

Health & Social Care (Double Award)

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1493**

Report on the Units

January 2007

1493/MS/R/07J

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A-level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

The mark schemes are published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

The reports on the Examinations provide information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Mark schemes and Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme or report.

© OCR 2007

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annersley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

GCSE Health and Social Care (Double Award) 1493

REPORT ON THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
*	Chief Examiner's Report	1
4869/4870	Principal Moderator's Report	2
4871	Understanding Personal Development & Relationships	9
*	Grade Thresholds	13

Chief Examiner's Report

For the written paper results are consistent with previous testing opportunities. Portfolio's have slightly improved in this Moderation series.

A larger number of candidates achieved 'A' grades and 'C' grades for Unit 4871: Understanding Personal Development and Relationships. The responses showed that candidates have been well prepared and that delivery has strictly followed the requirements of the specifications. Where candidates did less well their answers reflected a lack of specificity and factual knowledge. Details are given in the Principal Examiners report.

Specific factual knowledge is required for Unit 4869: Health, Social Care and Early Years Provision. Some candidates have given the facts for one service, but failed to provide sufficient detail for the second service, suggesting possible poor time management or lack of attention to the 'Banner'.

Some result for Unit 4870 are disappointing and assessment decisions in some instances are considered to be lenient. This could be because of a lack of factual evidence within the unit. Candidates must produce a plan for the person chosen and must give facts within the plan. It must be remembered that this unit is often the first to be completed and candidates may lack maturity and knowledge to meet the full requirements of the unit. It is necessary to ensure that full guidance is provided when teaching the unit to provide candidates with the opportunity to achieve their full potential.

Overall the achievements of candidates in both the written paper and the portfolio evidence is pleasing and meets the national requirements of the specification.

4869 / 4870 Health and Social Care (Coursework)

General Comments

Centres generally had guided their candidates well and there was evidence to show that they clearly understood the organisation of Health, Social Care and Early Years services and also showed understanding of how to promote the health and well being of a specific individual.

The assessment of the candidates' work for this examination session shows a gradual improvement as Centres become more experienced at interpreting the requirements of the specifications. Most teachers took a great deal of time to annotate candidates' work which made the moderation process run smoothly. Those that have attended training have also been in a position to apply their experience from this to that of their candidates and eventually through to the work identified in the candidates portfolios. Centres appeared to have implemented the feedback received at previous examination sessions.

Those Centres which supported their candidates with well constructed assignment tasks that enabled understanding of the 'banner evidence' clearly gained marks. It is important that Centres use the exemplification notes in the specification where the assessment criteria are described in more detail; most centres had clearly read these. Many centres had written clear task sheets for candidates which included the depth and breadth of knowledge, understanding and skills required.

Most Centres were co-operative and undertook the correct administration procedures. However, there were poor administrative practices sometimes from teachers and also with exams officers which held up the moderating process. It was pleasing to find that the majority of centres included the CCS160 form with the work for moderation and that they sent their work promptly when requested. Centres with 10 or fewer candidates entered sent all their work once the Moderator was known to them.

Many Centres annotated work clearly throughout the portfolio(s) and on the Unit Recording Sheet (URS). When this was done, it was supportive to the candidate and the moderation process as it showed how the Centre had applied the assessment criteria. In cases where the criteria had not been met, the Moderator could see how 'the judgements had been made' and could highlight specific aspects within the report to the Centre.

4869 - Health, Social Care and Early Years Provision

Candidates continue to find this unit harder to complete but there was evidence of some very interesting and excellent practice. It is important that centres ensure that the banner requirements are met. Where Centres had guided candidates to select two different services; e.g. a GP surgery providing health care to the local community, and a nursery providing early years education for pre-school children, primary data could be collected. Those candidates who selected two local settings tended to produce work of a higher standard than those candidates who worked from written case studies. Whilst access to settings can be difficult, some Centres were creative, using video footage and also inviting speakers to classes for students to interview.

Candidates need to produce work of equal standard for both services if they are to achieve a particular mark. Some candidates produced a very good standard of work for one of the services chosen but were not as consistently good for the other service. This tended to mean an adjustment to the marks was necessary.

