



## Course report 2019

Subject	Care
Level	National 5

This report provides information on candidates' performance. Teachers, lecturers and assessors may find it useful when preparing candidates for future assessment. The report 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.

The statistics used in this report have been compiled before the completion of any post-results services

# **Section 1: comments on the assessment**

## **Question paper**

Overall it was a fair paper which candidates completed within the allocated time.

Questions differentiated appropriately and allowed A-level candidates to develop their answer for full marks, and C-level candidates to gain marks. Course content was sampled adequately. The weighting for each section is: Values and Principles 20 marks, Social Influences 10 marks, and Human Development and Behaviour 10 marks.

There were examples of candidates who performed between A and D grades across all centres.

## **Project**

Overall candidates performed well in the 2019 projects. This was the second year of the new project. There was no change to the choice of briefs. The majority of candidates chose brief 1 with a few selecting brief 3.

The project has a good balance of the course topics with the addition of 'actions taken by society'.

The wording of the project is 'the needs of an individual requiring care', to clarify the requirement for one individual to be investigated.

The project had examples of candidates who performed between A and D grades across all centres.

In section 2, candidate differentiation across all parts was evident. Candidates working at A grade were able to apply theories and the concepts described, to their chosen brief and individual. Candidates working at C grade were able to describe with little application to the chosen individual.

## Section 2: comments on candidate performance

### Areas that candidates performed well in

#### Question paper

Candidates performed well in section 1.

For question 4, candidates showed a good understanding of Nature/Nurture and referred both to Jayden's condition. This was a 4-mark question.

#### Project

In section 1, the action plan was well executed overall. Most candidates gained marks for evidence of 1(a), (b) or (c). The range of individuals chosen was diverse, with centres using innovative ways to engage the candidates in selecting a client. This included case studies based on the main character in DVDs.

Candidates detailed the tasks and timescales effectively and the majority referred to their individual in the sources of information section.

Candidates at all grades performed well in section 3 as evaluation was personal to them.

### Areas that candidates found demanding

#### Question paper

Question 2

A few candidates either did not respond to this question or showed a lack of understanding of what the question was asking for. However, many answered this fully with good responses from A and B level candidates.

Question 3 was the most challenging for C-level candidates.

Question 11 and 12(a) differentiated well across candidate ability.

For questions 11 and 12(b) some candidates appeared to confuse positive care environment with positive care practice.

#### Project

C-level candidates found the following sections demanding:

- 2(b)** This section showed a mixed performance from candidates. The main issue was giving a detailed review of the psychological theory with little linking of the feature identified to explain aspects of development, and behaviour of the chosen individual.
- 2(c)** Some candidates described sociological influences rather than concepts. The area of linking the impact to the individual was applied by A and B-level candidates but was a challenge for C-level candidates.

- 2(d)** Some candidates described life chances in general with no reference to their chosen individual.
- 2(e)** A few centres directed candidates to out-of-date legislation and used the Regulation of Care Scotland Act 2001 rather than Health and Social Care Standards 2018. Some candidates spoke about the care worker and their role, rather than the feature of the positive care environment. Although candidates answered this part better, the link between the care environment and how it met the needs of their chosen individual, could be improved. Differentiation was evident from A-C level candidates.

## **Section 3: preparing candidates for future assessment**

### **Question paper**

Candidates need to be aware of how to respond to command words, for example describe, explain, identify.

Centres should remind candidates that if the question relates to an individual in a scenario, they must refer only to the named individual and not an elderly person in general.

In terms of the positive care environment, centres should make sure candidates understand the four areas: organisational, physical, therapeutic, and community and that they are able to refer to them and the description of what each one refers to.

### **Project**

The word count is set at 2,500–3,500 excluding references, footnotes and appendices with a penalty applied if the word count exceeds the maximum by more than 10%.

Centres must remind candidates that it is mandatory to submit their log book with their project. Most candidates submitted a log book with their project and these were used with varying degree of effectiveness. Some log books had one or two sentences and others had a weekly account of progress.

Centres must use the Health and Social Care Standards 2018 'my support, my life' and direct candidates to use this rather than dated standards.

Centres should remind candidates who chose clients they have worked with during their placement or friends or family to maintain the confidentiality of the individual.

If a centre distributes a case study or refers to a DVD for candidates to use as their chosen individual, it is important that teachers and lecturers check that it allows the candidates enough scope to develop the project fully and access marks.

Candidates should be made aware of the importance of putting information gained into their own words rather than copying directly from websites.

Centres should ensure that the current project guidelines are being followed by referring to the *National 5 Care Coursework assessment task* available on the [National 5 Care subject page](#) of SQA's website.

## Grade boundary and statistical information:

### Statistical information: update on courses

Number of resulted entries in 2018	645
------------------------------------	-----

Number of resulted entries in 2019	481
------------------------------------	-----

### Statistical information: performance of candidates

#### Distribution of course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of course awards	Percentage	Cumulative %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum mark				
A	33.9%	33.9%	163	84
B	24.3%	58.2%	117	71
C	21.6%	79.8%	104	59
D	11.9%	91.7%	57	46
No award	8.3%	-	40	-

## **General commentary on grade boundaries**

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.

SQA aims to set examinations and create marking instructions that allow:

- ◆ a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional C boundary)
- ◆ 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.

Therefore, SQA holds a grade boundary meeting every year for each subject at each level to bring together all the information available (statistical and judgemental). The principal assessor and SQA qualifications manager meet with the relevant SQA head of service and statistician to discuss the evidence and make decisions. Members of the SQA management team chair these meetings. SQA can adjust the grade boundaries as a result of the meetings. This allows the pass rate to be unaffected in circumstances where there is evidence that the question paper has been more, or less, challenging than usual.

- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the question paper is more challenging than usual.
- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the exam is less challenging than usual.
- ◆ Where standards are comparable to previous years, similar grade boundaries are maintained.

Grade boundaries from question papers in the same subject at the same level tend to be marginally different year to year. This is because the particular questions, and the mix of questions, are different. This is also the case for question papers set by centres. If SQA alters a boundary, this does not mean that centres should necessarily alter their boundary in the question papers that they set themselves.