



## External Assessment Report 2010

Subject	<b>Care</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

Centres are now fairly experienced in the delivery of the revised Care Intermediate 2 Course. It is encouraging that there is some evidence that centres are acting on advice from previous reports in terms of the candidates being presented at the most appropriate level.

The general standard of response was good with a fair spread of marks. The feedback from Markers was that many candidates were well prepared for the exam; however, in general, candidates found Section A — Psychology for Care the most challenging section with fewer marks gained overall. Once again more mature candidates tended to achieve higher grades, possibly due to greater life/care experience.

Candidate numbers were increased this year which is very encouraging with the number of centres presenting candidates also up from 2009.

## Areas in which candidates performed well

### Section B

- ◆ Question 1: Describe the influence of two of the main agents of socialisation on an individual.

Candidate's responses were very good and many gained full marks for this question.

- ◆ Question 6: Describe the terms prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination.

This first part of Question 6 generally was answered well with a significant number of candidates achieving all Knowledge and Understanding (KU) marks available.

### Section C

- ◆ With the exception of Questions 2 and 5 (a), this whole section was very well answered. Generally candidates had good understanding of the principles underpinning the National Care Standards, care planning, and formal and informal care, which in turn highlights that centres continue to work hard in preparation for the exam.

## Areas which candidates found demanding

### Section A

- ◆ Many candidates found Section A — Psychology for Care very difficult and gave poorer answers compared to Sections B and C. Candidates obviously knew a number of theories but got them mixed up when answering the questions. Section A, Question 1 is considered to be a ramping question which is designed to be fairly straightforward and allow the candidate to settle into the paper. However, there were many poor answers for a physical feature of adulthood, in particular the candidates seemed to confuse this with older adulthood and therefore lost marks.

## Section B

- ◆ Question 4: State three ways in which equality can be promoted at a personal level by members of the team.

Overall this was answered poorly. Candidates seemed to be unable to apply this knowledge and many continue to state that 'equality is about treating everyone the same', rather than treating everyone as individuals with specific needs and wants.

- ◆ Question 5: Explain how Tobias' life chances could be affected by the discrimination shown to him by the other parents at the playgroup.

This question was not answered well; candidates did not explain how Tobias' life chances could be affected. Most candidates discussed that he would feel left out or marginalised but did not relate it to life chances.

- ◆ Question 6: Describe the terms prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination and explain the link between them.

Very few candidates provided a clear explanation of the link.

- ◆ Question 7: People with disabilities often face discrimination within society. The Disability Discrimination Act 2005 addresses this specific form of discrimination. Describe two ways in which the Act promotes equality.

This question was designed to be a 'headroom question' where able candidates would have access to higher marks by giving more in-depth information in their responses. However, it is recognised that the question is very specific and this could have disadvantaged some candidates. In response to this it was agreed that general information in relation to any appropriate legislation which would promote equality, would also be accepted. Having said that, there were many excellent responses regarding the Disability Discrimination Act which indicates centres are preparing candidates very well in this area.

## Section C

- ◆ Question 2: Listed below are two examples of values underpinning care planning. Give a brief description of each.

- Informed consent
- Acceptable risk

Candidate responses to this part of Question 2 were very poor and many had no concept of what acceptable risk meant.

- ◆ Question 5 (a): Identify two unmet needs Hilda has.

This was meant to be a straightforward question for candidates, however, many found this extremely difficult and did not seem to understand the meaning of 'unmet needs'.

There were very few good answers with many candidates identifying either strands of development or issues/problems Hilda had rather than identifying her needs.

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

Centres should continue to ensure candidates are entered at the appropriate level. Candidates would also benefit from the use of formative assessment as well as prelim papers that reflect the current format of the external exam. It would also be advantageous to encourage significant practice in application of knowledge to case studies.

Centres should stress to candidates the difference between KU and AE/App type questions. It would also be beneficial for the candidate to have a clear understanding of matching the amount of detail to the mark allocation given to questions. As in previous reports, candidates would benefit from a sound understanding of key words. Clear and honest feedback from NABs and formative assessment will guide the candidates to focus on specific areas for development in preparation for the external exam.

## Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2009	681
Number of resulted entries in 2010	726

## 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	26.2%	26.2%	190	54
B	22.5%	48.6%	163	46
C	19.3%	67.9%	140	38
D	7.2%	75.1%	52	34
No award	24.9%	100.0%	181	—

### 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.