



External Assessment Report 2009

Subject	Home Economics
Level	Intermediate 1 - Health and Food Technology - Lifestyle and Consumer Technology - Fashion and Textile Technology

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 overall performance of candidates is consistent with previous years.

Areas in which candidates performed well

Step 1: Candidates are continuing to grasp the concept of identifying the main points from the brief and are choosing only one or two additional points as advised in the guidelines.

Steps 2/3: Most candidates made good decisions about the item or items they chose to make in their ten hours.

Step 7: Candidates were good at completing the star rating chart and gave good evaluative comments to support the star ratings allocated.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Step 1: A few centres had candidates with the wrong wording for the brief title, some missing out a word or adding one in.
Some centres had candidates listing too many additional points, some up to five, this creates difficulties when evaluating in Step 7.

Step 2: A few candidates failed to complete the choice table accurately and made choices from items that were not eligible, i.e. items that were not ticked across the points identified.

Step 3: A few candidates did not provide a range of items, i.e. two or more suitable items.

Step 4: A few centres did not give the candidates the correct amount of time to complete the practical assignment, some planned for more than 10 hours and some for less.
A few candidates did not plan to make the item or items that they had chosen in step 3 or made and evaluated others not chosen.
Some centres had candidates who omitted the time or date from their plans.
Quite a few centres allowed candidates to make identical items.
A very few candidates wrote their plans retrospectively.
A few candidates do not make it clear in their time plans exactly what they are planning to do, e.g. Day 1 practical, Day 2 make dish 2, Day 3 sew item.
Many centres did not adhere to the new guidelines with regard to requisitioning equipment, materials and resources, by not referring to requisitioning in the time plan.

Step 5: Some centres included the requisitioning form/s, this is not required.

Step 7: Some candidates have difficulty in making evaluative comments and fail to refer to the item/s that they made.
Some also fail to refer to the skills or the equipment they have used and in doing so only make statements which are not evaluative.

Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

- Centres should refer **every** year to the SQA website for the updated Guidelines for Candidates and Teachers.
- Centres should make sure that they use the accurate brief title for the coming session 2010. To be found on the SQA website along with the up to date Candidate pro formas.
- Centres should ensure that candidates are given 10 hours to carry out the Practical Assignment, with at least 5 hours allocated to practical work.
- Centres should make sure that candidates are given the opportunity to practise another Practical Assignment before embarking on the official SQA brief for the year 2010.
- Centres should make good use of up to date exemplar materials available on the SQA website.
- Centres could make use of IT to word process the written stages of the Practical Assignment.
- The calendar of Home Economics and Hospitality procedures compiled by SQA should be used to keep up to date with SQA administration.

Fashion & Textile Technology

Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2008	535
---	-----

Number of resulted entries in 2009	473
---	-----

Statistical information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark - 45				
A	36.8%	36.8%	174	38
B	39.1%	75.9%	185	32
C	14.4%	90.3%	68	27
D	3.0%	93.2%	14	24
No award	6.8%	100.0%	32	-

Health & Food Technology

Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2008	491
---	-----

Number of resulted entries in 2009	453
---	-----

Statistical information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark - 45				
A	42.6%	42.6%	193	36
B	40.6%	83.2%	184	30
C	12.4%	95.6%	56	25
D	1.3%	96.9%	6	22
No award	3.1%	100.0%	14	-

Lifestyle & Consumer Technology

Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2008	730
------------------------------------	-----

Number of resulted entries in 2009	790
------------------------------------	-----

Statistical information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark - 45				
A	40.0%	40.0%	316	36
B	40.8%	80.8%	322	30
C	11.6%	92.4%	92	25
D	3.2%	95.6%	25	22
No award	4.4%	100.0%	35	-

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 SQA therefore 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 Business Manager 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