



External Assessment Report 2012

Subject(s)	Health and Safety in a Care Setting
Level(s)	Intermediate 2 (PBNC)

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

There has been significant rise in candidate entries this year. The majority of candidates' submissions for this PBNC were very good. Most of the centres submitting evidence used the e-portfolio CLASS system, with only a few submissions that were paper-based. (The CLASS system is a web-based facility for recording candidate evidence using a wiki and blog). Centres used the correct marking scheme, although a centre-devised checklist that did not match SQA project paperwork was submitted.

Candidates tended to do well where there was convincing evidence of their individual contribution to the group project. CLASS allowed markers to capture individual contributions more readily because the wiki and blogs highlighted all individual contribution. Overall, candidates performed better in the Evaluation and Plan section than in 2011, although some candidates considered their own strengths and weaknesses without considering the strengths and weaknesses of the project in terms of how they chose to interpret it and carry it out. Marks for the development stage were more transparent on CLASS than the paper based submission.

CLASS allows the candidate to explore other media to display their ideas, and evidence included examples of using 'YouTube' and candidate-developed video that was uploaded to the wiki.

Overall there was an improvement in referencing by candidates.

Areas in which candidates performed well

Candidates performed well in the evaluation part of the project and the better projects linked research clearly to the project brief. There was a marked improvement in candidates providing evidence of how the team worked. Where centres used CLASS it was possible to track candidates' contributions throughout the project, and it also highlighted the importance of *blogging* between group members and the lecturer.

The blog demonstrated candidates' communication skills and 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 1 some candidates did submit particularly accurate and innovative Care Plans.

In Brief 2 some visual displays for the service user were very appropriate and would be easy for a client to understand.

In Brief 3 the tasks and information required for most candidates was well laid out and the fact sheet was aimed at the appropriate level.

Overall candidates put additional information into their timescales rather than just dates.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Similar to 2011, Brief 1 — advice on diet — was not always related to the client's needs. Some centres discussed suitable diets but did not explain or define what this entails.

Similar to 2011, in Brief 2 some displays aimed at the service-user were not appropriate, were overloaded with information, and used inappropriate technical jargon. Advice on diet during illness and recovery was not always included and was mostly put together rather than dealt with separately. Diet during recovery was often omitted.

In Brief 3 material sourced from the internet was not always relevant. Many used an American/Canadian site and discussed the vaccination programme. There was evidence where the information for parents/carers and nursery staff had little demarcation.

In the plan, sources and resources caused confusion for some candidates, and timescales varied greatly between centres. Also in some centres the plans looked similar and were written in past tense.

The timescale should include detail of what they plan to do and not just dates.

In the evaluation candidates were not referring back to the reason they chose in the brief.

Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

The strongest advice to centres is to ensure they use the Arrangements documents, and to read the External Assessment Reports for Health and Safety in a Care Setting. These are available on the SQA website.

This should eliminate some recurring issues, eg centres omitting to complete the Declaration of Invigilation and Authentication of worksheet, or forgetting to sign and tick the boxes that apply to the candidate. Some centres did not tick the back of the flysheet to confirm the level of input the candidate required, and in one centre both items were ticked and but not signed by the candidate.

A few centres were marking work internally more strictly than the marking scheme guidelines, especially at the planning and stage. Internal Verification prior to submission is good practice and may eliminate mark discrepancies.

If a centre deducts a percentage of marks this must be clearly documented along with a summary of the reason for the deduction. It is recommended that lecturers provide a feedback sheet.

Centres are asked to remind candidates that evidence should be in their own words and referencing of sources is essential.

Wiki material should not be placed in the blog.

Statistical information: update on Courses

Intermediate 2

Number of resulted entries in 2011	175
------------------------------------	-----

Number of resulted entries in 2012	264
------------------------------------	-----

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	49.2%	49.2%	130	140
B	20.8%	70.1%	55	120
C	18.2%	88.3%	48	100
D	1.9%	90.2%	5	90
No award	9.8%	100.0%	26	-

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.