



National Qualifications Review Investigation Report

***Physical Education
August 2003***

Contents

Executive summary	1
1 Terms of reference	3
2 Methodology	4
3 Findings	6
4 Conclusions	10
5 Recommendations	12
Appendices	
Appendix 1: Agreed Actions from the Subject Review Report	13
Appendix 2: Summary of responses to questionnaire	15
Appendix 3: Feedback from other key stakeholders	19
Appendix 4: Existing and proposed Course structures	27
Appendix 5: Assessment	28
Appendix 6: Statistics	31
Appendix 7: PE Qualifications (AS Level) in other awarding bodies	32

Executive summary

This report is the outcome of an investigation into how to implement the agreed actions which were detailed in the Physical Education Subject Review Report, published in May 2002.

The main concerns identified in the Review of Physical Education were:

- ◆ use of 20 and 60-hour Units at Intermediate 1 and 2 and Higher
- ◆ the requirement to select an activity from list A and B at Intermediate 1
- ◆ volume and duplication of assessment
- ◆ Unit and Course requirements at Advanced Higher
- ◆ progression from Standard Grade, through National Courses in PE, to Higher National programmes and other higher education provision
- ◆ the purpose and focus of the Courses, including comparison with other performance-based subjects and analysis of the perceived 'value' of PE Courses
- ◆ the volume and nature of internal assessment in all Units at all levels — this may require changes to Unit specifications and/or Course structures
- ◆ reliability, validity and level of demand of question papers
- ◆ the apparent disparity between candidate achievement in performance and written components of external assessment
- ◆ standards in Performance, concordance, and consistency over time
- ◆ the revised model of visiting moderation, and mechanisms to achieve consistency in quality assurance across the Performance-based subjects
- ◆ experience of using the new administrative procedures and whether further simplification is necessary for Moderators and/or centres

The consultation process, carried out between January and March 2003, involved:

- ◆ questionnaires issued to all local authorities and SQA Moderators, and posted on the SQA website
- ◆ semi-structured interviews with subject experts in centres, examining team members and Principal Assessors
- ◆ two meetings of the PE Subject Advisory Group
- ◆ meetings with PE networks and curricular groups

The responses to the consultation indicated that:

- ◆ The purpose and focus of the Course is appropriate. While there is some disagreement as to the proportion of the Course that should be dedicated to Performance, retaining the 50% weighting for the Performance mark would be widely supported.
- ◆ The existing Course structure containing separate *Analysis* and *Investigation* Units leads to a duplication of assessment, and increases the volume of assessment.
- ◆ The main concern with external assessment is the duplication of assessment created by the Investigation Report component. The level of demand of the question paper is broadly acceptable, although some concerns were expressed that the questions can be repetitive from year to year.
- ◆ There is poor understanding of National Standards.
- ◆ The visiting moderation method of quality assurance in PE is acceptable.

- ◆ Recent improvements to the submission of Performance marks have simplified administration for centres, Moderators and SQA, but further improvements are necessary.

The following recommendations have been made:

- ◆ The Course at Intermediate 1 and 2 and Higher levels should be restructured to create two 60-hour Units: *Performance* and *Analysis of Performance* (the current *Investigation* Unit content should be subsumed within *Analysis of Performance*).
- ◆ The requirement to select activities from List A and B at Intermediate 1 should be removed.
- ◆ Further investigation is necessary to find out whether centres' concerns about progression have any implications for Course design.
- ◆ The total volume of assessment should be reduced and the duplication of assessment removed by internally assessing the investigation element by the production of a log book/Investigation Report. The number of external assessment components should be reduced to two: the current requirement to externally assess the log book/Investigation report should be removed.
- ◆ Units should be revised, and new NABs and exemplar material should be developed.
- ◆ The question paper should be redesigned to reflect the new Course structure, pulling on the approaches of other awarding bodies and other subject areas.
- ◆ The method of calculating and submitting Performance mark component should be reviewed. Marks for this component should be level specific.

Further work is required to:

- ◆ assist centres with the understanding of standards
- ◆ determine whether there is a business case for retention and revision of Advanced Higher

1 Terms of reference

The Scottish Executive initiated a review of all National Courses in June 2001 with the purpose of considering how best to reduce the complexity, variety and total volume of assessment in each subject. Following the review process, Subject Review Reports were published between February and June 2002. The reports identified a number of actions to be taken forward for each subject. These agreed actions received Ministerial approval.

This report is the result of an investigation into the best ways of addressing the issues and implementing the agreed actions specified in the Physical Education Subject Review Report which was published in May 2002.

The issues to be addressed and the agreed actions to be met are detailed in Appendix 1. The main concerns identified in the review of Physical Education were:

- ◆ use of 20-hour and 60-hour Units
- ◆ the retention of the Performance List A and B requirements at Intermediate 1
- ◆ candidates progressing from Standard Grade to Higher Courses
- ◆ dual purpose and duplicate assessment
- ◆ perception of the Higher Course (candidates progressing to further and higher education)
- ◆ centres' understanding of National Standards
- ◆ progression from Intermediate 2 to Higher
- ◆ Unit and Course requirements in Advanced Higher
- ◆ level of demand of question papers
- ◆ candidate achievement in the Performance element of the Course, compared with their achievement in the written elements of the Course
- ◆ calculation of internal assessment marks for Performance, and the administrative arrangements for Physical Education Courses

These issues and agreed actions are the focus of this report:

- ◆ use of 20-hour and 60-hour Units
- ◆ the retention of the Performance List A and B requirements at Intermediate 1
- ◆ dual purpose and duplicate assessment
- ◆ the broad design of the external assessment

These issues and actions will be addressed at the next stage of development:

- ◆ the issue of progression
- ◆ the redesign of the question papers to reflect the new Course structure and to ensure the appropriate level of demand
- ◆ assisting centres with understanding National Standards
- ◆ calculation of internal assessment marks for Performance, and the administrative arrangements for Physical Education Courses

The following issue will be addressed for 2005 - 06 if a business case can be made:

- ◆ Unit and Course requirements in Advanced Higher

2 Methodology

In order to capture as many views as possible, and to meet the needs of the PE community, the research methodology was:

- ◆ questionnaires issued to all local authorities and SQA Moderators, and posted on the SQA website
- ◆ semi-structured interviews with subject experts in centres, examining team members and Principal Assessors
- ◆ two meetings of the PE Subject Advisory Group
- ◆ meetings with PE networks and curricular groups

2.1 Questionnaires and semi-structured interviews

A full-time Development Officer (DO) for PE was appointed. The Development Officer's remit was to work with the Qualifications Manager for PE, and the NQ Review team, to carry out the agreed actions of the Subject Review Report.

