

General Certificate of Education June 2012

Law LAW02

The Concept of Liability

Unit 2

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools and colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools or colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the school or college.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

LAW02

Assessment Objectives One and Two

General Marking Guidance

You should remember that your marking standards should reflect the levels of performance of students, mainly 17 years old, who have completed some part of the advanced subsidiary course, writing under examination conditions. The Potential Content given in each case is the most likely correct response to the question set. However, this material is neither exhaustive nor prescriptive and alternative, valid responses should be given credit within the framework of the mark bands.

Positive Marking

You should be positive in your marking, giving credit for what is there rather than being too conscious of what is not. Do not deduct marks for irrelevant or incorrect answers, as students penalise themselves in terms of the time they have spent.

Mark Range

You should use the whole mark range available in the mark scheme. Where the student's response to a question is such that the mark scheme permits full marks to be awarded, full marks must be given. A perfect answer is not required. Conversely, if the student's answer does not deserve credit, then no marks should be given.

Citation of Authority

Students will have been urged to use cases and statutes whenever appropriate. Even where no specific reference is made to these in the mark scheme, please remember that their use considerably enhances the quality of an answer.

Assessment Objective Three

QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION (QoWC)

2 marks	The work is characterised by some or all of the following:							
	clear expression of ideas							
	a good range of specialist terms							
	few errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling							
	 errors do not detract from the clarity of the material. 							
1 mark	The work is characterised by:							
	reasonable expression of ideas							
	 the use of some specialist terms 							
	 errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling 							
	 errors detract from the clarity of the material. 							
0 marks	The work is characterised by:							
	poor expression of ideas							
	limited use of specialist terms							
	 errors and poor grammar, punctuation and spelling 							
	 errors obscure the clarity of the material. 							

The level of understanding in AS Law - LAW02

To help you find the level of understanding shown in a script, there will be some of the following characteristics shown. It is important to remember that the assessment is aimed at the notional 17-year-old, so the level of understanding required by these criteria will be that of the notional 17-year-old.

Sound	 The material will be generally accurate and contain material relevant to the Potential Content. The material will be supported by generally relevant authority and/or examples. It will generally deal with the Potential Content in a manner required by the question. As a consequence, the essential features of the Potential Content are dealt with competently and coherently.
Clear	 The material is broadly accurate and relevant to the Potential Content. The material will be supported by some use of relevant authority and/or examples. The material will broadly deal with the Potential Content in a manner required by the question.
	As a consequence, the underlying concepts of the Potential Content will be present, though there may be some errors, omissions and/or confusion which prevent the answer from being fully rounded or developed.
Some	 The material shows some accuracy and relevance to the Potential Content. The material may occasionally be supported by some relevant authority and/or examples. The material will deal with some of the Potential Content in a manner required by the question. As a consequence, few of the concepts of the Potential Content are established as there will be errors, omissions and/or confusion which undermine the essential features of the Potential Content.
Limited	 The material is of limited accuracy and relevance to the Potential Content. The material will be supported by minimal relevant authority and/or examples. The material will deal superficially with the Potential Content in a manner required by the question.
	As a consequence, the concepts of the Potential Content will barely be established, as there will be many errors, omissions and/or confusion which almost completely undermine the essential elements of the Potential Content.

Section A Introduction to Criminal Liability

Total for this scenario: 45 marks + 2 marks for AO3

0 1 Explain the meaning of causation in criminal law.

(7 marks)

Potential Content

(A) Explanation of the meaning of causation. This can include:

Factual causation – 'but for' test and explanation, cases/examples to illustrate, eg White.

Legal causation – significant and operative cause; *novus actus interveniens*: cases/examples to illustrate, eg medical negligence, eg Smith, Jordan, Cheshire; contribution of others, eg Benge, pre-existing medical condition, eg Hayward; victims own contribution, eg Roberts, Williams.

NB Factual causation only MAX 4 Legal causation only MAX 5

- 7 6 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** sound.
- 5 4 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** clear.
- The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** some.
- 2 1 The student demonstrates limited capacity for explanation
 or
 mistakes and confusion fundamentally undermine a more substantial attempt at explanation.
- The answer contains no relevant information.

0 2 Explain the meaning of the term 'mens rea' in criminal law.

(7 marks)

Potential Content

(A) Explanation of the meaning of *mens rea* in general terms (guilty mind).

Recognition that the courts have developed definitions of common states of mind found in criminal liability. These include:

Direct intent (definition + illustration, eg Mohan)

Oblique intent (definition + illustration, eg Woollin)

Recklessness (definition and illustration, eg Cunningham).

