Course report 2022

Subject	Physical Education
Level	National 5

Grade boundary and statistical information

Statistical information: update on courses

Number of resulted entries in 2022	19180

Statistical information: performance of candidates

Distribution of course awards including grade boundaries

A	Percentage	54.5	Cumulative percentage	54.5	Number of candidates	10455	Minimum mark required	87
B	Percentage	28.6	Cumulative percentage	83.1	Number of candidates	5475	Minimum mark required	73
C	Percentage	13.0	Cumulative percentage	96.1	Number of candidates	2500	Minimum mark required	60
D	Percentage	3.2	Cumulative percentage	99.3	Number of candidates	615	Minimum mark required	46
No award	Percentage	0.7	Cumulative percentage	N/A	Number of candidates	135	Minimum mark required	N/A

You can read the general commentary on grade boundaries in appendix 1 of this report.

In this report:

♦ 'most' means greater than 70%
♦ 'many' means 50% to 69%
♦ 'some' means 25% to 49%
♦ 'a few' means less than 25%

You can find more statistical reports on the statistics page of SQA's website.

Section 1: comments on the assessment

Portfolio

It was felt that the portfolio performed better than previous years, with feedback suggesting that teachers and lecturers developed a clearer understanding of how the assessment is marked by attending understanding standards and moderation events.

Feedback indicates that it was felt to be fair and accessible for all candidates, with comments suggesting that there were questions within the assessment accessible to C candidates, as well as questions to challenge A candidates. The majority of candidates understood what was required and were able to complete the whole portfolio.

On the whole, all questions performed as expected, however in question 3e, it was felt that some candidates did not understand the process of evaluation.

Performance

The performance component performed as expected. The live assessment verification was generally welcomed in centres. A range of activities was verified and information from centres showed a wider range of activities were being assessed. Centres appear to have embraced the chance to allow personalisation and choice. The marking instructions allowed for a full range of marks to be accessed.

Section 2: comments on candidate performance

Areas that candidates performed well in

Portfolio

Question 2(a) — Candidates were able to explain the challenges faced when gathering data and link back to the reliability of the data.

Questions 2(b), 2(f) — Candidates had to identify methods of data collection and targets.

Question 2(c) — Descriptions were short and concise, allowing most candidates to achieve marks for the process and the data collection method.

Question 2(e) — Most candidates described a strength and development need for both factors. Candidates were able to clearly use short and concise descriptions.

Question 2(h) — Candidates clearly understood how to describe approaches to performance development.

Areas that candidates found demanding

Portfolio

Question 1 — Candidates found it challenging to give a specific context and then impact. Candidates continue to find it challenging when using 'sadness', 'happiness' and 'etiquette' to explain the actual context and impact on the performance.

Question 2(i) — Although we did see an improvement in responses — candidates found it challenging to justify their decisions. Some candidates still tried to justify the approaches used rather than the decisions they had made and so did not access marks.

Question 3(d) — Although we did see improvements in responses, candidates still found it challenging to evaluate what aspect of the Personal Development Plan had value or not and then make a judgement relevant to the Personal Development Plan. Some candidates still took their judgement back to performance and so did not access marks.

Question 3(e) — Candidates found it challenging to make a judgement and determine the value of its impact on performance. Some candidates found it challenging to relate the value to the end of their performance development process.

Question 3(f) — Although we did see improvement in responses, candidates found it challenging to offer a current performance, provide an action and personal reason for their future plans.

Performance

Candidates performed well in the performance component of the course, with many achieving full marks. Verifiers reported that they observed some excellent performances where some National 5 candidates were playing against, or with, Higher candidates who were introduced to enable the National 5 candidate to have the opportunity to access a full

range of marks in an appropriate context. It was clear that centres knew their candidates' capabilities and so were able to provide suitable contexts for assessment.

Personalisation and choice led to strong performances in this component of the course. There were few, if any, reports of candidates having difficulty accessing marks in any particular area.

Section 3: preparing candidates for future assessment

Portfolio

Question 1(a) — Candidates should be encouraged to write about more than one factor (demonstrating breadth of knowledge) within each of the mental, emotional, social or physical factors. Similarly, candidates can choose to demonstrate depth of knowledge by giving more information about the factor they have chosen to focus on. For example, a candidate may use cardiorespiratory endurance and then use two different contexts to explain its impact. This would be acceptable.