A meeting with the Scottish Local Authorities Network of Physical Education (SLANOPE) was held at Forthbank Stadium Stirling on 6 February 2003 — 29 out of 32 local authorities had a representative at this meeting. Those not present were sent a copy of the presentation by e-mail, ensuring that all local authorities in Scotland had the opportunity to comment.

All representatives were then sent a copy of the Subject Review Report and Consultation Questionnaire on 12 and 13 February by e-mail so that they could download and distribute it to centres.

Representatives were asked to contact the DO to organise meetings between the DO and PE network/curricular groups in their local authority.

The questionnaire was posted on the SQA website, and a notification/reminder letter was sent to all centres to inform them of the consultation mechanism.

As an additional means of encouraging feedback, the DO gave a presentation on the consultation process at a meeting of Visiting Moderators on 20 February — Visiting Moderators were covering 60% of centres in the country during March. The Visiting Moderators were given contact details for the DO and a copy of the questionnaire and Subject Review Report. They were asked to remind centres of the consultation process during their moderation visits.

A letter was sent, along with a questionnaire, to every member of the Assessment Panel not already contacted through the main consultation process.

92 completed and partially-completed questionnaires were returned.

These measures were taken to ensure that all stakeholders had the opportunity to contribute to the consultation process. At all times respondents were encouraged to discuss issues with departmental colleagues before completing the questionnaire.

2.2 Physical Education Subject Advisory Group

A Subject Advisory Group was established in order to advise the development team at all stages of the review.

The membership of this group includes representatives from schools, further education, and Learning and Teaching Scotland. The initial meetings held on 19 February and 9 March focused on preliminary feedback, conclusions and proposals. The group was asked to comment on the fitness for purpose of the proposed two x 60 hour Unit structure and the emerging assessment model (see Appendix 3).

2.3 Meetings with local authority networks/curricular advisory groups

Further consultation meetings with groups of teachers took place during February and March. The Development Officer met with PE networks in 10 education authorities. The meetings were attended by 109 staff from 91 centres.

After the groups were briefed on the preliminary findings of the consultation, they provided further feedback on areas of concern. This feedback is summarised in Appendix 3.

2.4 Assessment Panel

The DO updated the Assessment Panel at their meeting on 20 March 2003 on the consultation process and on the feedback already received. The panel discussed models for Course design and assessment, and made three recommendations (see Appendix 3).

2.5 Other stakeholders

Interviews took place with four Principal Assessors (including an FE representative), one member of HMIE, and an SQA Moderator during February and March 2003 (see Appendix 3).

2.6 Statistical analysis of uptake

As an indicator of the perceived value of the PE Higher, and to investigate the uptake pattern of candidates using the current Course for entry to further and higher education, statistics were examined for candidates taking PE with one, two, three and four other Highers for the years 2000 - 2002. These are shown in Appendix 6.

2.7 Other awarding body approaches

The content of PE courses at AS level was investigated (see Appendix 7).

3 Findings

The number of completed and partially completed questionnaires returned was not sufficient to draw firm conclusions on the way ahead. However, when taken together with the feedback from the various groups consulted, there is sufficient consultation evidence in order to draw conclusions. All of the evidence suggests that there is stakeholder consensus on the approach to take in revising the Courses.

3.1 Purpose and focus of PE Courses

Staff present at PE network meetings confirmed that the current performance focus of the Course is appropriate. Many were keen to retain the 50% weighting of the Performance mark in the Course award. Some would have liked a reduction to 40% in the weighting attached to Performance marks.

Some respondents would welcome an increase in the weighting of the Performance marks.

The Advisory Group discussed at length the design of the Course. The group initially considered a Course which gave a 40% weighting to the Course component marks for the Performance element, but this would mean a change in the Course rationale which defines PE as a performance-based Course. The group concluded that a two-Unit Course with a 50/50 weighting (*Performance* and *Analysis*) should be considered.

The Assessment Panel suggested that any new Course should be structured so that candidates cannot achieve a Course award on the basis of a Performance mark alone.

Courses at all levels have seen a marked increase in uptake over the last few years (see Appendix 7). Candidates opting to take PE Courses do so for various reasons. Some are studying PE as part of their general education. Out of a total of 3,800 candidates for Higher PE in 2002, 1,275 candidates were taking it along with three or four other Highers. Others study PE to allow them to progress to HNC/HND programmes in the subject.

3.2 Use of 20-hour and 60-hour Units

The consultation responses were mixed on this issue. The main problem identified was that 20 hours is not long enough to deliver the *Investigation* Unit. There was strong support for amalgamating the *Analysis* and *Investigation* Units into a single 60-hour Unit.

The Assessment Panel proposed a model which reduced the *Performance* Unit from 60 hours to 40 hours, and creating a three x 40-hour Unit Course. This model would require further consultation with stakeholders to agree an appropriate distribution of Course content between the remaining two Units.

Local authority representatives supported the two x 60-hour Unit model and the amalgamation of *Analysis* and *Investigation* into a single Unit.

3.3 Intermediate 1 Performance A and Performance B activity list requirements

The consultation responses suggested that the *Performance* Unit at Intermediate 1 should mirror the *Performance* Unit at Intermediate 2 and Higher. Local authority representatives felt that it was important to retain a broad, balanced *Performance* Unit at this level. The removal of the activity lists would be acceptable.

3.4 Progression from Standard Grade

Stakeholders have found that it is essential for candidates to have a Credit level pass in the elements of Knowledge and Understanding, and Evaluating if they are to progress successfully onto a Higher Course. The same feedback is expressed with General level candidates progressing to Intermediate 2. Many respondents were concerned about this issue, but their concerns were focused on centre management of progression rather than the design of either Standard Grade or the National Courses.

Some respondents expressed concerns about the future of Standard Grade, and reported that their centre was considering moving to National Courses at all stages – some of the subject specialists had reservations about making this change.

3.5 Dual-purpose and duplicate assessment

There was strong support for reducing the number of externally assessed components. There was support from all stakeholder groups for removing the Investigation Report/Log Book as a component of external assessment (this is produced during the delivery of the existing *Investigation Unit*).

All stakeholders agreed that the Log Book (Intermediate 1) and Investigation Report (Intermediate 2 and Higher) were time-consuming to produce, and that the 20 hours allocated to this Unit for delivery and assessment was inadequate. The content of the *Investigation Unit* is also being duplicated in the existing *Analysis Unit*.