- 7 6 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** sound.
- 5 4 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** clear.
- The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** some.
- 2 1 The student demonstrates limited capacity for explanation **or** mistakes and confusion fundamentally undermine a more substantial attempt at explanation.
- The answer contains no relevant information.

lgnoring liability for any property offences, discuss the criminal liability of Bryan for the incident with the brick.

(8 marks + 2 marks for AO3)

Potential Content

(A) Recognition of the crime of assault.

Reference to S.39 Criminal Justice Act 1988.

Discussion and application of the *actus reus* and *mens rea* of assault. This should include recognition of the fear/apprehension of immediate unlawful force and the lack of the need for any physical injury; a discussion of intention or recklessness as to creating the fear/apprehension of immediate unlawful force can be applied to the throwing of the brick. Reference to cases, such as Savage, Logdon, Smith v Chief Constable of Woking Police Station, Ireland.

Mark Bands

- 8 7 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** sound.
- 6 5 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** clear.
- 4 3 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** some.
- 2 1 The student demonstrates limited capacity for explanation and/or application but neither is clear

٥r

mistakes and confusion fundamentally undermine a more substantial attempt at explanation and application.

The answer contains no relevant information.

AO3

AO3	
2 marks	The work is characterised by some or all of the following:
	clear expression of ideas
	a good range of specialist terms
	few errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling
	 errors do not detract from the clarity of the material.
1 mark	The work is characterised by:
	reasonable expression of ideas
	the use of some specialist terms
	 errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling
	 errors detract from the clarity of the material.
0 marks	The work is characterised by:
	poor expression of ideas
	limited use of specialist terms
	 errors and poor grammar, punctuation and spelling
	 errors obscure the clarity of the material.

Outline the principle of coincidence of *actus reus* and *mens rea* (the contemporaneity rule). Briefly discuss the criminal liability of Ahmed for the serious injury to Carl's spine.

(10 marks)

Potential Content

- (A) Outline explanation of the meaning of the contemporaneity rule. This can include the idea of the *actus reus* and *mens rea* happening at the same time, same place and same person.
 - Outline of the potential exceptions, eg continuing acts, Dutch courage, failure to deal with an accident. Cases, such as Fagan v MPC, Thabo Meli, Church, Miller.
- (B) Application to scenario continuing *actus reus* and *mens rea* when Ahmed sees it is Carl and walks away or Ahmed's failure to act following an initial accident. Discussion and application of gbh s20 (definition + application). Credit alternative s18. Cases/examples in support of gbh.

Mark Bands

10 - 8 The student deals with (A) and (B) as follows:

max 10: two sound

max 9: one sound, one clear

max 8: one sound, one some or two clear.

7 - 5 The student deals with (A) and (B) as follows:

max 7: one sound, one limited or one clear, one some

max 6: one sound or one clear, one some

max 5: one clear or two some.

- 4 3 The student demonstrates some understanding of (A) or (B), or limited understanding of (A) and (B).
- 2 1 The answer consists of brief, fragmented comments or examples so that no coherent explanation emerges

or

mistakes and confusion fundamentally undermine a more substantial attempt at explanation and application.

Outline the procedure, up to the start of the trial, that would be followed if Bryan were charged with a summary offence. (5 marks)

Potential Content

(A) Outline and application of procedure. This could include:

First appearance at Magistrates Court
Duty solicitor
Plea
Legal representation
Pre trial review

Dail

Trial to be at Magistrates Court.

Mark Bands

- The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** sound.
- The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** clear.
- The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** some.
- 2 1 The student demonstrates limited capacity for explanation and/or application but neither is clear

or

mistakes and confusion fundamentally undermine a more substantial attempt at explanation and application

- **0 6** Assuming that Bryan has been convicted of an offence and is due for sentencing, outline the following:
 - the factors that the court would take into account when considering the sentence
 - the **range** of sentences available to the court.

(8 marks)

Potential Content

(A) Outline of the relevant factors, both jurisdictional and personal.

Possible recognition of the 'seriousness' criteria (CJA 1991).

Possible reference to other relevant legislation.

Aggravating factors such as racist nature of attack, history of racism; possible mitigating factors suggested.

(B) Outline of the range of sentences, ie custodial (immediate or suspended); community (+ requirements); financial (means); discharge (types).

Mark Bands

8 - 7 The student deals with (A) and (B) as follows:

max 8: one sound, one clear.

max 7: one sound, one some or two clear.

6 - 5 The student deals with (A) and (B) as follows:

max 6: one sound or one clear, one some

max 5: **one** clear or **two** some.

