

Principal Moderator's Report Summer 2010

GCSE

GCSE Health & Social Care (5321) Unit 1 - Health, Social Care & Early Years Provision

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

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

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

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

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

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

Summer 2010

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2010

General Comments

This series saw the final entry for candidates taking the GCSE Health and Social Care and it was pleasing to see that, on the whole, candidates presented some appropriate work based on placements undertaken within a variety of appropriate care settings.

As in previous series, however, candidates made similar mistakes and assessors awarded marks where aspects of the assessment criteria had clearly not been met.

It was pleasing to see that most centres met the submission deadline this series and the majority of candidates had authenticated their work; however, centre administration remains poor in a small but significant number of cases with similar mistakes being made as have been seen over a number of years.

- Clerical errors by centre - incorrect addition of marks and incorrect transfer of marks to OPTEM forms continues to be a major issue. Centres must check this carefully before submitting marks to the board as mistakes can lead to regression of a whole cohort of candidates.
- The wrong sample being sent, particularly where the requested sample did not include the highest and lowest scores
- The top copy of the OPTEM being sent to moderators
- Poor annotation
- Poor presentation of portfolios

Whilst assessment was, in general, slightly more accurate than in previous series, assessors are still awarding marks where evidence is clearly missing. As previously, the most obvious errors were in the awarding of marks in Mark Band 3 for AO1 where learners had not compared their chosen service provider to another and in AO2(c) where there was little, if any evidence seen of a consideration of gaps in the service or the identification of future needs of the two clients.

Assessment Objective 1 (a)

Some excellent work was seen for this assessment objective this series with a range of suitable organisations being chosen. Where candidates had chosen a suitable organisation, work on services was generally good. The large proportion of candidates had addressed funding in some detail although the work presented by learners from the same centre was very similar indicating that this section was very much teacher led. Understanding of National provision and where the chosen service provider fits in still seems to allude a large number of candidates with many providing an organisational chart with no explanation and not relevant to the service provider and in some cases the sector. As mentioned in the overview, comparison with another similar organisation was either covered very briefly or completely omitted, even though centres awarded marks in mark band 3.

Assessment Objective 2 & 3(b)

Generally, work on individual job roles was covered well this series with some nice examples of both primary and secondary research. Understanding of the Care Value Base, and the ability to apply it to either the worker or the organisation remains weak in a significant number of portfolios with many candidate clearly copying information about the Care Value Base directly from text books.

Assessment Objective 2 (c)

There was some improvement seen in the work presented for this assessment criterion this year with candidates choosing appropriate service users on which to base their work. Identification of gaps and future needs of the individuals continues to be less well done with candidates struggling to demonstrate any analytical skills. Candidates still found it difficult to describe how services were organised and delivered to the client with this aspect being completely ignored by a large percentage of candidates.

Assessment Objective 2 & 3 (d)

Work on referral was generally quite good although a small but significant number of candidates are still not relating this section to the clients discussed in (c). Barriers to access still tend to be described generically rather than relating them to the service users under discussion. Evidence of an ability to evaluate the access to the services continues to be very weak in the majority of cases.

This is the final report for this qualification; however, some of the comments made will also be relevant to the new qualification and assessors should take note of the need for accurate administration and checking of evidence against the requirements of the assessment criteria.

Statistics

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

5321

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Raw boundary mark	50	48	42	36	30	25	20	15	10
Uniform boundary mark	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20

Notes

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

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

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

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

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