

## Principal Assessor Report 2005

**Assessment Panel:**

**Physical Education, Sport and Leisure**

**Qualification area**

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

**Physical Education  
Intermediate 2  
Intermediate 1**

## Statistical information: update

### Intermediate 1

Number of resulted entries in 2004	435
------------------------------------	-----

Number of resulted entries in 2005	627
------------------------------------	-----

### Intermediate 2

Number of resulted entries in 2004	2,083
------------------------------------	-------

Number of resulted entries in 2005	2,618
------------------------------------	-------

### General comments re resulted entry numbers

#### Intermediate 1

An increase of nearly 40% at this level. The shift from Standard Grade to NQ is evident again but not significant.

In general, more centres are considering the shift to NQs. This evidence will take a number of years to gather as more candidates are also selecting PE. Standard Grade numbers have not decreased significantly even in line with the increase in Intermediate 2 / Intermediate 1 entries.

#### Intermediate 2

Candidate uptake shows a 20%+ increase from 2004. Some of this is due to a number of centres moving from Standard Grade to NQs. Staff in centres may also have used the new course framework and guidelines on assessment to set candidates at a more realistic level.

## Statistical Information: Performance of candidates

### Distribution of awards including grade boundaries

#### Intermediate 1

Distribution of awards	%	Cum %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark - <b>100</b>	-	-	-	-
A	53.1	53.1	333	70
B	20.4	73.5	128	60
C	12.4	86.0	78	50
D	2.4	88.4	15	45
No award	11.6	100.0	73	-

#### Intermediate 2

Distribution of awards	%	Cum %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark - <b>100</b>	-	-	-	-
A	38.5	38.5	1,008	72
B	32.4	70.9	847	61
C	15.4	86.3	404	50
D	2.6	88.9	68	44
No award	11.1	100.0	291	-

### General commentary on passmarks and grade boundaries

- While SQA aims to set examinations and create mark schemes which will allow a competent candidate to score a minimum 50% of the available marks (notional passmark) and a very well-prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70%, it is almost impossible to get the standard absolutely on target every year, in every subject and level
- Each year we therefore hold a passmark meeting for each subject at each level where we bring together all the information available (statistical and judgmental). The Principal Assessor and SQA Qualifications Manager meet with the relevant SQA Business Manager and Statistician to discuss the evidence and make decisions. The meetings are chaired by members of the senior management team at SQA
- We adjust the passmark downwards if there is evidence that we have set a slightly more demanding exam than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance
- We adjust the passmark upwards if there is evidence that we have set a slightly less demanding exam than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance
- Where the standard appears to be very similar to previous years, we maintain similar grade boundaries
- An exam paper at a particular level in a subject in one year tends to have a marginally different set of grade boundaries from exam papers in that subject at that level in other years. This is because the particular questions are different. This is also the case for exams set in centres. And just because SQA has altered a boundary in a particular year in say Higher Chemistry does not mean that centres should necessarily alter boundaries in their prelim exam in Higher Chemistry. The two are not that closely related as they do not contain identical questions

- Our main aim is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and all levels and maintain standards across the years, even as arrangements evolve and change.

### **Comments on any significant changes in distribution of awards/grade boundaries**

#### **Intermediate 1**

With changes to the weighting of assessment at this level there had to be a drop in percentage at upper A and A awards overall. This was mainly due to the drop in percentage weighting of performance 66%-50%. This change also meant that, as expected, there would be an increase in No Awards at this level as the Grade Boundaries and weighting came in line with Intermediate 2.

#### **Intermediate 2**

Given NQ Review all Grade Boundaries were significantly changed to reflect the new composition of assessment and the fact there was no merit in duplication of assessment as there had been in previous years.

With the modification/improvement to assessment it was expected that there would be more candidates passing at 'C' level and less at upper 'A'. This is reflected in the percentage at these boundaries and it is pleasing that the overall pass rate has been maintained given Examining Team and Markers felt the Question Paper was equivalent in standard to previous years. Markers also confirmed that the responses from this years cohort were no different in standard from previous years.

## **Comments on any significant changes in distribution of overall awards**

### **Intermediate 1**

Change to weighting and Grade boundaries meant that the distribution at this level would have a shift towards level B + C in the way of an increase.

As predicted this was reflected with the same reduction at Upper A and A.

Again this will have to be monitored closely over the next few years as more candidates opt for Int 1/NQs and staff settling groups of candidates at appropriate levels will be a key issue at Intermediate 2 and Intermediate 1 as more candidates move from Standard Grade and centres have younger candidates on NQ courses.

### **Intermediate 2**

Upper A is 2.0% below 2004 which relates to the reduction in duplication of assessment with the removal of the Investigation of Performance unit.

The shift from 2004 shows a slight reduction at each level A + B which is balanced out at C level and No Award which show a slight increase.

This is expected to be replicated in following year as there is now a more coherent hierarchy in place Intermediate 1 – Higher which will allow staff to select the appropriate level of course for their candidates.

## **Comments on candidate performance**

### **General comments**

Question Paper was well received by examining team and markers.

Centres/staff felt that questions continued to be accessible at both Intermediate 2 and 1 levels for candidates.

### **Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well**

In both papers candidates did well in Structures and Strategies if they answered on Football formations and Basketball fastbreaks and zones. Description of skills and strengths and weaknesses were done well as were basic fitness requirements of self and activity.

Many candidates at both levels were showing a depth of response and knowledge above the level of the course which they were entered at.

### **Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty**

Developing practices/drills to improve structures, strategies still requires development.

Candidates still require more understanding of PAR and Methods of Practice and Methods of Training. There were still a number of candidates who wrote in volume trying to access marks with little knowledge of what was being asked.

## Recommendations

### Feedback to centres

Candidates need to read questions carefully. More assistance/teaching required on how to interpret questions and construct a relevant response.

Centres must consider in future teaching the area of Performance Appreciation to give candidates the opportunity to access **all** questions in the exam paper.

Centres who do Performance Appreciation at present have candidates who perform well in this area. The average for these questions is reduced by candidates who make an attempt at a question and have not covered this area in their course.

Centres should reduce their emphasis on the NAB and the detail required and spend time covering the Key Concepts in each of the areas.

The Key Concepts are the main focus of questions. Staff must cover the content required for each of the Key Concepts in a given Area of Analysis to give candidates the breadth and depth of knowledge to answer questions in each of the areas.

Once candidates have grasped the cycle of analysis process taught, staff must work to develop their knowledge of analysis and development of performance.