



## External Assessment Report 2011

Subject	<b>Care Issues for Society: Child Care/ Older People</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**

Quality within and across centres varied greatly.

There was a significant difference between centre and central marking totals for the Research Based Report and Conclusions and Recommendations.

A number of candidates restated and summarised the case study rather than drawing conclusions.

Evaluation of own learning — including personal skills, strengths and weaknesses — was consistently well covered.

Overall, the marking in centres was lenient. In addition, central markers were often unable to identify mark allocations.

Numerical errors in scripts from centres was again an issue. This was highlighted in the external assessment report in 2010.

### **Areas in which candidates performed well**

#### **Child Care**

Planning evidence was better than 2010.

#### **Older Adult**

Planning evidence was better than 2010.

The candidates were good at applying their knowledge to the issues raised in case study.

Most candidates made relevant recommendations and drew workable conclusions from the case study scenario.

As in 2010, only a few candidates cover the consequences if the individual needs are not met in the report.

Overall, the projects were more fluent with a clearer layout than those presented previously and achieved better results than the Child Care submissions.

## **Areas which candidates found demanding**

### **Child Care**

Some candidates combined social and economic factors rather than looking at them as separate issues. There was little evidence of the positive aspects of single parenting.

Social and economic circumstances were all related to marriage and, as the view of single parenting was predominately negative, this led to a negative slant on these issues.

As in 2010, parenting roles were often ignored.

### **Older Adult**

In the report, as in 2010, only a few candidates covered the consequences if individual needs are not met.

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

### **General**

Overall, marking was fair but a few centres were particularly generous.

- ◆ Centres should allocate marks according to the marking guidelines.
- ◆ Centres should refer to the PA report for guidance.

## Statistical information: update on Courses

### Child Care Intermediate 2

Number of resulted entries in 2010	81
------------------------------------	----

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

## 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	0.0%	0.0%	0	140
B	5.1%	5.1%	3	120
C	47.5%	52.5%	28	100
D	15.3%	67.8%	9	90
No award	32.2%	100.0%	19	-

### Older People Intermediate 2

Number of resulted entries in 2010	59
------------------------------------	----

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

## 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	25.0%	25.0%	23	140
B	31.5%	56.5%	29	120
C	27.2%	83.7%	25	100
D	3.3%	87.0%	3	90
No award	13.0%	100.0%	12	-

## **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.