



External Assessment Report 2014

Subject(s)	Home Economics: Health & Food Technology Lifestyle & Consumer Technology Fashion & Textile Technology
Level(s)	Intermediate 1

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

Although the numbers of candidates was greatly reduced this year the overall performance was very similar to previous years.

Areas in which candidates performed well

Step 1

- ◆ Candidates successfully identified the main points from the given brief and selected relevant additional points.

Steps 2 and 3

- ◆ Most candidates made good selections for their chosen item/s and planned their ten hours of practical activity well.

Step 7

- ◆ Most candidates successfully completed the star rating chart and gave good evaluative comments to support their ratings.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Step 1

- ◆ Some centres had candidates listing more than five additional points, making evaluating the main and additional points at step 7 more difficult and time consuming.

Steps 2 and 3

- ◆ A few candidates did not offer a range of items, ie two or more items. A few did not make choices from items ticked across the table and so were not appropriate.

Step 4

- ◆ A few candidates did not plan to make the item/s that they had chosen in Step 3 or made and evaluated items not chosen.
- ◆ Some candidates omitted the time or length of period or dates from their plans.
- ◆ A few centres had candidates making identical items.
- ◆ A few candidates did not make reference to requisitioning of equipment, materials and resources in their time plans.
- ◆ Some time-plans were very vague and only stated 'Day 1 – practical'.

Step 5

- ◆ Many centres included the requisition form(s). This is not required.

Step 7

- ◆ Some candidates missed out some of the points to be evaluated.

- ◆ Some candidates failed to refer to the items made when evaluating.
- ◆ Some candidates did not evaluate, they made statements.

Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

- ◆ As always centres should keep up to date with the SQA website for updated Guidelines for Candidates and Teachers.
- ◆ Centres should use the correct brief titles, which will be made available on the SQA website from September 2014.
- ◆ Centres should ensure the candidates are given ten hours to carry out their Practical Assignment, with at least five hours of practical activity.
- ◆ Centres should make sure candidates are given the opportunity to practise a similar assignment prior to carrying out the official assessment for 2015.
- ◆ Centres should make sure all flyleafs are signed and dated by candidates.
- ◆ Where appropriate centres should consider using I.T. to word process the written stages of the Practical Assignment.

**Statistical information: update on Courses
Fashion and Textile Technology – Intermediate 1**

Number of resulted entries in 2013	453
---	-----

Number of resulted entries in 2014	74
---	----

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	43.2%	43.2%	32	38
B	36.5%	79.7%	27	32
C	12.2%	91.9%	9	27
D	5.4%	97.3%	4	24
No award	2.7%	-	2	-

**Statistical information: update on Courses
Health and Food Technology – Intermediate 2**

Number of resulted entries in 2013	393
---	-----

Number of resulted entries in 2014	37
---	----

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	35.1%	35.1%	13	36
B	29.7%	64.9%	11	30
C	29.7%	94.6%	11	25
D	5.4%	100.0%	2	22
No award	0.0%	-	0	-

Statistical information: update on Courses Lifestyle and Consumer Technology

Number of resulted entries in 2013	508
------------------------------------	-----

Number of resulted entries in 2014	42
------------------------------------	----

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	45.2%	45.2%	19	36
B	33.3%	78.6%	14	30
C	14.3%	92.9%	6	25
D	4.8%	97.6%	2	22
No award	2.4%	-	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, 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.