- 4 3 The student demonstrates some understanding of (A) or (B), or limited understanding of (A) and (B).
- 2 1 The answer consists of brief, fragmented comments or examples so that no coherent explanation emerges

or

mistakes and confusion fundamentally undermine a more substantial attempt at explanation and application.

Section B Introduction to Tort

Total for this scenario: 45 marks + 2 marks for AO3

0 7 Explain how the law decides whether a duty of care has been breached, including how any **two** risk factors may affect the court's decision. (8 marks)

Potential Content

(A) Explanation with cases and/or examples of the meaning of the reasonable man. Objective test and special characteristics of the defendant – the position of professionals and learners and children. Cases could include; Blyth v Birmingham Waterworks, Nettleship v Weston, Mullins v Richards, Bolam v Friern Barnet HMC. Explanation with cases and/or examples of the meaning of any two risk factors and the effect that has on the standard of care; this can include special characteristics of the claimant – if known to the defendant to be more vulnerable, then higher standard expected; the size of the risk – the reasonable man does not take care against minute risks, but does against big risks; practical precautions – taking reasonable but not excessive precautions; the benefits of taking the risk – emergencies and public utility. Cases could include; Paris v Stepney BC, Bolton v Stone, Haley v LEB, Latimer v AEC, Watt v Herts CC.

- 8 7 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** sound.
- 6 5 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** clear.
- 4 3 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** some.
- 2 1 The student demonstrates limited capacity for explanation
 or
 mistakes and confusion fundamentally undermine a more substantial attempt at explanation.
- The answer contains no relevant information.

Damage in negligence involves the rules of factual causation and the rules of remoteness of damage. Explain these rules. (8 marks)

Potential Content

(A) Explanation of factual causation.

Case/example, eg Barnett v Chelsea & Kensington Hospital. Explanation of the meaning of remoteness of damage. This can include:

Reasonable foreseeability test, eg The Wagon Mound Kind of damage, eg Hughes v Lord Advocate Thin skull rule, eg Smith v Leech Brain.

NB factual causation only max 5 remoteness of damage only max 6

- 8 7 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** sound.
- 6 5 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** clear.
- 4 3 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** some.
- 2 1 The student demonstrates limited capacity for explanation **or** mistakes and confusion fundamentally undermine a more substantial attempt at explanation.
- The answer contains no relevant information.

Outline the principles of duty of care and briefly discuss whether Eve owed a duty of care to Fran.

(8 marks + 2 marks for AO3)

Potential Content

(A) Outline of the meaning of the term duty of care:

eg neighbour test, Caparo 3-part test

Cases could include; Caparo v Dickman, Donoghue v Stevenson, Kent v Griffiths, Bourhill v Young, McLoughlin v O'Brien, Hill v Chief Constable of West Yorkshire, Mitchell v Glasgow City Council.

Discussion and application with appropriate conclusion of duty owed. This can include application of Caparo 3 part test:

- It is foreseeable that someone in Fran's position would suffer loss as a result of Eve's actions;
- They are proximate in time and space (friendship not relevant);
- There is no reason to exclude liability as there is no public policy reason for this
 on the grounds of extending categories of liability or protecting public services.

Reference may be made to decided cases and application of those cases.

N.B: If no application, max 5

Mark Bands

- 8 7 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** sound.
- 6 5 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** clear.
- 4 3 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** some.
- 2 1 The student demonstrates limited capacity for explanation and/or application but neither is clear

or

mistakes and confusion fundamentally undermine a more substantial attempt at explanation and application.

AO3

AUS								
2 marks	The work is characterised by some or all of the following:							
	clear expression of ideas							
	a good range of specialist terms							
	few errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling							
	 errors do not detract from the clarity of the material. 							
1 mark	The work is characterised by:							
	reasonable expression of ideas							
	the use of some specialist terms							
	errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling							
	 errors detract from the clarity of the material. 							
0 marks	The work is characterised by:							
	poor expression of ideas							
	limited use of specialist terms							
	 errors and poor grammar, punctuation and spelling 							
	 errors obscure the clarity of the material. 							

1 0 Assuming that she did owe a duty of care to Fran, discuss whether Eve was in breach of that duty. (8 marks)

Potential Content

(A) Discussion and application with appropriate conclusion of breach of duty.

The reasonable hairdresser; the effect of being a novice; the industry standards; magnitude of risk and known danger from container warning.

Relevant authority in support.

Mark Bands

- 8 7 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** sound.
- 6 5 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** clear.
- 4 3 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** some.
- 2 1 The student demonstrates limited capacity for explanation and/or application but neither is clear

or

mistakes and confusion fundamentally undermine a more substantial attempt at explanation and application.

