

Research and Information Services

MONITORING STANDARDS REPORT



Comparison of Biology Standard Grade 2006 and 1998

Summary of findings

This Monitoring Standards report compared Standard Grade Biology from 2006 and 1998. Credit and General levels were considered in relation to four areas: the level of demand of the arrangements, examination questions, examination marking and the grading of the candidates' performance. Knowledge and Understanding (KU) and Problem Solving (PS) elements were dealt with separately and in detail; Practical Ability (PA) was only considered in relation to the final award.

Syllabus

The Arrangements, with regards to KU and PS in 2006, were no more demanding than in 1998. However, the weighting of PA in 2006 was reduced compared to 1998.

Examination papers

Despite some minor differences in the types of examination questions, there was little evidence to suggest that this affected the overall demand of the examination questions set in 2006 and 1998.

Examination marking

The level of demand set by the marking instructions was comparable in 2006 and 1998.

Candidate performance

Candidates with the same grades for each KU and PS Element in 2006 showed comparable performance to candidates with these grades in 1998. The Panel did not identify any specific strengths or weaknesses in either set of scripts.

1 Introduction

Standard Grade Biology entries have increased slightly from 22,055 (35.6% of the cohort) in 1998 to 23,200 (36.1% of the cohort) in 2006 with the majority of candidates being from S4 (99% in 2006, 98.3% in 1998). There has been no significant change in the proportion of candidates gaining an award at Credit or General level: 52% were awarded Credit and 35% were awarded General level awards in 2006, whilst in 1998 the corresponding figures were 56% at Credit level and 37% at General level.

The panel reported that in comparison to 1998, there was an overall increase in the number of boys now taking Biology, though statistics show the numbers fluctuate from year to year. The increase in attractiveness could possibly be as a consequence of greater media coverage relating to Biotechnology and Molecular Biology.

A move towards greater access to materials on the SQA website, eg past papers with examination answers, has enabled teaching staff to develop greater expertise and appreciation of teaching towards the requirements for Standard Grade exams. Interactive resources are now more widely available, and more widely employed by candidates in school and at home than they were in 1998.

Of the four SQA appointees involved in setting Standard Grade Biology in 1998, two were still involved in 2006. Despite a few changes, this provides some degree of continuity between the two years being assessed.

2 Level of demand of arrangements

(See Appendix 1: Comparison of Arrangements for 2006 and 1998)

2.1 Breadth

2.1.1 KU and PS arrangements

These were considered separately by the panel and it was concluded that the breadth of the arrangements in 2006 was no more demanding than in 1998 and the elements remained the same between the 2 years, with no additions, omissions or changes.

2.1.2 PA arrangements

This was the only section with any changes — these are summarised in Appendix 1. In Section 4: Assessment for Certification, the weighting and calculation of the PA element was modified. In 1998 the weighting was KU 1: PS 1: PA 1, whilst in 2006 it was KU2: PS 2: PA 1. This probably results in awards more realistically reflecting the ability of the candidate, however it may disadvantage a minority of weaker candidates by lowering their final award. This would be most applicable to candidates with a lower KU and PS element grade (3, 4 or 5) and a higher PA element grade (1 or 2) (see section 5).

2.2 Depth

The Panel considered the KU and PS elements separately.

As there were no changes to the Arrangements, we can report that the amount of detail and depth, and the emphasis on integration of skills and content in the separate Elements in 2006 was no more demanding than in 1998

In summary, the level of arrangements with regards to KU and PS in 2006 were no more demanding than those in 1998, however the change in weighting of PA in 2006 may affect a vary small minority of candidates.

3 Level of demand of examination questions

The structure of the total assessment task was identical in 1998 and 2006. This comprised one written paper of 90 minutes at both Credit and General levels: the Credit paper consisted of 40 marks KU element and 40 marks PS element; the General paper consisted of 50 marks KU element and 50 marks PS element. All questions were compulsory in both papers.

The following appendices identify, and allow comparison of, questions which assess the same learning outcomes and problem solving elements in 2006 and 1998.

