

Assessment Schedule – 2013

History: Interpret sources of an historical event of significance to New Zealanders (91003)

Evidence Statement

Question One

N1	N2	A3	A4	M5	M6	E7	E8
<p>Extracts some material from the sources about carless days.</p> <p>Not directed to either part of the question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • what • why. 	<p>Extracts some material from the sources about carless days and connects it to why they were introduced.</p> <p>Answers only one part of the question – what OR why – sufficiently.</p>	<p>Interprets material from the sources relating to what carless days were and why they were introduced.</p> <p>Descriptions are weak with limited supporting evidence and/or are lacking in depth; these could include extracted and/or paraphrased material.</p> <p>One description could be stronger than the other.</p>	<p>Interprets material from the sources, accurately describing what carless days were and why they were introduced.</p> <p>Descriptions use relevant evidence, which could include well-selected paraphrased material directed to the question.</p> <p>One description could be stronger than the other.</p>	<p>Interprets, in depth, material from the sources by explaining what carless days were and why they were introduced.</p> <p>Uses appropriate and relevant supporting evidence.</p> <p>Focus on what and why with minimal additional discussion of effect, usefulness, additional measures etc.</p> <p>Some aspects of evidence are discussed in detail.</p> <p>May include irrelevant material.</p>	<p>Interprets, in depth, material from the sources by explaining what carless days were and why they were introduced.</p> <p>Uses appropriate and relevant supporting evidence, selected and assessed in detail.</p> <p>A coherent answer directed to the set question.</p> <p>May include some irrelevant material.</p>	<p>Comprehensively interprets the sources by explaining what carless days were and why they were introduced.</p> <p>Uses detailed relevant supporting evidence appropriately and with discrimination.</p> <p>A clear and coherent answer that addresses the question.</p> <p>Little irrelevant material.</p>	<p>Comprehensively interprets the sources to perceptively explain what carless days were and why they were introduced.</p> <p>Uses detailed relevant supporting evidence with discrimination, linking it effectively to the point(s) made to produce a sophisticated response.</p> <p>A clear, coherent answer that answers the question.</p> <p>Little irrelevant material.</p>
ONLY ANSWERS WHAT OR WHY		MUST ANSWER WHAT AND WHY					
Interpretation = shows understanding of the material and selects appropriate information to answer the question				Interpretation = using the material to provide a reasoned, well thought out answer base on the sources			
NARRATIVE					ANALYSIS		

N0 = No response; no relevant evidence.

EVIDENCE NOT NECESSARILY QUOTES

Question Two

N1	N2	A3	A4	M5	M6	E7	E8
<p>Extracts some material from the sources about carless days.</p> <p>Identifies one response with some clarity.</p>	<p>Extracts some material from the sources about carless days and connects it to people's responses.</p> <p>Identifies two responses with little description.</p>	<p>Interprets material from the sources to show some understanding by describing how people responded to carless days.</p> <p>Descriptions are weak with limited supporting evidence and /or are lacking in depth.</p> <p>Two responses – could be accurate but superficial OR One response might be stronger than the other.</p> <p>Could be lifted directly from the source without explanation.</p>	<p>Interprets material from the sources to show an understanding by describing TWO ways in which people responded to carless days.</p> <p>Descriptions use relevant evidence, but could include irrelevant information.</p> <p>Two accurate responses.</p> <p>Both supported with relevant evidence BUT one could be stronger than the other.</p>	<p>Interprets material from the sources to show an understanding of TWO ways in which people responded to carless days.</p> <p>Uses appropriate and relevant supporting evidence.</p> <p>Evidence is linked to these ways.</p> <p>Link between evidence and explanation needs to be made.</p> <p>One could be stronger than the other.</p> <p>May include some irrelevant material.</p>	<p>Accurately interprets material from the sources to show an in-depth understanding of TWO ways in which people responded to carless days.</p> <p>Evidence is linked to the ways people responded to the carless days.</p> <p>A coherent answer directed to the set question.</p> <p>May include some irrelevant material.</p>	<p>Comprehensively interprets the sources to show a thorough understanding of TWO ways in which people responded to carless days.</p> <p>Evidence is directly linked to the ways people responded to the carless days.</p> <p>A clear and coherent answer that directly addresses the question.</p> <p>Little irrelevant material.</p>	<p>Comprehensively interprets the sources to show a perceptive understanding of TWO ways in which people responded to carless days.</p> <p>Specific evidence is linked to the ways people responded to the carless days.</p> <p>A clear, coherent answer that directly answers the question.</p> <p>No irrelevant material.</p>

