



External Assessment Report 2013

Subject(s)	HEALTH AND SAFETY IN A CARE SETTING
Level(s)	INTERMEDIATE 2

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

The number of candidate entries was slightly reduced from last year. A total of 216 projects were submitted.

Only one college submitted in paper format — all other centres are using the CLASS system. All centres used the SQA marking grid and, in addition, there was a trial of online marking in two centres which received positive feedback from the colleges involved and at central marking.

Overall central marking concurred with estimated marks submitted by colleges. Tutor feedback sheets, when used, helped to ascertain how individuals and the group worked together. In addition, the blog entries highlighted an individual candidate's input and gave evidence of the team working together.

As in the previous year, the online version of the project was clearer to mark and it was easier to monitor how each individual performed.

It was noted that there was less of the use of informal language that was evident in previous years, and there was only one incidence of inappropriate language being used.

Areas in which candidates performed well

- ◆ Leaflets and photographs submitted supported the wiki and were of a high standard.
- ◆ Blogs gave clear evidence of teams working well together and the decision making process was evident.
- ◆ The vast majority of the wikis were interesting to read, well researched and presented in a clear format.
- ◆ Brief 1: There was an increase in the number of candidates attempting this project. Overall the standard was very high, with clear evidence of research provided.
- ◆ Brief 2: Several good examples of displays were uploaded and forwarded. Images sent to SQA for central marking were of a high standard.
- ◆ Brief 3: This was the most popular brief chosen and more relevant sources of information were included.

Areas which candidates found demanding

- ◆ The evaluation section of the project remains the weakest segment. Candidates failed to reflect on their actions and decisions, and there were several examples of the evaluation being similar to the plan.
- ◆ Candidates are still unsure of the differences between a source and a resource.
- ◆ Some candidates changed their name or reduced their name to an initial throughout the project, which was very confusing for SQA markers. The use of headers and footers would have clarified this issue.

- ◆ There was evidence that some candidate groups completed the wiki as individuals and had not worked as a team. The development stage should be approached as a group, and evidenced through the blog.

Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

Course tutors need to be reminded to complete the reverse side of the candidate flyleaf. This contains a box that needs to be ticked to clarify that the project being completed was the candidate's own work.

Several candidates submitted evidence without names, so headers and footers would have been helpful.

Central markers find the tutor feedback form a valuable tool in allocating marks, and it would be helpful if all centres provided this response. A template is available in the tutor section and the 'sandbox' area of the class system.

It would also be helpful if evaluations were word processed.

It would appear that generally candidates require further support and guidance in the evaluation section of the project.

Tutors should remind candidates to record the word-count of the plan and evaluation in their submissions.

If a candidate has failed to complete all three stages of the project, they should still submit all evidence available. Even with a section missing, it is still possible for the candidate to achieve an award.

**Statistical information: update on Courses
Intermediate 2**

Number of resulted entries in 2012	264
---	-----

Number of resulted entries in 2013	214
---	-----

Statistical information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark 200				
A	50.9%	50.9%	109	140
B	20.1%	71.0%	43	120
C	20.6%	91.6%	44	100
D	1.4%	93.0%	3	90
No award	7.0%	100.0%	15	-

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.