



Course report 2022

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 appeals.

Grade boundary and statistical information

Statistical information: update on courses

Number of resulted entries in 2022	180
------------------------------------	-----

Statistical information: performance of candidates

Distribution of course awards including grade boundaries

A	Percentage	19.7	Cumulative percentage	19.7	Number of candidates	35	Minimum mark required	82
B	Percentage	16.3	Cumulative percentage	36.0	Number of candidates	30	Minimum mark required	68
C	Percentage	26.4	Cumulative percentage	62.4	Number of candidates	45	Minimum mark required	54
D	Percentage	22.4	Cumulative percentage	84.8	Number of candidates	40	Minimum mark required	40
No award	Percentage	15.2	Cumulative percentage	N/A	Number of candidates	25	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 was accessible and fair. All candidates completed it within the allocated time.

Questions differentiated appropriately between candidates and allowed A-grade candidates to develop their answer for full marks, and C-grade candidates to gain marks. The course content was sampled adequately.

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

Project

All candidates in 2021–22 were presented with project brief 1.

There were 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 the brief and the 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 question 1, describing one emotional need of an individual.

For question 7, candidates showed a good understanding of the impact of discrimination on the life chances of an individual.

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 an individual in receipt of a care service. As in previous years, 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.

Areas that candidates found demanding

Question paper

Question 3 was open for candidates to describe one key concept from either a behaviourist or humanistic approach. Many candidates could not offer a description of any key concept.

Question 9 allowed candidates to describe any two principles, but many were not able to identify or describe any principles of the Health and Social Care Standards.

Question 12 elicited no response for many candidates and many more candidates showed a lack of understanding of what the question was asking for. Knowledge of the 'Statutory' sector of care should be basic, fundamental knowledge for National 5 Care candidates.

Project

It was noted this year that many of the projects submitted fell significantly short of the minimum word count. This limited the ability of many of these candidates to access the marks available in each section.

C-grade 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/or 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 grade candidates but was a challenge for C-grade candidates.

- 2(e) Many candidates did not identify three care services in the first instance. Additionally, many candidates were not clear about what the features of the positive care environment are. This made it a difficult task to access the marks available to explain how these could meet the needs of the chosen individual. Details can be found in the marking instructions in the coursework assessment task. This item is worth 12 marks, so a lot of marks were lost here.
- 3(a) This item was incomplete for many candidates.
- 3(b) This item was incomplete for many candidates. Many candidates omitted their explanation **related to care**, which resulted in them not gaining marks in this item.

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 a question relates to an individual in a scenario, they must refer only to the named individual and not an individual in general.

Centres should strive to ensure that candidates understand the Care Planning Process, the different sectors of care, and the principles of the Health and Social Care Standards.

Candidates are expected to display knowledge of key concepts of the four psychological approaches identified. Candidates are also expected to display knowledge of a range of sociological concepts identified therein.

Centres should direct candidates to the National 5 Care course specification on the Care subject page of SQA's website.

Project

Centres should ensure candidates are aware that 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%.

In terms of the positive care environment, centres should ensure that candidates understand the four features: organisational aspects, physical aspects, therapeutic or interpersonal aspects, and community aspects, and that they are able to refer to them and the description of what each one refers to. This information is available in the marking instructions in the coursework assessment task.

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 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 Care subject page of SQA's website.

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](#).