



# Estimates and Assessment Appeals Workshop

Publication code: BD4257

Published by the Scottish Qualifications Authority  
The Optima Building, 58 Robertson Street, Glasgow G2 8DQ  
Ironmills Road, Dalkeith, Midlothian EH22 1LE

[www.sqa.org.uk](http://www.sqa.org.uk)

*The information in this publication may be reproduced in support of SQA qualifications. If it is reproduced, SQA should be clearly acknowledged as the source. If it is to be used for any other purpose, then written permission must be obtained from the Publishing Team at SQA. It must not be reproduced for trade or commercial purposes.*

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2008



## Task 1

The table below provides information on Appeal rates and success rates at Higher.

On average 10% of entries are appealed for at Higher.

### Discuss.

#### Higher Appeals for Subjects with more than 1000 Entries

Level/Subject	Number of Entries	Number of Appeals	Appeals as a % of Entries	Unsuccessful Appeals as a % of Number of Appeals
Higher Accounting	1458	233	16.0%	64.8%
Higher Administration	2997	331	11.0%	68.3%
Higher Art & Design	6747	689	10.2%	73.7%
Higher Biology	9169	597	6.5%	76.9%
Higher Business Management	5736	1018	17.7%	67.4%
Higher Chemistry	9489	316	3.3%	71.2%
Higher Computing	4177	350	8.4%	76.3%
Higher Drama	2034	289	14.2%	66.4%
Higher English	27750	3136	11.3%	68.1%
Higher French	4573	374	8.2%	82.9%
Higher Geography	7292	1193	16.4%	51.4%
Higher German	1621	221	13.6%	71.0%
Higher Graphic Communication	3489	509	14.6%	26.5%
Higher History	8185	735	9.0%	46.5%
Higher Human Biology	3710	214	5.8%	59.3%
Higher Information Systems	1653	165	10.0%	84.2%
Higher Mathematics	18786	1045	5.6%	70.5%
Higher Modern Studies	7025	897	12.8%	46.3%
Higher Music	4278	213	5.0%	76.1%
Higher Physical Education	4629	534	11.5%	53.6%
Higher Physics	8580	603	7.0%	91.7%
Higher Product Design	2139	499	23.3%	57.7%
Higher Psychology	2597	279	10.7%	62.4%
Higher RMPS	1751	144	8.2%	31.3%
Higher Spanish	1220	74	6.1%	77.0%



## Comments



## Task 2

The feedback forms for this workshop cover subjects of different natures and with different types of Course assessment.

Appendices 1 and 2 provide an analysis of the reasons for Appeals being unsuccessful across subjects at Higher and Advanced Higher. These may prove useful when considering the following questions:

1. Higher English, Mathematics, French, Modern Studies, Chemistry and Business Management are assessed by question papers.

**What were the main reasons identified in your centre's unsuccessful Appeals feedback for these subjects?**



# NATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS 2007



**Feedback to centre: unsuccessful Appeal(s)**

**Centre No**

**Course** English X115

**Level - Higher**

**Candidate Name**

or All unsuccessful candidates

The original assessment decision has not been changed. Factors that have contributed to the decision(s) about the evidence submitted by the centre are indicated below.

**1. Issues relating to the candidate evidence**

The overall attainment of the candidate(s) in the evidence submitted did not justify the estimated grade

**2. Issues relating to the validity of the assessment instrument(s) and/or marking scheme(s)**

**Close Reading      Critical Essay**

- (a) The assessment instrument does not sufficiently replicate the Course assessment
- (b) Level of demand: individual tasks/questions are set at a level too low for the course
- (c) **Overall** level of demand: the particular selection of questions has produced an assessment instrument which is not sufficiently demanding
- (d) A commercially produced paper has been adapted in such a way that the level of demand is too low
- (e) The passages are not sufficiently demanding