Many stakeholders viewed the process of ‘investigating’ as being very useful and would like to retain this aspect in any new Course that is developed.

There was strong support from questionnaire responses and local authority representatives for amalgamating the *Analysis* and *Investigation* Units.

3.6 Unit assessment

Stakeholders have welcomed the increase in the number of moderation visits during 2003. Another popular move would be to moderate *Performance* at the same time as other Units. Many felt that this was one way to address the issue of understanding National Standards, as the moderation feedback would cover most or all of the Course Units and would help to give centres a better understanding of likely candidate performance in the external assessment.

In *Performance* the majority felt that a single activity should be assessed for Unit assessment.

There was strong support for reducing the overall volume of internal assessment by amalgamating the content of the current *Analysis* and *Investigation* Units.

There was strong support for continuing with the internal assessment of a single area of analysis.

Stakeholders would support a reduction in the volume of assessment at Intermediate 1 by changing the assessment to a restricted response test covering one activity.

3.7 Log Book/Investigation Report

There was strong support for removing the Log Book/Investigation Report as an externally assessed component.

There were mixed views on the retention of the internally assessed Log. Book/Investigation given that there appears to be no common practice in its delivery throughout the country. Many would prefer that the *Investigation* Unit itself is removed from the Course, though there was also a view that the 'Investigation' was a valuable teaching and learning process that should not be lost from the Course.

However there was also recognition that the investigation process could be used as another piece of internal assessment in the re-designed *Analysis* Unit and not dropped completely, so that candidates could have a smooth progression from Higher to Advanced Higher.

3.8 Level of demand of question papers

Although the level of demand of question papers is broadly acceptable, there was some feedback that the language in question papers was not candidate-friendly

Both the Subject Advisory Group and the Principal Assessors for the subject agree that existing guidance for setting question papers is restrictive, and results in questions which are repetitive year by year. This guidance should be re-developed to allow setters to sample Course content more effectively and make questions less predictable.

3.9 Candidate achievement in components of external assessment and visiting moderation

Markers' reports have confirmed that candidate achievement in the question paper component is often poor.

Examiners have reported that, in general, candidate appeal evidence submitted was not sufficiently persuasive to improve awards to estimated grades. Both the Subject Advisory Group and Principal Assessors have suggested that there are problems with centres' understanding of National Standards. Moderation is seen as an opportunity to address this issue.

Consultation responses suggest that centres are happy with the process for moderation at present.

3.10 Calculation of marks and administration of PE Courses

All stakeholders agree this requires significant improvement. The Subject Advisory Group, and almost all local authority representatives agree that the simplification of Performance marks calculation is a priority.

The Subject Advisory Group felt that further investigation was required to look into models for marking Performance with a view to streamlining assessment and data processing. This would also help improve understanding of the relationship between the Performance marks for the Course and a Unit pass in *Performance*.

3.11 Unit and Course requirements at Advanced Higher

There were 36 responses on Advanced Higher issues. This Course had less than 100 candidates in each of its first two years of implementation.

These respondents felt that many of the issues related to this Course had been addressed at an information seminar on Advanced Higher in November 2002, which was attended by 30 staff from 27 centres (see Appendix 3).

Nine respondents felt that the level of demand of the dissertation was too high.

Both the Principal Assessor, and those who attended the seminar in November 2002, identified duplication between the *Perspectives on Performance* Unit and the Investigation Log Book.

Three respondents were concerned that the level of demand of the Performance activity at Advanced Higher is stopping candidates from taking the Course. There are many academically able candidates whose standards of Performance are not at the required level. These respondents felt that the level of Performance required at Advanced Higher should be the same as that required at Higher.

The Principal Assessor suggested a reduction to internal and external assessment (see Appendix 3).

4 Conclusions

4.1 Purpose and focus of PE Courses

The contribution of the Performance element to the Course should remain at 50%.

4.2 Use of 20-hour and 60-hour Units

Many respondents would support an amalgamation of the *Analysis* and *Investigation* Units to form a single Unit. This would also lead to a natural two-Unit Course structure: retaining the existing 60-hour *Performance* Unit, and a new 60-hour *Analysis* Unit which incorporates the Investigation element. The Investigation process should remain as part of the content of the re-designed *Analysis* Unit to ensure a smooth progression to the Advanced Higher Course. There is wide stakeholder support for this model.

A three-Unit structure was mooted by the Assessment Panel and others, but this would require significant further consultation on the distribution of content of the Units.

4.3 Intermediate 1 Performance A and Performance B activity list requirements

The Intermediate 1 Course should be structured in line with the newly re-designed Intermediate 2 and Higher, with a 50% weighting for the Performance element and a broad experience of activities offered to candidates. The activity list requirements should be removed.

4.4 Progression from Standard Grade

Progression from Standard Grade to NQ Courses appears to be a centre management issue. It does not appear to be a problem with Course design.

4.5 Dual-purpose and duplicate assessment

The content and design of the existing *Investigation* Unit is an obstacle to teaching and learning, and creates duplication in internal and external assessment. The investigation element is a valuable process which is already covered in the analysis Unit three times through the 'cycle of analysis'.

4.6 Unit assessment

Units should be revised, and new NABs and exemplar material should be developed which reflect the fact that:

- ◆ *Analysis of Performance* (Intermediate 1) – should be assessed by a restricted response test covering one activity.
- ◆ *Analysis of Performance* at all levels should be assessed through analysis of a performance in one activity. The assessment should meet the agreed assessment parameters (1 hour 30 minutes for a 60-hour Unit).
- ◆ The *Performance* Unit should require assessment in one activity.

4.7 Log Book/Investigation Report

The Log Book/Investigation Report should be removed as a component of Course assessment.

4.8 Level and demand of question papers

Other approaches to the external assessment of PE should be explored, including that of other awarding bodies.

4.9 Candidate achievement in components of external assessment and visiting moderation

Principal Assessor and Senior Moderator reports state that centres require help in understanding National Standards for internal and external assessment of Analysis and investigation of Performance at all levels. This concern is shared by Intermediate and Higher markers, Performance Moderators and Moderators of written components. Candidate achievement in these components is commonly well below their achievement in the Performance component.

Visiting moderation of Performance appears to be successful. Marks in this component appear to have peaked at an average of 75 out of 90.

