



External Assessment Report 2015

Subject(s)	Music
Level(s)	Intermediate 1 and 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

In this final year of Intermediate examinations it is not surprising that presentation decreased as centres transferred to the new National 4 and 5 Qualifications. There were a total of 50 candidate entries — one at Intermediate 1 level and 49 at Intermediate 2 — and presentation was spread across 14 centres.

The award of Upper A at Intermediate 2 Music, with over 16% of candidates gaining this grade, was the highest percentage for four years. The Lower A award also reflected this four-year peak, with nearly 50% of candidates reaching this level.

At Intermediate 2 level a remarkable level of consistency was again evident, with 98% of candidates gaining a pass from A – C. This percentage figure has been well above 90% over the past four years and reflects not only a very stable question paper but also the highly professional application of Performance marking criteria by Visiting Assessors across the country.

The question papers at both Intermediate 1 and 2 again seemed to hold no surprises for candidates. Centres are making full use of the SQA past papers in the public domain (and the corresponding marking instructions on the SQA website) when preparing their candidates for the external exam.

Areas in which candidates performed well

In the Performance component candidates were generally well prepared for the experience, including the sampling of performances.

The familiarity with the question paper layout and its consistency in successive years has resulted in robust performance in this component.

Areas which candidates found demanding

In Intermediate 2, questions requiring candidates to supply an answer proved to be a challenge, eg Question 1(d).

In Question 6 columns with *common to both* answers were not done well. Some candidates also struggled to supply the Italian term required in Question 8.

Intermediate 1

Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2014	100
------------------------------------	-----

Number of resulted entries in 2015	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 - 100				
A	100.0%	100.0%	1	70
B	0.0%	100.0%	0	60
C	0.0%	100.0%	0	50
D	0.0%	100.0%	0	45
No award	0.0%	-	0	-

Intermediate 2

Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2014	1479
------------------------------------	------

Number of resulted entries in 2015	49
------------------------------------	----

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	63.3%	63.3%	31	70
B	18.4%	81.6%	9	60
C	16.3%	98.0%	8	50
D	0.0%	98.0%	0	45
No award	2.0%	-	1	-

Intermediate 1 and Intermediate 2

For this Course, grade boundaries have been stable for a number of years and the intention was to set similar grade boundaries to previous years. 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.