

## Assessment Schedule – 2015

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

#### Evidence

		Acheivement		Merit		Excellence		
		Interpret sources of an historical event of significance to New Zealanders		Interpret in depth sources of an historical event of significance to New Zealanders		Comprehensively interpret sources of an historical event of significance to New Zealanders		
	N1	N2	A3	A4	M5	M6	E7	E8
Is there evidence?	MINIMAL		YES – some	YES – some	FREQUENT	FREQUENT	EXTENSIVE	EXTENSIVE
Is it relevant?	NO		SOMETIMES	SOMETIMES	USUALLY	USUALLY	PRIMARILY	CONSISTENTLY
Is it USED to address the question?	NO		MINIMAL	MINIMAL	USUALLY	USUALLY	CONSISTENTLY – this doesn't mean ALWAYS	CONSISTENTLY – this doesn't mean ALWAYS
Is the question answered?	<b>Question One</b> Who was Nancy Wake, and what did she do during World War II? Use specific evidence* from any of the sources to support your answer.							
	NO	NO	IN PART	BOTH PARTS ANSWERED	IN SOME DEPTH	IN DEPTH	COMPREHENSIVELY	COMPREHENSIVELY
			<b>Typically Includes:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Who was Nancy Wake: New Zealander, spy, most decorated woman, White Mouse, saboteur, organiser, highly trained, resourceful, cunning, feisty, tough.</li> <li>What she did: led the resistance, spied, rescued and saved allied soldiers, killed German officers, moved documents, re-established contact with England, shot traitors, sabotaged German war effort, D-Day, Resistance leader, etc.</li> <li>Can be transcription, narration.</li> </ul>				<b>Typically Includes:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As for N2–M5 AND</li> <li>Range of specific actions</li> <li>Clear use of multiple sources</li> <li>Evidence of interpretation* through linking actions to events, often paraphrased</li> <li>Overall coherence – demonstrates an overall structure</li> </ul> * Interpretation = showing understanding of the material, and selecting appropriate information to answer the question	

	N1	N2	A3	A4	M5	M6	E7	E8
<p><b>Question Two</b> Describe the different perspectives of Nancy Wake held by TWO different people and / or groups. Use specific evidence from any of the sources to support your answer.</p>								
	NO	NO	IN PART	IN PART <b>OR</b> BOTH PARTS IN NO DEPTH	IN SOME DEPTH	IN DEPTH	COMPREHENSIVELY	COMPREHENSIVELY
<p><b>Typically includes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorrect perspectives, e.g.: Sebastian Faulks</li> <li>• Filmmakers</li> <li>• Charlotte Gray</li> <li>• People of London</li> <li>• Dominion Post</li> <li>• Nancy Wake herself</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perspectives include: Allies, Gestapo, Northern Territory News, politicians, Sonya D'Artois, Professor Wake, Pat Hickton</li> <li>• Different means <b>distinct</b> from one another – as in non-related – NOT opposing</li> <li>• Could tackle this as Wake in past vs Wake today</li> <li>• Must cover what the person / group thinks / thought of / about Wake. What did (person / group) think of Wake? What is the group / persons attitude toward Wake? What evidence is there to back this up?</li> <li>• Must <b>interpret</b> what the group/person thought of / about Wake and / or the group / persons attitude towards her.</li> </ul>					
			<p><b>Typically includes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Straight description of attitude</li> <li>• Minimal evidence</li> </ul> <p>Can be awarded for <b>ONE</b> perspective.</p>		<p><b>Typically includes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perspective of individual / group correctly identified for M6+</li> <li>• Quality of description/explanation with evidence determines M6–E8</li> </ul> <p><b>TWO</b> different perspectives</p>			
<p><b>Question Three</b> Using any of the sources, describe how Nancy Wake and her actions during World War II may or may not be considered of significance to New Zealand. Use specific evidence from the sources to support your answer.</p>								
	NO	NO	YES	YES	IN SOME DEPTH	IN DEPTH	COMPREHENSIVELY	COMPREHENSIVELY
<p>Students may try to establish significance and / or non-significance to either New Zealand and / or New Zealanders. Interpretation = showing understanding of the material, and selecting appropriate information to answer the question.</p>								
<p><b>Typically includes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Might not have a clear concept of significance</li> <li>• Could talk about importance as synonym for significance if illustrated with evidence – could reach M5 with this</li> </ul>					<p><b>Typically includes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must have clear concept of significance Needs to interpret/argue a view either significant or not to New Zealand or New Zealanders</li> <li>• Ties significance to her her actions in WW2, not just to being a NZer</li> <li>• Might not reach a conclusion M5 – M6</li> <li>• Conclusion is reached for E7-8</li> </ul>			

**N0** = No response; no relevant evidence.

\* **Note:** Use specific evidence = clear reference to the sources; ideally the source(s) is / are identified but this is not essential and should not be used to penalise a candidate. Evidence is not necessarily quotes.

**Cut Scores**

<b>Not Achieved</b>	<b>Achievement</b>	<b>Achievement with Merit</b>	<b>Achievement with Excellence</b>
0 – 7	8 – 12	13 – 18	19 – 24