



External Assessment Report 2014

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

The statistics used in this report are prior to the outcome of any Post Results Services requests

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 majority of submissions were of good quality this session. There were entries from six centres, all using the e-portfolio on CLASS. CLASS allowed markers to capture individual contributions more readily, as the wiki and blogs highlighted all individual work.

Plans varied from excellent examples to poorly constructed.

In a few submissions web links were copied and pasted with no attempt to interpret into the candidate's own words. There was also evidence of plagiarism. Candidates should be reminded that evidence should be in their own words, and that referencing of sources is essential. Any images uploaded should not breach copyright.

Referencing was improved from last year. Most information collated was web-based, with a few references to other media.

The Evaluation stage was conducted under invigilated conditions as per the PBNC arrangement. However, this section was missing from some candidates' submissions.

Areas in which candidates performed well

Overall, candidates performed well in the evaluation section of the project, and the better projects linked research clearly to the brief.

Group participation was more apparent than in the previous year, and there was a marked improvement in candidates providing evidence of how the team worked.

CLASS candidate contributions throughout the project were traceable, which highlighted the importance of Blogging between group members and the lecturer.

Overall the development stage was well done, focused and concise.

Brief 1: The majority of candidates did submit accurate and innovative Care Plans.

Brief 2: The majority of visual displays for the service-user were very appropriate and would be easy for a client to understand.

Brief 3: The tasks and information required for most candidates was well laid out, and the fact sheet was aimed at the appropriate level. Advice on the child diet was vibrant, creative, accurate and displayed well.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Brief 1: Advice on diet was not always related to the clients' needs. Some diets were clearly not suitable and contained irrelevant information. Some candidates discussed suitable diets but did not explain or define what this entails.

Brief 2: Some displays were combined and showed the information for both the service-user and staff — this was not as directed by the brief. In a few groups the information for the service-user was not appropriate, overloaded with information and technical jargon. Advice on diet for during illness and recovery was mostly combined and not always specific to needs.

Brief 3: Materials from the web were not always relevant. There was evidence where the information for parents/ carers and nursery staff had little demarcation.

The timescale should include detail of what candidates plan to do and not just dates. This should not be directed by the centre.

Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

Centres should use the Arrangement documents and read the External Assessment Report for Health and Safety in a Care Setting, which is available on the SQA website.

All evidence must be available in an accessible area and not in a lecturer's private file. This caused issues when accessing candidate work at marking. To facilitate marking in 2015, centres should provide paper copies of the Plan and Evaluation and the marking guidelines.

Lecturers should be encouraged to use the blog as a means of communication with the groups.

There was evidence of lenient centre marking across all three stages of the project, but especially at the Planning stage. Internal verification prior to submission is good practice and may eliminate marking discrepancies.

Where a centre has reason to deduct marks there should be a clear explanation included. It is recommended that lecturers provide a feedback sheet.

Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2013	214
------------------------------------	-----

Number of resulted entries in 2014	248
------------------------------------	-----

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	46.8%	46.8%	116	140
B	23.8%	70.6%	59	120
C	22.2%	92.7%	55	100
D	0.8%	93.5%	2	90
No award	6.5%	-	16	-

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.