There was evidence that Centres had supported candidates in organising their portfolios because many were presented in a logical way, favouring combining the two settings for each of the respective strands. However, some candidates' work was totally illogical and did not appear to have been given any direction at all.

Candidates should be encouraged to choose carefully the services that they wish to investigate. Poor choices meant that the candidate could not achieve all of the assessment criteria and so this limited the number of marks that could be awarded. Some Centres continue to misguide students and a portfolio is produced based on **two** different job roles. It should be noted that the banner requirement states that it needs to be on **two** different health and /or social care and/or early years **services**.

It is important that candidates do not copy text from books or the Internet into their portfolio work.

Application of Assessment Criteria

Achievement within Strand A

This strand was often the weakest area – structures can be problematic and many candidates spent time describing the whole of the care services i.e. statutory/non-statutory and informal carers, and were too generalised in their comments. The funding issue is still challenging for some candidates. The evidence submitted must be related to the two services chosen.

A1 – Candidates need to show the care sector to which the service belongs and include a basic statement describing how services are funded at a local and national level. Candidates included a diagram or map of the structure for the services chosen at both national and local level, but many did not include a brief explanation of the diagram or map in order to achieve a high level response to this criterion. A diagram alone, copied from a text book/Internet source is insufficient evidence.

A2 –Candidates need to give a detailed description of the funding of the two services, both locally and nationally, with examples. Use of relevant data, which was explained, gave candidates the opportunity of achieving the highest marks in this strand.

A3 - This strand was often over-marked; marks were wrongly awarded on the basis of generalised statements with no supporting evidence. Careful selection of appropriate services was important to achieve marks at the higher level. Candidates often found this difficult and clearly need guidance on the effect of funding on services. Candidates need to show how funding at national and local levels affects the provision of the service.

Achievement within Strand B

B1 - This was generally very well done and most candidates had obviously been well prepared. A high level response would include a detailed breakdown of the day-to-day tasks of the direct care workers chosen; this was evident when candidates had access to primary data. Candidates needed to be aware that caring for some service users requires 24 hour cover and shift work may be involved. Some candidates did not select two direct care workers (one from each service) nor give a detailed breakdown of the day-to-day tasks; instead there was a brief description of a person's job role, often taken from a text book or Internet resource.

B2 – Most candidates were well aware of the requirements of the care workers they studied, with examples to illustrate their points. Marks were lost when there was not specific reference, description and understanding of the qualities and the skills that each care worker required to complete their job. For a high level response, candidates also showed awareness of the specific qualifications needed for a job or career. A low level response resulted in candidates simply stating that the person would need a degree, rather than being specific.

B3 – Many candidates did not give alternative career routes for their chosen jobs or professions and therefore did not gain marks for this strand. For a high level response, candidates needed to actually discuss the advantages and disadvantages of the different

career routes, giving opinions.

Achievement within Strand C

The evidence for this strand demonstrated the greatest improvement. This strand was done well when candidates were able to apply the care values to their chosen workers. Candidates who gave a lot of generic information and those who did not realise that the care values in health and social care services differ from those in early years settings did not score highly in this strand.

C1- Candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of at least three care values and could apply these to the day-to-day tasks of the two direct care workers studied.

C2 – Candidates were able to demonstrate how at least four care values could be applied to the work of their chosen care workers. In some cases, the care values were applied to each day-to-day task and this was presented clearly in a chart.

C3 – A high level response to this included: comparing the care values of the two care workers; examining the similarities and differences between the two job roles, with a conclusion statement at the end. In some Centres, a chart was drawn listing the care values in one column and noting the similarities and differences in two subsequent columns. This helped candidates to provide a clear and detailed response and they could then draw a conclusive statement.

Achievement within Strand D

It was disappointing to see that many Centres still do not guide candidates to conduct a survey, which resulted in generic information being given for this strand. Candidates were therefore unable to assess how the care setting met the needs of the clients.

Where this Strand was done well, candidates had carried out a survey and were then able to address Strands D2 and D3; they used, in detail, the primary evidence they had collected.

