



## Course report 2022

Subject	Care
Level	Higher

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 appeals.

# Grade boundary and statistical information

## Statistical information: update on courses

Number of resulted entries in 2022	375
------------------------------------	-----

## Statistical information: performance of candidates

### Distribution of course awards including grade boundaries

<b>A</b>	Percentage	10.7	Cumulative percentage	10.7	Number of candidates	40	Minimum mark required	88
<b>B</b>	Percentage	25.3	Cumulative percentage	36.0	Number of candidates	95	Minimum mark required	74
<b>C</b>	Percentage	24.8	Cumulative percentage	60.8	Number of candidates	95	Minimum mark required	61
<b>D</b>	Percentage	23.7	Cumulative percentage	84.5	Number of candidates	85	Minimum mark required	47
<b>No award</b>	Percentage	15.5	Cumulative percentage	N/A	Number of candidates	60	Minimum mark required	N/A

You can read the general commentary on grade boundaries in appendix 1 of this report.

In this report:

- ◆ 'most' means greater than 70%
- ◆ 'many' means 50% to 69%
- ◆ 'some' means 25% to 49%
- ◆ 'a few' means less than 25%

You can find more statistical reports on the statistics page of [SQA's website](#).

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

## **Question paper**

The question paper performed as expected and allowed candidates an opportunity to provide knowledge and understanding of the different topics being assessed.

Taking into consideration the potential disruption to exam preparation for candidates, the Grade Boundary was adjusted to reflect the poorer performance of question 7.

The question paper presented a range of different types of questions allowing for discrimination between candidates of differing ability. Section 3 of the question paper allowed candidates to choose which Health and Social care principles and pieces of legislation they would like to discuss. This section allowed for candidates to present a variety of answers.

## **Project**

All candidates were presented with Brief 1 — ‘Is it always better for people requiring care to be cared for at home?’ Candidates demonstrated a sound understanding of the brief and were able to apply this brief to the relevant Items.

Candidate performance for the project was as expected. The project is an opportunity for candidates to demonstrate individualised learning throughout the course and many chose to research a variety of care services and link knowledge to their own case studies.

Candidates were able to adhere to the word count and some chose to provide additional information and research in appendices.

## **Section 2: comments on candidate performance**

### **Areas that candidates performed well in**

#### **Question paper**

As in previous years, candidates tend to perform better on the less demanding command words. Question 1 was answered particularly well, and candidates had a clear understanding of the nature and nurture debate. Many candidates chose to discuss both nature and nurture, but only knowledge of one was required. Candidates who were able to provide an accurate description of nature or nurture were then able to go on and apply this knowledge to the case study presented.

Questions 2, 3 and 6 — many candidates produced high quality, detailed responses and demonstrated sound knowledge of the theories they were being assessed on.

#### **Project**

- Item A and B: Candidates' performance in these sections was strong and many candidates were able to access full marks. Average marks for these sections were high.
- Item D: Average performance on this item was good. Candidates were able to demonstrate an understanding of social influences and were able to link this understanding to individuals accessing care services.
- Item G: Performance was good and candidates were able to demonstrate well-structured conclusions to the brief.
- Item H: Candidates were able to reference their projects appropriately and many were awarded full marks for this section.

### **Areas that candidates found demanding**

#### **Question paper**

Candidates struggled with making the link between the influences of the government with individual's life chances, many candidates not discussing different life chances in any detail.

Question 7 performed worse than expected — 'Explain how the government influences the life chances of individuals who are using care services'. The average mark for this question was 1.2 out of a possible 4 marks. Few candidates were awarded 3 out of 4 marks or full marks for this question. Some candidates were awarded no marks for this question. Feedback from the marking team reported that candidates were unable to fully answer all parts of this question. They were unable to ensure they discussed the government as a social influence, the impact on life chances and then link this to individuals using care services. The marking team reported that a number of candidates described key features of Conflict Theory as an answer to this question

In question 4 some candidates demonstrated a lack of knowledge of what common sense or sociological explanations are. Some candidates received 0 marks for this question and few candidates received full marks.

In Question 3 candidates were required to describe one stage of transition and then use this stage to apply knowledge to practice. A number of candidates did not use the same stage of transition in Part B that they had described in Part A and were therefore unable to gain the available marks.

Question 10 asked candidates to demonstrate knowledge of two pieces of relevant legislation and then use this knowledge to explain how they influence positive care practice. Most candidates provided accurate knowledge of the legislation, however many were unable to explain how the legislation can impact on positive care practice. Many candidates were unable to give an explanation of positive care practice and some only discussed features of the legislation with one link to positive care practice. Very few candidates were able to gain full marks for this question.