Outline the three-track case management system used in the civil courts **and** identify which track and which court are most likely to be used in a claim that Fran could make against Eve.

(5 marks)

Potential Content

(A) Outline of tracks (small claims, fast and multi) and financial limits. Civil Procedure Act 1997.

Brief explanation and application to Fran's claims, ie Application - fast track for entire loss, (as likely to be around £20 000), so in County Court.

Mark Bands

- 5 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** sound.
- The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** clear.
- The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** some.
- 2 1 The student demonstrates limited capacity for explanation and/or application but neither is clear

or

mistakes and confusion fundamentally undermine a more substantial attempt at explanation and application

1 2 Assuming that Eve were to be found liable in negligence, explain how the court would calculate an award of damages to Fran. (8 marks)

Potential Content

(A) Outline explanation of the calculation of damages. This could include:

General and special damages.

Heads of damage (damage to property and expenses incurred, loss of future earnings, loss of amenity, pain and suffering, 'tariff' award based on the injury itself).

Mitigation.

Structure of awards (lump sum or structured settlement).

Application to Fran (general damages personal injury and pain and suffering, loss of amenity, and special damages for physical losses and quantifiable loss of earnings as model up to trial).

(Account should be taken of depth and breadth, ie a strong application can be balanced by a weaker framework explanation or vice versa.)

N.B: If no application, max 5

Mark Bands

- 8 7 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** sound.
- 6 5 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** clear.
- 4 3 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** some.
- 2 1 The student demonstrates limited capacity for explanation and/or application but neither is clear

or

mistakes and confusion fundamentally undermine a more substantial attempt at explanation and application.

Section C Introduction to Contract

Total for this scenario: 45 marks + 2 marks for AO3

1 3 Explain the rules which apply to the ways in which an offer can be accepted. (8 marks)

Potential Content

- (A) Acceptance by conduct; orally or in writing; acceptance by post This is likely to include:
 - explanation recognising the need for actual communication based on a positive act. Case, eg Felthouse v Bindley
 - explanation of the exception relating to unilateral contracts, eg Carlill v Carbolic Smokeball Co.
 - explanation of the exception relating to the postal rule, eg Household Fire Insurance Co v Grant.

- 8 7 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** sound.
- 6 5 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** clear.
- 4 3 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** some.
- 2 1 The student demonstrates limited capacity for explanation **or** mistakes and confusion fundamentally undermine a more substantial attempt at explanation.
- The answer contains no relevant information.

1 4 Explain the meaning of the term 'consideration', including an explanation of past consideration. (8 marks)

Potential Content

(A) Explanation of consideration, eg the value in a contract which both parties must give/promise to give (executed and executory).

Consideration must move from the promise.

Explanation of past consideration is not valid consideration; Consideration already done at time of making contract does not provide some new act or forbearance, etc.

Cases and/or examples, eg Chapple v Nestle, Re McArdle, Lampleigh v Braithwaite.

- 8 7 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** sound.
- 6 5 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** clear.
- 4 3 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** some.
- 2 1 The student demonstrates limited capacity for explanation **or** mistakes and confusion fundamentally undermine a more substantial attempt at explanation.
- The answer contains no relevant information.

1 5 Briefly discuss the legal effect of each stage in the negotiations between Greta and Hari and decide whether those negotiations resulted in a contract.

(10 marks + 2 marks for AO3)

Potential Content

(A) Greta telephoned and asked Hari to leave a number of possible times on her voicemail – an invitation to treat.

Then either

- When Greta listened to her voicemail on 2 May, she received an offer.
- Greta texted back stating that 4:00 pm on 12 May was fine an acceptance that
 is effective when communicated, assuming it agrees to the terms of an offer.
 Unfortunately, Greta had not listened to all the message that finished with 'All
 times are for the week beginning 5 May'. This makes the offer only relate to that
 week, so Greta's reply could be seen as a counter offer.
- Greta then lost her phone so did not pick up Hari's text stating that 12 May was no
 - Good the rejection of any offer would have to be communicated to Greta. This has not been communicated so it is of no effect.

Or

- When Greta listened to her voicemail on 2 May, she received more information so still not an offer.
- Greta texted back stating that 4:00 pm on 12 May was fine an offer that is effective when communicated. Unfortunately, Greta had not listened to all the message that finished with 'All times are for the week beginning 5 May'. This does not alter the offer.
- Greta then lost her phone so did not pick up Hari's text stating that 12 May was no
 - Good rejection of her offer would have to be communicated to Greta it has not been communicated, so it has no effect and there is no contract but the offer might still stand.

