



External Assessment Report 2012

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 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

Disparity between centre marking and central marking is now less of an issue.

Candidates who achieved the highest grades in both Older People and Child Care prepared clear plans and identified relevant issues to be researched in relation to the case study and referred to relevant sources of information.

The plan and research-based report were better this year for both Older People and Child Care.

The Evaluation section remains variable with some particularly good accounts of learning gained.

The highest scoring candidates also tended to be those with good evaluating skills.

Both Older People and Child Care entries were down from 2011.

Areas in which candidates performed well

The Child Care case study reports were good and overall the section on Recommendations and Conclusions was better than the Plan and Evaluation section.

Evaluation of the candidate's 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

Child Care

Some candidates had difficulty separating social and economic factors although in general this was better than 2011.

When documenting the specific viewpoint of the Nursery Assistant, candidates should base the case study report on observations in the nursery and not in Amy's home. This was a common error.

Older Adult

Similar to 2011, the report did not cover the consequences if individual needs are not met. Also, there were inaccuracies in the way various family structures were described especially in relation to descriptions of family roles fifty years ago. This has been a recurrent theme since 2009.

Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

General

Be realistic when marking and follow the marking guidelines. Do not double-mark 'changes in the last 50 years' and 'social and economic issues'. This is in reference to centres that have given marks to changes in the last 50 years when the candidate has described social and economic issues — and also awarded the candidate marks for the same information in the social and economic issues section.

Candidates should select to research family types 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. This is in reference to candidates only describing one family type in detail and being awarded full marks from centres. Candidates should only be awarded full marks when they mention two family types from the case study and provide a description of each.

Highlight to candidates the difference between 'resources' and 'sources'.

Submit the Marking sheet but do not completed the EX6.

Some centres are omitting to complete the Declaration of Invigilated and Authentication of Work sheet and should sign and tick the boxes that apply to the candidate.

There were a few cases where 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 because errors were identified in more than a few centres and marks were added twice.

Centres are encouraged to internally verify or group mark prior to submitting candidate evidence.

Statistical information: update on Courses

Intermediate 2 Child Care

Number of resulted entries in 2011	59
------------------------------------	----

Number of resulted entries in 2012	35
------------------------------------	----

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	2.9%	2.9%	1	140
B	8.6%	11.4%	3	120
C	57.1%	68.6%	20	100
D	17.1%	85.7%	6	90
No award	14.3%	100.0%	5	-

Statistical information: update on Courses

Intermediate 2

Older People

Number of resulted entries in 2011	92
------------------------------------	----

Number of resulted entries in 2012	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	38.6%	38.6%	27	140
B	32.9%	71.4%	23	120
C	20.0%	91.4%	14	100
D	2.9%	94.3%	2	90
No award	5.7%	100.0%	4	-

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.