**3. Issues relating to the reliability of the assessment instrument(s) and the candidate evidence**

**Close Reading      Critical Essay**

- (a) The commercially produced paper, used in its entirety, is not the current year's (published in or after June 2006)
- (b) The local authority/consortium paper, used in its entirety, is not the current year's (published in or after June 2006)
- (c) Past SQA paper or Specimen Question Paper has been used in its entirety
- (d) Questions have been drawn from too few sources
- Close Reading:**
  - (a) Marking scheme: incorrectly applied – "U" questions
  - (b) Marking scheme: incorrectly applied – "A" and "E" questions
  - (c) Clerical error(s) in addition of marks
- Critical Essay:** Overmarked because assessment did not take sufficient account of:
  - (a) Relevance to question
  - (b) Knowledge and understanding of text(s)
  - (c) Analysis/evaluation of text(s)
  - (d) Technical accuracy

**4. Additional Information**

- (a) Other material submitted in support of the appeal has been taken into account
- (b) The marking of the examination scripts has been reviewed

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

**Worksheet No** \_\_\_\_\_



# NATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS 2007



Feedback to centre: **unsuccessful Appeal(s)**

Centre No

Course Mathematics X100/X102

Level - Higher

Candidate Name

or All unsuccessful candidates

The original assessment decision has not been changed. Factors that have contributed to the decision(s) about the evidence submitted by the centre are indicated below.

## 1. Issues relating to the candidate evidence

The overall attainment of the candidate(s) in the evidence submitted did not justify the estimated grade

## 2. Issues relating to the validity of the assessment instrument(s) and/or marking scheme(s)

- (a) The evidence does not sufficiently replicate the Course assessment
- (b) Sufficiency: knowledge, understanding and skills not adequately sampled
- (c) Sufficiency: no evidence/insufficient evidence from later part of Course (evidence concentrates on early part of Course)
- (d) Sufficiency: evidence does not appropriately sample all units
- (e) Additional evidence covering content not assessed in 'prelim' was: not provided   
not of appropriate standard
- (f) Undue weight in estimating performance has been given to additional evidence (eg short assessment produced later in the Course)
- (g) Level of demand: **individual** tasks/questions set at too low a level for the Course
- (h) The selection of questions includes too many questions assessing the same aspect of the Course
- (i) **Overall** level of demand: the particular selection of questions has produced an assessment instrument where more than 65% of the marks are at grade C or below
- (j) Level of demand: cut-off score(s) are set too low for the standard set in the assessment instrument
- (k) Inappropriate time allocation(s)
- (l) Retention: insufficient tasks/questions requiring knowledge to be retained over an extended period of time
- (m) Integration: insufficient tasks/questions requiring integration across the Course
- (n) The evidence provides the opportunity to demonstrate attainment at grade C only
- (o) Marking Scheme: there is insufficient detail on the allocation of marks   
inappropriate marking scheme



# NATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS 2007



**Feedback to centre: unsuccessful Appeal(s)**

**Centre No**

**Course** French X059

**Level – Higher**

**Candidate Name**

or All unsuccessful candidates

The original assessment decision has not been changed. Factors that have contributed to the decision(s) about the evidence submitted by the centre are indicated below.

**1. Issues relating to the candidate evidence**

The overall attainment of the candidate(s) in the evidence submitted did not justify the estimated grade

**2. Issues relating to the validity of the question–paper component evidence ( assessment instrument(s) and/or marking scheme(s))**

- (a) The evidence does not sufficiently replicate the Course assessment
- (b) Tasks/questions set at too low a level of demand for:
  - Reading Comprehension
  - Translation into English
  - Directed Writing
  - Listening Comprehension
  - Short Essay
- (c) The selection of questions includes too many questions assessing the same aspect of the course
- (d) **Overall** level of demand: the particular selection of questions has produced an assessment instrument which is not sufficiently demanding
- (e) Level of demand: cut-off score(s) are set too low for the standard set in the assessment instrument
- (f) Inappropriate time allocation(s)
- (g) Retention: insufficient tasks/questions requiring knowledge to be retained over an extended period of time
- (h) Marking Scheme: there is insufficient detail on the allocation of marks   
 inappropriate marking scheme

