

Principal Assessor Report 2004

Assessment Panel:

Physical Education

Qualification area

**Subject(s) and Level(s)
Included in this report**

**Physical Education — Standard Grade
(Foundation, General and Credit)**

Statistical information: update

Number of entries in 2002 Pre appeal	18,332
---	--------

Number of entries in 2003 Pre appeal	17,249
---	--------

General comments re entry numbers

Evaluating	17,249
Knowledge and Understanding	17,249
Practical Performance	17,852
Encouraging seeing only a slight decrease in the uptake of Standard Grade PE as Centres and Local Authorities consider their options as regards National Qualifications.	

Statistical Information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of awards

3201 Knowledge and Understanding

Slight change at Credit level. Although 26.7% achieved at 1 or 2 there has been a slight downturn in those gaining an upper award.

At General level a good increase has been made at the upper level.

3202 Evaluating

General trend is an upward direction with increases being made in the upper award grades of all three levels. Disappointingly there has been a slight increase in Grade 7's.

Comments on any significant changes in percentages or distribution of awards

Marginal concerns over the Credit Evaluating section. Markers reports suggested that candidates responses merited a change to a lowering of the final cut-off score applied at Grade 1.

Grade boundaries for each subject area included in the report

Standard Grade

Performance — Directly graded

Standard Grade			
Assessable Element –	Knowledge and Understanding		
Grade	Maximum Mark	Minimum Mark for Grade	% Mark
1	55	33	
2	55	23	
3	50	24	
4	50	16	
5	45	21	
6	45	15	

Standard Grade			
Assessable Element –	Evaluating		
Grade	Maximum Mark	Minimum Mark for Grade	% Mark
1	50	32	
2	50	25	
3	50	27	
4	50	22	
5	50	17	
6	50	18	

Comments on grade boundaries for each subject area

Grade boundaries are slightly up on previous years for the Evaluating section, across all levels, to reflect the Setting teams desire to stabilise the allocation of marks, ie for the 2004 diet each of the five Evaluating questions, at each level, has been allocated a total score of 10 marks giving a sum total of 50 marks. This change will be maintained in the future. Knowledge and Understanding boundaries remain consistent to that of previous years.

Comments on candidate performance

The following comments are based on feedback from Markers reports and indicate:

Foundation

A fair paper in its content in relation to its target audience. Candidates responded better in Evaluating section than the Knowledge and Understanding section. The Markers attributed this to the scope they had to award partial marks. Overall the number of candidates gaining an upper award has increased.

General

A fair paper in relation to its target audience with an appropriate increase in the level of Demand from F to G being evident. The paper clearly differentiates between F/G and G/C candidates. Overall candidates performed better in the Evaluating section where a full range of marks were gained. Markers reported good evidence of higher scores. Overall candidate performance, they suggested, had shown an improvement.

Credit

A fair paper in relation to its target audience with some challenging questions being asked. Candidates were stretched. Candidates performed better in the Evaluating section where an even spread of marks and achievement were evident. In Evaluating a greater number of candidates achieved the upper level.

The following has been gained through feedback from the Markers reports:

Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well

Markers reported that candidates performed better, at each level, in the Evaluating section of the paper. They attributed this to the allocation of marks, which allowed most candidates to be rewarded for limited responses. Across all levels Markers reported that the overall wording of questions was much clearer this year and candidates were given clearer lead in and instruction to the questions. They commented favourably, again across all levels, on how the video footage focussed on individual performances. Generally Markers commented that at all levels all questions were accessible and that clear differentiation between levels was apparent.

Foundation

Candidates performed well in all Evaluating questions with the exception of Question 3 Part B. In the Knowledge and Understanding section candidates coped well with the exception of Question 7B and Question 8B.

General

Candidates performed well in the Evaluating questions with the exception of Question 4 Part A. In the Knowledge and Understanding section candidates coped well with the exception of Question 9 and Question 10B. More generally Markers commented candidates failed to develop their answers in the Part B questions of the Knowledge and Understanding section. Markers comments on performance reflected the widespread of quality expected across the paper.

Credit

Candidates performed very well in Evaluating questions with the exception of Question 4 Parts A and B. Candidates, in the Knowledge and Understanding element, on the whole coped well. There was evidence from markers however that Part B of each question had lacked depth of understanding in response. Markers indicated some concerns about candidates being presented inappropriately at this level.

