



External Assessment Report 2010

Subject	Health and Safety in a Care Setting
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 projects had significantly improved from 2009. Submissions for this session included both paper based and e-portfolios which were accessible to the Markers on the CLASS website. All centres used the correct marking scheme.

Candidates performed better where there was good evidence of their individual contribution to the group project. CLASS allowed Markers to capture this more readily as the wiki and blogs highlighted all individual contributions. As in 2009, overall the students performed better in the Evaluation section than the Plan, although some candidates wrote too narrowly about their own strengths and weaknesses without considering the strengths and weaknesses of the project as they chose to interpret it and carry it out.

Some students omitted to 'review choice of brief'. Marks for the development stage were more transparent on CLASS.

No CLASS submission used the set brief templates but variations were acceptable and showed creativity.

Areas in which candidates performed well

Candidates performed well in the Evaluation part of the project and the best projects linked research clearly to the project brief. There was a marked improvement in candidates providing evidence of how the team worked.

CLASS candidates' contributions throughout the project were easy to track and highlighted the importance of blogging. The blogs showed the students communication skills and the use of language that was appropriate for this level. The blog captured live entries rather than retrospective logs/diaries. Overall, the development stage was focused and concise.

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

Areas which candidates found demanding

Similarly to 2009, Brief 1 advice on diet was not always related to the clients' needs. Some centres discussed suitable diets but did not explain or define what this entails. Some candidates submitted a blank care plan pro forma with no explanatory notes on how to develop the plan.

Also, as in 2009, in Brief 2 some displays aimed at the service user were not appropriate, as they were overloaded with information. Advice on diet for both during illness and recovery was not always included. The diet during recovery was often omitted.

In Brief 3, material from the internet was not always relevant. Many used an American website and discussed the vaccination programme.

In the plan, sources and resources caused confusion for some candidates and timescales varied greatly between centres. The timescale should include detail of what they plan to do and not just dates, this may be due to the wordage restraint.

Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

The strongest advice to centres is to use the Arrangements documents for Health and Safety in a Care Setting (which is available on the SQA website) and use the brief template.

It is the intention that from 2010 the project should no longer be paper based and centres will be encouraged to submit their projects using CLASS. From August 2011, no paper based projects will be accepted. This should eliminate some recurring issues, eg centres omitting to complete the Declaration of Invigilated and Authentication worksheet properly (not signing and ticking the boxes that apply to the candidate) and not indicating on the flyleaf the level of input the candidate required. CLASS should include these as mandatory fields.

As in previous years, a few centres were still marking work at a higher level than the marking scheme guidelines, especially at the planning stage. Internal verification is strongly recommended to ensure that centre marking is at an appropriate level prior to submission.

If a centre deducts a percentage of marks this must be clearly documented and a summary of the reason why.

The word limit in the planning stage may be reviewed as it was agreed that the wordage was limiting the scope for candidates to include detail; some candidates were listing to save words.

Centres should participate in the CLASS training to prepare candidates and should direct candidates to relevant sources/resources.

Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2009	200
Number of resulted entries in 2010	162

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	59.3%	59.3%	96	140
B	25.3%	84.6%	41	120
C	13.6%	98.1%	22	100
D	1.2%	99.4%	2	90
No award	0.6%	100.0%	1	—

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.