how the NHS ensures that patients avoid contracting illnesses other than those for which they are being treated. Whilst the Examiners did reward learners for commenting on health and safety procedures, they were hoping that there might have been consideration of (for example) MRSA. No learner was willing to challenge the claim by showing that standards of safety in NHS hospitals are high anyway.
In the first recommendation ('children'), there was little realisation amongst learners that children are not placed on wards with adults or that those medical professionals who work with children are specifically trained for such a purpose. No mention of the term 'paediatrician' was made. Furthermore, learners need to be aware that there is only one significant recorded case of children being actively harmed whilst resident on a paediatric ward. Learners might find useful information by following this weblink: http://www.bmj.com/cgi/content/extract/308/6927/491. This gives a brief outline of the public inquiry which followed the case of Beverly Allitt in 1991. There were some alarming suggestions from some learners about the threat to children who stay in hospitals. Once again, the Examiners remind learners to try to look beyond sensationalised (and often inaccurate) accounts of events.

Level 3 Unit 3 Partnership Working

General comments

There were a good range of submissions for this unit, with a number of learners scoring very high marks. The three assigned tasks were fully addressed by some learners and the Moderators were pleased with the overall quality of the submissions. It was clear that learners were aware of the purpose of the reflective diary and they were able to record a wide range of observations. They responded with enthusiasm to the organisation of the team event, with a number raising appreciable sums for local charities. The Moderators commend the approach of such learners and acknowledge the support provided for them by Course Tutors and local organisations.

All learners considered the three partnerships, as specified. Most Assignment Briefs that were submitted were clear and written in language appropriate to the learners and they were able to respond effectively to them. Where present, detailed annotation of the portfolios by the centre assessors was most helpful.

Most centres were accurate in their awarding of marks. Generally, Course Tutors were aware of the assessment guidance and learners were often well-versed in the demands of the specification. It was clear that the learners had responded effectively to their teaching and enjoyment of their work was evident in their submissions.

Supporting evidence submitted by more-able learners was good. The inclusion of books in more bibliographies would be appreciated. Course Tutors should encourage their learners to accurately identify relevant source material.

Nearly all work was well-presented but not all candidates used the pagination facility and they are strongly recommended to do so. Particularly gratifying was the use of subtitles to identify Learning Outcomes. Not all work was properly spell-checked and centres should encourage future learners to ensure that they do this. It was pleasing to note that nearly all investigations used formal language. Finally, all abbreviations should be explained.

Learning Outcome 1

Attainment at Mark Band 3 proved difficult even for the most able learners. The Moderators recommend that Course Tutors could usefully devote a little more time to the principles of research to enable learners to more effectively evaluate their investigation(s) from different perspectives.

Learning Outcome 2

Learners were far more comfortable with Learning Outcome 2 and were able to demonstrate detailed knowledge of key features of their chosen partnerships.

Learning Outcome 3

Similarly with Learning Outcome 3, knowledge of barriers to partnership working was well-contextualised and a number of learners were easily able to attain Mark Band 3.

Learning Outcome 4

More-able learners showed that they could analyse the outcomes of shared information.

Learning Outcome 5

Learners' approaches to this Learning Outcome were successful but the Moderators note that there was less certainty about the impact of service users on service provision. The Moderators recommend that the Course Tutors might consider how the needs of service users are taken into account and how this influences provision.

Learning Outcome 6

It was very pleasing to see the success of collaborative relationships developed for Learning Outcome 6. The team events were obvious sources of learning and enjoyment. Evidence from the three settings was abundant. It is pleasing to note that where group work was involved, each team members' role and responsibilities was usually stated. Whilst learners focussed on the same three partnerships, most wrote about these in their own words and emphasised different aspects. Course Tutors are commended for encouraging such an approach.

Level 3 Unit 4 Communication and Information Sharing

General comments
The unit specification asks that learners should produce a training toolkit which could be used by new employees working for an organisation that is involved in partnership working across the four sectors. Learners must provide information about a range of communication issues needed when working across the four sectors. The Moderators were looking for examples of learners' creativity but very few took the opportunity to realise this. Most submissions were indistinguishable in style from the investigation required in Unit 3, the portfolio required in Unit 5 and the report required in Unit 6. The Moderators hope that future submissions will go some way to address this issue. A number of learners submitted copies of PowerPoint slides on individual sheets. The Moderators would be quite happy for these to be submitted on one sheet, which can be achieved using the 'slide sorter' facility.

