



External Assessment Report 2013

Subject(s)	Physical Education
Level(s)	Standard Grade – F/G/C

The statistics used in this report are pre-appeal.

This report provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers/lecturers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding. It would be helpful to read this report in conjunction with the published question papers and marking instructions for the examination.

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

Feedback suggests that the 2013 Question Papers at Foundation, General and Credit were very well received.

Examiners and Markers felt that Evaluating at Foundation had a similar demand and challenge to last year. However, it was more demanding at General and Credit level, while Knowledge and Understanding was more demanding at Foundation, similar to last year at General, and slightly less demanding at Credit level. Appropriate alternations were made to Grade Boundaries to reflect this.

To increase accessibility to marks at all levels, Setters ensured that the wording of each question was straightforward, and candidates were given clear instructions and a lead-in to the questions.

Again, a major factor in the consistency and improvement of performance could be the fact that the Standard Grade Physical Education exam is one of the first exams to take place. This can contribute to course material being fresh in candidates' minds, as it is one of the first they study for.

There was clear evidence that most candidates had been well prepared by centres and were responding in detail, which allowed them to demonstrate their full potential in both elements of the paper. Markers commented that there were few question papers with very low marks, and that there were few occasions where candidates had left blanks or whole questions unanswered.

The method of marking remained the same, and again a wide range of answers were given in the Evaluating Marking Instructions, and a wide variety of examples were given in the Knowledge & Understanding Marking Instructions which set the level of difficulty required for one and two mark responses. There were no three mark questions in the Credit Knowledge & Understanding this year.

A large number of F/G and G/C Markers commented that both papers were fair, and that the majority of candidates responded well overall, accessed marks at both levels and, as expected, performed better at the lower level.

Many F/G Markers indicated that candidates did particularly well in both EV and K&U at Foundation level due to the format of the questions.

Many commented that centres were preparing candidates well to answer Evaluating questions at all levels, with few candidates providing negative responses to Part B questions.

G/C Markers comments were mostly constructive, but the overall comment was that the General Evaluating paper was more demanding than last year.

As in previous years, the countdown clock on the DVD assists candidates' time management of the exam at all three levels.

Areas in which candidates performed well

Foundation

Examiners and Markers commented that both sections in the Foundation paper were designed with questions which were appropriate in demand and that many candidates were able to access and achieve high marks.

Overall, candidates responded well to the variety of activities in the Evaluating section, and in particular to the true/false, done well/needs improvement and tick-box type answers in all Part A questions. Part B was also accessible with lead-in type questions and simple well defined questions.

Most candidates responded positively to the accessible Knowledge & Understanding content, and again were able to access marks consistently in the box format where a tick or a one word answer was required for an answer as in questions; 6a), 7a), 8a), 9a) and 10a). Marks were accessible in Part B with simple and well defined questions.

General

Examiners and Markers felt that this was a fair paper in relation to its target audience, with an appropriate level of demand and differentiation from Foundation to General.

It was pointed out that marks were very easily accessed in Knowledge & Understanding Q6a) & Q7a) due to the tick-box/one word answer type questions.

Q9a) warm-up/warm-down - was answered well by all candidates.

Credit

There was clear differentiation between the General and Credit papers in both elements, and again candidates performed well in the Evaluating section, responding well to the variety of activities and many achieved good marks.

Q9a) and 9b) tactics, were answered very well with a lot of candidates accessing good marks.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Foundation

Candidates performed well in both elements of the Foundation paper.

However in Q9b) some candidates seemed to have difficulty with the concept of cooperation and keeping their partner safe.

General

There was clear differentiation between the Foundation and General papers, and this was highlighted in the Marker's reports.

Most Examiners and Markers thought that the Evaluating paper was more demanding than 2012, due to Q3a) and Q5b).

In Q3a) description of footwork was not particularly well answered, with a lot of candidates not reading the question properly and answering about the pass. Some Markers felt that it was difficult to access all six marks.

The main comments were about the discus and part 5b) in particular. Candidates struggled with this footage and the associated question, and very few were able to access 6 marks. As a result of this an adjustment was made to the EV General Grade Boundary so candidates were not disadvantaged.

Some Foundation/General Markers commented that in Q7b)ii), many candidates mixed up personal and physical qualities, despite this topic frequently occurring in past papers.

Some Foundation/General Markers thought that Q10b) was not particularly well answered, as concept of practice is difficult for F/G pupils, and in Q10b)ii), a number of Markers across both levels indicated that candidates were answering 'how' and not 'why' as asked in the question.

Credit

Some Markers commented that there was a lean towards more aesthetic activities and that Cheerleading, Q4), was not a core activity. To keep questions fresh, non-core activities have been used in the past and in this case description of shapes was asked for, which is easily transferred from gymnastics.

The consensus of opinion from Examiners and Markers was that the Credit Evaluating and Knowledge & Understanding papers were fair for credit level, with the EV paper being slightly more demanding, and the K&U paper slightly less demanding, than 2012.

In Q6a)i), the definition of speed, few candidates accessed two marks, most achieving only one. This was due to the Examining Team requiring a mention of muscle application in the answer for the second mark. This was raised at the Marker's meeting, with no objection. Also in Q6b)ii), the description of a speed training session was not answered well, despite speed as a topic being included frequently at all three levels of past papers.

In Q8a)ii), marks were awarded for a variety of factors affecting balance, which was a shift from the team's expectations. However, this was raised at the Marker's meeting prior to the marking process.

Q10a) and b) was thought by the Setting and Vetting team to be a demanding question, but was in fact answered reasonably well. There was a small amendment at the Marker's meeting regarding Q10b)i) and this assisted marking. It was obvious when marking, however, that groups of candidates who did not answer satisfactorily had apparently not covered the topic in their centres.

Statistical information: update on Courses
STANDARD GRADE

Number of resulted entries in 2012	15852
---	-------

Number of resulted entries in 2013	15046
---	-------

Statistical Information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of overall awards

Grade 1	22.8%
Grade 2	37.4%
Grade 3	26.5%
Grade 4	10.2%
Grade 5	2.1%
Grade 6	0.2%
Grade 7	0.0%
No award	0.7%

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	35	25	50	28	22	45	22	16
EV	50	33	25	50	24	19	50	30	23