The survey work can be undertaken in many different ways: in the form of observations; questioning clients that use the services; or interviewing care workers. It is good practice for candidates to explain how they have conducted their survey.

D1 - Candidates were generally able to list client needs and to observe how these were met. Those candidates who actually carried out surveys had the opportunity to extend the evidence to D2 – showing how well the services met client needs.

D2 and D3 – Where candidates had identified needs carefully, had surveyed clients as well as care workers, they were then able to give a detailed response and a conclusion about how well the services met needs. The higher marks required a depth of understanding.

Achievement within Strand E

When this Strand was well done, candidates applied the barriers to the chosen services and did not describe them generically.

E1 and E2 - Candidates showed a clear understanding of at least three barriers to the services chosen and to the different types of barriers. They were also able to suggest how the barriers identified might affect the users of the services physically, intellectually, socially and emotionally across the two services.

E3 – A high level response included evidence of synthesis of knowledge i.e. drawing together information from a range of sources. Candidates chose realistic solutions to overcome the barriers identified and in some cases had interviewed care workers or service users to gather ideas. Some excellent work was seen when candidates looked at the effect the barriers had on clients; there were some very thoughtful comments made

with explanations how barriers could be or were overcome. Candidates who showed how service users are empowered, if barriers are removed, achieved the highest marks.

Unit 4870 – Promoting Health and Well-being

There was some good evidence presented when candidates had been guided on their choice of an individual. Those who had been able to access primary data showed individuality and these candidates achieved the higher marks.

The development of the health plan continued to prove difficult with the lower end of the ability range. Some candidates appeared unable to relate the plan to the individual under study. It appears that this area was frequently rushed by candidates.

Confidentiality continues to be a problem with some candidates as they did not understand the necessity to use another name for their client.

Centres are advised to guide candidates in organising their time to ensure that the work in Strand E is completed to the same standard as Strand A.

Achievement within Strand A

This strand was generally done very well when candidates paid great attention to detail in developing their questionnaire. Some candidates did not use the information collected when completing the other strands of this portfolio.

A1 – Some excellent questionnaires were seen. Candidates were able to show that they could relate to all areas of the person's development (physical, intellectual, emotional, and social health).

A2 – Most candidates were able to describe the person's health and to draw conclusions from their findings.

A3 – For a high level response, candidates needed to look back at the completed questionnaire and go through it in detail before drawing clear conclusions about the person's state of health. They also needed to compare the person's health with the 'norms'; it should be noted that a chart without comments is insufficient evidence for a comparison.

Achievement within Strand B

Candidates often do not make a link to the questionnaire and just gave generic information with no reference being made to the client. How the positive factors linked together were often not explicit - some candidates linked two factors and then another two, whilst others attempted to make links through PIES. Some candidates described a factor in this strand as being positive and then described in Strand C that the factor was a risk e.g. diet.

Some Centres would be advised to use the factors listed in the 'What You Need To Learn' in *OCR's Approved Specification and Assessment materials for Teaching from September 2002* to guide candidates on factors to consider.

B1 – Candidates were able to identify and describe at least two positive factors. Candidates should be encouraged to describe factors affecting the health of the individual and avoid making lists without any real explanation.

B2 – Most candidates were able to describe at least three positive factors. For a high level response they needed to describe how the factors chosen linked and worked together to enable the person chosen to maintain their health. In some cases this was not evident.

B3 – Candidates need to draw upon knowledge from a range of sources in order to

describe at least four positive factors. They also need to make clear conclusions about the person's health. In some portfolios good use was made of the opinion of a theorist and relevant links were made to their client. It is good practice for centres to encourage candidates to record resources used in the text of the portfolio and include a bibliography.

Achievement within Strand C

Generally this section continued to be well done. To have achieved full marks, candidates needed to understand the verbs used in the assessment criteria. A list of effects was insufficient when asked to review and assess possible long-term risks to the health and well-being of the individual. Candidates again needed to refer back to the questionnaire so that the risks specifically applied to the individual

C1 - Candidates were able to clearly identify two risks for the person concerned and gave brief notes on how the risks might affect them

C2 – Candidates were able to identify three risks and described short-term effects for the person concerned.