**3. Issues relating to the reliability of the assessment instruments(s) and the candidate evidence for the question–paper component**

- (a) The commercially produced paper, used in its entirety, is not the current year’s (published in or after June 2006)
- (b) The local authority/consortium paper, used in its entirety, is not the current year’s (published in or after June 2006)
- (c) Past SQA paper or Specimen Question Paper has been used in its entirety
- (d) Questions in the assessment have been drawn from too few sources
- (e) A set of questions has been lifted *en bloc* from a past paper or specimen paper
- (f) Ambiguities or technical errors in some questions and/or marking scheme
- (g) Marking scheme: incorrectly applied   
inconsistently applied   
leniently applied in Reading Comprehension questions   
Translation into English  Directed Writing   
Listening Comprehension questions  Short Essay
- (h) Clerical errors in addition of marks in the candidate evidence submitted

**4. Additional Information**

- (a) The marking of the examination script(s) has been reviewed
- (b) The evidence submitted for the question-paper component demonstrated attainment but when combined with the mark for the Speaking assessment did not justify an upgrade on the course award.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

**Worksheet No** \_\_\_\_\_

# NATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS 2007



**Feedback to centre: unsuccessful Appeal(s)**

**Centre No**

**Course** Modern Studies X236

**Level - Higher**

**Candidate Name**

or All unsuccessful candidates

The original assessment decision has not been changed. Factors that have contributed to the decision(s) about the evidence submitted by the centre are indicated below.

## 1. Issues relating to the candidate evidence

The overall attainment of the candidate(s) in the evidence submitted did not justify the estimated grade

## 2. Issues relating to the validity of the assessment instrument(s) and/or marking scheme(s)

- (e) The evidence does not sufficiently replicate the Course assessment
- (f) Sufficiency: no evidence/insufficient evidence from Paper 1 Study Themes
- (g) Sufficiency: insufficient evidence sampling Paper 2
- (h) Undue weight in estimating performance has been given to additional evidence (eg short assessment produced later in the Course)
- (i) **Overall** level of demand: the particular selection of questions has produced an assessment instrument which is not sufficiently demanding because
  - ◆ **Individual** tasks/questions set at too low a level for the Course
  - ◆ The selection of questions includes too many questions assessing the same aspect of the Course
- (j) Level of demand: cut-off score(s) are set too low for the standard set in the assessment instrument
- (k) Inappropriate time allocation(s)
- (l) Retention: the evidence was produced in a split prelim and the level of challenge and demand was not adjusted sufficiently by cut-off scores or other measures
- (m) Marking Scheme: there is insufficient detail on the allocation of marks
  - inappropriate marking scheme for Paper 1
  - inappropriate marking scheme for Paper 2

**3. Issues relating to the reliability of the assessment instruments(s) and the candidate evidence**

- (a) The commercially produced paper, used in its entirety, is not the current year's (published in or after June 2006)
- (b) The local authority/consortium paper, used in its entirety, is not the current year's (published in or after June 2006)
- (c) Past SQA paper or Specimen Question Paper has been used in its entirety
- (d) Questions in the assessment have been drawn from too few sources
- (e) A set of questions has been lifted *en bloc* from a past paper or specimen paper
- (f) Ambiguities or technical errors in some questions and/or marking scheme
- (g) Marking scheme: Paper 1 incorrectly applied 
  - inconsistently applied
  - leniently applied
  - Paper 2 incorrectly applied
  - inconsistently applied
  - leniently applied
- (h) Clerical errors in addition of marks in the candidate evidence submitted

**4. Additional Information**

The marking of the examination script(s) has been reviewed

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

**Worksheet No** \_\_\_\_\_

# NATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS 2007



Feedback to centre: **unsuccessful Appeal(s)**

Centre No

Course Chemistry X012

Level – Higher

Candidate Name

or All unsuccessful candidates

The original assessment decision has not been changed. Factors that have contributed to the decision(s) about the evidence submitted by the centre are indicated below.