4.10 Calculation of marks and administration of PE Courses

Further simplification of the Performance marks calculation for the external assessment would be welcomed. Further investigation will be required to eliminate weighting and scaling of Performance marks once the new design model for the Courses has been confirmed.

4.11 Unit and Course requirements at Advanced Higher

The issues identified in the Advanced Higher Course may require further investigation.

SQA is currently developing policy and procedures for dealing with Courses with very low uptake. The Advanced Higher in PE has had very low uptake in its three years of implementation (see Appendix 7). It is, therefore, proposed that no changes should be made to the Advanced Higher for 2004 - 2005. Instead, the Course should be monitored in the light of the emerging policy on low uptake and the impact of changes at Higher. A business case should be made for the retention and revision of the Advanced Higher - if this business case can be made, then the Advanced Higher may be revised in line with Higher for 2005 - 2006. Alternatively, the Course may be withdrawn, leaving free-standing Units. There are no progression issues in taking this action as very few candidates progress from Higher to Advanced Higher.

5 Recommendations

- 5.1 The Course at Intermediate 1 and 2 and Higher levels should be restructured to create two 60-hour Units: *Performance* and *Analysis of Performance* (the current *Investigation* Unit content should be subsumed within *Analysis of Performance*).
- 5.2 The requirement to select activities from List A and B at Intermediate 1 should be removed.
- 5.3 The total volume of assessment should be reduced and the duplication of assessment removed by internally assessing the Investigation element by the production of a Log Book/Investigation Report. The number of external assessment components should be reduced to two: the current requirement to externally assess the Log Book/Investigation Report should be removed.
- 5.4 Units should be revised, and new NABs and exemplar material should be developed.
- 5.5 The question paper should be re-designed to reflect the new Course structure and to ensure that guidance for setters allows more effective sampling of Course content, and less repetition of questions from year to year. In re-designing the question paper, the examining/setting team should pull on the approaches of other awarding bodies and other subject areas.
- 5.6 The method of calculating and submitting Performance mark component should be reviewed. Marks for this component should be level specific.

Further work is required to:

- ◆ assist centres with the understanding of standards
- ◆ determine whether there is a business case for retention and revision of Advanced Higher

Appendix 1: Agreed actions from Subject Review Report

1 Use of 20-hour and 60-hour Units

The two 20-hour Units in Intermediate 1 Physical Education will be retained, pending wider revision of the Courses.

The 60-hour Units in Intermediate 2 and Higher Physical Education will be retained, pending wider revision of the Courses. The content and duration and the 20-hour Units will be investigated.

2 Intermediate 1 Performance A and Performance B activity list requirements

Investigate whether there is a need to retain this requirement, and if so, how it can be formalised. The wider revision of the Courses should propose a more valid and effective approach to ensuring appropriate coverage of varied performance activities at Intermediate 1.

3 Progression from Standard Grade

This issue should be considered as part of the wider revision of the Courses.

4 Dual-purpose and duplicate assessment

Investigate the combination of external assessment components (all levels) to reduce the duplication of internal and external assessment. The investigation will review experience to date and evaluate alternative models of marking Performance with a view to streamlining assessment, possibly by separating determination of the Performance mark for the Course from determination of the level of *Performance* Unit passed. Ways to achieve this will be investigated as part of the wider revision of the Courses.

5 Revision of PE Courses

Revision of PE Courses should begin as soon as possible. The revisions should address this issue, as well as all of the issues of Course content, assessment and administration raised in this report.

6 Internal assessment

As part of the wider revision of the Courses, the volume and nature of internal assessment evidence should be reviewed. Unit specifications and NABs may need to be re-written to clarify National Standards. Consideration should be given to amalgamating the *Investigation of Performance* and *Analysis of Performance* Units at all levels, eliminating the need for 20-hour Units and allowing the development of integrative instruments of assessment. Use of a log book as an instrument of assessment should also be evaluated.

As part of this work, early consideration should be given as to whether there are measures which can be taken in the short-term to reduce the complexity and increase the practicability of Unit assessments, especially for the *Investigation of Performance* and *Analysis of Performance* Units.

7 Log Book/Investigation Report

The Log Book and Investigation Reports are assessed both internally and externally. Centres have questioned their use as components of external assessment in terms of validity, reliability and practicability, especially at Intermediate 1 and 2. The burden of assessment must be reduced and duplicate assessment of these skills eliminated. Ways to achieve this will be investigated as part of the wider revision of the Courses.

8 Unit and Course requirements at Advanced Higher

Clarify the guidelines in the Course and Unit specifications on what constitutes a suitable activity for the Performance. Clarify the requirements for the *Perspectives on Performance* and *Investigation of Performance* Units. Provide more exemplification and guidance for the Dissertation component of the external assessment.

9 Level and demand of question papers

The level of demand of the question papers should be investigated as part of the wider revision of the Courses.

10 Candidate achievement in components of external assessment and visiting moderation

This issue should be investigated as part of the wider revision of the Courses at all levels.

11 Calculation of marks and administration of PE Courses

These issues should be investigated as part of the wider revision of the Courses.

Appendix 2: Summary of responses to questionnaire

There are 345 centres that offer National Courses in Physical Education. 92 questionnaires were returned from respondents in 80 centres. In addition, 109 teachers of PE from 91 centres had an opportunity to respond at consultation meetings. In total, then, over 40% of centres returned questionnaires or had an opportunity to comment.

Structure of Course

How can this Course better meet the design requirements?

Intermediate 1

33 out of 92 questionnaire respondents commented on Intermediate 1.

	Responses
a) <i>Performance</i> Units in line with Higher/Int. 2	11
b) happy with status quo	7
c) <i>Investigation</i> logbook internally assessed	4
d) combine <i>Analysis</i> with <i>Investigation</i>	11

Intermediate 2/Higher

53 out of 92 questionnaire respondents commented on Intermediate 2/Higher.

a) 50% weighting <i>Performance/Analysis</i>	9
b) amalgamate <i>Analysis</i> and <i>Investigation</i>	12
c) <i>Performance</i> 40% or 1/3	12
d) design for Int 1 and Higher must be the same	2
e) clearer progression in demand of Higher and Int 2	6
Other Comment	12

Advanced Higher

26 out of 92 questionnaire respondents commented on Advanced Higher.

a) <i>Perspective on Performance</i> and <i>Investigation</i> should be combined	4
b) level too high — especially in the Dissertation	9
Other comment	13

Assessment rationale

Dual-purpose and duplication of assessment

	Responses	
	Yes	No
The <i>Investigation</i> Log book should be assessed internally and externally at Intermediate 1	19	49
The <i>Investigation</i> Log book should be assessed internally and externally at Intermediate 2	19	54
The <i>Investigation</i> Log book should be assessed internally and <i>Investigation</i> Report should be assessed externally at Intermediate 2.	27	51
The <i>Investigation</i> Log book should be assessed internally and <i>Investigation</i> Report should be assessed externally at Higher.	31	42
The <i>Investigation</i> Report should be assessed internally and externally at Higher.	33	45

Internal assessment of Units: all pass/fail

Performance Unit

For the *Performance* Unit, one activity is assessed. Should Performance for Unit purposes remain as one activity only?

