

2015 NCEA Assessment Report

Agricultural and Horticultural Science Level 3 91530, 91531, 91532

Report on standards

1. Assessment Report for 91530: Demonstrate understanding of how market forces affect supply of and demand for New Zealand primary products

Achieved	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide examples of how market forces had affected their chosen primary products in recent years chose primary products that are significant in New Zealand or their local region followed the instructions throughout the paper.
Not Achieved	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> did not attempt all questions in the examination paper gave vague responses which did not answer the question gave answers about what 'may' happen rather than what 'has' happened.
Achieved with Merit	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrated in-depth understanding by providing details such as volumes in kgs or tonnes, or tariffs rates or quota tonnes wrote well-constructed, accurate answers without unnecessary text demonstrated understanding of how the market forces interacted with each other.
Achieved with Excellence	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> produced a series of accurate and well-constructed paragraphs which was logical in its sequence. produced a clear and convincing argument justifying a chosen market force over others.
Standard specific comments	<p>Candidates must ensure they are able to answer this paper about two or more primary products, not just answering one.</p> <p>Candidates must ensure that they are familiar with all the market forces, and can apply them to their chosen primary products.</p> <p>Candidates must ensure they answer all questions in the paper to ensure they get the best possible mark.</p>

2. Assessment Report for 91531: Demonstrate understanding of how the production process meets market requirements for a New Zealand primary product(s)

Achieved	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> understood the essential management practices provided basic information on quality or quantity produced provided general descriptions of quality or quantity linked an aspect of market requirement to quality or quantity understood the term market requirements and how they related to their product.
Not Achieved	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provided rote learnt answers misunderstood the meaning establishment phase and growth phase misunderstood the meaning of the term quantity failed to link management practices with a market and the requirements.

Achieved with Merit	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • defined quantity or quality using data or detail • defined establishment phase and growing phase using data or detail • showed in-depth understanding of the management practices selected.
Achieved with Excellence	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • produced chains of reasoning that were logical and clearly expressed • were able to evaluate pros and cons of relevant management practices • provided new data for points made in discussion.
Standard specific comments	<p>Candidates found difficulty providing a range of management practices that influenced the quality and quantity requirements when pine or milk were used as their chosen product.</p> <p>A detailed knowledge of the key aspects of quantity and quality are fundamental for the chosen product.</p> <p>Linking the market requirements and management practices is the requirement of this standard.</p> <p>It was pleasing to see that some teachers have taken candidates on field trips and candidates have used information gathered, including quotes and data from farmers/orchardists when answering examination questions. In general, these candidates achieved very good results.</p>

3. Assessment Report for 91532: Analyse a New Zealand primary production environmental issue

Achieved	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • explained economic, social and environmental factors for irrigation both positively and negatively • gave reasons why water storage is better than other options.
Not Achieved	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • used nutrient management information from 2014 that was not applicable to the question • used rote-learned answers that were not relevant to the question • had large inaccuracies with figures or could not back up their figures • quoted directly from the resource without applying it to the question • didn't answer in regards to all environment, social or economic factors • didn't give the water storage scheme as a source of action over other options.
Achieved with Merit	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • explained economic, social and environmental factors for irrigation both positively and negatively • gave reasons why water storage is better than other options • gave reference to more than one stakeholder and didn't tend to discuss "shareholder" • were clear in their explanations for justifying a water storage scheme for one of economic, social and environment, but not covering all three factors or justifying them.
Achieved with Excellence	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • explained economic, social and environmental factors for irrigation both positively and negatively • gave clear explanations why water storage is better than other options • had clear references to more than one other stakeholder • used accurate figures to back up statements • clearly justified all three factors or at least two of them with relevant and precise information.

Standard specific comments	<p>There was a lot of reference to the 2014 nutrient management information, which most of it was not relevant to the 2015 question. The effects of irrigation versus nutrient management are two different topics and many candidates would have been disadvantaged by applying too much of this into the exam. Many of the figures used were inaccurate such as \$30,000 to put in 100ha of irrigation, or adding \$1 trillion to the economy. Comparisons against using a water storage scheme versus bore or river water were generally weaker than expected.</p> <p>Many candidates used shareholders rather than stakeholders which are of two different interests.</p>
-----------------------------------	---