Assessment Schedule – 2017

History: Examine sources of an historical event that is of significance to New Zealanders (91231)

Evidence: Question One

N1	N2	A3	A4	M5	M6	E7	E8
Extracts some material from the sources related to the extent to which Māori and Pākehā lived in a bicultural community at Jerusalem.	Extracts some material from the sources related to the extent to which Māori and Pākehā lived in a bicultural community at Jerusalem, and attempts to connect it to the question.	Examines material from the sources related to the extent to which Māori and Pākehā lived in a bicultural community at Jerusalem.	Examines material from the sources related to the extent to which Māori and Pākehā lived in a bicultural community at Jerusalem.	Examines material from the sources, reflecting a *thorough understanding* of, through detailed explanation, the extent to which Māori and Pākehā lived in a bicultural community at Jerusalem.	Examines **in reasonable depth** material from the sources, reflecting a *thorough understanding* of, through detailed explanation, the extent to which Māori and Pākehā lived in a bicultural community at Jerusalem.	Examines in reasonable depth material from the sources, reflecting a *perceptive understanding* of the extent to which Māori and Pākehā lived in a bicultural community at Jerusalem.	**Comprehensively** examines material from the sources, reflecting a *perceptive understanding* of the extent to which Māori and Pākehā lived in a bicultural community at Jerusalem.
		Attempts to use supporting evidence, which may be implied.	Uses some supporting evidence. May include irrelevant material(s).	Response is framed in the candidate's own words, while drawing on the sources for supporting evidence. May include some irrelevant material(s).	Response is framed in the candidate's own words, while drawing on the sources for supporting evidence.	Responses are framed in the candidate's own words, while drawing on the sources (including implied or inferred) for supporting evidence.	Detailed responses are framed in the candidate's own words.
						Explains in detail.	Explains in detail.
					Response is more fluent and engaged with the sources.	Draws conclusions beyond the immediately obvious.	Draws conclusions and raises relevant questions, beyond the immediately obvious. Explanation, examples, and evidence are drawn from the sources and wider knowledge.
N0 = No response; no relevant evidence.							

Sample evidence for Question One:

The extent to which Māori and Pākehā lived in a bicultural community at Jerusalem:

- Baxter, the leader of the Pākehā, adopted five Māori principles for the community (Source A)
- Jerusalem pā, had a Roman Catholic Church (Source B) – reciprocation
- Pākehā at Jerusalem ate, slept and made music communally (Source C)
- Māori elders gave cultural education to Pākehā at Jerusalem (Sources D and E)
- Māori and Pākehā joined together in a tangihanga for Baxter at Jerusalem (Source F).

NB Not all of this is expected for M and E.

- Baxter's crucifix: Pākehā cultural icon (Source A)
- "Ban the bomb" / peace sign reflecting cultural values and protests outside of the Pākehā / Māori dynamic (Source C)
- music-making/guitar – Pākehā instrument adopted by Māori culture (Source C)
- limits to biculturalism: Māori women laying down boundaries in pā and wondering why young people from favoured culture would want to come to Jerusalem (Source E).

Evidence: Question Two

N1	N2	A3	A4	M5	M6	E7	E8
Identifies ONE perspective. Attempts to describe the perspective, with some supporting material from the sources.	Identifies TWO perspectives. Attempts to describe one or both of the perspectives, with some supporting material from the sources.	Examines ONE perspective. Attempts to use supporting evidence. *OR* Examines TWO perspectives with little evidence/reference to sources.	Examines TWO differing perspectives. Uses supporting evidence. May include some irrelevant information or application of sources. Mainly quotations to illustrate perspectives.	Examines TWO perspectives, reflecting a *reasonable understanding*. Accurately uses appropriate and relevant supporting evidence but may show weaknesses. Responses are framed in the candidate's own words, while drawing on the sources for supporting evidence.	Examines **in reasonable depth**, TWO differing perspectives, reflecting a *thorough understanding*. Accurately uses appropriate and relevant supporting evidence but may contain weaknesses. Responses are framed in the candidate's own words, while drawing on the sources for supporting evidence. Examination is strong but evidence may be implied/inferred.	Examines **in reasonable depth** TWO perspectives. Reflects a *perceptive understanding* of both perspectives. Accurately uses appropriate and relevant supporting evidence. Detailed responses are framed in the candidate's own words, while drawing on the sources (including implied or inferred) for supporting evidence. Candidate may be aware of limitation of evidence. Reflects some insight, via conclusions / questions.	**Comprehensively** examines TWO differing perspectives. Reflects a *perceptive understanding* of both perspectives. Accurately uses appropriate and relevant supporting evidence. Detailed responses are framed in the candidate's own words, while drawing on the sources for supporting evidence. Candidate demonstrates awareness of limitation of evidence. Draws insightful conclusions beyond the immediately obvious and / or raises relevant questions.
N0 = No response; no relevant evidence.							