- ◆ Appendix 2: Mapping tables for Credit Papers in 2006 and 1998
- ◆ Appendix 3: Questions testing the same learning outcomes: Credit
- ◆ Appendix 4: Mapping tables for General Papers in 2006 and 1998
- ◆ Appendix 5: Questions testing the same learning outcomes: General
- ◆ Appendix 6: Credit and General KU mark allocation in 2006 and 1998.
- ◆ Appendix 7: Credit and General PS mark allocation in 2006 and 1998

3.1 Differences in the questions

3.1.1 Credit KU Element

Questions relating to similar learning outcomes were identified (Appendix 2) and used to compare the demand over the two years. These questions represented 13/40 marks in 2006 paper and 12/40 marks in 1998 paper (Appendix 3). The variation in the type of questions set each year for a specific learning outcome often made it difficult to allow a direct comparison. However, the panel identified a few questions in 2006 paper which made more demand to gain a similar number of marks than in the 1998 paper. The two papers covered a range of styles and structures of questions with similar coverage of the syllabus. The allocation and balance of marks for each topic area varies slightly: 1998 shows less distinction between the topics compared to 2006. The two papers are representative of the syllabus and the mark allocations are within acceptable ranges in both years (Appendix 6).

On the whole, the balance of the papers resulted in the KU element questions in 2006 being as demanding, if not slightly more demanding, than those in 1998.

3.1.2 General KU Element

Questions relating to similar learning outcomes were identified (Appendix 4) and used to compare demand over the two years. These questions represented 18/50 marks in 2006 paper and 17/50 marks in 1998 paper (Appendix 5). The Panel identified some questions which were more demanding in 1998 than 2006, and visa versa. Both papers covered a range of styles and structures of questions, with a comparable coverage of the syllabus in both years. The allocation and balance of marks for each topic area is quite closely matched: it is representative of the syllabus and is within acceptable ranges in both years (Appendix 6)

Overall, the papers were considered to be balanced and the questions set in 2006 were as demanding as those examining KU in 1998.

3.1.3 Credit PS Element

Questions were set based on the range of assessment instruments, and included selecting information, presenting information, calculations, experimental procedures, conclusions and predictions. Appendix 2

demonstrates the comparable questions set in both 2006 and 1998, and illustrates a similar wide coverage of the syllabus. Appendix 7 ‘PS Mark allocation in 1998 and 2006’, shows the allocation of marks to each assessment instrument. The Panel noted a difference between allocation to ‘selecting information’ and ‘presenting information’ over the two years. However, if this is totalled to assess ‘handling information’, the allocation of marks is balanced between 1998 and 2006.

In general, there was a good balance between the papers and the question set to assess PS abilities in 2006 were of a similar level of demand to those in 1998.

3.1.4 General PS Element

Papers from both 1998 and 2006 used a range of assessment instruments, including selecting information, presenting information, calculations, experimental procedures, conclusions and predictions (Appendix 4). The questions set in both 1998 and 2006 resulted in similar wide coverage of the syllabus. One difference that the panel felt worthy of comment was that in the Experimental Procedures instrument to test ‘validity’ there were examples in the 1998 paper (4 marks), but there were no such examples in the 2006 paper. Those set in the 1998 paper were straightforward examples, and we recommend that in future an attempt is made to cover all assessment instruments.

Presenting information instruments — involving line graphs and bar charts — have changed significantly from 1998 to 2006. In 1998, questions involved extensive construction of graphs and charts where candidates were expected to shade bars and add both axes on graphs. This has been simplified in 2006, where candidates receive specific instructions and allocation of marks for completion of graphs, and are given at least one axis already completed. This change in style of assessment at General level has been introduced to help differentiate it from the grade related criteria for Credit level.

Appendix 7 shows PS Mark allocation in 2006 and 1998, and illustrates that a higher proportion of marks were allocated to ‘conclusions’ in 2006 (16 marks) than in 1998 (8 marks). This was balanced by a lower mark allocation in ‘selecting information’ and ‘experimental procedures’ in 2006.

