



## External Assessment Report 2011

Subject	<b>Health and Safety in a Care Setting</b>
Level	<b>Intermediate 2</b>

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

Six out of seven centres are now submitting group projects using the Collaborative Learning Assessed Social Software (CLASS). This has allowed centres and central markers to track where individual and collaborative/co-operative working is evident. The process of tracking is through a wiki and blog.

There were concerns that some centres may view the CLASS project as limiting the necessity for candidates to receive tutor support. This was evident in comments posted by candidates on their blog. This was unfair as some candidates went off the brief and were not given adequate guidance from their tutor to get back on track. That having been said, this was the second year of submission using CLASS and there is a distinct improvement in the candidates' abilities to provide evidence of how their team worked.

There was evidence that inappropriate websites were downloaded and irrelevant material used in the brief. Candidates should be directed to use only UK-based information.

## Areas in which candidates performed well

Planning evidence was better than in 2010.

Overall, the development stage was focused and concise.

Candidates performed well in the evaluation part of the project. Again, the best projects linked research clearly to the project brief.

CLASS candidates' contributions throughout the project were tracked and this highlighted the importance of blogging. Contributions made by individual candidates were easily identifiable.

The blog captured live entries. This was useful during the prolonged period of bad weather and when candidates were off as blogging entries were still evident. This ensured candidates did not fall behind in their project and were still active contributors when away from college.

The blogs showed the students' communication skills and the use of language that was appropriate for this level.

In Brief 3, the tasks and information required for most candidates were well laid out and the factsheet was aimed at the appropriate level.

## **Areas which candidates found demanding**

Plans generally lacked detail but were better than in 2010.

Quality within and across centres varied — in particular for the development section.

Some candidates struggled to clearly link their research to the brief.

Evaluations varied between centres. Some tended to be descriptive with limited reflection, while others produced a high level of evaluative and insightful work.

In centres where tutor input was evident via a blog or paper-based feedback, it ensured that the candidates were focused on the task set out in the brief.

Some candidates used only web links on the wiki as evidence. Please note this is not acceptable as it shows no ability to link to the care issue.

## **Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates**

### **General**

There were concerns that some centres may view the CLASS project as limiting the necessity for candidates to receive tutor support. This was evident in comments posted by candidates on their blog. The PBNC should receive the same amount of hours of tutor support as any other Intermediate 2 Course.

Centres should not permit candidates to use inappropriate websites or to download irrelevant materials.

Centres should view candidates work online at regular intervals and communicate with the individuals and in their groups to feedback on their progress and direct them at each stage of the project.

Overall, centre estimating was fair but a few centres were particularly generous. One centre gave the majority of candidates full marks for both the Plan and Evaluation. This was inappropriate as the level of work was inconsistent and gave candidates unrealistic expectations. Centres should allocate marks according to the marking guidelines.

Centres should refer to the PA report for guidance.

# Statistical information: update on Courses

## Intermediate 2

Number of resulted entries in 2010	162
------------------------------------	-----

Number of resulted entries in 2011	175
------------------------------------	-----

## 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	32.6%	32.6%	57	140
B	38.9%	71.4%	68	120
C	18.9%	90.3%	33	100
D	4.6%	94.9%	8	90
No award	5.1%	100.0%	9	-

## **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, therefore, SQA 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 Head of Service 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.