



External Assessment Report 2014

Subject(s)	Care
Level(s)	Intermediate 2

The statistics used in this report are prior to the outcome of any Post Results Services requests

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 entries decreased from 2013

There were two new centres presenting Intermediate 2 Care in 2014, which equates to 8.4% of entries. However, the total number of centres presenting has reduced from 25 in 2013 to 21 in 2014.

Entry numbers may have been affected by the dual running of new National 5 Care qualification.

Overall, the standard of candidate response was good, with candidates achieving marks ranging from 78/80 to 4/80. Results showed a spread of marks, with few attaining very low marks.

There was a decrease in candidates achieving an A grade, down from 37.6% in 2013 to 34.5% in 2014. There has also been a corresponding decrease in candidates achieving A–C grade, from 85.6% in 2013 to 78.1% in 2014.

Overall, 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: Psychology for Care

Question 2: Generally very well answered with clear responses. Many candidates achieved high marks for this question.

Section B: Sociology for Care

Question 4(b): Well answered.

Question 6: Most candidates gave very good responses to this question and achieved high marks.

Section C: Values and Principles in Care

Question 5: Overall well answered.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Section A: Psychology for Care

Question 1: A number of candidates possibly misread this question and gave responses for a social feature of adulthood, instead of older adulthood as stated.

Question 3(b): There were poor responses from a number of candidates. Many were not able to explain the link between antecedent and consequence.

Question 4(b): There were a number of candidates who did not attempt to answer this question. For those who did, many could not relate their response to a person who has had a stroke.

Question 5: A number of candidates did not relate their responses to psychology.

Section B: Sociology for Care

Question 1: Overall responses were fairly poor for this question. Many candidates gave examples of roles within a family unit, eg father/mother, rather than the role the family plays in terms of an agent of socialisation.

Question 3(b): Poorly answered. A number of candidates could not explain how socialisation might play a part in the learning of stereotyping.

Question 4(a): A high number of candidates gave examples of indirect discrimination instead of unconscious discrimination within the care setting.

Question 4(b): Many responses given were not related to a care setting.

Question 5: A high number of candidates gave very vague explanations and did not relate their responses to unemployment.

Section C: Values and Principles in Care

Question 1: A significant number of candidates gave very brief responses to this question. Many identified rather than described how a care worker could promote choice and as a result lost marks.

Question 4: Generally poor responses to this question. Many seemed to have a very poor understanding of empowerment and almost no understanding of the meaning of acceptable risk.

Question 5: As in previous years, some candidates had difficulty in describing needs and instead tended to identify problems faced by the individual from the case study.

Question 6(a): Unfortunately some candidates lost marks by describing the purpose of a care plan rather than the care planning process itself.

Question 6(b): Some candidates did not relate their response to the individual in the case study.

Question 7: Generally poor responses from a number of candidates. Many clearly had a poor knowledge of Attachment Theory and as a result lost significant marks.

Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

Centres should continue to ensure candidates are entered at the appropriate level.

Centre estimates should be based on candidate performance, and centres should endeavour to be as realistic as possible. This will help candidates prepare more appropriately for the external examination.

Candidates often 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 in responses expected between Knowledge and Understanding (KU) and Analysis and Evaluation (AE)/Application (App) type questions. It may be helpful to reinforce this throughout the academic year so that candidates have as much opportunity to practice these skills as possible.

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 as well as peer assessment, will guide the candidate to focus on specific areas for development in preparation for the external exam.

Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2013	733
------------------------------------	-----

Number of resulted entries in 2014	653
------------------------------------	-----

Statistical information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark 80				
A	33.5%	33.5%	219	56
B	22.2%	55.7%	145	48
C	19.6%	75.3%	128	40
D	4.3%	79.6%	28	36
No award	20.4%	-	133	-

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.