



Course Report 2018

Subject	Care
Level	National 5

This report provides information on the performance of candidates. 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 Post Results Services.

Section 1: comments on the assessment

Summary of the course assessment

The course consists of two components: a question paper worth 40 marks, and a project worth 80 marks.

Both course components performed as expected.

Component 1 — question paper

The question paper component was introduced in session 2017–18 and is worth 40 marks

Questions differentiated appropriately and allowed A-level candidates to develop their answer for full marks, and C-level candidates to gain marks. Course content was sampled adequately. The weighting for each section is: Values and Principles 20 marks, Social Influences 10 marks and Human Development and Behaviour 10 marks.

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

Component 2 — project

Overall candidates performed well in the 2018 projects. This was the first year of the new project. The marks were reduced from 100 to 80 marks. The sections of action plan, responding to the brief, and evaluation remained the same. There was no change to the choice of briefs. There was a rise in candidates who opted for brief 3, which may be due to the 2020 childcare expansion.

The project has a better balance of the course topics now with the addition of ‘actions taken by society’.

The wording of the new project has been amended to ‘the needs of an individual requiring care’, to clarify the requirement for one individual to be investigated. A statement was added to reiterate that the submission of candidate log books with the projects is mandatory, as in previous years not all centres instructed candidates to submit this.

The project had examples of 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 their chosen brief and individual.

Section 2: comments on candidate performance

Areas in which candidates performed well

Component 1 — question paper

Candidates performed well in questions 1, 8(a) and 9.

Component 2 — 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 a client.

Candidates detailed the tasks and timescale well and the majority referred to their individual in the sources of information section.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Component 1 — question paper

Overall it was a fair paper which candidates completed within the allocated time.

Question 4 and question 11(a) and (b) differentiated well across candidate ability.

Question 10 and question 3 were not attempted by a small number of candidates. Question 10 was based on positive features of the private care sector.

For question 9 the original standards, new standards, or a hybrid answer were accepted for this year only. This is because the new standards were only put in place in April 2018.

Component 2 — project

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 behaviour of the chosen individual. Differentiation was evident from A-C level candidates.
- 2(c) Some candidates described sociological influences rather than concepts. The area of linking the impact to the individual was applied by A-B level candidates but was a challenge for C-level candidates.
- 2(d) Some candidates described life chances in general with no reference to their chosen individual.
- 2(e) Rather than the feature of the positive care environment, some spoke of the care worker eg physiotherapist and their role. Although candidates answered this part better, the link between the care environment and how it met the need of their chosen individual, could be improved. Differentiation was evident from A-C level candidates.

Section 3: advice for the preparation of future candidates

Component 1 — question paper

Candidates should be aware of how to respond to command words, eg describe, explain.

Component 2 — project

Those candidates who chose clients they have worked with during placement or friends or family must be reminded to maintain the confidentiality of the individual.

If a centre distributes a case study for candidates to work from it is important that teachers and lecturers check that it allows the candidates enough scope to develop the project fully and access marks.

The word count is set at 3000-4000 excluding references, footnotes and appendices with a penalty applied if the word count exceeds 4000 words.

All centres should ensure that the current project guidelines are being followed by referring to the *National 5 Care Coursework assessment task* available on the subject page of SQA's website.

Grade boundary and statistical information:

Statistical information: update on courses

Number of resulted entries in 2017	829
Number of resulted entries in 2018	645

Statistical information: performance of candidates

Distribution of course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of course awards	Percentage	Cumulative %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum mark 120				
A	32.9%	32.9%	212	84
B	23.7%	56.6%	153	72
C	21.4%	78.0%	138	60
D	13.8%	91.8%	89	48
No award	8.2%	-	53	-

General commentary on grade boundaries

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.

SQA aims to set examinations and create marking instructions which 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.

Therefore SQA holds a grade boundary meeting every year for each subject at each level to bring 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.

Grade boundaries from exam papers in the same subject at the same level tend to be marginally different year to year. This is because the particular questions, and the mix of questions, are different. This is also the case for exams set by centres. If SQA alters a boundary, this does not mean that centres should necessarily alter their boundary in the corresponding practice exam paper.