## 1. Issues relating to the candidate evidence

The overall attainment of the candidate(s) in the evidence submitted did not justify the estimated grade

## 2. Issues relating to the validity of the assessment instrument(s) and/or marking scheme(s)

- (a) The evidence does not sufficiently replicate the Course assessment
- (b) Sufficiency: Knowledge and Understanding not adequately sampled
- (c) Sufficiency: Problem Solving not adequately sampled
- (d) Sufficiency: no evidence/insufficient evidence from later part of Course (evidence concentrates on early part of Course)
- (e) Sufficiency: no evidence/insufficient evidence from part of Course (evidence concentrates on only part of Course)
- (f) Sufficiency: evidence does not appropriately sample all units
- (g) Undue weight in estimating performance has been given to additional evidence (eg short assessment produced later in the Course)
- (h) Level of demand: **individual** tasks/questions set at too low a level for the Course
- (i) The selection of questions includes too many questions assessing the same aspect of the Course
- (j) **Overall** level of demand: the particular selection of questions has produced an assessment instrument which is not sufficiently demanding
- (k) Level of demand: cut-off score(s) are set too low for the standard set in the assessment instrument
- (l) Inappropriate time allocation(s)
- (m) Retention: insufficient tasks/questions requiring knowledge to be retained over an extended period of time
- (n) Integration: insufficient tasks/questions requiring integration across the Course
- (o) The evidence provides the opportunity to demonstrate attainment at grade C only
- (p) Marking Scheme: there is insufficient detail on the allocation of marks   
inappropriate marking scheme
- (q) Over/Under allocation of marks to one skill eg selecting information from data booklet, formulae, calculations, balancing equations
- (r) Lack of balance of PCs covered by the assessment
- (s) Inadequate assessment of prescribed practical activity
- (t) Insufficient number of marks awarded for questions embedded in an unfamiliar (everyday) context

Continued Over

## 2 Continued

- (u) Additional evidence of Course questions (beyond NAB level) covering content not assessed in the 'prelim' is required for appeals for A or B grades:  
evidence not provided   
not of an appropriate standard
- (v) A high scoring performance in a NAB (or equivalent) covering content not assessed in the 'prelim' may be used as evidence for appeals for grade C:  
evidence not provided

### 3. Issues relating to the reliability of the assessment instruments(s) and the candidate evidence

- (a) The commercially produced paper, used in its entirety, is not the current year's (published in or after June 2006)
- (b) The local authority/consortium paper, used in its entirety, is not the current year's (published in or after June 2006)
- (c) Past SQA paper or Specimen Question Paper has been used in its entirety
- (d) Questions in the assessment have been drawn from too few sources
- (e) A set of questions has been lifted *en bloc* from a past paper or specimen paper
- (f) Ambiguities or technical errors in some questions and/or marking scheme
- (g) Marking scheme: incorrectly applied   
inconsistently applied   
leniently applied
- (h) Clerical errors in addition of marks in the candidate evidence submitted
- (i) Candidate performance in Course questions covering content not assessed in the 'prelim' was not of an appropriate standard for appeals at grades A or B
- (j) Candidate performance in a NAB covering content not assessed in the 'prelim' was not of an appropriate standard for appeals at grade C
- (k) There is no indication of how the evidence was aggregated into an overall estimate
- (l) Too much of the evidence is in the public domain

### 4. Additional Information

The marking of the examination script(s) has been reviewed

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

**Worksheet No** \_\_\_\_\_

# NATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS 2007



**Feedback to centre: unsuccessful Appeal(s)**

**Centre No**

**Course** Business Management X234

**Level – Higher**

**Candidate Name**

or All unsuccessful candidates

The original assessment decision has not been changed. Factors that have contributed to the decision(s) about the evidence submitted by the centre are indicated below.

