



## Course Report 2015

Subject	Care
Level	National 5

The statistics used in this report have been compiled before the completion of any Post Results Services.

This report provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers, lecturers and assessors in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It 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 and marking instructions for the examination.

## **Section 1: Comments on the Assessment**

This was the second cohort to submit National 5 Care projects, with candidates selecting from all three briefs.

561 projects were submitted, from 24 centres. The majority of responses to the project were good, with some being very well interpreted.

A small number of candidates did not submit the log books. The submission of the log book is mandatory evidence with the project. Teachers/lecturers should ensure that candidates submit the log books next session.

Teachers/lecturers should also ensure that they are using the most up to date briefs from the SQA Secure Site.

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

Overall candidates performed well in 2015 and some good practice was observed.

In section 1, the Action Plan, some candidates chose to structure their work through the use of mind maps and checklists, which was good practice.

Unfortunately, some candidates indicated that they did not fully understand the requirements of an action plan. Some teachers/lecturers had replaced the action plan with a tick list, which did not allow candidates to gain marks for evidence of 1(a), 1(b) or 1(c). All sections of the project should be detailed in the action plan – including the evaluation section — however not all candidates included this.

Few candidates who chose brief 1 produced a separate leaflet. The production of a leaflet will no longer be required for future projects.

The range and variety of individuals chosen for the project was varied, and in some cases teachers/lecturers were using innovative ways to engage their candidates in selecting a client. Examples included case studies; DVDs with social issue; celebrities and media articles; clients they have worked with during placement; and personal experience-see note below

If a teacher/lecturer is distributing a case study for candidates to work from, it is important that it allows candidates enough scope to develop the project fully and access all available marks. Care must also be taken to maintain the confidentiality of the individuals referred to in the project. Candidates should be aware that information gathered during questionnaires and interviews can be sensitive and should remain confidential.

Some candidates based their project on their own personal experiences which is normally inappropriate due to the personal and confidential information of the issues that can be discussed.

Candidate comments from the evaluation section indicated that they did not fully understand what they had to address in the project. More direction on evaluative skills could be delivered to ensure candidates are aware of what is required within this section.

## **Section 3: Areas in which candidates performed well**

Candidates performed well in the following assessment items:

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

1(b) Response to this assessment item was mixed. Some candidates gave detailed timescales; others were limited. Some candidates forgot to input details of the evaluation stage of the project and were unable to access these marks, although the other two stages were comprehensive.

1(c) The majority of candidate responses to this assessment item were good.

2(a) Most candidates answered this assessment item fully, but a few mixed up needs and development.

2(c) Most candidates answered this assessment item fully and were able to explain the impact on the individual. However, those candidates who did not fully understand the idea of a sociological concept had difficulty explaining the impact on their chosen individual. Some candidates used primary and secondary socialisation as separate concepts.

2(f) There were mixed responses to this item, but generally most candidates achieved 6 marks.

2(g) Candidates were achieving the 4 marks if they followed the format of the brief and completed each section.

3(a) The majority of candidates gave a clear evaluation but not all referred to the plan or log, and some only gave their own opinion.

## **Section 4: Areas which candidates found demanding:**

- ◆ 2(b), 2(c) and 2(d) some candidates had difficulty applying theories to their chosen individual.
- ◆ 2(b) A challenging section and overall content was lacking. Candidates found it difficult to apply theory to aspects of development and behaviour of the chosen individual.
- ◆ 2(d) Overall there was a poor response for this assessment item, for a variety of reasons. Some 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 need of the individual.

- ◆ 2(e) For some candidates this was the most challenging section, and was poorly executed by even the highest scoring candidates. Some candidates confused theorists with theories, and reference to the chosen individual was limited. Some used the same aspect of the feature as applied in 2(d) and failed to give two features of a theory. Candidates struggled to identify different aspects of the theory. Response to positive care practice was an area that some candidates found difficult as they were not linking their individual to a theory or to positive care practice. A few candidates missed out this section completely; and some candidates only identified one feature, meaning they could not access all the available marks. Candidates need advice on how to break this section into the component parts.
- ◆ 3(b) A few candidates did not speak about future projects or they referred to the plan or log.
- ◆ 3(c) Some candidates did not explain how they would use the knowledge and understanding gained from the projects in a care context, with most candidates discussing future study.

## **Section 5: Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates**

- ◆ Candidates must use one of the Care briefs devised by SQA which are available on the SQA secure website. Centre-devised briefs are not acceptable, and may disadvantage candidates.
- ◆ The title of the chosen brief should be accurately recorded on the flyleaf for the project.
- ◆ It is good practice to discuss and agree on the chosen individual before beginning the project, as some individuals chosen were inappropriate and did not have enough detail to allow the candidate to follow the brief.
- ◆ Log books are mandatory and must be submitted to SQA with the project.
- ◆ Candidates may find it useful to use mind maps to focus on how to structure the information in their action plan.
- ◆ Candidate evidence should be in their own words, and referencing of sources is essential. Copying and pasting information is plagiarism.
- ◆ It is inappropriate for candidates to base the project on themselves as this would contain sensitive and confidential information.
- ◆ Centres should support candidates to understand what is required from an evaluation. The evaluation must be produced under controlled conditions and within one hour.

## Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2014	24
------------------------------------	----

Number of resulted entries in 2015	561
------------------------------------	-----

## 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	43.5%	43.5%	244	70
B	19.3%	62.7%	108	60
C	21.6%	84.3%	121	50
D	3.6%	87.9%	20	45
No award	12.1%	-	68	-

The Course assessment functioned as intended, therefore no adjustment to grade boundaries was required.