



External Assessment Report 2012

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 down slightly this year from 388 in 2011 to 326 in 2012.

Overall, the standard of candidate response was good, with an increase in candidates achieving A grade, as well a 4% increase in candidates achieving A–C grades respectively.

Candidates seemed to be entered at the correct level and were well prepared.

At times, the standard of English and spelling was poor and these candidates may have benefited from a scribe.

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

Areas in which candidates performed well

Section A

Questions 4 (a), 4 (b) and 5: Most candidates easily identified strands of development and how they could be affected.

Question 6: Good and varied examples given for each stage of development.

Section B

Overall this section was well answered.

Question 1 (a): Candidates had a good understanding of first aid actions.

Question 1 (b): Good understanding of prevention of infection shown.

Question 4: Overall, the responses were good.

Section C

Many candidates demonstrated a good understanding of principles underpinning the National Care Standards.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Section B

Question 4: Unfortunately, a number of candidates identified AIDS as being an infection spread through blood-to-blood contact and therefore lost valuable marks.

Section C

This section seemed to be the most challenging for many candidates.

Question 2: Candidates continue to identify the issues/problems rather than the needs of the individual.

Question 3: There were a number of candidates who lost significant marks in this question. Many could not identify the discrimination or the effect that this could have on the individual in the case study.

Question 4: Many candidates could not describe the link between stereotyping and prejudice.

Question 5: A number of candidates did not have a sound understanding of qualities required within a care setting.

Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

General

Centres should continue to ensure candidates are entered at the appropriate level. Candidates would also benefit from the use of formative 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.

As mentioned in previous reports, candidates would benefit from a sound understanding of key 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 2011	388
------------------------------------	-----

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

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	32.2%	32.2%	105	42
B	22.4%	54.6%	73	36
C	18.7%	73.3%	61	30
D	5.2%	78.5%	17	27
No award	21.5%	100.0%	70	-

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.