## 1. Issues relating to the candidate evidence

The overall attainment of the candidate(s) in the evidence submitted did not justify the estimated grade

## 2. Issues relating to the validity of the assessment instrument(s) and/or marking scheme(s)

- (a) The evidence does not sufficiently replicate the Course assessment
- (b) Sufficiency: knowledge, understanding and skills not adequately sampled
- (c) Sufficiency: no evidence/insufficient evidence from part of Course (evidence concentrates on only part of Course)
- (d) Level of demand: **individual** tasks/questions set at too low a level for the Course
- (e) **Overall** level of demand: the particular selection of questions has produced an assessment instrument which is not sufficiently demanding
- (f) Level of demand: cut-off score(s) are set too low for the standard set in the assessment instrument
- (f) Retention: the evidence was produced in a split prelim and the level of challenge and demand was not adjusted sufficiently by cut-off scores or other measures
- (h) Integration: insufficient tasks/questions requiring integration across the Course
- (i) Marking Scheme: there is insufficient detail on the allocation of marks   
inappropriate marking scheme

## 3. Issues relating to the reliability of the assessment instruments(s) and the candidate evidence

- (a) The commercially produced paper, used in its entirety, is not the current year's (published in or after June 2006)
- (b) The local authority/consortium paper, used in its entirety, is not the current year's (published in or after June 2006)
- (c) Past SQA paper or Specimen Question Paper has been used in its entirety
- (d) Questions in the assessment have been drawn from too few sources
- (e) A set of questions has been lifted *en bloc* from a past paper or specimen paper
- (f) Ambiguities or technical errors in some questions and/or marking scheme
- (g) Marking scheme: incorrectly applied   
inconsistently applied   
leniently applied
- (h) Clerical errors in addition of marks in the candidate evidence submitted

**4. Additional Information**

The marking of the examination script(s) has been reviewed

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

**Worksheet No** \_\_\_\_\_

## Comments



## **Task 2**

2. Higher Music, Higher Art and Design, Higher History, Higher Drama and Advanced Higher Geography are assessed by question paper and by coursework which is externally marked.

**What were the main reasons identified in your centre's unsuccessful Appeals feedback for these subjects?**







# NATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS 2007



**Feedback to centre: unsuccessful Appeal(s)**

**Centre No**

**Course** Art and Design X223

**Level - Higher**

**Candidate Name**

or All unsuccessful candidates

The original assessment decision has not been changed. Factors that have contributed to the decision(s) about the evidence submitted by the centre are indicated below.

**1. Issues relating to the candidate evidence**

The overall attainment of the candidate(s) in the evidence submitted did not justify the estimated grade

**2. Issues relating to the validity of the question–paper component evidence ( assessment instrument(s) and/or marking scheme(s))**

- (a) The evidence does not sufficiently replicate the Course assessment
- (b) Sufficiency: no evidence/insufficient evidence from Art Studies  Design Studies
- (c) Level of demand: **individual** tasks/questions set at too low a level for the Course
- (d) **Overall** level of demand: the particular selection of questions has produced an assessment instrument which is not sufficiently demanding
- (e) Marking Scheme: there is insufficient detail on the allocation of marks   
inappropriate marking scheme

**3. Issues relating to the reliability of the assessment instrument(s) and the candidate evidence**

- (a) The local authority/consortium paper, used in its entirety, is not the current year's (published in or after June 2006)
- (b) Past SQA paper or Specimen Question Paper has been used in its entirety
- (c) Questions in the assessment have been drawn from too few sources
- (d) Marking scheme: incorrectly applied   
inconsistently applied   
leniently applied

**4. Additional Information**

- (a) The examination script and the Expressive and Design Activities have been reviewed, and were in line with the grade awarded
- (b) Additional evidence submitted for the Expressive Activity demonstrated attainment but did not justify an upgrade in the Course award
- (c) Additional evidence submitted for the Design Activity demonstrated attainment but did not justify an upgrade in the Course award
- (d) No additional evidence was submitted for the Folio

