

Commentary on Candidate Evidence

Candidate 1 – Question 5(a)

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

- ◆ See commonly observed response 4 of the marking instructions.
- ◆ Mark 3 already not being awarded so no further marks lost for subtraction.

Candidate 2 – Question 5(a)

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**.

- ✗ No evidence of inverse proportion
- ✗ Not calculated the time feed would last for one sheep
- ✗ Incorrect strategy

Candidate 3 – Question 8(d)

The candidate was awarded **full marks** (2 marks).

- ✓ Comment is correct and consistent with working
- ✓ Comment is correct and consistent with working

Candidate 4 – Question 8(d)

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**.

- ✗ Comment does not refer to 'average speed'
- ✗ No mention of 'spread' or 'consistency'

Candidate 5 – Question 9(a)

The candidate was awarded **full marks** (1 mark).

- ✓ Tasks allocated correctly

Candidate 5 – Question 9(b)

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**.

- ✗ Incorrect critical path (missed 2 seconds)
- ✗ Error in converting to minutes and seconds (see note 3 of the marking instructions)

Candidate 6 – Question 9(c)

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

- ✗ More than 2 arrangements attempted
 - ✗ Number of boxes calculated incorrectly
 - ✓ Repeated error and consistent conclusion
- See notes 3 and 4 of the marking instructions

Candidate 7 – Question 11(c)

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**.

- ✓ Evidence of composite volume
- ✓ Part of volume calculated correctly ($8 \times 0.5 \times 4 = 16$)
- ✗ Rest of volume incorrect
- ✗ No attempt to convert to litres