

Principal Assessor Report 2002

Assessment Panel:

Care

Qualification area

**Subject(s) and Level(s)
included in this report**

Care Intermediate 1 and Intermediate 2

Statistical information: update

Number of entries in 2001	Int 1	Int 2
Pre appeal	42	313
Post appeal	43	327

Number of entries in 2002	Int 1	Int 2
Pre appeal	121	695
Post appeal		

General comments re entry numbers

Intermediate 1

This was the first year with significant numbers which inevitably meant a greater spread of marks.

Intermediate 2

Numbers more than doubled from 2002. This gave a wider spread of results.

General comments

Intermediate 1

This year's results reflect more accurately the range of candidate performance that can be expected at Intermediate 1.

Intermediate 2

Some candidates would have been more suitable for Intermediate 1 but overall centres seem better than last year at gauging the appropriate level for candidates.

Grade boundaries at C, B and A for each subject area included in the report

	Intermediate 1	Intermediate 2
Grade A	43	53
Grade B	37	45
Grade C	31	38

General commentary on grade boundaries

Notional percentage cut-offs for each grade

Question papers and their associated marking schemes are designed to be of the required standard and to meet the assessment specification for the subject/level concerned.

For National courses the examination paper(s) are set in order that a score of approximately 50% of the total marks for all components merits a grade C (based on the grade descriptions for that grade), and similarly a score of 70 % for a grade A. The lowest mark for a grade B is set by the computer software as half way between the C and A grade boundaries.

Comments on grade boundaries for each subject area

Intermediate 1

The grade boundaries brought Intermediate 1 more in line with national ratings.

Intermediate 2

The grade boundaries were in line with last year as the paper was no more or less difficult and the 2001 paper was very closely aligned with national ratings.

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

Intermediate 1

The standard of candidates work was overall still good although not as good as last year. However, it is probably a truer reflection of Intermediate 1 candidates. Some poor handwriting and poor spelling were identified which at times caused difficulty in marking. The Accident and Emergency unit remains the area where candidates are more likely to achieve high marks. For a significant number of candidates, their responses in this option resulted in achieving a pass overall although they had done poorly in the mandatory units.

Intermediate 2

Markers commented that responses from college-based candidates were, in the main, better than those from school-based candidates.

Overall, estimates from centres were much more optimistic about candidate performance than the actual awards candidates achieved.

Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well

Intermediate 1

Question 8 of the Accident and Emergency unit which required candidates to recognise hazards from a picture was overall the best answered question and most candidates achieved full marks.

Intermediate 2

Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty

Intermediate 1

Candidates did less well on Part A of the paper. However, the questions in Part A are a truer reflection of Int 1 standard. There was no particular question which proved difficult but some candidates had difficulty applying the concepts *needs* and *wants* and had difficulty identifying relevant support services.

Intermediate 2

The questions on confidentiality and individual rights were less well answered overall than other questions. All candidates need to be encouraged to expand answers. Often where an expanded answer was required e.g. giving a description of **one** feature, candidates identified/ listed several features and offered no expansion.

Areas of common misunderstanding

Intermediate 1

Question 6 would have been clearer had it read *Support Services* rather than merely *support*. However, this advantaged rather than disadvantaged candidates and gave a wider scope for the answer.

Intermediate 2

There were no significant areas of misunderstanding

Recommendations

Feedback to centres

Intermediate 1

Centres should be aware that the level of difficulty of the Accident and Emergency Procedures unit compared to the other units in the course is causing concern. In an attempt to bring the questions for this unit more in line with the rest of the paper, the picture question will be dropped and replaced by short answer questions. At a later date, the unit itself should be examined to see if it truly is concordant with Intermediate 1 standards.

Intermediate 2

Candidates need practice at answering exam questions. A common fault was evident in question 1, which is a straightforward Human Development question, which should allow the candidates to settle. Where they were asked to describe a feature of human development relating to a particular stage of development for 2 marks, a substantial number of candidates identified 2 different features and described neither.

In the Understanding Care skills unit, some candidates have difficulty distinguishing between qualities/ skills and in identifying specific interpersonal skills. Candidates should also have practice in selecting skills appropriate to particular situations.

The existing Health Promotion unit will eventually be replaced entirely by the new unit Social Influences on Health. In the 2003 paper, there will be option questions specific to the Health Promotion unit but also questions specific to the new unit which is now available.

The new unit more truly reflects Intermediate 2 standards and links more clearly to the other units in the Intermediate 2 course.