C3 – Candidates were able to show why the short-term risks developed in several stages to have long-term effects on the person concerned. The high level response required candidates to show increase depth and breadth of understanding.

Achievement within Strand D

BMI/height and weight were the most popular measures of fitness used. Candidates gaining higher marks showed the use of a height and weight chart and converted the measurements into BMI. Where candidates undertook another measurement, e.g. peak flow or pulse rate, this provided them with a greater opportunity to analyse and interpret results.

In some portfolios candidates were not clear what constituted a measure of health. A small number of Centres guided candidates to describe the different measures without actually using them to record the results or identify the individual's health status.

Centres would be advised to use the indicators of physical health as set out in the 'What You Need To Learn' in *OCR's Approved Specification and Assessment materials for Teaching from September 2002* to guide candidates. Diet, smoking and alcohol consumption charts are not physical fitness measures.

D1 - Candidates were able to identify one health measure and to accurately record this. Some candidates needed to draw conclusions about the effects on the person concerned and show how this information could have been used when developing a health plan.

D2 – Most candidates were able to identify two health measures and to accurately record these and draw conclusions (including their own opinions) about the effects on the person concerned.

D3 – Candidates were able to produce a detailed examination of the above and compare results to the norms of development for the person concerned with a high level of understanding. Conclusions were drawn from the data collected and a full assessment of the person's physical fitness made for full marks.

Achievement within Strand E

Some wonderful health plans were seen, which included SMART targets, aspects of motivation, analysis of relevant health promotion material and an excellent understanding of the effect of the plan on the PIES of the individual; the work was produced in a logical and progressive way. When portfolios were done well, candidates were imaginative in their presentation of plans e.g. wall charts for the kitchen. In portfolios achieving higher grades there was clear indication of targets that had been set and how these targets had

been decided upon. Some candidates relied on downloading from the Internet with little or no application of knowledge.

The focus of this Strand was ensuring that the plan developed would be able to be used by the individual. It was disappointing that some candidates did not clearly define at least two targets for their plan. Many plans did not contain factual information about how the individual could improve their health. Candidates did not recognise that having a purpose to do something can be one of the greatest motivators. There needed to be a greater depth of understanding showing how the individual could be supported to maintain or improve their health and how they could be motivated to achieve the targets.

E1 – Candidates were able to produce a basic plan with two targets and helpful advice on how the person could be supported to achieve them. They were able to draw simple conclusions about the effect the plan would have on the health of the individual.

E2 – Candidates were able to suggest at least three ways of motivating the person and referred to PIES when assessing the effects of the plan. Some candidates gave limited suggestions as to how to motivate and support the person. Centres should be aware that motivation and support can include a variety of ways, for example, the use of leaflets, videos, websites, attending clubs or classes, the support of family and friends.

E3 – Candidates produced a detailed plan with at least two suggestions for supporting the individual. For the high level response, they drew logical conclusions using information from a range of sources. They used the research within their assignment to support their suggestions and evaluated the plan in terms of how it might affect the person. When candidates compared alternative methods of support for the person, by suggesting advantages and disadvantages of different methods and then drawing conclusions, they were awarded the highest marks. This comparison was effectively done by some candidates in the form of a chart.

Examples of Good Practice within Teachers' Preparation and Marking of the Portfolio

It is good practice to:

- Ensure that marking is consistent between members of a department by undertaking internal standardisation.
- Support candidates with time management to ensure that all Strands meet the same depth of understanding.
- Ensure that pupils number the pages of their assignment once it is complete. The page references should be clearly shown on the URS form as this allows for quick referral to each section when looking for assessment evidence.
- Annotate work clearly throughout the text and on the URS front mark sheet as this supports and justifies the marks awarded.
- Encourage candidates to refer to the information they gather from the Internet or from books/journals rather than just add it to their work without applying it.
- Avoid excess material in the portfolio, e.g. only include one copy of a survey used; make reference to leaflets, internet research in a bibliography rather than include this in the portfolio evidence.
- Where writing frames are given to guide candidates to access the criteria they must not be too prescriptive otherwise all candidates from the Centre produce similar work and this suggests a lack of independent learning skills being developed.
- Encourage candidates to set out their work clearly with appropriate headings that link to the assessment criteria as this greatly assists assessment.
- Encourage candidates that use ICT skills to present their portfolio in a maximum size 14 font.

