

## Principal Assessor Report 2004

**Assessment Panel:**

Care

**Qualification area**

**Subject(s) and Level(s)  
Included in this report**

Care Intermediate 1 & 2

## Statistical information: update

<b>Number of entries in 2003 (pre appeal)</b>	Intermediate 1 <b>190</b>
	Intermediate 2 <b>980</b>

<b>Number of entries in 2004 (pre appeal)</b>	Intermediate 1 <b>207</b>
	Intermediate 2 <b>747</b>

### General comments re entry numbers

#### Intermediate 1

- Increase in entries of 9%
- More schools presenting candidates
- 11 colleges and 6 schools

Overall candidates appear to have been entered at the correct level and the question paper appears sufficiently challenging particularly for the more able candidates.

#### Intermediate 2

- Decrease in entries of 24%
- More schools presenting candidates
- 25 colleges and 16 schools

Overall the candidates appear to have been entered at the correct level.

## Statistical Information: Performance of candidates

### Distribution of awards and grade boundaries

Distribution of awards Intermediate 1	%	Cum %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
A	36.7	36.7	76	44
B	17.9	54.6	37	38
C	15.5	70.0	32	32
D	6.3	76.3	13	29
No award	23.7	100	49	

Distribution of awards Intermediate 2	%	Cum %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
A	40.2	40.2	300	53
B	15.1	55.3	113	46
C	11.1	66.4	83	40
D	4.6	71.0	34	36
No award	29.0	100	217	

### General commentary on passmarks and grade boundaries

- While SQA aims to set examinations and create mark schemes which will allow a competent candidate to score a minimum 50% of the available marks (notional passmark) and a very well-prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70%, it is almost impossible to get the standard absolutely on target every year, in every subject and level
- Each year we therefore hold a passmark meeting for each subject at each level where we bring together all the information available (statistical and judgmental). 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 senior management team at SQA
- We adjust the passmark downwards if there is evidence that we have set a slightly more demanding exam than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance
- We adjust the passmark upwards if there is evidence that we have set a slightly less demanding exam than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance
- Where the standard appears to be very similar to previous years, we maintain similar grade boundaries
- 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 are different. This is also the case for exams set in centres. And just because SQA has altered a boundary in a particular year in say Higher Chemistry 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
- Our main aim is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and all levels and maintain standards across the years, even as arrangements evolve and change.

### Comments on grade boundaries for each subject area

The grade boundaries for Intermediate 1 are moving in line with a priori.

The grade boundaries at Intermediate 2 are consistent with a priori.

This confirms that candidates are being entered at the correct level.

## Comments on candidate performance

### General comments

There was a general feeling that candidates had been entered at the correct level, both at Intermediate 1 and Intermediate 2. There was a continued increase in the number of entries from schools, particularly at Intermediate 2. The standard was variable but there were some excellent scripts from schools, the 2 candidates at Intermediate 2 who achieved full marks were from a school. In some of the scripts, however it was obvious that the candidates had had no direct experience of Care settings.

In general candidates with special assessment needs appear to have received the appropriate level of support and this is encouraging.

The Question Papers were considered to be even and well balanced with no major problems identified. The questions which were designed to stretch the more able candidates appear to have been effective and there was a fairly even distribution of marks across section A and B at Intermediate 2. Fewer candidates attempted the optional Unit Social Influences on Health, the majority attempting the optional Unit Understanding Care Skills.

At Intermediate 1 the majority of candidates scored high marks in the optional Unit Accident & Emergency Procedures and there were relatively few entries for the optional Unit Understanding Health.

The standard of written English in the candidate scripts was considered to be appropriate to the level and improved from previous years.

### Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well

#### Intermediate 1

- Accident & Emergency Procedures option was generally well answered and candidates tended to achieve higher scores than in section A
- The content of the paper was well matched to the Units and afforded candidates plenty of opportunities to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding. Some of the questions were sufficiently stretching for the more able candidates
- A few candidates achieved full marks but the range was focussed on average grades rather than any exceptionally good or poor papers

#### Intermediate 2

- Q4 Institutionalisation was understood and answered well
- Q7 Needs and communication was generally well answered and some responses showed a great deal of insight
- Q6 Personal qualities was generally answered well
- Q3 Socialisation was answered well

## **Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty**

### **Intermediate 1**

- Q3 a part of the question was a little confusing
- Q4 was a stretching question and few candidates achieved full marks
- Q11 the use of the word 'regarding' in the question appeared confusing to some candidates

### **Intermediate 2**

- Q1 'Development' answers were disappointing — most candidates seemed only to relate to child development
- Far fewer candidates undertook the optional Unit Social Influences on Health and this was not well answered
- It appeared that teaching materials had not been revised for Social Influences on Health as some answers appeared to relate better to the previous Unit
- Q 4 'Stereotyping' — this was a very stretching question and few candidates achieved full marks. The question tended not to be answered fully
- Q5a was confusing for students and many seemed unsure of what was being asked for

## **Recommendations**

### **Feedback to centres**

- Ensure teaching materials are fully updated to reflect changes in Units
- Too much of a focus on child development at Intermediate 2
- Candidates entered at correct level
- Candidates with special assessment needs are being adequately supported