Taken as a whole, there was a good balance between the questions set in the papers to assess PS abilities, which in 2006 were of a similar level of demand to those set in 1998.

3.1.5 Boundary marks and distribution of grades achieved

Also see:

- ◆ Appendix 8: Grade Boundaries in 2006 and 1998
- ◆ Appendix 9: Distribution of Grades Achieved in 2006 and 1998

Credit Awards

Appendix 8 details the boundary marks set, and demonstrates that for Credit grade 1 and 2 the boundaries were set higher in 1998 for KU than in 2006. PS boundary marks in 1998 and 2006 for grades 1 and 2 were identical. This may reflect the observation (section 3.1) that some of the KU elements in the 2006 Credit paper were more demanding than the 1998 paper.

Appendix 9 details the distribution of grades achieved in the Elements and final award. There would appear to be a slight overall decrease in Credit awards in 2006 (52%), but with a higher proportion of grade 1 when compared to 1998 (56%). The higher percentage of grade 1 awards in 2006 may be as a consequence of the lower boundary score in KU; however other factors, such as the distribution of marks across the whole range from 0 to 40, and the effect of the change in assessment weighting of PA, would have to be considered to substantiate this.

General Awards

Appendices 8 and 9 detail similar information for General grades. Grade boundaries at Grades 3, 4 and 5 for KU and PS elements are all lower in 2006 compared to 1998, however the distribution of candidates attaining these grades remains fairly constant from 2006 (43%) to 1998 (42%).

In summary, the panel concluded that although there were minor differences in the types of examination questions, there was little evidence to suggest that this affected the overall demand of the examination questions set in 2006 and 1998.

4 Level of demand of examination marking

4.1 Marking instructions

The format of the marking instructions shows consistency from 1998 to 2006, though the column detailing specific negating answers has been removed from 2006 instructions and has been incorporated into the 'Additional Marking Notes' in the generic part of the document.

4.1.1 Credit Paper marking instructions

Marking instructions for KU and PS elements were considered separately for 1998 and 2006. The panel concluded that instructions given in the two years were comparable, with similar numbers of marks being allocated for the same depth of answers. The numbers of examples of acceptable and unacceptable answers given was comparable for similar types of questions.

4.1.2 General Paper marking instructions

The same process was carried out for the KU and PS elements and similar conclusions were drawn to those for the Credit papers.

The panel concludes that the level of demand set by the marking instructions was comparable in 2006 and 1998.

5 Grading of candidates' performances

The script selection criteria noted in the 'Methodology for Monitoring Standard Grade over time, 2007' differed for the two years: 2006 scripts were as close as possible to the grade boundary mark, whilst in 1998 they had a mark nearer the middle of the grade. The selection of the fifteen scripts for each year has proven problematic for the panel, since the selector was unable to provide scripts which were straight 3s, 4s or 5s in KU and PS elements as well as in the overall awards. This is as a consequence of the archiving process of scripts for each year.

See Appendix 10: Script Marks Summary

5.1 Performance at the same grades in 2006 and 1998

5.1.1 Credit Awards

Appendix 10 summarises the marks for each element and the final grade awarded for the 15 candidates considered. The consideration of Grade 1 and 2 scripts was straight forward as all had the same grade in KU, PS and overall grade awarded.

2006 candidate 3: marks were on boundary for PS, and the panel was of the opinion that two marks had been awarded which were not justified. As a consequence of these marking errors the candidate has been awarded grade 1 in the PS element which probably more closely reflects a grade 2, but with no change in the overall award of grade 1.

1998 candidate 5: marks were on the boundary for KU and PS; awarded 1 mark in each of KU and PS, which the panel deemed were not justified. As a result of marking errors, this candidate has gained grade 2 in both KU and PS elements, but probably more closely reflects a high scoring grade 3. When PA was taken into account, this had no overall effect on the award of grade 2.

With the exception of these two candidates, the panel can report that the Grade 1 candidates in 2006 show comparable performance in KU and PS elements and final award to those granted grade 1 in 1998. This observation also applies to grade 2 awards across the two years.