Good Practice within Coursework Administration

- Complete the teacher mark column of the MS1 as well as shading in the lozenges

Report on the Units taken in January 2007

clearly checking that the Moderators copy is clear to read.

- Avoid plastic wallets for individual pieces of work.
- All Candidates' portfolios need to be kept in order. The use of treasury tags is a simple and effective way and also assists the moderation process.
- Check that the marks for each Strand have been added up correctly and all marks are out of 50.
- Send a signed CCS160 Centre Authentication Form for each unit sampled.
- Include the Coursework Assessment Form (which gives a breakdown of marks given for each strand of each unit) with the copy of the MS1 that is sent to the moderator.
- Avoid sending ring binders of work as these are heavy to post and bulky to send.
- Ensure that Internal Moderation is evident.
- Send work promptly once the Moderator is known to the Centre – when there are 10 candidates or fewer, send work straight away, do not wait for the Moderator to make contact.

4871: Understanding Personal Development & Relationships

1. General Comments:

The question paper performed well with candidates demonstrating that they had acquired improved techniques for answering the questions. For candidates who performed well, answers were more specific and accurately answered the question asked. For those who achieved less well, answers were vague, for example, 'will give support', which does not indicate the type of support that would be given. Within lower level answers repetition was evident, for example in question 2(c).

For some questions candidates misread the question, for example, question 6(b), and discussed the advantages and disadvantages of the service user living at home or in the nursing home instead of answering the question asked. Poor literacy skills could have contributed to this type of response.

A few candidates gave bullet point answers where the question asked for an 'explanation'. If 'explain' is the command word in the question continuous prose is required which includes specific facts, examples and either when, why and how.

Candidates could be helped to improve their achievement by:

- Making sure they obey the command word within the question, for example, describe and explain.
- Providing the opportunity for candidates to undertake interesting learning activities which will enable them to draw on knowledge within the test situation, for example, matching exercises, completing sentences orally etc.
- By helping candidates to be able to give specific answers to questions. This could be achieved by presenting them with different answers and encouraging them to discuss in pairs which is specific and why, followed by a whole group discussion.

2. Comments on Individual Questions:

Question
No.

- 1(a) Most candidates achieved a high score for this question which related to life stages and age spans. Where they did not, candidate answers were either recorded in the wrong boxes or they were unable to accurately give the age span.
- 1(b) Candidates gained at least one mark from this question. Many were unable to differentiate between gross motor and fine motor skills.
- 1(c) A large number of candidates did not gain any marks for this question as they were not sufficiently specific in their responses. For example, they could have written, 'growing **physically** to the **norm**'.

2 (a) Responses well reflected the candidates' ability to be able to give the correct sequence for the characteristics given.

2 (b) This question had a very good response with candidates successfully being able to differentiate between the PIES.

2 (c) Repetition and lack of specificity often contributed to low marks in this question. Answers given to 'social' changes were least well given. An example of a correct answer could have been, for example:

'May become housebound and isolated as they were unable to go out through not being able to walk long distances'.

3 (a) Most candidates were able to differentiate between the different factors given. Where candidates were least successful they were unable to decide where 'having a good education' would best fit or could not differentiate between economic factors and social factors.

3 (bi) The question was well answered as candidates could give positive factors and could explain why the answer was positive.

3 (bii) This question, which asked about 'negative factors', was not answered quite so well. The factor was often correctly selected but the reason (explanation) was not sufficiently detailed.

3 (c) In the main responses were poor as candidates failed to actually link one factor with another. Additionally, they were not sufficiently specific, simply reiterating the three factors already given without giving any 'explanation'. Part of an example of a good response would be:

'Having a broken marriage could make Steve feel lonely and isolated as he now has no one to share his life with, but having a supportive family could mean that he could talk over his problems and be given advice as to how best to deal with the situation. His health may have been affected by the broken marriage but he can access his GP easily and could have been diagnosed with...'