Response = action or expression of an attitude

could just 'dump' evidence

N0 = No response; no relevant evidence.

RESPONSES could include:

- More mileage on the days that they were allowed to drive
- Black market in stickers
- Stickers covered in glad wrap to move between cars
- Disruptive
- Community co-operation
- Carpooling

EVIDENCE NOT NECESSARILY QUOTES

NOTE Candidate may summarise a class of response e.g. changing behaviour and illustrate this with examples – these answers tend to be showing higher-level skills – synthesizing, generalising etc

- People had more than one car
- Changing behaviour

Question Three

N1	N2	A3	A4	M5	M6	E7	E8
<p>Extracts some material from the sources and attempts to identify official and personal views of carless days.</p>	<p>Extracts some material from the sources and identifies official and personal views of carless days.</p> <p>May attempt an explanation.</p>	<p>Interprets material from the sources to identify the official and personal views of carless days.</p> <p>Explanations are weak, with limited supporting evidence and/or lacking depth.</p> <p>Only ONE explanation might be given.</p>	<p>Interprets material from the sources to identify and compare the official and personal views of carless days.</p> <p>Explanations use mostly relevant evidence.</p> <p>Only ONE explanation might be given</p> <p>OR</p> <p>One explanation could be stronger than the other.</p> <p>MUST be at least ONE valid comparison.</p>	<p>Accurately interprets material from the sources to show an understanding of official and personal views of carless days.</p> <p>Explanations use a range of appropriate and relevant supporting evidence.</p> <p>May include some irrelevant material.</p>	<p>Accurately interprets material from the sources to show an in-depth understanding of official and personal views of carless days.</p> <p>Explanations use a range of appropriate and relevant supporting evidence. Some aspects of evidence are discussed in detail.</p> <p>Demonstrates elements of critical thinking and analysis</p> <p>A coherent answer directed to the set question.</p> <p>May include some irrelevant material.</p>	<p>Comprehensively interprets the sources to show a thorough understanding of official and personal views of carless days.</p> <p>Explanations have detailed reference to the sources.</p> <p>Explanations are literate, clear, and critically respond to the question in light of the evidence.</p> <p>Includes evidence of historical thinking in the comparison of material.</p> <p>A clear and coherent answer.</p> <p>Little irrelevant material.</p>	<p>Comprehensively interprets the sources to show a perceptive understanding of official and personal views of carless days.</p> <p>Explanations include specific detailed reference to the sources.</p> <p>Explanations are literate, clear, and critically respond to the question in light of the evidence, linking evidence to context.</p> <p>Includes evidence of historical thinking in comparison of material.</p> <p>A clear and coherent answer the directly addresses the question.</p> <p>Little irrelevant material.</p>

Explanation is the discriminator in this question: this entails the candidate processing the evidence to come up with a reasoned response, not just citing the evidence.

N0 = No response; no relevant evidence.

EVIDENCE NOT NECESSARILY QUOTES

Official View:

- supply vulnerable and demand and restraint measures developed
- saved them only around 3%, instead of projected 10%
- Lot of fuss for very little reward
- Previous system flawed, this system has potential

Problems:

- didn't save much
- Weekend closing more effective – saved 5 – 7%
- Carless days not work as only saved 3%
- Patrol less weekends work better as very unpopular

Judgement Statement

	Not Achieved	Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
Score range	0 – 7	8 – 12	13 – 18	19 – 24