5.1.2 General Awards

Appendix 10 illustrates the problem encountered in relation to script selection when comparing the candidates' performances over the two years at grades 3, 4 and 5. For grades 3 and 5, only one candidate out of 12 had the same element grades for KU and PS, whilst the remaining 11 had

different grades at KU and PS. The grade 4 candidates all had KU and PS elements at grade 4, however three candidates were awarded overall grade 3 and the remaining three candidates were awarded grade 4. This led to a different approach in the consideration of grades 3, 4 and 5: all candidates who received grade 4 KU were compared (four from 2006 with six from 1998), then grade 4 PS were compared (six from 2006 with six from 1998). The remaining few candidates for elements at grades 3 and 5 were then compared to the scripts at grade 4.

Grade 4 scripts

In 1998 the six KU scripts considered were nearer the middle of the grade boundary, whereas the four KU 2006 scripts considered were on and just above the grade boundary. The candidates' answers reflected the difference in overall marks, but it was agreed that they were all of grade 4 level, and that they were comparable across the two years.

In 1998 the six PS scripts considered were near to the middle of the grade boundary, as were the six 2006 PS scripts considered. The grade boundary was lower in 2006, which was considered to be due to more demanding examination questions (see 3.1). Appendix 7 shows that fewer marks were allocated to 'selecting information' in 2006 (15 marks) compared to 1998 (22 marks). In 1998, 8 marks were allocated to 'conclusions', whilst this allocation was 16 marks in 2006. In 2006, most of the candidates were giving the wrong answers to these 'conclusions' questions.

Making allowances for distribution of question types, we concluded that the scripts graded 4 in PS in 2006 would have attained grade 4 in PS in 1998.

Grades 3 and 5 scripts

As so few scripts were straight 3 or 5 in KU, PS and award, it was difficult to formulate a significant conclusion. Relative to the grade 4 scripts, the grade 3 were of a higher standard and the grade 5 of a lower standard.

Effect of Change in PA Weighting between 2006 and 1998

Based on the elements obtained and the new weighting for PA, out of the fifteen scripts provided, only one candidate would have been awarded a different grade in 2006 — 1998 Candidate 11 was awarded grade 3, but in 2006 would have been awarded grade 4. We observed that the PA grades awarded in 2006 were more closely related to the KU, PS and grade award than they were in 1998. Of the 15 candidates at all grades in 1998, the lowest PA element was 3 compared to 5 in 2006.

5.2 Specific weaknesses and strengths in 1998 and 2006 scripts

The team concluded that there was no difference in specific weaknesses or strengths in KU or PS elements of Credit and General scripts when comparing those from 2006 with those of a similar level in 1998.

In summary, for all elements and grades, it was considered that candidates with the same grades for each KU and PS Element in 2006 showed comparable performance to candidates with these grades in 1998. The panel did not identify any specific strengths or weaknesses in 2006 or 1998 scripts.

Appendix 1: Comparison of Arrangements for 2006 and 1998

Section	Sub-section	1998	2006
1 Course rationale		No changes	
2 Objectives		No changes	
3 Course Content		No changes	
4 Assessment for Certification	4 1 Certification	Weighting KU1: PS1: PA1	Weighting KU2: PS2: PA1
	4 2 Assessment Schemes	No change	
	4 3 External assessment	No change	
	4 4 Grade 7 and no overall award	No change	
	4 5 (1998) 4 5 - 4 12 (2006) Internal Assessment	<p>Investigative skills identified by TAPS listed under 4 headings (G, E, Ev and RR)</p> <p>14 Investigative Skills objectives</p> <p>Investigation booklet (TAPS) provides eg of acceptable structure</p> <p>Final mark= mean 2 best investigations /25</p> <p>Weighting of marks /25 G 4; E 10; Ev 3; RR 8</p> <p>Final PA grade: Carrying out Techniques + Design and Carry out investigations have equal weighting</p>	<p>Investigative skills listed under 4 headings (G, E, Ev and RR) (TAPS not listed) 1 of which must include a continuous variable</p> <p>13 Investigative Skills objectives (RR3 + 4 combined)</p> <p>SQA Investigation booklet must be used for assessment purposes</p> <p>Final mark= sum 2 best investigations /48</p> <p>Weighting of marks / 24 G 5; E 7; Ev 2; RR10</p> <p>Final PA grade: Carrying out techniques has twice weighting of Designing and carrying out investigations</p>
Grade Related Criteria		No changes	