63 out of 92 questionnaire respondents answered this question.

	1 Strongly agree	2	3	4 Strongly disagree
No of responses	32	15	7	9
% of those who answered	51%	24%	11%	14%

For diet 2002, the process for submission of performance marks was simplified. The system of marking for the performance should continue to be monitored and improved.

70 out of 92 respondents answered this question

	1 Strongly agree	2	3	4 Strongly disagree
No of responses	52	13	1	4
% of those who answered this q	74%	19%	1%	6%

Investigation Unit

	No of responses	
	Yes	No
The internal assessment at Intermediate 1 should be changed to a restricted response test completed in one activity	43	13
The <i>Investigation</i> and <i>Analysis</i> Units should have combined assessment (eg one NAB) for all levels	45	27

Analysis Unit

	No of responses	
	Yes	No
The internal assessment at Intermediate 1 should be changed to a restricted response test completed in one activity	46	10
Is the assessment of one area of <i>Analysis</i> sufficient for internal requirements at Intermediate 2 and Higher?	54	18

Comments

a) simplify assessments – clearer guidelines on validity of NABs	12
b) Two areas of <i>Analysis</i> to be assessed internal and external	6
c) combine <i>Analysis</i> and <i>Investigation</i> into 1 paper/exam	27

External assessment

Investigation

a) get rid of it	35
b) keep it internally assessed	5
c) Log Book at Int 2 report at Higher internally assessed	5
d) Log Book or report at Higher/Int2 internally assessed	8
e) status quo - internally assessed and externally moderated	6
f) more than 20 hours required to achieve pass quality	24

Demand of question papers

a) too many questions at Higher	2
b) language not candidate friendly	15
c) Higher and Advanced Higher papers too demanding	5
d) too many key concepts/features	2
e) questions too similar year to year	9

Quality assurance

Visiting moderation of the Performance assessment for the Course could be combined with the Unit moderation of both *Investigation* and *Analysis of Performance*?

66 out of 92 respondents answered this question.

	1 Strongly agree	2	3	4 Strongly disagree
No of responses	13	10	12	31
% of those who answered	20%	15%	18%	47%

Visiting moderation of the Performance assessment for the Course could be combined with the Unit moderation of *Investigation*?

58 out of 92 respondents answered this question.

	1 Strongly agree	2	3	4 Strongly disagree
No of responses	5	10	11	32
% of those who answered	9%	17%	19%	55%

Visiting moderation of the Performance assessment for the Course could be combined with the Unit moderation of *Analysis of Performance*?

58 out of 92 respondents answered this question

	1 Strongly agree	2	3	4 Strongly disagree
No of responses	9	12	15	22
% of those who answered	15%	21%	26%	38%

The existing model of quality assurance for PE should be retained.

66 out of 92 respondents answered this question.

	1 Strongly agree	2	3	4 Strongly disagree
No of responses	22	22	11	11
% of those who answered	33%	33%	17%	17%

Comments

a) moderation on a rolling basis every 3/4 years	14
b) Moderators must be properly trained	4
c) centres require feedback/support	17
d) concerns re time moderating - also staff out of school (release)	16
e) concerns re the time of year for moderating	11

Respondents made the following general comments on the Courses

a) better exemplars for <i>Analysis</i> required	7
b) candidates find Course difficult	5
c) Course design – three Units from <i>Analysis of Performance</i> area	5
d) performance weighting too high	5

Appendix 3: Feedback from other key stakeholders

3.1 Subject Advisory Group

Membership

Donnie MacLeod	Lenzie Academy	(East Dunbartonshire)
David Lobban	PA Higher	
Colin McEwan	Bannerman HS	(LTS Representative)
Billy Calder	Dalbeattie HS	(Dumfries & Galloway)
John Pearson	Kelso HS	(Borders Region)
Tony McDaid	Cathkin HS	(North Lanarkshire)
Ann Duff	Shawlands Academy	(City of Glasgow)
Andrew Fairnie	SQA Moderator	
Russell Muir	Larbert HS	(Falkirk Council) Assessment Panel
Jenny Menzies	Royal HS	(City of Edinburgh)
John Anton	Development Officer	
Paul Gallacher	Qualifications Manager	

Key issues/recommendations from Subject Advisory Group meetings:

The following issues were raised at meetings in February and March 2003:

General

- ◆ Whether the Performance element should have a 50% or 40% - it was felt that a weighting of 40% would create a Course design issue.
- ◆ Whether two Courses - Performance based and Theory based are needed?
- ◆ Do the Courses have credibility with HE/FE?
- ◆ Concerns regarding duplication of assessment and workload and whether the Investigation should stay, and if so, in what form.
- ◆ Whether the exam should include assessment of Investigation process and if so, in what form.
- ◆ Whether a mark needs to be put on Performance or could it be assessed as Pass/Fail (ie be assessed for the Unit only)?
- ◆ Whether the three PE Units should be from *Analysis of Performance*.
- ◆ The possibility of developing two 60 hour Units rather than three with mandatory Investigation within Analysis Unit 60 hours.
- ◆ Three equal Units is probably a bridge too far at present but must be recommended for the future.
- ◆ It was felt that the exam should remain as it is.

Quality assurance and moderation

The group discussed Principal Assessor reports for Intermediate 1 and 2 and Higher. Consideration was given to how centres could be supported in delivering PE Courses to National Standards. It was recognised that moderation is a key issue. The need to put a good quality assurance package in place was emphasised.

The group discussed whether visiting moderation should look at more than Performance, which would have serious implications for Moderator training. The group asked if centres would welcome this and whether Moderators would opt for this, whether moderation should stay as it is, or perhaps a different model of visiting moderation could be used.

Analysis/Investigation

Internally – Should the *Investigation* be retained but not externally assessed, and should it be done through one area of Analysis?

