



External Assessment Report 2013

| | |
|------------|----------------|
| Subject(s) | Care |
| Level(s) | Intermediate 1 |

The statistics used in this report are pre-appeal.

This report provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers/lecturers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding. It would be helpful to read this report in conjunction with the published question papers and marking instructions for the examination.

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

Candidate numbers were increased slightly this year from 327 in 2012 to 374 in 2013.

There were 4 new centres presenting Intermediate 1 Care this year, which equates to 20.3% of entries.

Overall, the standard of candidate response was good, with an increase of 6.2% of candidates achieving A grade, as well as almost 4% increase in candidates achieving A–C grades respectively. Candidates seemed to be entered at the correct level and were well prepared.

The exam paper performed as expected with no note of concern from any centres.

Areas in which candidates performed well

Section A

- Q1 Candidates seemed to have a good understanding of the term 'Sociology', and many gained full marks.
- Q4a Candidates were able to clearly describe how emotional development may be affected. This allowed more able candidates to achieve higher marks.
- Q4b Many candidates were able to give some very good descriptions of how social development can be affected by life changes.

Section B

- Q3 A significant number of candidates found this to be a straightforward question and quite clearly knew the correct first aid action, which is encouraging. Although this question was generally answered very well, a number of candidates ticked all boxes rather than only the correct ones, and as a result marks could not be credited.

Section C

- Q2 Many candidates were clearly able to correctly identify examples of stereotyping, prejudice or discrimination.
- Q3 A significant number of candidates could clearly state possible effects of discrimination.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Section A

- Q6 Overall, this question was poorly answered. A number of candidates could not describe features of development and as a result lost marks. Many stated or named a feature rather than describe it.

Section B

- Q4 A number of candidates, when asked to describe responsibilities of the employer, either did not know or confused this with the responsibilities of the employee.
- Q5 Candidates often gave non-specific answers regarding the treatment of first aid conditions. If a particular injury/condition is indicated in the question specific treatment should be given in the response to achieve high marks.

Section C

- Q4 Candidates seemed to find giving a definition of some of the principles underpinning the National Care Standards challenging and as a result many did not achieve high marks for this question.

Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

- ◆ Centres should continue to ensure candidates are entered at the appropriate level.
- ◆ Candidates would benefit from the use of formative and peer assessment, as well as prelim papers that reflect the current format of the external exam.
- ◆ It would also be advantageous to encourage practice in application of knowledge to case studies.
- ◆ Centres should stress to candidates the difference between Knowledge and Understanding (KU) and Analysis and Evaluation (AE)/Application (App) type questions.
- ◆ It would also be beneficial for candidates to have a clear understanding of how to match the detail in their answers to the mark allocation given to questions.
- ◆ As mentioned in previous reports, candidates would benefit from a sound understanding of key command words.
- ◆ Clear and honest feedback from NABs and formative assessment will guide the candidates to focus on specific areas for development in preparation for the external exam.

Statistical information: update on Courses

Intermediate 1

| | |
|------------------------------------|-----|
| Number of resulted entries in 2012 | 326 |
|------------------------------------|-----|

| | |
|------------------------------------|-----|
| Number of resulted entries in 2013 | 373 |
|------------------------------------|-----|

Statistical information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

| Distribution of Course awards | % | Cum. % | Number of candidates | Lowest mark |
|-------------------------------|-------|--------|----------------------|-------------|
| Maximum Mark 60 | | | | |
| A | 37.8% | 37.8% | 141 | 42 |
| B | 20.6% | 58.4% | 77 | 36 |
| C | 16.1% | 74.5% | 60 | 30 |
| D | 3.8% | 78.3% | 14 | 27 |
| No award | 21.7% | 100.0% | 81 | - |

General commentary on grade boundaries

- ◆ While SQA aims to set examinations and create marking instructions which will allow a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional C boundary) and a well prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70% of the available marks (the notional A boundary), it is very challenging to get the standard on target every year, in every subject at every level.
- ◆ Each year, SQA therefore holds a grade boundary meeting for each subject at each level where it brings together all the information available (statistical and judgemental). The Principal Assessor and SQA Qualifications Manager meet with the relevant SQA Business Manager and Statistician to discuss the evidence and make decisions. The meetings are chaired by members of the management team at SQA.
- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the exam is more challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.
- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the exam is less challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.
- ◆ Where standards are comparable to previous years, similar grade boundaries are maintained.
- ◆ An exam paper at a particular level in a subject in one year tends to have a marginally different set of grade boundaries from exam papers in that subject at that level in other years. This is because the particular questions, and the mix of questions, are different. This is also the case for exams set in centres. If SQA has already altered a boundary in a particular year in, say, Higher Chemistry, this does not mean that centres should necessarily alter boundaries in their prelim exam in Higher Chemistry. The two are not that closely related, as they do not contain identical questions.
- ◆ SQA's main aim is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and all levels and maintain comparable standards across the years, even as arrangements evolve and change.