Appendix 2: Mapping tables for Credit Papers in 2006 and 1998

2006 Credit									
Qu	KU		PS						
	LO	Mark	Select Info	Present Info	Calc	Ex Proc	Conclusion	Predict	Mark
1ai			line graph						1
aia			line graph						1
aiii			line graph						1
bi							relationship		2
bii	1.12	2							
biii				line graph					1
ci	7.9	1							
cii	1.2	1							
2ai			table						1
aia				table					2
aiii							conclusion		1
aiv					other				1
av				line graph					2
b	2.3(G)	1							
c	2.4	2							
3a	2.5	2							
b	2.7	2							
4a	3.9	1							
b	3.11(G)	1							
c	3.11	1							
5ai	3.4	1							
aia	3.4	1							
b	3.4	1							
ci			table						1
cii			table						1
ciii					ratio				1
di			line graph						1
dii					%				1
6ai							conclusion		2
aia	3.17	1				error			1
aiii									
bi	3.18	1				validity			1
bii	3.18(G)	1							
7a					%				1
bi	4.6(G)	1							
bii	4.6	1							
c						validity			1
8a	4.10(G)	1							
b	4.9	1							
9			text						5
10a	5.19	2							
bi			line graph						1
bii							conclusion		1
biii							reliability		1
11a	6.11/6.12	2							
b	6.11	1							
12ai	6.8	2							
aia							conclusion		1
aiii	6.3	1							
b	6.8	1							
13ai							conclusion		1
aia							conclusion		1
aiii						validity			2
b	7.23	1							
c	7.3	2							
14ai							conclusion		1
aia							conclusion		1
bi	4.14	1							
bii	4.11	1							
15ai			line graph						1
aia			line graph						1
bi	5.23	1							
bii	5.23	1							

Appendix 2 (continued): Mapping tables for Credit Papers in 2006 and 1998

1998 Credit									
Qu	KU		PS						
	LO	Mark	Select Info	Present Info	Calc	Ex Proc	Conclusion	Predict	Mark
1a				key					3
b	2.5	2							
2ai					%				1
aii	1.10	1							
aiii	1.10	1							
b	2.2	1							
3a	1.15	2							
bi							explanation		1
bii					%				1
4ai						validity			2
aii	2.4	2							
bi						reliability			1
bii							explanation		1
biii							explanation		1
5ai	5.6	1							
aii	5.5	2							
b	2.9/5.4	1							
6a				table					2
b			text						1
c	3.14	2							
7ai				line graph					2
aii							relationship		1
b	5.19	1							
c	4.9	2							
8ai			line graph						1
aii				line graph					1
b	1.2	1							
c					other				2
9ai			text						1
aii			text						2
aiii				table					2
aiv					ratio				1
av	5.12	1							
bi	4.6	1							
bii	4.7	1							
biii	4.4	1							
10a				table					1
b	3.11	1							
c	3.9	1							
11a	6.8	1							
b	6.5(G)	1							
	6.6	1							
	6.8	1							
c	6.8	1							
12a			line graph						1
b							explanation		1
c						error			1
13a	7.3	1							
b						validity			1
c				line graph					2
d							relationship		1
14a	7.4	2							
b	7.5	1							
c	7.9	1							
d	7.12	1							
15a							conclusion		2
b						validity			1
c	7.22	1							
16ai					average				1
aii					ratio				1
aiii	3.4	1							
bi	3.4	1							
bii	3.4	1							