In this example there are definite links and explanations.

4 (a) Candidates did not seem to know which were the emotional characteristics for an adolescent. Responses were generally poor.

4 (b) Misreading of the question contributed to poor responses as did only giving half an answer. The command word was 'explain' and as a consequence the 'subject' and the 'effect' were needed in order to gain both marks. An example of an acceptable answer would be:

'You would feel fulfilled because you enjoy working with colleagues and feel part of the decision making process.'

In this answer the subject and the effect are given.

Some candidates would write 'He would have a high self-esteem...'. Words are needed to describe what a 'high self esteem' would involve, for example, having confidence or have a sense of fulfilment, besides giving the subject.

Question
No.

- 4 (c) Many candidates only achieved a sub-max for this question as they did not give the subject and the effect. An example of an appropriate answer could be:

'Could feel lonely and isolated **because** he was no longer seeing his work colleagues.'

The effect is 'lonely'. The subject is 'not seeing his work colleagues'.

- 5 (a) This question received a generally poor response as candidates did not realise that different 'effects' were required. Also, some candidates only gave one word answers.

- 5 (b) Most candidates gained at least half of the allocated marks for this question. Where candidates were successful they gave both the subject and the effect. An example of an acceptable answer could have been:

She is happy and confident (effect) that she is being looked after well (subject) and so will not worry (additional effect).

- 5 (c) Vague answers were given in the responses to this question with the average maximum score being two or three marks but most not scoring any marks. An example of an acceptable answer would be:

'Could arrange for someone to **talk** to her about her problems'.

Talk is specific rather than 'could arrange for her to have support'.

- 6 (a) Most candidates successfully identified that this was an 'unexpected' situation but they were less successful in giving a specific reason. An acceptable answer could be:

'It was not planned'.

- 6 (b) There was a mixed response to this question with many candidates not differentiating between the hospital social worker and the family. Candidates need to select tasks that would be carried out by:

- the hospital social worker

- the family

and

- identify how these tasks would help the person to cope

Once again, low scores resulted because of lack of differentiation and a lack of specificity. For example, 'they would be there for her'.

Part of an example of a more specific answer could have been:

‘Anne’s family could have come round to visit her regularly and talk to her about what jobs she would like them to do, as this would have helped her confidence and stopped her from worrying.

The hospital social worker could have arranged for different specialist to visit Anne in her home, such as an occupational therapist, to help Anne decide which aids and adaptations would best help. This would make it easier for Anne to do tasks on her own and she would feel independent. The family could...’

Candidates must learn how to be succinct and how to be specific.

- 6(c) Specificity and succinctness were two features of an appropriate answer. Marks were not given for the number of positives or negative aspects given, although these would have had an influence, but for the quality of the response. Part of an example of an acceptable answer could have been:

‘Anne would feel dependent on others because they will be doing everything for her. Her daughter could feel guilty that she can’t give her the care she needs, but she will not need to worry about her mother because she will be cared for by professionals who have the training to provide for her mother’s care. Anne...’

**General Certificate of Secondary Education
Applied Health & Social Care (Double Award) 1493
January 2007 Assessment Series**

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
4869	Raw	50	46	41	36	31	26	21	16	11	0
	UMS	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	0
4870	Raw	50	46	41	36	31	26	21	16	11	0
	UMS	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	0
4871	Raw	100	91	81	71	62	52	42	32	22	0
	UMS	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	0

Entry Information

Unit	Total Entry
4869	1291
4870	2066
4871	8152

Specification Aggregation Results

GRADE	A*A*	AA	BB	CC	DD	EE	FF	GG	UU
UMS	270	240	210	180	150	120	90	60	0
Cum %	0.00	1.75	3.51	22.81	33.33	40.35	42.11	82.46	100.0

432 candidates were entered for aggregation this series

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;
http://www.ocr.org.uk/exam_system/understand_ums.html

Statistics are correct at the time of publication

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

(General Qualifications)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: helpdesk@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2007