The following has been gained through feedback from the Markers reports:

Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty

Foundation

Evaluating

No pattern in Markers feedback to specifically suggest any area where candidates had consistent difficulty although some felt that the quality of the second performance in Question 3 Part B stretched true foundation candidates to response with two improvements.

Knowledge and Understanding

- 7B Candidates showed a lack of knowledge and often responded with Strength answers.
8B In relation to Creativity and quality of performance

General

Evaluating

- 4A Candidates were led by the examples given in this question and very often responded by giving two answers where only one was required. This led to wrong/right answer issues for Markers.

Knowledge and Understanding

- 9A Involving Feedback — where candidates had difficulty relating their weakness to a relative detailed practise.
10B Involving Team Tactics — many candidates failed to spot to complete Part B (iii) Markers felt that the question layout did not help this.

Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty (continued)

Credit

Evaluating

- 3A Although a short sentence candidates managed to respond adequately.
4B(i) Candidates responded with team improvements where the question asked for individual improvements. Markers noted that this could have been possibly avoided if the word 'individual' had been bolded.

Knowledge and Understanding

- 8 Principles of Play — Candidates clearly showed a lack of knowledge to fully answer this question.
9B Principles of Training — lack of depth in responses to Parts (iii) and (iv)
10B Complex skills/techniques — candidates failed to develop suitable responses. Some candidates failed to spot Part B (iii) on the last page.

Across all three levels the Knowledge and Understanding content proved to be demanding but consistently reflects the syllabus of Standard Grade.

Recommendations

Feedback to centres

The following feedback has been gained from Markers reports.

Foundation level

The Foundation paper was deemed to be largely a very fair paper in relation to its target audience. Overall candidates responded better in the Evaluating section than in the Knowledge and Understanding section. It was noted that where candidates were not responding in structured sentences Markers were still able to award marks. There was also evidence of the use of less negative statements. No pattern of difficulty was evident in the Evaluating section while in the Knowledge and Understanding section candidates performed well with the exception of Question 7 Part B (Muscular Endurance) and Question 8 Part B (Creativity) where lack of knowledge and detail gave rise to Markers concerns. The number of incidences where inappropriate activities were used is a matter of concern. Overall the number of candidates gaining an upper award has increased.

General level

The General paper proved to be a fair paper in relation to its target audience. The paper clearly differentiated between F/G and G/C candidates. Overall candidates performed better in the Evaluating section where a full range of marks were gained with the expected spread in good evidence. Scores in this element proved to be higher than in previous years. Markers commented that candidates, especially in the latter questions of the Knowledge and Understanding section, failed to respond with any depth of answer. Markers reported, correctly, that in the Evaluating section Questions 4 Part A, candidates had followed the examples given and had answered in a similar manner it caused confusion and gave rise to wrong/right answer issues. This question also proved problematic where left/right issues arose. In Knowledge and Understanding Question 9 Part B (Feedback) and Question 10 Part B (Team Tactics) Markers reported that candidates responded with no real clarity of knowledge. Many candidates also failed to complete Question 10 Part B (iii). Again Markers commented, correctly, that this may have been due to the layout of this question. The number of candidates gaining an upper award has marginally increased. While Markers raised some concerns over the activities used in the first three questions of the Evaluating section of the paper candidates, on the whole, gave better quality answers to these questions than those they responded to in the more traditional activities — this trend was maintained across other levels.

Credit level

The Credit paper was deemed, overall, to be a very fair paper in relation to its target audience. Some questions proved to be both demanding and challenging and Markers reported that G/C candidates had been stretched. Standards and fullness of answers were not maintained for the duration of the paper and Markers commented on candidates being unable to sustain the depth of knowledge required to gain full marks. Overall the number of candidates gaining an upper award has increased. In the Evaluating section Question 4 Part B (Volleyball) proved to be problematic where Markers indicated that had the word ‘individual’ been bolded inappropriate responses, from candidates, may have been avoided.

In the Knowledge and Understanding section the areas of Principles of Play (Question 8), Principles of Training (Question 9) and Complex skills/techniques (Question 10) proved difficult for candidates to sustain fully developed and/or detailed responses. Clearly these areas require further practise within centres.

Overall Markers commented favourably on the distribution of marks available in the Evaluating section across all three levels. They also favoured the focus of attention on individual performers with the exception of Credit Question 4 Part B. All Markers responded positively to the new layout of the papers and no negative feedback has been received about the exam timing and duration, video footage or the special needs arrangements. Overall, across all three levels, it was evident that fewer candidates were responding to questions with negative answers and that more candidates were making attempts at all questions.