Candidates need to make sure that they have an understanding of the factor, the specific context within the performance and the actual impact it can have on performance. For example, 'My agility when playing hockey, allowed me to move at pace and change direction quickly when moving up the pitch dribbling the ball. This meant I was able to beat oncoming defenders and create space for a successful pass to one of our strikers'.

Centres should be aware that 'confidence' is an emotional factor and marks will not be awarded in this question if candidates use 'confidence' as a mental factor. Centres should be aware that anxiety can be used for both mental and emotional factors.

Centres should be aware that candidates were not awarded marks if they flipped their response from positive to negative within the same body of knowledge.

Question 2(i) — Candidates must state what else they would consider and then give personal reasoning as to why they have considered this aspect. Candidates must be reminded that they cannot justify their use of approaches in their response. The justification in 2(i) must give a decision, explanation and reasoning.

Question 3(d) — Candidates must identify an aspect from their Personal Development Plan, place a positive or negative judgement and then make a value judgement back to the Personal Development Plan on whether it is effective or not. The value must link back to the impact on the Personal Development Plan and not performance.

Question 3(e) — Candidates need to place a positive or negative value in relation to the factors and then make a judgement on the impact on performance. Candidates must show that they understand that this is the end impact of the performance development process.

Question 3(f) — Candidates must state where they are in their current performance, the action they will take, and their personal reasoning as to why. They must have considered this aspect in order to access marks.

Performance

It is a key aim of the National 5 course to develop candidates' ability to perform in physical activities by enabling them to acquire a comprehensive range of movement and performance skills in a variety of activities.

The modification of assessing candidates in only one activity, will continue in the next session.

To set it apart from normal learning and teaching activities the assessment of this single performance must take place in a context which is suitably challenging for a National 5-level candidate. Guidance can be found on SQA's website to help teachers and assessors decide which activities are acceptable for assessment.

Appendix 1: general commentary on grade boundaries

SQA's main aim when setting grade boundaries is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and levels and maintain comparable standards across the years, even as arrangements evolve and change.

For most National Courses, SQA aims to set examinations and other external assessments and create marking instructions that allow:

♦ a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional grade C boundary)
♦ a well-prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70% of the available marks (the notional grade A boundary)

It is very challenging to get the standard on target every year, in every subject at every level. Therefore, SQA holds a grade boundary meeting for each course to bring together all the information available (statistical and qualitative) and to make final decisions on grade boundaries based on this information. Members of SQA's Executive Management Team normally chair these meetings.

Principal assessors utilise their subject expertise to evaluate the performance of the assessment and propose suitable grade boundaries based on the full range of evidence. SQA can adjust the grade boundaries as a result of the discussion at these meetings. This allows the pass rate to be unaffected in circumstances where there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been more, or less, difficult than usual.

♦ The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been more difficult than usual.
♦ The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been less difficult than usual.
♦ Where levels of difficulty are comparable to previous years, similar grade boundaries are maintained.

Grade boundaries from question papers in the same subject at the same level tend to be marginally different year on year. This is because the specific questions, and the mix of questions, are different and this has an impact on candidate performance.

This year, a package of support measures including assessment modifications and revision support, was introduced to support candidates as they returned to formal national exams and other forms of external assessment. This was designed to address the ongoing disruption to learning and teaching that young people have experienced as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, SQA adopted a more generous approach to grading for National 5, Higher and Advanced Higher courses than it would do in a normal exam year, to help ensure fairness for candidates while maintaining standards. This is in recognition of the fact that those preparing for and sitting exams have done so in very different circumstances from those who sat exams in 2019.

The key difference this year is that decisions about where the grade boundaries have been set have also been influenced, where necessary and where appropriate, by the unique circumstances in 2022. On a course-by-course basis, SQA has determined grade boundaries in a way that is fair to candidates, taking into account how the assessment (exams and coursework) has functioned and the impact of assessment modifications and revision support.

The grade boundaries used in 2022 relate to the specific experience of this year's cohort and should not be used by centres if these assessments are used in the future for exam preparation.

For full details of the approach please refer to the National Qualifications 2022 Awarding — Methodology Report.