Course Report 2014

Subject	Care
Level	National 5

Section 1: Comments on the Assessment

Component 1: Project

Overall the candidates performed well in the first year of National 5 delivery.

All candidates chose brief 1. The cohort was a mix of both Further Education and school candidates.

The number of submissions was low at only 24, with only three centres submitting.

Candidates who used mind maps were able to structure the information in their action plan

Candidates are to be reminded that referencing of sources is essential and the evidence submitted in the project should be in their own words.

Section 2: Comments on candidate performance

Component 1: Project

This was the first cohort to submit National 5 Care projects and all candidates chose brief 1.

The majority of project responses were good. Submissions for this session were 24 projects over 3 centres. Two of the centre submissions were from schools and one from a college. One centre did not include the log book with all submissions, which is mandatory. However, the log book was referred to by candidates and included with one project.

Overall, the candidates performed well in the Plan, and the use of mind maps and checklists were good practice.

In a few cases candidates referred to not fully understanding what an 'action plan' was, and there were a few instances where the plan had been written in past tense.

The Evaluation section and candidate comments indicated that evaluating was a difficult skill for this level. Perhaps more direction on evaluative skills could be delivered by the centres.

Section 3: Areas in which candidates performed well

Component 1: Project

Candidates performed well when responding to the following prompts:

1(a) Although different approaches were applied, candidates gave a clear description of the chosen individual and were able to explain why they were a suitable choice.

1(b)   Responses to this were mixed. A number of candidates gave detailed timescales, which is more beneficial, whilst others were brief.

1(c)   Generally good responses.

2(a)   Most candidates answered this prompt fully, however a few mixed up needs and development.

2(c)   Most candidates answered this prompt fully and were able to explain the impact on the individual.

2(f)   There was a mixed response to this prompt but generally a straightforward 6 marks were awarded.

2(g)   A straightforward 4 marks if candidates followed the layout of the brief.

3(a)   Most candidates gave a clear evaluation but not all referred to the plan or the log.

Section 4: Areas which candidates found demanding

Component 1: Project

2(b)   This was a challenging prompt and, overall, content in responses was lacking.

2(d)   Overall there was a poor response for this prompt, for a variety of reasons. Candidates referred to the care environment and described the service rather than describing and linking to the features of the positive care environment. Some had a poor understanding of the care service. Not all included meeting the needs of the individual.

2(e)   This was the most challenging prompt and was poorly executed by even the higher scoring candidates. Some confused theorists with theories; reference to the chosen individual was limited. Some used the same service as applied in 2(d) and failed to give two features of a theory

3(b)   Not all candidates spoke about future projects or referred to the plan or log.

3(c)   Few candidates related the knowledge and understanding gained to care and most discussed their further study

Section 5: Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

Component 1: Project

♦ The Log book is required to be sent in with the project.

♦ 2(e) is a complex prompt to understand and candidates need advice on how to break down the prompt into the component parts.

♦ Use of mind maps was good and focused the candidate on how to structure the information in their action plan.

♦ Candidates need to improve their skills of evaluation, as some only gave their opinion.

♦ Candidates are to be reminded that the evidence should be in their own words and referencing of sources is essential.

Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2013	0

Number of resulted entries in 2014	24

Statistical information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark 100				
A	29.2%	29.2%	7	70
B	37.5%	66.7%	9	60
C	25.0%	91.7%	6	50
D	4.2%	95.8%	1	45
No award	4.2%	-	1	-