



External Assessment Report 2014

Subject(s)	Care Issues for Society: Older People Care Issues for Society: Child 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

- ◆ Child Care had 28 candidates. Older Adult had 70 candidates.
- ◆ Disparity between centre marking and central markers is now low.
- ◆ In a few cases Plans were awarded 0 marks because of unrealistic timescales.
- ◆ The Evaluation section has improved, with some particularly good accounts of learning gained.
- ◆ The highest scoring candidates also tended to be those with good evaluating skills.

Areas in which candidates performed well

Child Care

- ◆ Generally the Childcare projects were of a good standard.
- ◆ The Plan and Evaluation sections of the project were in general concordant between central and centre marks.
- ◆ In the Childcare development stage the Nursery Assistants and Family support worker reports have generally improved.

Older Adult

- ◆ Evaluation of the candidates' own learning, including personal skills, strengths and weaknesses was consistently well done.
- ◆ Overall, for Older Adult, the projects were more fluent, with better links and clearer layout than those presented previously.
- ◆ The link between chosen family structure and the case study was strong.
- ◆ The Evaluation section was better, with candidates reflecting on the learning they gained.

Areas which candidates found demanding

- ◆ Some candidates missed opportunities to gain better marks because of a lack of relevance in their statements or because of the use of sweeping statements.
- ◆ The Childcare case study reports were good, although in the Recommendations and Conclusions there was evidence of repetition in some candidates' work.

Older Adult

- ◆ The report did not always cover the consequences if individual needs are not met.
- ◆ There were inaccuracies in the way various family structures were described, especially in relation to family roles fifty years ago. This has been a recurrent theme since 2009.

Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

Be realistic when marking and follow the marking guidelines. Do not double mark 'changes in the last 50 years' and 'social and economic issues'.

Candidates should select to research family types that are relevant to the case study, and should refer to the case study throughout the project to keep them on track.

When marking do not give double marks where evidence is only based on one family type rather than two.

Highlight to candidates the difference between resources and sources.

Submit the marking sheet but do not complete the EX6.

A few centres are omitting to complete the Declaration of Invigilated and Authentication of work sheet for a few candidates and should sign and tick the boxes that apply to the candidate.

In a few cases the centre had not ticked the back of the flysheet to confirm the level of input the candidate required.

Centres should also check the addition of marks as errors were identified in more than a few centres where marks were added twice.

Use of internal verification or group marking by centre prior to submission should be encouraged.

Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2013	40
------------------------------------	----

Number of resulted entries in 2014	70
------------------------------------	----

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	50.0%	50.0%	35	140
B	42.9%	92.9%	30	120
C	5.7%	98.6%	4	100
D	0.0%	98.6%	0	90
No award	1.4%	-	1	-

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.