



## External Assessment Report 2009

---

<b>Subject</b>	Latin
<b>Level</b>	Intermediate 1

**The statistics used in this report are pre-appeal.**

**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

There was one candidate, whose performance was of a very high quality. It would be gratifying to see more candidates being presented at this level.

## Areas in which candidates performed well

### *Interpretation:*

The candidate was clearly very well prepared and gave very mature and thoughtful answers. The answers to the Ovid questions showed strong engagement with the “human interest” aspect within the story.

### *Translation:*

The candidate demonstrated highly developed skills of translation for this level. The standard of English was also very high

## Areas which candidates found demanding

### *Interpretation:*

None.

### *Translation:*

There was some confusion between the perfect and pluperfect tenses, with a tendency to make perfect verbs pluperfect.

## Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

Centres should perhaps consider presenting candidates at this level, rather than having them presented at the wrong level at Intermediate 2.

## Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2008	-
------------------------------------	---

Number of resulted entries in 2009	1
------------------------------------	---

## Statistical information: Performance of candidates

### Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark - 60				
A	100.0%	100.0%	1	42
B	0.0%	100.0%	0	36
C	0.0%	100.0%	0	30
D	0.0%	100.0%	0	27
No award	0.0%	100.0%	0	-

## 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 all the available information is brought together (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 Higher Chemistry for example, this does not mean that centres should necessarily alter boundaries in their prelim exam in Higher Chemistry. The two are not particularly closely related as they do not contain identical questions.
- SQA's main aim is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and levels, and maintain comparable standards across the years, even as arrangements evolve and change.