

NETBALL NEW ZEALAND
THEORY EXAMINATION–New Zealand Paper 1, June 2010
EXAMINERS REPORT

(a) Summary of Results

Twenty-three New Zealand candidates sat the June examination, of these Twenty (87%) were successful.

The average mark for the examination was 55.

Congratulations to Christina Matthews from Netball North Harbour, who gained full marks which is an exceptional result, followed closely by Susan Geddes from Mid Canterbury and Kathy Ferguson from Dunedin on 59.5.

(b) General Comments

It was very pleasing to see the high pass rate in this exam. The marks reflected a very good understanding of the rule book and candidates clearly have a sound practical on Court knowledge.

In section one the average mark was 19.	This demonstrates a solid understanding of the basic rules.
In section two the average was 9.	Clearly umpires understand protocols and discipline procedures fully.
In section three the average was 27.	In relation to previous years this section was very well answered.

In section three answers where “first infringement penalised” was all that was required, some candidates elaborated unnecessarily given too much information.

Check marking ensured that any question errors did not adversely affect candidate’s marks. This check marking was completed in green pen.

Unsuccessful candidates scripts were remarked and moderated to ensure the marking standard was consistent for all candidates.

Anne Blomfield and Fay Meiklejohn
Mandy Nottingham

New Zealand Theory Examiners
Moderator

JUNE 2010

APPENDIX

Section 1 Comments

Q1	Well answered
Q2	Incorrect Centre Pass White not well answered.
Q3	Very well answered
Q4	Exceptionally well answered
Q5	Very well answered
Q6	Both time of suspension and reason for suspension needed for full mark
Q7	Very well answered
Q8	Must have "three other personnel, one of whom must be a Primary Care person"
Q9	Very well answered-moderated after reviewing rule book
Q10	Very well answered

Section 2 Comments

Q1	Long whistle roll not well answered and ½ mark lost. Reserve umpire doing nothing re electronic devises failing - not well answered
Q2	Very well answered
Q3	Very well answered
Q4	Very well answered
Q5	Very well answered

Section 3 Comments

Q1	Well answered
Q2	Candidates lost marks when both infringements were not given or they misunderstood the correct infringement.
Q3	Most candidates lost ½ mark for not including – ball not involved
Q4	Well answered
Q5	Well answered, however some candidates lost ½ mark for awarding a Penalty Pass instead of a Free Pass.
Q6	Both obstruction and contact required to gain full marks. 1st infringement would have been sufficient in part (iii).
Q7	Well answered.
Q8	In part (iii) some candidates did not realise advantage applied.
Q9	Well answered
Q10	Well answered.
Q11	Needed both simultaneous offside and simultaneous possession to gain full marks.