The Moderators were pleased to note that most work was well-presented but (to remind learners once again) not all used the pagination facility and they are strongly recommended to do so. Not all work was properly spell-checked and centres should encourage their future learners to ensure that they do so. The Moderators were very pleased to see the inclusion of contents pages. These, and in the portfolios of the most-able learners, detailed bibliographies, are seen as good practice.

Most Course Tutors were aware of the assessment guidance and their learners were well-versed in the demands of the specification. It was clear that the majority of learners had responded effectively to their teaching and enjoyment of their work was evident in their submissions.

Learning Outcome 1
Learners generally attained the higher Mark Bands in this Learning Outcome, some being able to fully describe methods of communication across different populations. More able learners were able to make judgements concerning the appropriateness of methods for differing populations. However, many of these examples were limited to young people and learners will be able to access higher Mark Bands if they are directed to consider a broader range of population groups that they encountered on work experience. The 'guidance for allocating marks' section of the unit specification reinforces this requirement.

Learning Outcome 2
Most learners were able to explain barriers to communication across the population groups but often appeared to lack the exposure to work experience which would have allowed them to 'connect ideas and experiences in inventive ways' to overcome these identified barriers. Learners may need more support and direction to do this in future submissions.

Learning Outcome 3
Many learners provided tables which identified terminology across the sectors and the Moderators were pleased to note that they were able to provide detailed descriptions of differences and similarities. However, the nature of the evidence provided in a tabular format did on occasion restrict learners from analysing these potential differences and similarities within and across sectors. The Moderators once again remind learners that this unit requires them to produce a training toolkit and this encourages them to find innovative solutions to the requirement in Mark Band 3 that they analyse terminology. It would help learners if they focus on the sorts of workers who might use the toolkit.

Learning Outcome 4
Learners handled this Learning Outcome quite well, often providing illustrations of the technology which could be employed to enhance communication. More-able learners were able to offer some evaluative commentary on the suitability of technology for particular populations and situations.

Learning Outcome 5
This Learning Outcome is delivered through a written commentary by the learner on the planning process, on the outcomes of two interactions and a witness testimony of the implementation. Many learners appeared to have been given ample opportunity and support to deliver on this outcome. Some learners provided transcripts of the one-to-one interactions. This type of evidence may be useful to include as an appendix but does not in itself contribute to the allocation of marks against this Learning Outcome. Tabulated formats for completing the planning process enabled learners to meet the requirements but they must ensure that any such format encourages them to reflect on their interactions so that they can consider their 'personal level of success' in an objective manner. Marking Grid B was clearly identifiable and completed appropriately.

Learning Outcome 6
This Learning Outcome was managed well. When learners drew on their work experience to consider the issues around record keeping and confidentiality, many were able to attain the higher Mark Bands.

Learning Outcome 7
This was a challenging Learning Outcome for many learners with the requirement to review the effectiveness of systems for recording and reporting. Simple descriptions of how organisations review the effectiveness for recording and reporting were not required even at Mark Band 1, but rather explanations, analysis and evaluation were needed. Learners will need to develop a clearer focus on this so that they can approach practitioners on work experience with more effective questions on this issue.

Level 3 Unit 5 Personal and Professional Development in the Work Environment

General comments
The Moderators draw the attention of learners to the need to create a clear structure to their portfolios with a contents page, index, bibliography and appendices, as appropriate. The inclusion of daily dairy entries by learners within the main body of the evidence will not, as stand-alone evidence, attract any marks. Learners could include diary entries as an appendix to this portfolio. Again (as in Unit 4), there are opportunities for learners to demonstrate their creativity in the production of a portfolio. As in Unit 4, a number of learners submitted copies of PowerPoint slides on individual sheets. The Moderators would be quite happy for these to be submitted on one sheet, which can be achieved using the 'slide sorter' facility.

Learning Outcome 1
This Learning Outcome requires learners to link a named piece of legislation into the policies, procedures and practices of a specific organisation. In order to attain the higher Mark Bands, learners will need to select from legislation where there are clear links to an easily accessible organisational policy and a procedure which guides practice in the workplace.

Learning Outcome 2
Learners approached this Learning Outcome in a predominantly descriptive manner thereby limiting access to the higher Mark Bands.

Learning Outcome 3
Some learners were able to provide explanations of the two concepts of evidence-based practice and reflective practice and give underpinning theory to support them. This is good practice in itself and is to be encouraged. The former concept, that of evidence-based practice, appeared to provide more challenge to learners than reflective practice. To achieve the higher Mark Bands, learners need to draw more consistently on their work experience to collect examples for analysis.