Appendix 3: Questions testing the same learning outcomes: Credit

Questions testing the same Learning Outcomes - Credit		
Learning Outcome	1998	2006
1.2	8(b)	1(c)(ii)
2.4	4(a)(ii)	2(c)
3.4	16(b)	5(a)
4.6	9(b)(i)	7(b)
5.19	7(b)	10(a)
6.8	11(a)(b)	12(a)
7.3	13(a)	13(c)
TOTAL MARKS ALLOCATED	12	13

Appendix 4: Mapping tables for General Papers in 2006 and 1998

2006 General									
Qu	LO	Mark	Select Info	Present Info	Calc	Ex Proc	Conclusion	Predict	Mark
1ai	1.1	1							
Aii	1.13	1							
aiii	1.4	1							
B	1.7	1							
Ci					average				1
Cii	1.4	1							
ciii							conclusion		1
Civ	1.2	2							
2a				bar chart					3
Bi							relationship		2
Bii							conclusion		1
biii	2.4	1							
3a	2.5	4							
Bi	2.5	1							
Bii	2.5	1							
4a			key						2
B				key					2
5ai			table						1
Aii					ratio				1
aiii			pie chart						1
B	3.1	1							
C	3.2	1							
6a			bar chart						1
B			bar chart						1
C			bar chart						1
D					average				1
7a	4.14	1							
B			line graph						1
C							relationship		2
Di	4.11	1							
Dii	4.14	1							
8ai	3.15	1							
Aii	3.15	1							
aiii	3.15	1							
Aiv	3.15	1							
Bi							conclusion		1
Bii			table						1
biii					other				1
biv							conclusion		1
9ai	4.3	2							

2006 General (continued)									
Qu	KU		PS						
	LO	Mark	Selecting Info	Presenting Info	Calc	Ex Proc	Conclusions	Predict	Mark
Aii	4.8	1							
bi	4.5	1							
Bii	4.4	1							
C					other				1
Di					other				1
Dii							conclusion		1
10a			text						1
B			text						1
C							conclusion		1
D					average				1
Ei			text						1
eii			text						1
11a	5.9	2							
B	5.8	1							
Ci					%				1
cii							relationship		1
ciii						reliability			1
12a	5.17	3							
b				line graph					3
13a	5.2	1							
B	5.2	2							
14ai			table						1
aii			table						1
aiii							relationship		2
B				table					2
15ai	6.9	2							
aii	6.9	1							
Bi	3.8	2							
bii	6.7	1							
C	6.7	1							
D	6.8	1							
16a	7.11	1							
B	7.11	1							
Ci	7.13	1							
Cii	7.13	1							
17a							conclusion		1
B							conclusion		1
C								prediction	1
D	7.7	1							

1998 General									
Qu	KU		PS						
	LO	Mark	Select Info	Present Info	Calc	Ex Proc	Conclusion	Predict	Mark
1ai	1.8	1							
aii	2.13	1							
b			diagram						2
ci			diagram						1
cii			diagram						1
d	4.15	2							
e			diagram						2
2a	5.2	3							
b	5.2	2							
c	5.3	1							
d	5.4	1							
3ai	4.3	1							
aii	4.8	1							
aiii	4.5	1							
bi	4.4	1							
bii	4.6	1							
4a				bar chart					2
b			bar chart						3
c					ratio				1
5a	3.11	2							

1998 GENERAL (CONTINUED)									
Qu	KU		PS						
	LO	Mark	Select Info	Present Info	Calc	Ex Proc	Conclusion	Predict	Mark
bi				line graph					3
bii							relationship		1
6a	6.5	1							
b	6.5	1							
c	6.6	1							
7a						validity			1
b						validity			1
c							conclusion		1
8a	5.9	2							
b							conclusion		2
ci					other				1
cii	5.8	1							
9ai				pie chart					1
aia				pie chart					1
aiii					%				1
b					ratio				1
c	1.15	3							
d	1.18	1							
10ai	3.13	1							
aia					other				1
b	3.13	2							
11ai	1.7	1							
aia	1.7	1							
bi	1.2	1							
bii	1.6	1							
12a			text						2
bi	2.5	1							
bii			text						1
biii			text						1
ci	2.5	1							
cii	2.5	1							
di			table						1
dii			table						1
diii							conclusion		2
13a	3.3	3							
bi	3.4	2							
bii	3.6	1							
biii	3.7	1							
14a							conclusion		1
b						validity			2
c					ratio				1
d					%				1
e						reliability			1
15ai			table						2
aia	6.11	1							
aiii							conclusion		1
b			table						2
c	7.18	1							
16ai			line graph						1
aia			line graph						1
aiii			line graph						1
aiv					other				1
b	7.3	2							
c	7.2	1							

