

## Principal Assessor Report 2003

**Assessment Panel:**

Environment

**Qualification area**

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

Managing Environmental Resources Intermediate 1 and  
2

### Statistical information: update

	<b>Int 1</b>	<b>Int 2</b>
<b>Number of entries in 2002</b>	9	48
<b>Pre appeal</b>		

<b>Number of entries in 2003</b>	10	47
<b>Pre appeal</b>		

### General comments re entry numbers

--

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

Intermediate 1 (out of 80)		Intermediate 2 (out of 100)	
40	C	52	C
48	B	62	B
56	A	72	A

### **Comments on grade boundaries for each subject area**

Intermediate 1 boundaries remain the same as 2002, reflecting the similar standard of the paper.

Intermediate 2 boundaries were raised by 2 marks from those set in 2002.

## Comments on candidate performance

### General comments

The first questions in each paper were answered well by all candidates: good settling in questions.

Poorer candidates had most difficulty with the biological parts of questions: these were the most discriminating.

Problem solving skills were good.

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

#### Intermediate 1

In the initial map work question, candidates performed well in all aspects of land use.

Q6 – candidates performed well in the extended writing.

Candidates performed well in problem solving, particularly pleasing in the calculation as a percentage increase.

#### Intermediate 2

Bar graph was well drawn, as was the description of a trend. The key was well answered, as was the removal of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere in photosynthesis.

The map question was well answered, as was the global warming interpretation.

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

#### Intermediate 1

Q2: “ Complete a food chain”, some candidates did not add arrows or start with a producer. When naming a piece of legislation, the name of the act must be stated.

Q7: The graph was difficult for some candidates.

Q9: When asked for a difference, both organisms have to be mentioned in the answer. The definition of an ecosystem was not understood by all candidates.

#### Intermediate 2

Q1: Explanation of an indicator species.

Q2: Candidates must answer the difference between two items clearly e.g. by using a comparison.

Q3: A food chain must have arrows.

Q9: Give a possible solution from the list below: Some candidates ignored the list and inserted their own example.

Q10: Some candidates only answered one part of the option questions e.g. Option B part (a) but did not attempt part (b)

## Recommendations

### Feedback to centres

#### Intermediate 1

Centres have to be congratulated on the high standard of performance in the external assessment.

The standard of the problem solving was high – with an improvement in the calculation of a percentage increase. If an organism is mentioned in the contents column of the arrangements document, this organism should be known by the candidate in its appropriate context. A food chain must start with a producer and have arrows between the organisms.

#### Intermediate 2

Centres have to be congratulated on the high standard of performance in the external assessment.

The standard of problem solving was high, including the key. If an organism, source of renewable energy or biological term is mentioned in the contents column of the arrangements document, then they must be known by the candidate. To state a difference in an answer, both parts must be included in the answer. Arrows must be included in a food chain.

A six-figure grid reference posed no difficulty for candidates.

In the extended answer question candidates should attempt all parts of their chosen option.