

Principal Assessor Report 2003

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	17271

Number of entries in 2003	
Pre appeal	18332

General comments re entry numbers

Evaluating:	18332
Knowledge and Understanding	
Practical Performance	18710
Encouraging to see a further increase and an upward trend in the uptake of Standard Grade PE.	

Grade boundaries at C, B and A for each subject area included in the report

Standard Grade

Performance – Directly Graded

Knowledge and Understanding (KU) – Available Scores: C – 55, G – 55, F – 45

Evaluating (EV) – Available Scores: C – 50, G – 45, F - 40

	Grade	KU Minimum score	EV for grade
Credit	1	33	31
	2	24	23
General	3	26	22
	4	18	16
Foundation	5	21	17
	6	15	12

Comments on grade boundaries for each subject area

No significant comment to report.

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

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 the Knowledge and Understanding section than the Evaluating section. 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 level being evident. The paper clearly differentiates between F/G and G/C candidates. Overall students performed better in the Knowledge and Understanding section where a full range of marks were gained with the expected spread in good evidence and scores seemed to be higher than in previous years.

Credit

A fair paper in relation to its target audience with some challenging questions being asked. Clear that candidates were stretched. Candidates performed marginally better in the Evaluating section where an even spread of marks and achievement were evident.

In both elements a greater number of candidates achieved the upper level.

Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well

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

Markers reported that candidates performed marginally better in the Evaluating element of the Credit level paper than in the General/Foundation papers. They attributed this to candidates responding too generally with lack of detail in the Part B sections of the questions contained in the latter two papers.

Foundation

Candidates performed better in questions with limited responses. Candidates performed well in all Evaluating questions with the exception of Question 3 Part A. In the Knowledge and Understanding element candidates performed well with the exception of Question 5 Parts C and D.

General

Candidates performed well in Evaluating questions with the exception of Question 3 Part B and Question 5 Part A. In Knowledge and Understanding candidates coped well with questions 2, 3 and 4. Markers comments on performance reflected the wide spread of quality expected across the paper.

Credit

Candidates performed well in most Evaluating questions. With the exception of Question 1 Parts C and D and Question 5 Parts C and D candidates, in the Knowledge and Understanding element, coped well. In the Knowledge and Understanding questions markers felt that an allocation of two (2) marks to some questions would have allowed limited response answers to be awarded one (1) mark. Markers indicated some concerns about candidates being presented inappropriately at this level

Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty

The following is reflective of responses made through Markers reports. Markers indicated that they had some difficulty in awarding marks to questions which had only been allocated one (1) mark.

Foundation

Evaluating

3A Where candidates were asked to view a singles tennis sequence.

Knowledge and Understanding

5 CD In relation to safety and equipment rules.

General

Evaluating

3B Where candidates had to suggest improvements to a Dance sequence.

5A In relation to Similarity/Differences in two High Jump performances.

Knowledge and Understanding

1CD Involving rules and restrictions.

2D Selecting a Playing role.

3C CRE. training where candidates were asked to suggest change to heart — the wording confused candidates into responding with short term results.

4D Creativity — candidates did not fully develop concept.

5C(i) Whole — part — Whole. Markers questioned the validity of the mark scheme interpretation of this concept.

5D(ii) Ways of developing skills — candidates lacked knowledge of different method of developing skills.

Credit

Evaluating

No pattern in markers feed back to specifically suggest any area where candidates had consistent difficulty.

Knowledge and Understanding

1C Levers — some markers questioned the validity of the marks scheme instructions.

1D Levers — candidates failed to develop suitable responses.

5C Aerobic and Anaerobic training.

5D Progression as a Principle of Training.

Difficulty arose in Question 1C primarily through the direction of the mark scheme instructions. The topic of levers is a difficult area of study and some measure of content expectation requires to be clarified. As a result of the direction of the mark scheme Question 1D became difficult for candidates. Question 1c was answered poorly. Some markers questioned the content and nature of Question 5d as to whether it lay within the syllabus. This was checked at vetting and scrutineer report stages.

Where some aspects of Knowledge and Understanding were difficult and some areas, as noted above, proved to be challenging, they accurately reflect the syllabus areas, and are more than capable of accommodating all three levels of Standard Grade and the range of abilities that are presented from centres.

Recommendations

Feedback to centres

The following feedback has been gained from markers reports.

Foundation level

The Foundation paper was deemed to be a fair paper in relation to its target audience. Overall candidates responded better in the Knowledge and Understanding section than in the Evaluating section. Markers reported that candidates responded better in questions where limited responses were required. Candidates performed well in all Evaluating questions with the exception of question 3 Part A — where they were asked to view a sequence of Tennis shot. In Knowledge and Understanding, with the exception of Question 5 Parts C and D — where candidates were asked to respond with Safety and Equipment rules — they performed well. 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 students performed better in the Knowledge and Understanding 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 too many candidates answered Evaluating Part B questions in a general manner resulting in lack of detail in responses. Markers reported that the question on Similarity and Differences was poorly answered and candidates need further practise in this area in their own centres. The markers also reported that students require further work in the area of being Creative with particular reference to team games. They further reported, correctly, that a clearer wording in the ‘changes to the heart’ question would have given candidates a clearer steer to the nature of the question and expected responses. It was further noted that candidates failed to notice that in Question 2 Part D they were required to respond with a Playing role. Markers commented that the question lead in could have confused candidates.

Credit level

The Credit paper was deemed, overall, to be a fair paper in relation to its target audience. Some questions were clearly challenging and markers reported that the G/C candidates had been stretched. Candidates performed marginally better in the Evaluating section where an even spread of marks and achievement were evident. In both elements a greater number of candidates achieved the upper level. The topics of Feedback and Aerobic and Anaerobic training again proved to be difficult areas for candidates as did Progression as a principle of training. These areas, with appropriately styled questions, require further practise within centres. Markers commented on the need for the topic of Levers to be clarified and the Principal Assessor has undertaken to consult with the SQA Qualifications Manager and the PE Assessment Panel on this issue.

Overall markers commented favourably on the quality of the video footage in this years Evaluation section. They also commented that questions that referred to generic team improvements did not sit comfortably with the approved mark scheme as it referred to specific players/positions/roles/number. This proved difficult for markers. Over 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.