

Principal Assessor Report 2004

Assessment Panel:

Classical Greek

Qualification area

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

Classical Greek Advanced Higher

Statistical information: update

Number of entries in 2003	0
---------------------------	---

Number of entries in 2004	2
---------------------------	---

Statistical Information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of awards

A - 1
C - 1

Comments on any significant changes in percentages or distribution of awards

No significant change.

Grade boundaries for each subject area included in the report

Distribution of awards	%	Cum %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
A	50	50	1	210
B	-	-	-	180
C	50	100	1	150
D	-	-	-	135
No award	-	-	-	0

General commentary on passmarks and grade boundaries

- While SQA aims to set examinations and create mark schemes which will allow a competent candidate to score a minimum 50% of the available marks (notional passmark) and a very well-prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70%, it is almost impossible to get the standard absolutely on target every year, in every subject and level
- Each year we therefore hold a passmark meeting for each subject at each level where we bring together all the information available (statistical and judgmental). 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 senior management team at SQA
- We adjust the passmark downwards if there is evidence that we have set a slightly more demanding exam than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance
- We adjust the passmark upwards if there is evidence that we have set a slightly less demanding exam than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance
- Where the standard appears to be very similar to previous years, we maintain similar grade boundaries
- 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 are different. This is also the case for exams set in centres. And just because SQA has altered a boundary in a particular year in say Higher Chemistry 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
- Our main aim is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and all levels and maintain standards across the years, even as syllabuses evolve and change

Comments on grade boundaries for each subject area

The grade boundaries were agreed and set at the *a priori* scores for C (50%), B (60%), A (70%). There was no need to make any changes to *a priori* scores.

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

The candidates had both worked hard and achieved their potential. They had both worked hard on their Dissertation, and one was outstandingly good.

Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well

Both the Dissertation and the Interpretation were well done by both. One candidate did outstandingly well in both these areas.

Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty

The candidates performed less well in the Translation paper although the A candidate did well. The verse passages were less well done than the prose.

Recommendations

Feedback to centres

Candidates performed well in Interpretation and Dissertation.

Candidates had worked well on Interpretation texts and had good understanding of the prescribed texts. They made good use of the text in quotation in their answers.

In Dissertation they produced well-researched pieces of work. Candidates should be encouraged to sustain their argument throughout the Dissertation. Translation was weaker than the other two elements, particularly verse passages. More attention should be paid to grammar and syntax.