

Principal Assessor Report 2005

Assessment Panel:

Physical Education, Sport and Leisure

Qualification area

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

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

Statistical information: update

Number of resulted entries in 2004 Pre appeal	17,852
--	--------

Number of resulted entries in 2005 Pre appeal	17,564
--	--------

General comments re resulted entry numbers

Evaluating	17,208
Knowledge & Understanding	17,215
Practical Performance	17,478

Again encouraging to see only a slight decrease in the uptake of Standard Grade Physical Education as Centres and Local Authorities consider their options as regards National Qualifications.

It is worth noting that in real terms the number of candidates presented for Practical Performance has dropped by less than 600 candidates since 2002.

Statistical Information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of overall awards

Grade 1	12.7%
Grade 2	31.8%
Grade 3	30.5%
Grade 4	17.4%
Grade 5	4.6%
Grade 6	0.5%
Grade 7	0.0%
No award	2.5%

3201 Knowledge and Understanding

Slight change at Credit level. Although 28.1% achieved at 1 or 2 there has been a slight upturn in those gaining an upper award.

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

3202 Evaluating

General trend has been a stabilising of results with a good increase in those achieving an upper award at General level. Significantly there have been no increases in Grade 7s.

Comments on any significant changes in distribution of overall awards

Marginal concerns over the Credit Knowledge and Understanding section. Candidate responses merited a change to a lowering of the final cut-off score applied at Grade 2.

Marginal concerns over the General Evaluating section. Candidate responses merited a change to a lowering of the final cut-off score applied at Grade 3.

Grade boundaries for each assessable element in the subject included in the report

Assessable Element	Credit Max Mark	Grade Boundaries		General Max Mark	Grade Boundaries		Foundation Max Mark	Grade Boundaries	
		1	2		3	4		5	6
KU	55	34	24	50	28	21	45	24	19
EV	50	35	27	50	25	20	50	30	24

Performance — Directly graded

Comments on grade boundaries for each assessable element

With the exception of General level, grade boundaries are generally up on previous years for the Evaluating section to reflect:

- A The Setting teams' desire to maintain the allocation of marks, ie for the 2005 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 will be maintained in the future.
- B The implications of a "Positive Marking" ethos adopted this year by Physical Education that has resulted in candidates accessing marks that would have otherwise, perhaps, not been awarded.
- C Knowledge and Understanding boundaries remain consistent to that of previous years with marginal increases to reflect the effect of "Positive Marking".

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

Foundation

A fair paper in its content in relation to its target audience. Candidates responded better in the 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 level being maintained. 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 has stabilised at the lower award level and shown a marginal increase at the upper award level.

Credit

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

Across all three levels there has been acceptance that they represent a maintenance of a fair and balanced breadth of the Standard Grade curriculum.

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 scoring of questions was much clearer and less ambiguous this year and candidates were given clearer lead in and instruction to the questions. Markers 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 and reported correctly that most candidates had attempted all questions.

Markers further reflected that candidate responses were generally better across all areas. Markers clearly were of the opinion that candidates had benefited from the adoption of the “Positive Marking” practise.

Markers expressed great concern at the number of activities that went beyond that which may be termed “a range of activities outwith the boundaries of Physical Education and school sport”.

Foundation

Candidates performed well in all Evaluating questions with the exception of Question 5 Part B. In the Knowledge and Understanding section candidates coped well with the exception of Question 7B and Question 9B.

General

Candidates performed well in the Evaluating questions with the exception of Question 2 Part A/B. In the Knowledge and Understanding section candidates coped well with the exception of Question 6 and Questions 9 and 10. More generally Markers commented that candidates failed to develop their answers in the Part B questions of the Knowledge and Understanding section. Markers comments on performance reflected the wide spread of quality expected across the paper.

Credit

Candidates performed very well in most Evaluating questions with the exception of Question 4 Part B. With the exception of Question 8 Part B, Question 9 Part A and Question 10 Part B candidates coped well in the Knowledge and Understanding element. Marks indicated some concerns about candidates being presented inappropriately at this level and in some cases where Part B responses were not detailed enough to access marks.

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 lead in words "does well" in Question 3 Part B(i) and Question 5 Part B(i) led true Foundation candidates to respond with a named skill and stifled a description. In Question 5B Markers reported that the mark scheme had not aligned the linking of the movements.

Knowledge and Understanding

7B Candidates seemed confused with the lead in word "helper" and in relation to "cooperation".
9B(ii) Inability of candidates to describe "one exercise".

General

Evaluating

2A Candidates were led by the examples given in this question and very often responded by giving two answers where only one was required.
2B In response to actions on view.

Knowledge and Understanding

6A In relation to Physical qualities.

9B(iii) Involving whole/part/whole where candidates had difficulty relating their weakness to a relative detailed practise.

10A(iii) Involving Speed — many candidates failed to respond positively.

Credit

Evaluating

4B Candidates were unable to respond adequately with quality answers.

Knowledge and Understanding

8B Force and Resistance — candidates clearly showed a lack of knowledge to fully answer this question.

9A(i) Feedback — candidates failed to relate to the timing of this.

10B Fitness training — candidates failed to develop suitable responses.

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

Recommendations

Feedback to centres

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 most candidates attempting all questions. 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 (Cooperation) and Question 9 Part B (Flexibility) where lack of knowledge and detail again gave rise to Markers concerns. The number of incidences where inappropriate activities were used continues to cause concern. Overall the number of candidates gaining an upper award has increased. While Markers raised minor concerns over the selection of activities used in 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.

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 marginally 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 Question 2 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. In Question 2 Part B candidate showed a lack of knowledge and detail in their responses. In Knowledge and Understanding Question 6 Part A candidates failed to notice the discreet example that had been given in the lead in and therefore gave this as a response. Markers correctly indicated it may have helped candidates if this lead in example had been bolded. Question 9 Part B (Learning and Developing Skills) and Question 10 Part A (Speed) Markers reported that candidates responded with no real clarity of knowledge and were unable to develop their responses to any depth. The number of candidates gaining an upper award has increased.

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 been maintained while those gaining the lower award has increased. In the Evaluating section Question 4 Part B (Diving) proved to be problematic where Markers indicated that the complexities of the movement may have led to inappropriate responses from candidates.

In the Knowledge and Understanding section the areas of Force and Resistance (Question 8), Feedback (Question 9) and Fitness training (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 with the exception of General Evaluation Question 1(Part A), 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 3 Part A. All Markers responded positively to the layout of the papers although feedback has been received about the exam timing and duration. This information has been passed as an area of concern to SQA who are aware of the problems encountered both in terms of candidate responses and how centres apply procedures for the exam. Both the standard video footage and the extra time video footage received positive feedback. Overall, across all three levels, it was evident that fewer candidates were responding to questions with negative answers and that most candidates were making attempts at all questions.