## **Project**

Item C: As in previous years, many candidates continue to find this item particularly demanding. This prompt requires the candidates to provide evaluation, not description. Features of positive care practice were generally described and not evaluated within the chosen care service. A number of candidates described care services and did not present features of positive care practice. Markers found that candidates did not present an answer which was an evaluation, therefore they had not fully answered the question. Most candidate responses were descriptive, and marks are not awarded for a description of services that a care service simply provides. No marks are available for a generic description of the positive care practice approach unrelated to a specific care service and can only be awarded for evaluation within a care service. No additional marks are available for basic repetition of common features across the three care services.

Item E and F: Most candidates presented good knowledge and understanding of the different sociological and psychological theories. However, only a minority of candidates were then able to make an appropriate explanation in relation to the brief. Therefore, few candidates were able to access higher marks in both these sections. In section F some candidates were unable to evaluate and were providing descriptive responses.

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

### **Question paper**

Teachers and lecturers should continue to prepare candidates to respond to the command words in each question and prepare candidates for answering questions with different parts, for example, Part A and Part B.

Teachers and lecturers should continue to focus on positive care practice, in particular supporting candidates who lack practical experience of delivering positive care practice, for example, by using case studies.

Centres should ensure they refer to the specimen question paper and marking instructions on the Higher Care subject page of SQA's website.

### **Project**

Teachers and lecturers should ensure candidates are aware of the requirements of the project from the outset. Guidelines are provided on the Higher care subject page of SQA's website.

Teachers and lecturers should have a discussion with candidates to clarify their understanding of the brief before candidates begin working on the project. If possible, centres should use anti-plagiarism software to address any potential plagiarism concerns and continue to support candidates to adhere to the word count.

Teachers and lecturers should support all candidates to carry out independent research and candidates should make their own choices when selecting relevant care services. Teachers, and lecturers should avoid any influence or directing of candidate's choices of care services or individuals using care services. The project should represent the candidate's own knowledge and understanding. A variety of case studies, guest speakers, visits or any other method to support development of practical understanding, particularly for candidates who lack experience of care practice could be provided.

Teachers and lecturers should continue to support candidates in their approach to evaluative discussions of positive care practice within a care service. Candidates can choose a variety of different examples of positive care practice to evaluate.

Candidates are expected to use appropriate language throughout the project, they should demonstrate anti discriminative practice and avoid using stereotypical terminology which conflicts with care values and principles.

## Appendix 1: general commentary on grade boundaries

SQA's main aim when setting grade boundaries is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and levels and maintain comparable standards across the years, even as arrangements evolve and change.

For most National Courses, SQA aims to set examinations and other external assessments and create marking instructions that allow:

- ◆ a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional grade C boundary)
- ◆ a well-prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70% of the available marks (the notional grade 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 for each course to bring together all the information available (statistical and qualitative) and to make final decisions on grade boundaries based on this information. Members of SQA's Executive Management Team normally chair these meetings.

Principal assessors utilise their subject expertise to evaluate the performance of the assessment and propose suitable grade boundaries based on the full range of evidence. SQA can adjust the grade boundaries as a result of the discussion at these meetings. This allows the pass rate to be unaffected in circumstances where there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been more, or less, difficult than usual.

- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been more difficult than usual.
- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been less difficult than usual.
- ◆ Where levels of difficulty 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 on year. This is because the specific questions, and the mix of questions, are different and this has an impact on candidate performance.

This year, a package of support measures including assessment modifications and revision support, was introduced to support candidates as they returned to formal national exams and other forms of external assessment. This was designed to address the ongoing disruption to learning and teaching that young people have experienced as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, SQA adopted a more generous approach to grading for National 5, Higher and Advanced Higher courses than it would do in a normal exam year, to help ensure fairness for candidates while maintaining standards. This is in recognition of the fact that those preparing for and sitting exams have done so in very different circumstances from those who sat exams in 2019.

The key difference this year is that decisions about where the grade boundaries have been set have also been influenced, where necessary and where appropriate, by the unique circumstances in 2022. On a course-by-course basis, SQA has determined grade boundaries in a way that is fair to candidates, taking into account how the assessment (exams and coursework) has functioned and the impact of assessment modifications and revision support.

The grade boundaries used in 2022 relate to the specific experience of this year's cohort and should not be used by centres if these assessments are used in the future for exam preparation.

For full details of the approach please refer to the [National Qualifications 2022 Awarding—Methodology Report](#).