External Assessment Report 2010

Subject	**Care Issues for Society: Older People** **Care Issues for Society: Child Care**
Level	**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

The disparity between centre marking and Central Markers remains an issue.

Candidates achieving the highest grades in both Older People and Child Care laid out clear plans with identification of the relevant issues to be researched in relation to the case study and relevant sources of information.

The plan and research based report was better this year for Older People.

Child Care research based reports were consistently poor, with some candidates given inaccurate information to work from. This was evidenced by a pattern of inaccurate subject contents.

The Evaluation section was variable 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

- The Child Care case study reports were good and overall the section on Recommendations and Conclusions was better than the Plan and Evaluation.
- Overall, for Older People, the projects were more fluent with better links and clearer layout than those presented previously.
- Child Care entries decreased this year, however, there has been a rise in the entries for Older People.
- The link between a specific family structure and the case study was stronger than in previous years.
- The Evaluation section was better with candidates reflecting on the learning they gained.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Child Care

- Some candidates had confusion on separating social and economic factors. There was little evidence of the positive aspects of single parenting.
- Social and economic circumstances were all related to marriage.
- As in the 2009 submissions, parenting roles were often ignored.

Older People

- As in 2009, the candidate submissions did not cover the consequences if individual needs are not met.
- Also similarly to 2009, there were inaccuracies in the way various family structures were described especially in relation to descriptions of family roles fifty years ago.

Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

- 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.
- Recommendations should be realistic.
- The use of bullet points or short answers should be discouraged.
- In Child Care, the Nursery Assistant should base the case study report on observations in the nursery and not in Amy's home. This was a common error.
- Some centres are omitting to complete the Declaration of Invigilated and Authentication of work sheet, and should sign and tick the relevant 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.
- Some centres continue to mark candidates' work more leniently than the advice given on the guidelines. In some centres candidates were marked as A grades when work reflected a low C. Centres should also check the addition of marks as errors were identified and on some occasions marks were added twice.
- The use of internal verification or group marking by centres

Statistical information: update on Courses

Care Issues for Society: Older People

Number of resulted entries in 2009	97
Number of resulted entries in 2010	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	20.3%	20.3%	12	140
B	35.6%	55.9%	21	120
C	35.6%	91.5%	21	100
D	0.0%	91.5%	0	90
No award	8.5%	100.0%	5	—

Statistical information: update on Courses

Care Issues for Society: Child Care

Number of resulted entries in 2009	68
Number of resulted entries in 2010	81

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	1.2%	1.2%	1	140
B	7.4%	8.6%	6	120
C	19.8%	28.4%	16	100
D	14.8%	43.2%	12	90
No award	56.8%	100.0%	46	—

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.