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

**Worksheet No** \_\_\_\_\_





**3. Issues relating to the reliability of the assessment instruments(s) and the candidate evidence for the question–paper component**

- (a) The commercially produced paper, used in its entirety, is not the current year's (published in or after June 2006)
- (b) The local authority/consortium paper, used in its entirety, is not the current year's (published in or after June 2006)
- (c) Past SQA paper or Specimen Question Paper has been used in its entirety
- (d) Questions in the assessment have been drawn from too few sources
- (e) A set of questions has been lifted *en bloc* from a past paper or specimen paper
- (f) Ambiguities or technical errors in some questions and/or marking scheme
- (g) Marking scheme: Paper 1 incorrectly applied 
  - inconsistently applied
  - leniently applied
  - Paper 2 incorrectly applied
  - inconsistently applied
  - leniently applied
- (h) Clerical errors in addition of marks in the candidate evidence submitted

**4. Additional Information**

- (f) The marking of the examination script(s) has been reviewed
- (g) The marking of the Extended Essay has been reviewed
- (h) The evidence submitted for the question-paper component demonstrated attainment but when combined with the mark for the Extended Essay did not justify an upgrade on the course award.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

**Worksheet No** \_\_\_\_\_



**4. Additional Information**

- (i) The marking of the examination script(s) has been reviewed
- (j) The Practical Examination has been reviewed
- (k) The evidence submitted for the Question Paper component demonstrated attainment but when combined with the mark for the Practical Examination did not justify an upgrade on the Course award.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

**Worksheet No** \_\_\_\_\_

# NATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS 2007



Feedback to centre: unsuccessful Appeal(s)

Centre No

Course Geography X208

Level – Advanced Higher

Candidate Name

or All unsuccessful candidates

The original assessment decision has not been changed. Factors that have contributed to the decision(s) about the evidence submitted by the centre are indicated below.

## 1. Issues relating to the candidate evidence

The overall attainment of the candidate(s) in the evidence submitted did not justify the estimated grade

## 2. Issues relating to the validity of the question–paper component evidence ( assessment instrument(s) and/or marking scheme(s))

- (a) The evidence does not sufficiently replicate the Course assessment
- (b) Sufficiency: knowledge, understanding and skills not adequately sampled
- (c) Sufficiency: no evidence/insufficient evidence from part of Course (evidence concentrates on only part of Course)
- (d) Undue weight in estimating performance has been given to additional evidence (eg short assessment produced later in the Course)
- (e) Level of demand: **individual** tasks/questions set at too low a level for the Course
- (f) **Overall** level of demand: the particular selection of questions has produced an assessment instrument which is not sufficiently demanding
- (g) Level of demand: cut-off score(s) are set too low for the standard set in the assessment instrument
- (h) Inappropriate time allocation(s)
- (i) Retention: the evidence was produced in a split prelim and the level of challenge and demand was not adjusted sufficiently by cut-off scores or other measures
- (j) The evidence provides the opportunity to demonstrate attainment at:
  - grade C only
  - grade C and grade B
- (k) Marking Scheme: there is insufficient detail on the allocation of marks 
  - inappropriate marking scheme

## 3. Issues relating to the reliability of the assessment instruments(s) and the candidate evidence for the question–paper component

- (a) Past SQA paper or Specimen Question Paper has been used in its entirety
- (b) Questions in the assessment have been drawn from too few sources
- (c) A set of questions has been lifted *en bloc* from a past paper or specimen paper
- (d) Ambiguities or technical errors in some questions and/or marking scheme
- (e) Marking scheme: incorrectly applied 
  - inconsistently applied
  - leniently applied
- (f) Clerical errors in addition of marks in the candidate evidence submitted

**4. Additional Information**

- (l) The marking of the examination script(s) has been reviewed
- (m) The marking of the Folio has been reviewed
- (n) The evidence submitted for the question-paper component demonstrated attainment but when combined with the mark for the Folio did not justify an upgrade on the course award.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

**Worksheet No** \_\_\_\_\_

## Comments



### **Task 3**

Identify areas where current practice in estimating, reviewing results and making decisions on Appeals can be improved within your centre.

