

2015 NZ Scholarship Assessment Report

Biology

Part A: Commentary

Comment on the overall response of s to the 2015 examination.

In general, s showed a lack of knowledge in ecological concepts. They also showed a poor understanding of NZ native flora and fauna. It was clear that many s did not have knowledge of human manipulations of cloning, selective breeding and trans genesis.

Students need to write legibly. It is easier to follow and read student responses when they use an asterisk or similar and add the additional information at the end rather than attempting to squeeze it between the lines or draw arrows all over the place. It is recommended that students use the provided lines.

Part B: Report on performance standard

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance	<p>Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> wrote detailed answers to all three questions used examples correctly integrated biological knowledge with resource material to answer the question addressed all parts of a question and explained multiple concepts justified their opinion wrote well-structured answers linked the amount of interbreeding to the theories of dispersal supported ideas with appropriate named examples included no irrelevant material wrote conclusions that supported their earlier responses rather than repeated what had been written earlier used the resource material effectively and efficiently wrote with a logical progression of ideas demonstrated a wider interest and knowledge of Biology beyond the provided resources wrote eloquently and fluently made correct use of extensive biological terminology showed evidence of extensive planning.
Scholarship	<p>Candidates who were awarded Scholarship commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> wrote detailed answers to at least two of the three questions demonstrated good knowledge of some of the concepts necessary to answer the three questions made good use of the provided resource material and referred to it in their responses applied their biological knowledge when answering the question included little, if any, irrelevant material wrote concisely used biological terminology accurately and without ambiguity showed clear evidence of planning.
Other candidates	<p>Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> failed to answer one or more questions included a lot of irrelevant material repeated the resource material without adding new ideas wrote without linking ideas wrote without justifying ideas used biological concepts and ideas which did not relate to the question

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• used very little specialised biology vocabulary in their answer• lacked supporting examples• failed to integrate resource material into their answer and just wrote what they remembered from the level three standards• used generalisations and vague biological statements in their responses• used biological terminology incorrectly• made reference to gene rather than allele• showed very little evidence of planning• repeated themselves rather than add new ideas. |
|--|--|