



Course Report 2016

Subject	Care
Level	Higher

The statistics used in this report have been compiled before the completion of any Post Results Services.

This report provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers, lecturers and assessors in their preparation of candidates for future assessment. 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 assessment documents and marking instructions.

Section 1: Comments on the Assessment

Component 1: Project

The Higher care project consists of eight sections (A–H) totalling 100 marks. Candidates choose from three briefs, and are expected to relate each section of the report to their chosen brief. For the second year, brief 2 was the least attempted. All Higher briefs will be reviewed to assess their suitability.

The project largely performed as expected. Feedback from the marking teams/centres, and statistical analysis, indicates the project was fair and the majority of candidates understood the requirements.

Section 2: Comments on candidate performance

Areas in which candidates performed well

Component: Project

Section A: The vast majority of candidates clearly explained the needs of care service users and related these to the brief. Average marks for this section were therefore high.

Section C: Most candidates performed well and demonstrated an understanding of psychological theory and ability to apply this. Some candidates did not relate theory to their chosen brief and therefore did not achieve the high marks available in this section.

Section E: Performance in this section was strong with the majority of candidates using relevant sociological theory. As in section C, there were some candidates who did not relate their analysis to their chosen brief.

Section G: Candidates performed very well in this section and were able to reach conclusions in relation to their chosen brief.

Section H: All candidates achieved extremely high marks in this section. It is clear that this section was not of sufficient demand for Higher level and the grade boundary at C was adjusted to reflect this. A review of this section will take place post diet 2016

Areas which candidates found demanding

Component: Project

Section B: Although many candidates performed well in this section, there were a significant number who did not because they did not use aspects of human

development. Although the requirements for this section are detailed clearly in the marking instructions, many candidates used psychological theory or the needs of care service users in their analysis, which was not required.

Section D: Most candidates were able to identify and describe relevant social influences, but many did not relate social influences to their chosen brief.

Section F Many candidates performed poorly in this section. The marking instructions clearly state a requirement to evaluate positive care practice in three care services. Many candidates gave only generic description of what constitutes positive care practice and did not evaluate this in relation to three specific services. Many candidates only described the actual service itself, and not the features of positive care practice within the service. Some candidates used organisations that do not provide care to individuals.

Section 3: Advice for the preparation of future candidates

Component: Project

Overall performance in the project has improved this year. This reflects a clearer understanding of the requirements of the project by lecturers/teachers with good support and guidance given to candidates.

There was good use of anti-plagiarism software in many centres, which reduced the level of plagiarism overall.

Candidates used a wide range of care services in their projects. Most projects were personalised, and candidates had clearly been given opportunities for the development of their own individual research skills.

Some candidates used services that were not health or social care services, for example secondary schools, food production companies or information websites. It is essential that centres give appropriate support to candidates to make sure they use relevant services that provide direct care to individuals.

Lecturers/teachers should refer to the detailed marking instructions when supporting candidates, particularly for Sections B and F. This will help to ensure that candidates are aware of the requirements of the project.

Centres should also support candidates in relating every section of their project to their chosen brief. There were many candidates who produced projects of a high standard but were awarded low marks because they had not related to their project to their chosen brief.

Grade Boundary and Statistical information:

Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2015	315
------------------------------------	-----

Number of resulted entries in 2016	1129
------------------------------------	------

Statistical information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark -				
A	17.4%	17.4%	197	71
B	22.4%	39.9%	253	61
C	24.2%	64.0%	273	51
D	9.8%	73.9%	111	46
No award	26.1%	-	295	0

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 comparable standards across the years, even as arrangements evolve and change.