Learning Outcome 4
Some learners found it difficult to provide evidence that moved beyond simple description. There also appeared to be some confusion as to the exact requirement of this Learning Outcome. Learners are expected to know the responsibilities of individuals in their own personal and professional development, rather than the role description of an individual employee.

Learning Outcome 5
Most learners were able to provide simple explanations of how personal and professional development can enhance service provision but need more direction in order to analyse the relationship between personal development and improved practice.

Learning Outcome 6
Most learners found this outcome particularly challenging and were only able to give simple descriptions of their personal strengths and areas for development (SWOT). Establishing clear links between the learners' Personal Development Plan (PDP) and an identified organisation's objectives will enable learners to attain the higher Mark Bands. Learners will also need to bring together their SWOT analysis, their PDP and a named organisation's objectives before they can provide the explanations or analyses required for the higher Mark Bands.

Learning Outcome 7

One again, learners were able only to give simple descriptions of issues observed or experienced in the workplace and limited accounts of how they may address such issues. Learners need to focus on collecting evidence of problems or issues from their workplace experiences before applying their own ways of addressing/resolving such issues. If learners are going to select issues that may have complex ethical dimensions which could potentially lead to a breach of confidentiality, they will need very clear guidance on how to manage and report on such issues. The Moderators strongly recommend that all involved give due consideration to such matters. Attention is drawn to the 'how you will be assessed' section of the unit specification.

Level 3 Unit 6 Safeguarding and Protecting Individuals and Society

General comments
The unit specification asks that learners investigate key legislation and organisational procedures that help to keep people safe and produce a report which demonstrates their knowledge and understanding. In response to this, some learners provided PowerPoint presentations as evidence against some Learning Outcomes. The Moderators accept that this approach can be a very positive way of articulating their understanding. However, the Moderators also note that those learners whose presentations were submitted with limited explanations for each slide, and who did not use supporting notes, did not produce evidence beyond Mark Band 1.

The Moderators' view, having carefully scrutinised the submissions, is that learners need more support and direction in Learning Outcomes 2, 6 and 7 and they hope that learners will address these Learning Outcomes more effectively in future submissions.

Learning Outcome 1
Learners' performance in this Learning Outcome was extremely variable. Many were able to give only an outline of the key legislation selected. Others were able to provide descriptions, but only a very small number of learners went on to meet the requirement to supply explanations of key legislation. Many learners recognised and used both primary and secondary research methods in their investigations.

Learning Outcome 2
Once again, learners' performance in this Learning Outcome was variable, with a minority of learners providing detailed explanations of the roles of workers in ensuring safe and secure environments.

Learning Outcome 3
Most learners were able to explain the importance of trusting relationships and professional boundaries with only a small number of learners whose evidence was restricted to descriptions.

Learning Outcome 4
Most learners were able to recognise signs of potential harm and abuse and were able to move well beyond simple outlines to give explanatory statements and, in some cases, analytical comments.

Learning Outcome 5
Many learners provided a detailed risk assessment/health and safety audit for two settings with a good level of explanatory comment to support the assessments.

Learning Outcome 6
All learners completed tasks that had a clear focus on crime reduction. Once again, learners' performance in this outcome was very variable, from simple descriptions of a risk assessment to support crime reduction through to detailed evaluations.

Learning Outcome 7
Generally speaking, only a small minority of learners were able to provide evidence that was clearly focused on this Learning Outcome in terms of evaluating personal strategies of dealing with conflict. Learners were more likely to respond with descriptive comments on their personal strategies.

Statistics

Level 3 Unit 1 The Sectors in Context

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	90	75	67	59	51	43	36
Points Score	21	18	15	12	9	6	3

Level 3 Unit 2 Principles and Values in Practice

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	90	74	66	58	50	42	35
Points Score	21	18	15	12	9	6	3

Level 3 Unit 3 Partnership Working

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	53	47	41	35	29	24
Points Score	21	18	15	12	9	6	3

Level 3 Unit 4 Communication and Information Sharing

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	53	47	41	35	29	24
Points Score	21	18	15	12	9	6	3

Level 3 Unit 5 Personal and Professional Development in the Work Environment

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	53	47	41	35	29	24
Points Score	21	18	15	12	9	6	3

Level 3 Unit 6 Safeguarding and Protecting Individuals and Society

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	53	47	41	35	29	24
Points Score	21	18	15	12	9	6	3

Notes

Centres are reminded that this is the first summer examination for this new specification and that boundaries may change in the following series

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.

Principal Learning
Society Health and Development
Level 3 Examiner Report
0906