

## Moderation Feedback — Central

**Assessment Panel:**

Physical Education

**Qualification area:**

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

Physical Education – Advanced Higher, Higher,  
Intermediate 2 and Intermediate 1

## **Central Moderation**

### **General comments on central moderation activity**

20% of centres were selected for moderation this year. The number of centres chosen for Analysis of Performance and Investigation of Performance was roughly equal. Of the centres moderated a total of 87% were judged to be accurately applying National Standards and this was encouraging. Although some of the work seen at each level was of a good standard, the majority tended to be only at or around relevant minimum competency levels. The internal assessment results of 13% of centres were not accepted and they were asked to complete an assessment review. For the first time some centres were allowed to submit incomplete evidence for moderator comment.

## Specific issues identified

### **Investigation of Performance**

Approximately half the centres moderated at Higher and Intermediate 2 chose to submit evidence in the form of the NAB logbook. The remainder submitted draft or completed reports. All Intermediate 1 evidence was in logbook form.

The NAB evidence was generally well presented and it was noted that many centres are now using the extended logbooks. Some centres submitted along with the logbooks an assessment proforma that summarised the teacher's judgements of the candidate's work. Others had recorded their assessment of the work inside the logbooks through completing the teacher's comments section at the end of each of the Outcomes. Some centres though had only recorded pass or fail on the logbooks and offered no record of the teacher's judgement of the candidates competence in the outcomes involved. Centres were informed that this is not satisfactory.

Similarly when draft investigation reports were submitted as evidence, it was typically the case that no record of the teacher's assessment of the work was included. This left moderators with the task of reading each report and gauging as and where each of the outcomes and performance criteria had been achieved. Centres were informed that an assessment proforma, marking schedule or evaluative comments written directly on the reports are required.

The results of moderation showed that many candidates had selected an appropriate aspect of performance for their Investigation and had followed a logical and structured plan of action. Almost all candidates achieved this outcome. In relation to Outcome 2PC(a), the quality of the data collected was a problem for candidates from a number of centres. Where data was limited in terms of depth and detail students often had difficulty explaining the significance of information that could be derived from collected data PC(b). This in turn tended to lead to programmes of work that were modest and general in design PC(c). It was in this area that candidates from a number of centres were judged not to have met the minimum competency levels of Higher and Intermediate 2. This was less of an issue with Intermediate 1 work. Evaluations about the effectiveness of the investigation process and its effects on performance (outcome 3) tended to be well explained and discussed if candidates had addressed Outcome 2 thoroughly. In some instances though a more narrative style that mainly described the processes followed and training undertaken was adopted and the outcome was not achieved. Overall, the quality of work seen here was generally modest and showed little headroom above the minimum levels required for unit achieved.

### ***Analysis of Performance***

Most of the centres moderated submitted evidence from a NAB assignment with only a few using a mix of NAB items and Prelim paper responses. In instances where prelim questions formed part of the evidence submitted details of the questions asked and of the relevant marking schemes were often not included and this caused problems. This information is essential. Most centres also included a summary proforma from the NAB to indicate their judgement of the student's competency. A number of centres did not include any form of judgemental comment and this made the moderation process difficult. Effectively this left moderators to basically assess the material and judge whether it met the relevant level of competency. It also restricted their ability to offer in the report detailed advice and feedback on the assessment decisions they had made.

At Higher and Intermediate 2 most students had collected relevant, general and focussed data. In some instances though the specific data items were not included with the assignment responses and this made the moderation process more difficult. In response to Outcome 1 most students were competent when describing the methods they had used to gather data and when explaining why they considered the particular methods selected to be appropriate. Descriptions about aspects of performance that could be derived from the data were also mainly sound. In response to Outcome 2 knowledge of relevant concepts was generally less satisfactory with their relevance to the individual's performance not always being well explained. Similarly in the completion of Outcome 3 where an explanation and justification of a course of action was required along with a suitable method of evaluating its effectiveness student's responses were mainly modest. A lot of the evidence assessed in these outcomes by moderators was regarded as being close to the minimum competency standards of presentation levels. It was in the assessment of these outcomes that moderators tended to disagree with centres judgements and where the majority of 'not accept' decisions were made.

## Feedback to centres

Generally the standard of evidence submitted was good. However, centres should **ensure that:**

- ◆ NAB items are followed carefully and that all the pages required for assessment are included.
- ◆ When submitting Analysis of Performance assignments, ensure that all the data which the student has gathered and discussed in the assessment of Outcome 1 is included as part of the assignment.
- ◆ When responses to prelim questions are submitted as part of evidence of a student's competency then details of the questions asked and of the relevant marking schemes used should also be submitted.
- ◆ When submitting Analysis of Performance assignments that comments and assessments are included to indicate the member of staff's judgement of the level of competency displayed by the student. These comments can be made on the actual work, at the end of the work or in the form of a completed proforma that accompanies the work. This information is important to moderators and will influence their decision about a centres ability to judge candidate evidence.
- ◆ When submitting Investigation of Performance logbooks that comments and assessments are included to indicate the member of staff's judgement of the level of competency displayed by the student. These comments can be made at the end of each outcome section of the logbook, at the end of the logbook or in the form of a completed proforma that accompanies the logbook. This information is important to moderators and will influence their decision about a centre's ability to judge candidate evidence.
- ◆ When Investigation reports are submitted as unit evidence, teachers should indicate where in each student's work the relevant outcomes and criteria of the unit have been met. This can be done by highlighting and commenting on particular sections of the text or completing a summary proforma relating to each student's work.