Externally – Exam could have two possible models:

Model 1 - Status Quo – through teaching and learning, pupils follow three mini investigations in each area of Analysis. Discrete internal and external assessment of *Investigation* would be removed - the skill would be covered in the *Analysis unit*. This would be a massive reduction in duplication of assessment.

Model 2 - *Investigation* question plus two from four areas, marked out of 60.

Scaling

- ◆ Can we simplify the data transfer process? Getting rid of double weighting would do this.
- ◆ Do we need the 0-70 scale? Would it be possible to allocate marks out of 20 or 30?

Appeals

Evidence might be:

- ◆ *Investigation* Log Book or Report at Int 2 and Higher
- ◆ Log book at Int 1
- ◆ assignment for analysis in one area
- ◆ prelim

3.2 Recommendations from Assessment Panel Meeting, March 2003

- ◆ consider three Units for Course design – reducing Performance weighting
- ◆ quality assurance and staff development are key issues for the future of NQ
- ◆ two Unit model *Analysis / Investigation*, no outline given at present - further investigation / consultation required re format of this model

3.3 Meetings with local authority network/curricular groups

Meetings were held with PE networks in ten education authorities. 109 staff from 91 centres attended. This is a summary of their comments, views and suggestions.

Performance

- ◆ There should be one activity list at Intermediate 1 – guidance/clarification for centres required.
- ◆ Four groups felt that Performance should have a 50% weighting, although some members of one group would like to see a reduction in its weighting, but not as far as 33%.

- ◆ The performance should have 50% weighting at Intermediate 1, in line with Intermediate 2/Higher
- ◆ One group suggested removing the weighting and simply submitting two marks to SQA.
- ◆ There was strong support for the review and refinement of the administration of Performance marks Units and Course Awards (still too many forms)
- ◆ Could Performance be centrally moderated? (For example, taking a sample of candidates to a central venue in an authority - one member of staff from each centre in the area would be required to attend to go through the moderation exercise.)

Analysis of Performance

- ◆ Are our papers at Intermediate 2 and Higher harder or easier than other subjects?
- ◆ Teachers at the meetings reported that candidates say the exam is harder than other subjects.

Investigation of Performance

There were mixed views on the *Investigation* Unit, with some people feeling strongly that it should go, while some others felt it should be retained, and one group suggested it could be assessed internally only. Some clearly felt that it took up too much time, kept candidates in the classroom for too long, and took time away from the performance aspects of the Course. These people felt that it should be subsumed within the *Performance* Unit. If the *Investigation* Unit were to remain, staff wanted to see the development of a new log book for assessment purposes. They were concerned about candidates trying to reflect on Performance in their own time out of school – a majority of candidates only had exposure to PE activities through timetabled PE in school. Some people were concerned that staff may tend to lead the investigation process to enable candidates to meet deadlines. Some were concerned about plagiarism and internet copies.

Course issues

- ◆ suggest the possibility of three Units – 40 hours each (20 hours for Investigation is unrealistic)
- ◆ some people liked the idea of two Unit Courses
- ◆ it was suggested that the following weighting could be applied in the Course grading - Performance 50% Exam 25% Report 25%
- ◆ combine *Analysis* and *Investigation* – internal and external? (to avoid/reduce duplication)
- ◆ should *Performance* and *Investigation* be combined?
- ◆ instead of *Investigation*, four areas could be covered in *Analysis* Unit
- ◆ concern expressed that centres are being asked to teach Higher and Advanced Higher together
- ◆ most groups felt that Intermediate 1 should come into line with other levels

External exam

- ◆ There is a perception that the QP tests English skills rather than PE.
- ◆ It was suggested that the paper should cover assessment of *Investigation* and *Analysis*
- ◆ Paper 1 – could include question based on the analysis of data.
- ◆ Paper 2 – could cover 2 out of 4 ‘areas’, not an Investigation area.
- ◆ One group felt the exam should be reduced to eight questions at Higher, and expressed concerns about the amount of reading time required.

Moderation

Particular concerns were raised about the administration and timing of moderation.

- ◆ A four-year cycle of moderation was suggested as follows: Performance, *Analysis*, *Investigation*, random Unit.
- ◆ Some groups felt that moderation should be a rolling process with feedback to centres on all Units, which was seen as very beneficial for teaching and learning. One group raised the SCOTVEC model of the visiting Moderator as a possibility as it was perceived to reduce the amount of paperwork.
- ◆ Moderation was seen as a key issue.
- ◆ One group raised the possibility of moderating *Investigation* or *Analysis* together with *Performance* during the Moderator visit.

Support

It was suggested that a Handbook on procedures for PE would be very helpful – a simple guideline to timescales and arrangements for Course delivery, internal and external assessment, moderation (visiting and central) and appeals.

There was a desire for support in quality assurance generally, and for guidance on what is acceptable as an activity in a *Performance* Unit.

Other comments related to the provision of examples of good practice and the return of external exam marks.

All staff felt that major in-service training was essential in the future. Many did not consider themselves up to speed with present Arrangements documents and were concerned about issues highlighted in the Subject Review Report for PE.

General

- ◆ Some people were concerned about the administration arrangements and the amount of paperwork for PE – staff find this difficult and time consuming
- ◆ It was suggested that SQA should issue schools with further simplification and guidance on the compilation of the final mark for Performance.
- ◆ Some people were concerned that the Higher is not a pre-requisite for university entrance
- ◆ There were some concerns regarding progression/linkage between Standard Grade and NQ. Important that candidates have a credit pass in Knowledge and Understanding and Evaluation elements.
- ◆ There were questions about the lifespan of Standard Grade.
- ◆ Some commented that NABs take longer than suggested, causing a reduction in teaching time.
- ◆ It was stated that NABs were required in all areas of *Analysis of Performance* – and they should be more user friendly
- ◆ There was some concern about the volume and duplication of assessment and content, and the length of time spent on internal assessment.

3.4 Meetings with individuals

Meetings were held with four Principal Assessors (including an FE representative), an SQA Moderator and the HMIE with responsibility for PE.

Meeting 1 – SQA Moderator

Key issues

- ◆ Concern was expressed about the administration associated with Performance marks – centres still have a lot of problems with this.
- ◆ Simplification of data transfer of Performance mark is essential.
- ◆ Suggested that a three-year cycle for moderation would be helpful.
- ◆ NABs need serious attention - centres require more exemplification of Unit standards.
- ◆ Importance of guidance on key concepts/features (should indicate which features are compulsory and which could be used for extension work in centres). This would have an effect on teaching and learning, assessment and exam setting.
- ◆ No more exemplar material required (apart from relevant changes). Important that there is a document on how to use appropriate materials.
- ◆ Requirements for Appeals/Moderation in the way of administration and procedures needs to be much clearer to staff and SQA co-ordinators in schools.
- ◆ A staff development programme is required to improve the understanding of National Standards.
- ◆ Re-design of Intermediate 1 – will have an affect on Access 3 cluster.

