External Assessment Report 2015

Subject(s)	Health and Safety in a Care Setting
Level(s)	Intermediate 2

The statistics used in this report are prior to the outcome of any Post Results Services requests

This report provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers/lecturers 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 question papers and marking instructions for the examination.

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

The majority of submissions were very good with 180 entries this session. All five centres used e-portfolios on CLASS, which allowed markers to capture individual contributions more readily as the wiki and blogs highlighted all individual work.

Overall, candidates answered the Project briefs well and the standard across all sections was consistently high.

Areas in which candidates performed well

Component 1: Project

♦ Plans were much better this year, with no candidates writing in past tense.
♦ In one centre, web links were copied and pasted, with no attempt to interpret material into their own words, and with significant plagiarism in some submissions. Candidates should be reminded that evidence must be in their own words and referencing of sources is essential. It is also important to note that any images uploaded should not be breaching copyright.
♦ Overall, candidates' referencing has improved. Most information collated was web-based, with little reference to other mediums.
♦ The evaluation stage was conducted under invigilated conditions as per the PBNC Arrangement Document.
♦ Group participation was clearly signposted and there was a marked improvement in candidates' evidence of how the team worked.
♦ Contributions submitted via CLASS were traceable and highlighted the importance of Blogging between group members and the lecturer.
♦ Overall, the Development stage was well done, focused and concise.
♦ Some candidates performed well in the Evaluation section, and the better projects linked research clearly to the project brief.
♦ There was evidence from all centres of candidates referencing their work.

Brief 1:   The majority of candidates submitted accurate and innovative care plans.

Brief 2:   The majority of visual displays for the service user were very appropriate and would be easy for a client to understand. There were fewer candidates who chose this brief.

Brief 3:   The information leaflets and fact sheets were well structured and aimed at the appropriate level. Advice on the child's diet was vibrant, creative and accurate, and displayed well.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Brief 1:   Several candidates did not give enough detail of the individual to constitute an accurate care plan, and some candidates gave detailed information but not in a care plan format. Advice on diet was focused on obesity and not always related to all the clients' needs. Some candidates discussed *suitable* diets but did not explain or define what this would entail.

Brief 2:   Advice on diet for during illness and then recovery was mostly combined, and not always specific to needs.

Brief 3:   A number of candidates used American websites about chickenpox vaccination. On some occasions, the information for parents/ carers and nursery staff had little demarcation.

The timescale should include detail of what the candidate plans to do — not just dates without explanation.

Some evaluations only stated what the candidate did during the project rather than evaluating the process.

Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2014	248

Number of resulted entries in 2015	180

Statistical information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark - 200				
A	53.3%	53.3%	96	140
B	31.1%	84.4%	56	120
C	13.3%	97.8%	24	100
D	0.6%	98.3%	1	90
No award	1.7%	-	3	-

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

General commentary on grade boundaries

♦ While SQA aims to set examinations and create marking instructions which will allow a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional C boundary) and 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.

♦ Each year, SQA therefore holds a grade boundary meeting for each subject at each level where it brings together all the information available (statistical and judgemental). The Principal Assessor and SQA Qualifications Manager meet with the relevant SQA Business Manager and Statistician to discuss the evidence and make decisions. The meetings are chaired by members of the management team at SQA.

♦ The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the exam is more challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.

♦ The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the exam is less challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.

♦ Where standards are comparable to previous years, similar grade boundaries are maintained.

♦ An exam paper at a particular level in a subject in one year tends to have a marginally different set of grade boundaries from exam papers in that subject at that level in other years. This is because the particular questions, and the mix of questions, are different. This is also the case for exams set in centres. If SQA has already altered a boundary in a particular year in, say, Higher Chemistry, this does not mean that centres should necessarily alter boundaries in their prelim exam in Higher Chemistry. The two are not that closely related, as they do not contain identical questions.

♦ 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.