



External Assessment Report 2011

| | |
|---------|-----------------------------|
| Subject | Physical Education |
| Level | Intermediate 1 and 2 |

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

Intermediate 1

On the whole, candidates performed well at this level. The number of candidates entered increased by approximately 100. Once again there were new centres (seven), though not as many as we have seen in previous years. It was noted that there was an increase in S3 candidates being presented for the Intermediate 1 course.

The Question Paper performed well, and allowed candidates to clearly show their understanding of the analysis and development process.

More candidates are responding to Performance Appreciation questions. There has been a definite improvement in candidates' responses in this area.

It was also noted that candidates are writing much more and that their depth of understanding has improved.

Intermediate 2

The number of candidates entered remained stable at 4810. There were three new centres and 10 returning centres. It was noted that a significant number of S4 candidates were entered for Intermediate 2.

Markers felt the question paper was straightforward and enabled candidates to access marks across the full course.

Candidates are writing more and have a much improved depth of knowledge. There were no marking issues.

Areas in which candidates performed well

Intermediate 1

The average mark for the Performance component was 46.9 — this is consistent with previous years.

The question paper average mark improved from 21.5 to 26.8. Candidates are now writing much more, and the question paper allowed them to access more marks. Candidates responded much better to the Performance Appreciation area than in previous years.

Question 2 (b) (ii): Most candidates applied their knowledge of two different tests for two different aspects of fitness. Most candidates looked at a Physical aspect of fitness and a skill-related aspect of fitness.

Intermediate 2

The average mark for Performance was 46.8 — this is consistent with previous years.

As in the Intermediate 1 paper, the average mark for the question paper has increased, in this case from 22.3 to 24.5.

Candidates did well when responding to the data-collection questions. Most candidates have a good understanding of how to describe methods of data-collection.

Candidates' responses to the stages of learning question were done well. Candidates were able to demonstrate their knowledge of this key feature with clear detail.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Intermediate 1

Candidates found question 4 demanding — they did not always show a link back to the Structure, Strategy or Composition that was selected in part (a).

In part 4(e), candidates may have opted to respond using a training programme or a change/adaptation to their Structure, Strategy or Composition.

Intermediate 2

Question 5(a) challenged candidates. Many responded to this question by identifying one skill, rather than looking at the range of requirements for a skilled performance.

Question 3(a) — many candidates' responses to this question was based solely on one type of fitness, rather than the three different types.

Across the question paper, it was noted that candidates still found questions relating to training programmes demanding. Only some candidates managed to access full marks in these types of questions.

Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

Centres are advised that all key concepts must be covered within their courses and studied at the appropriate depth and level of demand.

Centres are advised that they must cover the three types of fitness and progress this through to the fitness testing required for two of the three types.

More depth of knowledge and understanding is required in candidates' responses to training programmes across all four areas. Centres could look at the various support materials to consider how to develop a more in-depth response.

Centres should consider the knowledge required when preparing candidates for responding to a question on 'skilled performance'. Centres must consider the detail of applied

knowledge required in this response — for example, full performance, range of skills, fluency, consistency.

Candidates should always try to back their responses up with examples from their own performance.

Centres may find the 2011 marking instructions on the SQA website useful.

Statistical information: update on Courses

Intermediate 1

| | |
|------------------------------------|------|
| Number of resulted entries in 2010 | 1725 |
|------------------------------------|------|

| | |
|------------------------------------|------|
| Number of resulted entries in 2011 | 1752 |
|------------------------------------|------|

Statistical information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

| Distribution of Course awards | % | Cum. % | Number of candidates | Lowest mark |
|-------------------------------|-------|--------|----------------------|-------------|
| Maximum Mark 100 | | | | |
| A | 59.9% | 59.9% | 1049 | 71 |
| B | 23.7% | 83.6% | 416 | 60 |
| C | 8.8% | 92.5% | 155 | 50 |
| D | 1.4% | 93.9% | 25 | 45 |
| No award | 6.1% | 100.0% | 107 | - |

Statistical information: update on Courses

Intermediate 2

| | |
|------------------------------------|------|
| Number of resulted entries in 2010 | 4598 |
|------------------------------------|------|

| | |
|------------------------------------|------|
| Number of resulted entries in 2011 | 4783 |
|------------------------------------|------|

Statistical information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

| Distribution of Course awards | % | Cum. % | Number of candidates | Lowest mark |
|-------------------------------|-------|--------|----------------------|-------------|
| Maximum Mark 100 | | | | |
| A | 49.2% | 49.2% | 2352 | 72 |
| B | 32.0% | 81.2% | 1531 | 61 |
| C | 12.4% | 93.6% | 595 | 50 |
| D | 1.6% | 95.2% | 75 | 44 |
| No award | 4.8% | 100.0% | 230 | - |

General commentary on grade boundaries

SQA aims to set examinations and create marking instructions that will allow a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional C boundary), and a well prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70% of the available marks (the notional A boundary). It is, though, very challenging to get the standard on target every year, in every subject at every level.

Each year, therefore, SQA holds a grade boundary meeting for each subject at each level where it brings together all the information available (statistical and judgemental). The Principal Assessor and SQA Qualifications Manager meet with the relevant SQA Head of Service and Statistician to discuss the evidence and make decisions. The meetings are chaired by members of the management team at SQA.

The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the exam is more challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.

The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the exam is less challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.

Where standards are comparable to previous years, similar grade boundaries are maintained.

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, and the mix of questions, are different. This is also the case for exams set in centres. If SQA has already altered a boundary in a particular year in say, Higher Chemistry, this 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.

SQA's main aim is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and all levels and maintain comparable standards across the years, even as Arrangements evolve and change.