#### **Comments**



## Appendix 1

Level/Subject	Validity	Reliability	Validity & Reliability	Estimate	Coursework
Higher Accounting	62.3%	19.9%	17.2%	0.7%	
Higher Administration	52.2%	23.0%	24.8%	0.0	
Higher Art and Design	14.2%	0.0	0.4%	85.4%	
Higher Biology	39.2%	23.1%	34.6%	3.1%	
Higher Business Management	55.8%	15.2%	28.7%	0.3%	
Higher Chemistry	42.7%	8.9%	9.3%	39.1%	
Higher Computing	49.1%	5.6%	43.8%	1.5%	
Higher Drama	6.3%	38.0%	5.7%	41.1%	8.9%
Higher English	5.9%	60.4%	13.0%	20.8%	
Higher French	9.4%	74.2%	8.4%	5.5%	0.0
Higher Geography	60.0%	7.8%	30.0%	2.1%	
Higher German	3.2%	67.5%	22.3%	7.0%	2.5%
Higher Graphic Communication	38.5%	28.1%	23.7%	0.0	9.6%
Higher History	34.8%	36.8%	1.2%	18.7%	8.5%
Higher Human Biology	32.3%	7.9%	6.3%	53.5%	
Higher Information Systems	63.3%	20.9%	11.5%	4.3%	0.0
Higher Mathematics	92.8%	0.9%	3.8%	2.4%	
Higher Modern Studies	35.4%	44.6%	11.6%	8.4%	
Higher Music	61.1%	7.4%	9.9%	15.4%	6.2%
Higher Physical Education	19.6%	60.5%	14.3%	5.6%	
Higher Physics	39.1%	7.8%	37.3%	15.9%	
Higher Product Design	21.2%	44.1%	14.9%	8.0%	11.8%
Higher Psychology	60.3%	9.8%	12.1%	14.9%	2.9%
Higher RMPS	15.6%	33.3%	22.2%	28.9%	
Higher Spanish	22.8%	64.9%	1.8%	12.3%	0.0



## Appendix 2

Level/Subject	Validity	Reliability	Validity & Reliability	Estimate	Coursework
AH Applied Mathematics	66.7%	0.0	0.0	33.3%	
AH Art and Design: Design	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100%
AH Art and Design: Expressive	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100%
AH Biology	25.0%	25.9%	44.4%	4.6%	0.0
AH Business Management	30.6%	22.2%	47.2%	0.0	0.0
AH Chemistry	39.0%	2.6%	32.5%	18.2%	7.8%
AH Computing	45.5%	22.7%	31.8%	0.0	0.0
AH Drama	8.8%	29.4%	26.5%	35.3%	0.0
AH English	7.4%	1.1%	1.7%	54.9%	34.9%
AH French	11.5%	54.1%	9.8%	21.3%	3.3%
AH Geography	9.0%	24.7%	7.9%	22.5%	36.0%
AH German	90.0%	0.0	0.0	10.0%	0.0
AH Graphic Communication	15.4%	34.6%	34.6%	15.4%	0.0
AH History	21.8%	43.7%	19.3%	4.2%	10.9%
AH Mathematics: 1, 2 and 3	92.3%	1.4%	2.8%	3.5%	0.0
AH Modern Studies	17.9%	35.9%	7.7%	5.1%	33.3%
AH Music	25.8%	29.0%	25.8%	3.2%	16.1%
AH Physics	32.4%	20.3%	24.3%	5.4%	17.6%
AH RMPS	0.0	60.0%	0.0	10.0%	30.0%
AH Spanish	0.0	62.5%	31.3%	0.0	6.3%