Meeting 2 – Principal Assessor for Higher PE

Key issues

- ◆ Important when updating the Arrangements Document that the current Course rationale is retained as it is still appropriate
- ◆ Performance – good model at 50% - this has been the subject of debate within the PE profession for a number of years. Keep it as it is, internal assessment with moderation.
- ◆ Submission of results needs looked at, as current system is too complex.
- ◆ To make it a worthwhile appeal, the standard of evidence presented must be above that of the evidence already presented for external assessment of *Analysis / Investigation*.
- ◆ Moderation issues regarding Adv Higher.
- ◆ Advanced Higher marking scheme needs adjusted. Staff require exemplification of standards in dissertation.
- ◆ Future assessment could be:

Internally assessed and moderated:

- *Analysis* assignment (as present)
- *Investigation* – (Log book or Report?).

Externally assessed:

- One question paper in two parts:
 1. *Investigation* – evaluative questions (generic) 20 marks
 - data gathering methods
 - key findings from primary data
 - summary of evidence from secondary sources
 - structure of development programme
 - evaluation of training
 - benefits to performance
 2. *Analysis* – two from two areas different to *Investigation* (2 x 20 marks)
 - structure as now

Advantages:

- Course rationale not compromised
- assessment overlap addressed
- investment in curriculum and staff development protected

- could assist with existing issue of predictability in QP

Meeting 3 – Principal Assessor for Sports Coaching (FE representative)

- ◆ As part of the Higher examining team and as a Moderator for PE, sees the need for drastic change in the structure and assessment of Physical Education to reduce assessment burden.
- ◆ Subject must look to moderate centres on a more regular basis – the range of standards within *Analysis* and *Investigation* are a concern.
- ◆ Important that the subject has credibility and links to Courses in HE/FE.
- ◆ Entry to NC/HNC Courses for PE requires a basis of knowledge and understanding.
- ◆ Candidates must also investigate Performance and follow a process. Important that we don't lose this.

Meeting 4 – HMIE for PE

A general concern was expressed that centres appear to believe that evidence must be written. As part of the review, centres could be reminded that they can use oral, written, visual or graphic evidence where this meets the evidence requirements outlined in the Unit Specifications and Course Arrangements.

Meeting 5 – Principal Assessor for Standard Grade PE

- ◆ *Investigation* – takes a ridiculous amount of time in relation to the mark awarded. Likes process of Log book – used well internally.
- ◆ The Investigation is the same scenario as experienced with former S Grade assignment.
- ◆ Concerned that candidates may be disadvantaged if centres operate bi-level classes and teach *Investigation* Unit at Intermediate 2 and Higher together, since this is very difficult to do.
- ◆ At present, there is duplication of assessment between the *Analysis* and *Investigation* Units.
- ◆ Also had concerns about the quality assurance mechanisms for the Units and Courses.
- ◆ Suggested the possibility of regional moderation - using one facility, with groups of Moderators looking at Performance in one centre.
- ◆ Felt that the quality assurance of PE needs to change, and that moderation of Performance should take place throughout the academic year and not just in March.
- ◆ Likes the idea of visiting moderation looking at more than one Unit at a time.
- ◆ In many centres staff are cutting the Course to two activities to cope with timetable/facilities. This is already disadvantaging candidates and is not what this Course was meant to be about.
- ◆ Likes performance at present – double weighting.

Meeting 6 – Principal Assessor for Advanced Higher

Advanced Higher:

- ◆ Concerned that there is a great deal of overlap between the Investigation log book and the content of the *Perspectives in Performance* Unit
- ◆ Internal assessment should be changed to one perspective, logbook then dissertation, or two perspectives then dissertation.
- ◆ Candidates find the level of demand of Advanced Higher Performance difficult to achieve. The requirements for Performance at Advanced Higher should be the same as those at Higher.
- ◆ There is a need to change the marking scheme for the dissertation – currently there are nine marks for presentation – but this permeates the evidence and the marks for this

aspect could be subsumed within the rest of the marking scheme. The dissertation could then be marked out of 60 rather than out of 70 as at present.

- ◆ Candidates find it difficult to separate the nature, purpose, and rationale of their dissertation.
- ◆ Concerned about the quality of candidate responses– some Advanced Higher candidates would have struggled at Higher.

3.5 Extract from notes from SQA Advanced Higher PE Seminar November 2002

This meeting was attended by 30 staff from 27 centres. The following issues and comments were raised.

- ◆ Centres do not like the change in weighting for Performance from 50% at Higher, to 33% at Advanced Higher. Some candidates might do better at Advanced Higher because they can specialise in one activity. Other candidates who have a good academic record are not able to complete the Advanced Higher Course because the requirements for the Performance activity are too demanding.
- ◆ Candidates (and centres) require guidance on setting out work in the dissertation.
- ◆ Staff in centres state that there is a need for staff training.
- ◆ Further material exemplifying National Standards may be useful to centres.
- ◆ Moderation is an issue.
- ◆ There was general support for the suggestion that only one area from *Perspectives on Performance* needs to be used in detail and the proposed rewording to ‘at least one’ was agreed to be helpful.
- ◆ Centre staff would like there to be a reconsideration of the relative weighting of the dissertation and Performance components of the external assessment.
- ◆ Teachers would like clarification of the conditions in which the Unit essays must be completed. The arrangements suggest they should be completed in one hour under exam conditions. Staff have suggested that the review should result in a more appropriate method of assessment, with more appropriate timing and conditions.
- ◆ The distribution of examples of completed Unit assessments for *Perspectives on Performance* and the *Investigation* would assist centres.