Appendix 5: Questions testing the same learning outcomes: General

Learning Outcome	1998	2006
1.1	11(a)(ii)	1(a)(i)
1.2	11(b)(i)	1(c)(iv)
1.7	11(a)(i)	1(b)
2.5	12(b)(i) (c)(i)(ii)	3(a)(i)(ii)(iii)
4.3	3(a)(i)	9(a)(i)
4.4	3(b)(i)	9(b)(ii)
4.8	3(a)(ii)	9(a)(ii)
5.2	2(a)(b)	13(a)(b)
5.8	8(c)(ii)	11(b)
5.9	8(a)	11(a)
TOTAL MARKS ALLOCATED	17	18

Appendix 6: Credit and General KU mark allocation in 2006 and 1998

KU mark allocation 1998 & 2006				
Topic	1998 G	2006 G	1998 C	2006 C
1	9	7	5	3
2	4	7	5.5	7
3	12	8	7	9
4	7	8	5	6
5	10	9	5.5	4
6	4	6	5	7
7	4	5	7	4

Appendix 7: Credit and General PS mark allocation in 2006 and 1998

PS Mark allocation 1998 & 2006				
	1998 G	2006 G	1998 C	2006 C
Select Info	22	15	6	15
Present Info	7	10	13	6
Calc	8	8	7	4
Ex Proc	5	0	6	5
Conclusion	8	16	8	10
	0	1	0	0

Appendix 8: Grade Boundaries in 2006 and 1998

Award	KU 2006	KU 1998	PS 2006	PS 1998
Credit Max Mk	40	40	40	40
Gr 1 Boundary	25	29	29	29
Gr 2 Boundary	18	21	22	22
General Max Mk	50	50	50	50
Gr 3 Boundary	26	32	30	36
Gr 4 Boundary	19	24	22	28
Gr 5 Boundary	17	19	19	23

Appendix 9: Distribution of Grades Achieved in 2006 and 1998

Element Grade	KU		PS		PA		Final Grade		
	2006	1998	2006	1998	2006	1998		2006	1998
1	20	16	23	20	76	70	1	26	22
2	23	24	35	34	18	21	2	26	34
3	16	14	15	15	4	5	3	26	25
4	21	23	18	20	1	2	4	9	12
5	5	11	3	6	1	1	5	8	5
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	1
7	13	11	5	4	0	1	7	0	0

All figures are %

Appendix 10: Script Marks Summary

Script Grade	Candid.	Grade Boundary	1998				Grade Boundary	2006			
			KU	PS	PA	Gr awarded		KU	PS	PA	Gr awarded
1	1	29 / 29	31	30	1	1	25 / 29	35	31	1	1
1	2		33	32	1	1		29	35	1	1
1	3		35	31	1	1		26	29	1	1
2	4	21 / 22	27	22	1	2	18 / 22	22	24	1	2
2	5		21	22	1	2		18	27	1	2
2	6		24	23	1	2		22	26	1	2
3	7	32 / 36	32	35(4)	1	3	26 / 30	25 (4)	32	3	3
3	8		26 (4)	36	1	3		26	23 (4)	2	3
3	9		25 (4)	37	2	3		39	31	2	3
4	10	24 / 28	28	32	1	3	19 / 22	19	27	4	4
4	11		28	33	2	3		21	27	4	4
4	12		27	31	3	4		20	23	3	4
5	13	19 / 23	19	31 (4)	2	5	17 / 19	18	25 (4)	5	5
5	14		22	30 (4)	3	5		18	20	5	5
5	15		24 (4)	23	2	5		17	28 (4)	5	5