Conclusion – there is no contract

NB: Marking is to be positive, so that an incorrect application of one stage will not result in no mark being awarded.

Mark Bands

- 10-8 The student demonstrates a sound understanding of (A).
- 7 5 The student demonstrates a clear understanding of (A).
- 4 3 The candidate demonstrates some understanding of (A).
- 2 1 The student demonstrates limited understanding of (A).
- The answer contains no relevant information.

AO3

2 marks	The work is characterised by some or all of the following:						
	clear expression of ideas						
	a good range of specialist terms						
	 few errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling 						
	 errors do not detract from the clarity of the material. 						
1 mark	The work is characterised by:						
	 reasonable expression of ideas 						
	the use of some specialist terms						
	 errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling 						
	 errors detract from the clarity of the material. 						
0 marks	The work is characterised by:						
	 poor expression of ideas 						
	limited use of specialist terms						
	 errors and poor grammar, punctuation and spelling 						
	 errors obscure the clarity of the material. 						

16 Briefly explain what is meant by breach of contract.

Assuming that there was a contract between Ian and Hari, briefly discuss whether Ian was in breach of that contract when he failed to arrive for his pre-booked appointment.

(8 marks)

Potential Content

(A) Brief explanation of actual breach and anticipatory breach and significance to claimant.

Cases and/or examples, eg Poussard v Spiers, White and Carter Councils v McGregor, etc.

and/or

Brief explanation of breach of condition and breach of warranty and significance to remedies.

Cases/examples, eg Poussard v Spiers, Bettini v Gye.

Note – answers which deal with both aspects of breach will inevitably do so in less depth. Answers which deal with one aspect only will require more depth. Either approach is equally creditworthy up to max marks.

Application and conclusion related to the scenario.

Discussion of anticipatory or actual breach (actual) and/or discussion of breach of condition or warranty (condition).

Use of cases or examples.

N.B: If no application, max 5

Mark Bands

- 8 7 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** sound.
- 6 5 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** clear.
- 4 3 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** some.
- 2 1 The student demonstrates limited capacity for explanation and/or application but neither is clear

or

mistakes and confusion fundamentally undermine a more substantial attempt at explanation and application.

Outline the three-track case management system used in the civil courts **and** identify which track and which court are most likely to be used in any claim that Hari could make against lan.

(5 marks)

Potential Content

(A) Outline of tracks (small claims, fast and multi) + financial limits. Civil Procedure Act 1997.

Brief explanation and application to Hari's claim (small claims, as loss likely to be very small and within small claims financial limits); County Court.

Mark Bands

- The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** sound.
- The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** clear.
- The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** some.
- 2 1 The student demonstrates limited capacity for explanation and/or application but neither is clear

or

mistakes and confusion fundamentally undermine a more substantial attempt at explanation and application

18 Explain how the court would decide the amount of damages to be awarded to Hari if Ian were found to be in breach of contract for missing his appointment.

(6 marks)

Potential Content

(A) Explanation of the way in which court calculates an award of damages, ie

The two stage test in Hadley v Baxendale; mitigation. Application to Hari's claim – Loss of estimated profit from dental treatment; mitigation of loss, for example getting another client.

N.B: If no application, max 4

Mark Bands

- 6 5 The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** sound.
- The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** clear.
- The student deals with (A) as follows: **one** some.
- 2 1 The student demonstrates limited capacity for explanation and/or application but neither is clear

or

mistakes and confusion fundamentally undermine a more substantial attempt at explanation and application.

ASSESSMENT GRID

(to show the allocation of marks to Assessment Objectives)

Advanced Subsidiary Level Law (LAW02)

	AO1	AO2	AO3
Section A:			
Question 0 1	5	2	
Question 0 2	5	2	
Question 0 3	3	5	2
Question 0 4	3	7	
Question 0 5	4	1	
Question 0 6	3	5	
Totals Section A	23	22	2
Section B:			
Question 0 7	5	3	
Question 0 8	5	3	
Question 0 9	3	5	2
Question 1 0	3	5	
Question 1 1	3	5	
Question 1 2	3	2	
Totals Section B	22	23	2
Section C:			
Question 1 3	6	2	
Question 1 4	6	2	
Question 1 5	0	10	2
Question 1 6	4	4	
Question 1 7	3	2	
Question 1 8	3	3	
Totals Section C	22	23	2

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the Results Statistics page of the AQA Website: http://www.aqa.org.uk/over/stat.html.

Converting Marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion