



# Cambridge National

## Health and Social Care

Unit: **(R021)** Level 1/2 Cambridge National Certificate in Health & Social Care

Unit: **(R022)** Level 1/2 Cambridge National Certificate in Health & Social Care

## OCR Report to Centres

---

### January 2013

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the examination provides 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 specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

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

© OCR 2013

## CONTENTS

### Cambridge National

Health & Social Care (Level 1/2) Award (R021)

Health & Social Care (Level 1/2) Award (R022)

### OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
Overview	1
R021 – General Comments	3
R022 – General Comments	5

## Overview

The cohort taking the first series of the specification although small was wide and varied. The evidence seen both for the centre assessed unit, R022, and the examination paper, R021, proved accessible to all the learners and both gave opportunities for a range of abilities to gain success. At the same time it provided differentiation across a range of abilities. It was apparent that where teachers had a clear understanding of the specification the appropriate guidance and support was given to the learners.

### R022

Centres have taken the opportunity to enter learners for Unit R022 (the mandatory centre assessed unit of the specification) for this first series. The majority of the work followed the OCR model assignment and some permitted adaptations were made. **It is a requirement that the board set model assignments are used.** Centres may only adapt the model assignments as instructed in the 'Information to Centres' and must not change the focus of the requirements and topic as this could disadvantage the learners from accessing the full mark range.

Centres are reminded that to fulfil this unit learners must complete the model assignment and undertake two practical activities; a one-to-one interaction and a group interaction. It is recommended that if these interactions are carried out using role-play that appropriate persons are used so as not to disadvantage the learner who is being assessed.

All entries for R022 were paper based (code 02/3). Entries were divided equally between visiting and postal moderation. There were no e-repository (code 01) submissions this series.

It would be helpful to the process if paper assessments are presented with a treasury tag in the top right hand corner rather than ring binders; plastic wallets are not acceptable. The correct proforma unit recording sheet (URS) must be used. There are two versions available to download from OCR Interchange; an e-version and a hard copy.

Assessors annotated the learners work both in the body of the work and on the URS. This was good practice as the moderator could see how assessment decisions had been reached. Centre internal moderation is essential to ensure consistency in assessment decisions particularly if there is more than one assessor.

A signed copy of the CCS160 Centre Authentication Form and MS1 or equivalent must be completed and sent when a sample request is generated by email in preparation for the moderation process regardless of the moderation method chosen. It is important that the marks for each unit are added up correctly on the URS and correspond to the mark submitted to the board (via MS1 or equivalent). All units are marked out of 60.

The overall mark for the unit comes from the amalgamation of the marks given across the mark bands for each Learning Outcome within the unit. The grade for the unit will range from P1, M1, D1, P2, M2, D2, D2\* depending on the marks given.

### R021

The externally assessed unit R021 had questions that differentiated well. They showed that some learners had been adequately prepared for their entry; however for some entries there were some notable gaps of knowledge and it is important that in their planning of delivery centres take into consideration the maturity of the learners and ensure terminology and technical

*OCR Report to Centres – January 2013*

terms used in the specification are thoroughly explained. Understanding of terminology and technical terms would improve the quality of answers given

Although it is not prescribed in which order the units are assessed it is important to be aware of the links between units and the requirement for synoptic assessment. Synoptic assessment is included in units R022-R031.

Specific detail about individual units R021 and R022 have been given and centres are advised to study the Principal's advice when preparing their learners for future sessions.

## R021 – General Comments

This was the first series of this examination unit with the vast majority of candidates answering all the questions.

A spread of marks was achieved but few gained over 45 marks. Many candidates did not respond to the command words in the question. Although it was clear that they possessed knowledge some were unable to gain high marks as they did not do what the question asked. Teachers need to guide candidates about the command verbs in the questions – identify, describe, explain, analyse etc. Producing a description of an emergency procedure, when a discussion of its importance has been asked for, will not achieve level 3 marks.

Centres need to reference the learning outcomes in the specification to guide the candidates about the terminology and types of words that will be used, for example in LO1: effective communication, LO3: groups of people and LO4: security measures. This will enable candidates to access the higher mark levels.

Some candidates seemed to struggle with fundamental concepts such as the values of care and issues such as the impact of legislation on service providers. Some Centres may wish to consider whether their candidates would benefit from having completed a coursework unit before attempting the examination unit. Coursework can provide contextualised understanding across many aspects covered in this examination unit.

### Comments on Individual Questions

- 1 (a)** Well answered by the majority of candidates with realistic and practical suggestions. However, a number of candidates incorrectly stated that all doors should be locked and that CCTV cameras should be in all the rooms to watch the residents.
- 1 (b)** Some candidates gave basic descriptions of the security measures rather than describing how they protect the residents. Others gave good, clear, descriptions of how the measures they had identified in part (a) would protect the residents and so gained full marks.
- 1 (c)** This question required identification of individual's rights as listed in LO1 of the specification. Examples were not asked for and did not gain marks.
- 1 (d)** Some excellent answers were seen. Strengths of good answers were references to specific examples of what staff could do, such as using appropriate vocabulary, a friendly tone of voice, not shouting or being patronising etc. Others saw the word 'rights' and did not refer to effective communication at all. Some candidates confused the word 'communication' with 'confidentiality'.
- 2 (a)** Some answers showed that candidates did not know what the values of care are. 'Working in partnership with parents' was answered better than 'encouraging children's learning and development' where repetition of the word 'encourage' was frequent, but with no specific examples described of how this would be achieved.
- 2 (b)** The focus of responses tended to be on emotional development and some answers were list like; though a number of candidates did attempt to analyse two areas of development. Coverage of three areas of development (from: physical, intellectual, emotional or social) was required to achieve level three marks.

## OCR Report to Centres – January 2013

- 3 (a)** This was answered well by the majority of candidates. However, some candidates gave safety measures rather than personal hygiene which was not credited, or repeated 'washing hands' in three different situations. 'Washing hands' can only be credited once.
- 3 (b)** Many candidates responded well to this question and there were some excellent answers giving a range of explained practical examples that demonstrated understanding of the word 'diversity'. Weaker answers referred incorrectly to treating all the children 'the same' or focussed on equality and discrimination rather than describing practical examples of what the staff could do such as classroom displays reflecting diversity, assemblies about different cultures etc.
- 4 (a)** The vast majority of candidates gained full marks for this question. This demonstrated familiarity with the terminology used.
- 4 (b)** A number of candidates gained full marks here. Others were unfamiliar with the groups of people legislation is relevant to, listed in LO3 of the specification.
- 4 (c)** This question was not well answered. The Equality Act is listed in LO3 of the specification but many candidates did not seem to have any knowledge of this piece of legislation. Weak answers were vague and referred incorrectly to 'treating everyone the same'. Candidates need to have an awareness of the pieces of legislation listed in the specification. Some candidates did not seem to know what a 'service provider' is.

Few level 3 responses were seen due to candidates not making reference to the 'impact' on service providers which was a requirement of the question. Level two marks could have been achieved with examples of the main features of the Equality Act, level 3 being achieved with explanation of its impact on service providers.

- 5 (a)** Not all candidates knew what an 'emergency' procedure is and wrote about procedures in general or about policies such as 'confidentiality' which were not relevant and did not gain any marks. The question required a discussion of the importance of these procedures in protecting individuals. Some candidates limited their marks because they just described an emergency procedure, fire for example, rather than discussing its importance in protecting individuals.
- 5 (b)** This was not well answered overall. Some candidates wrote about individual's rights with no reference at all to the question. Other candidates wrote about confidentiality policies rather than complaints. Other candidates were familiar with complaints procedures as listed in LO1 of the specification and were able to explain how providing information about them helped to maintain individual's rights.

## R022 – General Comments

Assignments (Live Assessment Material) are provided for the moderated units and must be used in order to enable learners to access the full range of marks. It was also evident that some centres have not thoroughly understood the grading criteria and that the outcome of the unit is across 7 grade boundaries hence making it a Level 1/2 qualification.

In LO1, most evidence was accurate and had addressed methods of different types of communication with most learners giving examples relating to health, social care and early years settings.

Factors and barriers were not always clearly defined and there was lack of evidence on how and why factors positively influence communication. Learners in some centres did not identify factors at all and they were implicit when discussing barriers, therefore, learners were not able to access all the marks for this LO.

Most learners' evidence clearly showed knowledge and understanding of the barriers to communication and appropriate examples were given relating to health, social care and early years settings. Ways of overcoming barriers was omitted by some learners and realistic ways of overcoming the barriers were not always appropriate.

In LO2 learners gave a description of the different personal qualities that contribute to effective care at a basic level. Connections were not always made between personal qualities and few learners made links to how these are used when caring for an individual in a health, social care or early years setting. Evidence produced rarely showed relevant application and justification of personal qualities to be used and why.

In LO3 planning by most candidates met the grading criteria. A number of candidates had not covered the points required in the plan (indicated by the items followed by an i.e in the specification). This limited the mark bands the learners could access.

Both one-to-one and group activities were carried out by the learners, mostly appropriately. All centres had witness statements for both activities. However, the witness statements did not always reflect the competency that the learner had carried out the activity and did not meet the mark band criteria. The witness statement also did not reflect the plan ensuring that the learner was putting theory into practice and that it reflected their original plan.

Types of behaviour that fail to value people was omitted by most learners and was implicit when included.

Across all centres there was no evidence included of links between units and synoptic assessment. Centres need to be encouraged to look at their plans/programme of delivery for future submissions so the synoptic element of the qualification is covered.

Most centres had used the correct paperwork for moderation and work was well presented and annotated. The types of evidence presented was not always appropriate but this has been addressed in reports to the centres.

Overall there was a range of evidence meeting the mark band criteria to give the range from L1P to L2D.



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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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 2013