Sample evidence for Question Two

Perspectives on James K. Baxter's gravestone at Jerusalem:

- resentment about being charged to view the gravestone (Source H)
- that a charge to view the gravestone was appropriate compensation (Source H)
- that Baxter would object to a charge to view his gravestone (Source H)
- that people are welcome to view the gravestone (Source H)
- that it is appropriate to give some form of koha when visiting the gravestone (Source H)
- that visiting the gravestone has bicultural value (Source H).

Evidence: Question Three

N1	N2	A3	A4	M5	M6	E7	E8
Extracts some material from Sources I and J, and attempts to examine usefulness and / or reliability.	Extracts material from Sources I and J and attempts to examine usefulness and / or reliability.	Examines some material from Sources I and J, reflecting usefulness and / or reliability to a historian studying the bicultural community at Jerusalem.	Examines material from Sources I and J, reflecting usefulness and / or reliability to a historian studying the bicultural community at Jerusalem.	Examines material from Sources I and J, reflecting an understanding of the usefulness and / or reliability to a historian studying the bicultural community at Jerusalem.	Examines **in reasonable depth** material from Sources I and J, reflecting a reasonably thorough understanding of the usefulness and / or reliability to a historian studying the bicultural community at Jerusalem.	Examines **in reasonable depth** Sources I and J. Shows a perceptive understanding of the usefulness and / or reliability of the source(s) to a historian studying the bicultural community at Jerusalem.	**Comprehensively** examines Sources I and J, to show a perceptive understanding of the usefulness and / or reliability of the source(s) to a historian studying the bicultural community at Jerusalem.
		Reference to the source may be inferred. Some material may be narrow or have limited direct reference to the source(s).	Reference to the source(s) may be inferred	May include direct reference to the source(s). Explanation / supporting evidence may have limitations.	Includes direct reference to the source(s).	Must include direct **detailed** reference to the source(s).	Must include direct **detailed** reference to the source(s).
		May refer to/examine ONLY Source I OR J.	May refer to/examine ONLY Source I OR J.	Both sources SHOULD be examined.	Both sources examined	Reflects a degree of engagement, i.e. raising questions, awareness of limitations, etc. May demonstrate some insight.	Reflects a higher degree of engagement with the source(s), i.e. raising questions, awareness of limitations, and the basis for making assumptions from it.

N0 = No response; no relevant evidence.

Sample evidence for Question Three. NB: not all of these criteria are expected for M and E.

The usefulness and / or reliability of Source J for a historian studying the bicultural community at Jerusalem:

Usefulness:

- the source article is useful because the views expressed are those of a person who lived in the community (Source I)
- 'There are many, hundreds really, who come and go' usefully indicates the scale and transitory character of the community (Source J)
- 'there he is … rattling his beads … praying the prayer' usefully confirms the religious character of Baxter's leadership (Source J)
- 'down to the Pa' usefully indicates a degree of separation from the Māori part of the community (Source J)
- 'feeling at home' usefully indicates a degree of bicultural integration (Source J)
- gives picture of daily life: drugs; stashing of food; tobacco
- commune life may be intense (many "came and went").

- Baxter's charisma/leadership holds it together.

Reliability

- reliability aspects arise because the source is an 'intimate memoir' with associated issues of memory and subjectivity (Source I)
- while the writer, who 'bore' Baxter a child, describes the community as 'a family', other members without that familial bond might not agree (Sources I and J)
- while the cover of the book and the writer's words 'holding it all together' give prime importance to Baxter, others without the writer's relationship to Baxter might not agree (Sources I and J)
- while the writer describes herself as 'longing to' belong to the Māori part of the community (Source J), another member (Source E) recalls that he 'kept right away from it' (Peter Olds)
- while the writer describes 'pretending' to belong and that she 'might belong' (Source J), there is evidence of secure integration (Source D) in which another member of the community is shown speaking on the marae and describes performing 'whaikōrero'. (Greg Chalmers)

Cut Scores

Not Achieved	Achievement	Achievement with Merit	Achievement with Excellence
0 – 6	7 – 12	13 – 18	19 – 24