Appendix 4: Existing and proposed Course structure

Structure of existing Courses

Intermediate 1 Physical Education

Performance A	(40 hours)
Performance B	(40 hours)
Analysis of Performance	(20 hours)
Investigation of Performance	(20 hours)

Intermediate 2 Physical Education

Performance	(60 hours)
Analysis of Performance	(40 hours)
Investigation of Performance	(20 hours)

Higher Physical Education

Performance	(60 hours)
Analysis of Performance	(40 hours)
Investigation of Performance	(20 hours)

Advanced Higher Physical Education

Performance	(40 hours)
Perspectives on Performance	(40 hours)
Investigation of Performance	(40 hours)

Proposed structure of Courses

Intermediate 1 Physical Education

Performance	(60 hours)
Analysis of Performance	(60 hours)

Intermediate 2 Physical Education

Performance	(60 hours)
Analysis of Performance	(60 hours)

Higher Physical Education

Performance	(60 hours)
Analysis of Performance	(60 hours)

Advanced Higher Physical Education

Performance	(40 hours)
Perspectives on Performance	(40 hours)
Investigation of Performance	(40 hours)

Appendix 5: Assessment

5.1 Suggested volume and duration of assessment

Intermediate 1

	Unit assessment	Course assessment
Performance	Practical Performance, 2 - 4 minutes	Visiting moderation of Practical Performance 2 - 4 minutes
Analysis and Investigation	Restricted response test (1 area of Analysis), 20 - 30 minutes Investigation Log Book - within an area of Analysis, 1 hour	Question paper: structured questions Two areas of Analysis plus area covered by Investigation Log Book 1 hour
	Maximum 1 hour 34 mins	1 hour 4 mins
	TOTAL 2 hours 38 minutes	

Intermediate 2

	Unit assessment	Course assessment
Performance	Practical Performance, 2 - 4 minutes	Visiting moderation of Practical Performance 2 - 4 minutes
Analysis & Investigation	Essays/account (one area of Analysis), 40 - 60 minutes Investigation Log Book or report - within an area of Analysis, 1,500 words, 1 hour	Question paper: structured questions Two areas of Analysis plus area covered by Investigation Log Book 2 hours
	Maximum 2 hours 4 mins	2 hours 4 mins
	TOTAL 4 hours 8 minutes	

Higher

	Unit assessment	Course assessment
Performance	Practical Performance, 4 - 8 minutes	Visiting moderation of Practical Performance, 4 - 8 minutes
Analysis and Investigation	Essays/account (one area of Analysis), 60-80 minutes Investigation Log Book or 2,000 word Report or 10 minute video with explanatory note - within an area of Analysis, notional timing 1 hour	Question paper: structured questions Two areas of Analysis plus area covered by Investigation Log book 2 hours 30 mins
	Maximum 2 hours 28 mins	2 hours 38 mins
	TOTAL 5 hours 6 minutes	

Advanced Higher

	Unit assessment	Course assessment
Performance	Practical Performance, 2 - 4 minutes	Visiting moderation of Practical Performance, 2 - 4 minutes
Perspectives on Performance	Oral, written, visual or graphic evidence – estimated time 30 minutes Investigation Log Book - within an area of Analysis, 1 hour	Question paper: structured questions Two areas of Analysis plus area covered by Investigation Log Book 1 hour
Investigation of Performance	Log Book – evidence can be oral, written, visual/video, graphic, computer data – estimated time 30 minutes Summative assessment may comprise essay questions under exam conditions – 2 hours	Dissertation – 3,500 words
	Maximum 3 hours 4 mins	3 hours 12 mins plus 3,500 word dissertation
	TOTAL 3 hours 12 minutes plus 3,500 word dissertation	

5.2 Draft assessment rationale for the proposed Course model

Higher

Unit assessment

Internal Unit assessment is designed to assess the Outcomes and Performance Criteria for each Unit.

Performance

To achieve this Unit, candidates are required to demonstrate that they have met the Performance Criteria for the Outcome. Evidence from one activity is required. For all candidates, staff should record details of attainment in one activity.

Analysis and Investigation of Performance

Evidence should be generated through practical approaches which provide candidates with opportunities to experience, explore and discuss Performance issues. *Analysis of Performance* should be firmly rooted in practical problem-solving with the central purpose of improving Performance. Evidence should be generated as a natural outcome of Performance experiences. To achieve the Unit, sufficient evidence requires to be presented to indicate that all Outcomes and Performance Criteria have been met for one area of Analysis. Candidates should be made aware of assessment criteria and instruments of assessment.

Within the Unit, the Investigation aspect should engage candidates in activity of a practical problem-solving nature. Evidence should be gathered as a natural outcome of teaching and learning. Candidates should be given regular feedback on the progress of their work. The timing of assessments may vary according to progress of individual candidates.

Course assessment

Performance

Candidates' performance will be internally assessed, with the dual purpose of determining both Unit achievement and Course achievement. Performance should be assessed in each candidate's best two activities from the Course. This internal assessment will be subject to external moderation.

This contributes to 50% of the overall Course award.

Analysis and Investigation of Performance

Candidates will be assessed by a written examination paper. The paper will be grouped into four sections corresponding to each of the four areas of *Analysis of Performance*. Candidates will be required to answer 3 questions, each from a different section. The duration of the examination will be two hours.

This contributes 50% of the overall Course award.

Appendix 6: Statistics

Uptake figures for the last three years

	2000	2001	2002	2003 (estimated)
Adv Higher	0	38	61	102
Higher	3,028	3,701	3,696	5,000
Intermediate 2	1,372	1,844	1,980	2,700
Intermediate 1	113	342	480	600

Number of Highers sat by Higher PE candidates 2000 - 02

2000

No of other Highers	No of candidates
0	735
1	1,120
2	823
3	295
4	55

2001

No of other Highers	No of candidates
0	555
1	1,073
2	1,137
3	674
4	242

2002

No of other Highers	No of candidates
0	477
1	946
2	1,105
3	857
4	416

Appendix 7: PE qualifications (AS level) in other awarding bodies

Awarding Body	Content	Weighting	Written examination duration
Edexcel	The social basis of sport and recreation	30%	1 hour 15 minutes
	Enhancing performance Acquiring skill (12%) Practical Application OR Research Project (20%), Performance: Analysis and Provision (8%) Exercise and Training	40% (coursework) 30%	 1 hour 15 minutes
Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations (OCR)	Application of Physiological and Psychological Knowledge to improve Performance	40%	1 hour 30 minutes
	Contemporary Studies in Physical Education	30%	1 hour 15 minutes
	Performance and its improvement through Critical Analysis	30% (coursework)	
The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA)	Physiological and Psychological Factors which Improve Performance	40%	1 hour 30 minutes
	Socio-cultural and Historical Effects on Participation in Physical Activity and their Influence on Performance	30%	1 hour 15 minutes
	Analysis and Improvement of Performance	30% (coursework)	
	by Planning, Performing and evaluating a training programme (6%) and Practical Demonstration OR Written Projects Investigation (9%)		