

Assessment Report

New Zealand Scholarship Agricultural and Horticultural Science 2023

Performance standard 93105

General commentary

Candidates who articulated their understanding in depth across the questions demonstrated a sound understanding of their primary production system. There was less evidence of rote learned answers, with candidates genuinely attempting to answer the questions using different perspectives / styles.

While many candidates were able to answer the questions using primary products studied in their Level 3 Agricultural and Horticultural Science course, some primary products did allow for higher levels of achievement and appeared to have been selected deliberately.

Candidates who had an understanding of their primary products from producer to consumer were well-prepared to answer the questions, whereas students who only understood the on-farm stage of their production system were limited in their responses.

Report on performance standard

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with **Outstanding Performance** commonly:

- provided answers that were well structured, articulate, and contained evidence of a highly-developed level of knowledge and understanding of their chosen primary production system
- clearly demonstrated perception and understanding in their response with unique thinking relevant to the question that had been asked
- were able to distinguish which facts and ideas were critical or key to their response.

Candidates who were awarded **Scholarship** commonly:

- provided a well-structured series of paragraphs / sections within their answer
- used clear, correct statements and appropriate and accurate data to back up their discussion
- discussed the questions effectively with understanding of what was being asked
- were able to relate the questions to the whole primary production system, not just at the farm / producer level.

Candidates who were **not awarded Scholarship** commonly:

- provided vague answers that lacked detail in either the information provided or the discussion of that information
- provided data that was inaccurate or not relevant

- made valid statements but were unable to link them to the relevant aspects of the production system or the intent of the question.