



# NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Messages Round 2

01

## Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Physical Education
Verification event/visiting information	Visiting
Date published:	June 2016

### National Courses/Units verified:

H255 74	National 4	Performance (added value unit)
C756 75	National 5	Performance (course assessment)
C756 76	Higher	Performance (course assessment)
C756 77	Advanced Higher	Performance (course assessment)

02

## Section 2: Comments on assessment

### Assessment approaches

Most centres were fully prepared for their verification visit. The candidate evidence was available and clearly organised. Live performances allowed candidates to show their abilities in an appropriate context.

#### **H255 74 Physical Education: performance (added value unit)**

There was a range of individual and team activities seen in centres. All centres set up an approach to allow the candidates to access all the assessment standards. Some centres had provided written evidence of warming-up along with rules and etiquette in addition to the live performance.

#### **C756 75, 76 and 77 Physical Education: performance (course assessment)**

For the live performance part of verification, centres provided a context to allow candidates to perform in appropriately challenging situations. For planning and evaluation at National 5 and Higher most centres provided written evidence, on templates, using the set questions. Where centres used a different format,

problems arose with justifying where marks were awarded. Centres using the original questions for Higher were reminded that in future the amended questions and marking instructions should be used.

## **Assessment judgements**

### **H255 74 Physical Education: performance (added value unit)**

In all cases judgements made during verification were at the correct standard.

### **C756 75, 76 and 77 Physical Education: performance (course assessment)**

For the performance element of the course, most centres used the national standards reliably making valid and consistent judgements, awarding candidates the correct marks. In the planning and evaluation element most centres were accurate in their awarding of marks. Where there were discrepancies, most were in the evaluation part where centres had not ensured that in 3a, the evaluation (National 5) and the analysis (Higher), were linked to the plans from question 1. In a number of centres marks were awarded incorrectly for description. Care must be taken to ensure that the command word is noted. The marking instructions for planning and evaluation show clearly how many marks can be awarded for each part. The split of marks is different for National 5 and Higher.

03

## **Section 3: General comments**

In the evidence for the planning and evaluation element some candidates' responses were very lengthy. Some had detailed description which gained no marks, others had detailed responses which would have gained well above the maximum marks possible. When preparing for the question paper, candidates should be encouraged to be succinct.

There was clear evidence of internal verification procedures in most centres. Many single-person departments had gone out of their way to work with neighbouring centres to ensure that internal verification was carried out. The mark agreed by the internal assessor and internal verifier for each section should be clearly recorded. The agreed mark should be arrived at through discussion and reference to the marking instructions.

Centres should make use of the exemplars for National 5 and Higher. These can be found on SQA's secure website, which can be accessed through the centre's SQA co-ordinator, where there are examples of all elements of internally assessed components of course assessment along with commentaries.