

## Principal Assessor Report 2002

**Assessment Panel:**

**Gaelic**

**Qualification area**

**Subject(s) and Level(s)  
included in this report**

**Gaidhlig      Intermediate 1**

## Statistical information: update

<b>Number of entries in 2001</b>	0
<b>Pre appeal</b>	
<b>Post appeal</b>	

<b>Number of entries in 2002</b>	7
<b>Pre appeal</b>	
<b>Post appeal</b>	

### General comments re entry numbers

This was the first year in which candidates undertook the course assessment at this level. All seven candidates were from one centre. The low number of candidates achieving grades 5 or 6 at Standard Grade in recent years had suggested that there would be few candidates at Intermediate 1. However, the continuing rise in the number of candidates being presented at Standard Grade will probably lead to an increase in the number of candidates being presented at Intermediate 1 level in future.

### General comments

Since this was the first year of assessment at this level no comparison can be made in relation to previous years. The candidates appeared to be presented at the appropriate level.

## Grade boundaries at C, B and A for each subject area included in the report

Max Mark	100
A	70
B	60
C	50

### General commentary on grade boundaries

*Notional percentage cut-offs for each grade*

Question papers and their associated marking schemes are designed to be of the required standard and to meet the assessment specification for the subject/level concerned.

For National courses the examination paper(s) are set in order that a score of approximately 50% of the total marks for all components merits a grade C (based on the grade descriptions for that grade), and similarly a score of 70 % for a grade A. The lowest mark for a grade B is set by the computer software as half way between the C and A grade boundaries.

### Comments on grade boundaries for each subject area

Candidate performance indicated that papers had been set at an appropriate standard therefore the “a priori” grade boundaries of 50%, 60% and 70% were suitable.

## Comments on candidate performance

### General comments

Candidates performed quite well in all aspects of the examinations. There were no obvious areas which presented particular difficulties. One candidate performed significantly poorer than the rest.

### Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well

Six of the seven candidates who were presented performed very well. All the candidates were from one centre.

#### Reading

Candidates appeared to find the passages quite accessible and they had no great problem with most of the questions. Earrann B was more challenging than Earrann A in terms of difficulty of vocabulary and idiom. However, the best candidates achieved very good marks in the reading.

#### Listening

The passages were quite difficult but it was felt that the questions were phrased in such a way that they actually assisted pupils in understanding the passages. Most of the questions only required brief responses and candidates were able to cope with them quite well.

### Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty

There were few specific areas in which candidates had difficulty. Questions which caused difficulty for some candidates in the Reading included: Earrann A questions 5 and 6 (in which candidates tended to give insufficient information) and Earrann B; question 6 (which elicited a variety of responses). In the listening, Earrann B question 2 had the potential to cause some confusion because the question specified '....ag ithe ....' but part of the answer included '*Bovril*' and 'bainne'.

## **Recommendations**

### **Feedback to centres**

This was the first occasion on which we had candidates presented at this level. Seven candidates were presented. They were all presented by one centre. It was felt that the course and examinations were appropriate for these candidates and most of them performed very well. Presenting candidates at the most appropriate level for themselves is to be encouraged.

### **Feedback to centres from Senior Moderator, on Talk**

Candidates' performance was generally very good.

It is recommended that the following feedback be relayed to centres:

- Interviews/talks should not exceed the times specified
- Teachers should not intervene except when necessary
- On some tapes there was evidence of reading
- Teachers should identify candidates, and, if possible submit a separate tape for each candidate – if this is not possible, a gap should be left between candidates' performances.

The attention of centres should be drawn to the rule regarding the reading of scripts and the use of notes.