



NQ Verification 2013–14

Key Message Reports

Verification group name:	Physical Education
Levels	N3 to N5
Date published:	July 2014

This Report combines all Verification Key Messages for the academic session 2013-14.



NQ Verification 2013–14

Key Messages Round 1

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	National Courses Physical Education
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	January 2014

National Courses/Units/Awards verified:

H254 74 and 75 Physical Education: Factors Impacting on Performance

H252 74 and 75 Physical Education: Performance Skills

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

H254 74 and 75 Physical Education: Factors Impacting on Performance

Most centres used the workbook provided in the Unit assessment support pack (UASP), although some had centre-devised questions, which allowed the candidates to achieve the Assessment Standards.

Centres are reminded that whatever means is used to gather evidence (eg workbook, questions, presentation), candidate responses must be judged against the Assessment Standards and the information contained in the judging evidence table provided in the UASP.

Care should be taken to ensure that the candidate has the opportunity to give a sufficient depth of answer to reach the appropriate level.

H252 73, 74 and 75 Physical Education: Performance Skills

All centres used the judging evidence table from the UASP documents as a whole or had constructed their own version for different activities. In all cases, centres set up appropriate conditions for the verification to take place. There was

much evidence of good practice in the way the candidates coped with the situation and how staff handled it.

Assessment judgements

H254 74 and 75 Physical Education: Factors Impacting on Performance

At National 4, some centres were severe in their judgements, with some candidates who had satisfied Assessment Standards being judged as a 'Fail'.

There appeared to be some confusion in judgements when the command words '**describe**' and '**explain**' were not taken into account. On occasions, a good **description** was judged as a 'Pass' at National 5 when an **explanation** was required. See the appendix on page 4 for examples of acceptable responses.

H252 74 and 75 Physical Education: Performance Skills

Over the centres visited, a wide spectrum of abilities was seen, ranging from working towards gaining National 3 to National 5 and beyond. Staff in the centres were accurate in their judgements and fair to the candidates. Feedback from centre staff indicated that they felt the process to be supportive. Verifiers were very positive in their reports about how visits had been set up.

03

Section 3: General comments

H254 74 and 75 Physical Education: Factors Impacting on Performance

Centres should note that Outcome 1 of the Unit at National 5 does not have to be made personal. It can be judged solely on acquired knowledge and understanding.

In Assessment Standard 1.2 at National 4, no matter the detail of the description, the candidate must describe the **impact** of the factor. At National 5 Assessment Standard 1.2, they must explain the impact.

Outcomes 2 and 3 must relate to the development of personal performance. Centres must acknowledge that candidates have been observed undertaking their development plan. How this is completed is up to centres — it could be recorded on a candidate feedback sheet or on a workbook (if used).

In Assessment Standard 3.1, centres should provide evidence linking to the candidate's personal development.

For example: 'While I was practising I asked the teacher what to do to help my lay up and they said to put the ball gently on the backboard so that it didn't bounce back so much.'

Care must be taken to separate Assessment Standards 3.2 and 3.3. Assessment Standard 3.2 looks for comments on how effective the plan has been — ‘What was it in your training that helped/did not help?’ Whilst 3.3 asks for what has changed in the performance with reference to the evidence gathered by the candidates.

Often these Assessment Standards have naturally occurring evidence that can be found in earlier answers; perhaps in a review of a session and, as long as that is acknowledged clearly by the assessor, it does not have to be explicitly written down/recorded by the candidate.

If a centre is using marks to help guide candidates, it must ensure that each Assessment Standard is met rather than using a target mark. A candidate could score a ‘pass mark’ yet not have met all Assessment Standards. All Assessment Standards must be met to gain a Unit pass.

H252 74 and 75 Physical Education: Performance Skills

There was evidence of very useful internal verification where teachers had cross-marked within the centre and used video. Also, some centres had visited other centres to have wider access to cross-marking.

Overall, round 1 of Performance Skills verification was very successful.

Appendix

H254 Physical Education: Factors Impacting on Performance

Exemplar candidate responses — **minimum** standard at each level.

National 4 H254 74	National 5 H254 75
<p>1.1 Describing a method used to identify factors impacting on a performance</p>	<p>1.1 Explaining in detail two methods used to identify factors impacting on performance</p>
<p>Measure out a 20 metre section. You keep running for as long as possible until you can't keep up with the speed. You must run in time with the beep.</p>	<p>One method is being provided to exemplify the minimum standard required: Objective test — no judgement required. You can repeat it exactly the same way to check for change. or You can compare it to national norms and use it to set realistic goals.</p>
<p>Describing the impact of two factors on a performance</p>	<p>Explaining in detail the impact of one positive and one negative factor on performance</p>
<p>One factor is being provided to exemplify the minimum standard required: Stamina helps you keep up with the whole game so that you can keep up with your opponents, even near the end of the game.</p>	<p>One negative factor is being provided to exemplify the minimum standard required: If you have low stamina you get tired near the end of the game so you can't get back in time to defend so the other team have an easy chance to score. or Maybe you can't get to a pass because you're tired so your team lose possession.</p>
<p>Identifying a factor that affects a performance and describing an approach to develop this</p>	<p>Explaining two approaches to develop performance</p>
<p>Stamina — fartlek training You run/walk/sprint at different speeds. You have to do it for at least 30 minutes. or You set out a course, eg 400 m circuit, 50 m walk, 100 m jog, 50 m sprint, 50 m jog, 50 m heels up, 50 m knees up, 50 m sprint.</p>	<p>One approach is being provided to exemplify the minimum standard required: Fartlek training Can use for monitoring or setting targets easily by checking how many 'laps' completed in set time. or Varied pace makes it like basketball because you are using different speeds when you play so there's a link.</p>



NQ Verification 2013–14

Key Messages Round 2

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	National Courses Physical Education
Verification event/visiting information	Event and Visiting
Date published:	March 2014

National Courses/Units verified:

H254 73, 74 and 75 Physical Education: Factors Impacting on Performance
H252 73, 74 and 75 Physical Education: Performance Skills

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

H254 73, 74 and 75 Physical Education: Factors Impacting on Performance

Many centres used the workbook from the Unit assessment support pack, although some had used centre-devised questions, which highlighted good practice. Centres that create their own approach must ensure that if they change the terminology of the Assessment Standard the meaning does not change as this would disadvantage the candidate. Care should be taken to ensure that the candidate has the opportunity to give a sufficient depth of answer to reach the appropriate level. It must be clear in the approach which Assessment Standard is being met.

Thus far, no centre that has had an approach accepted through prior verification has allowed that approach to be published.

In Assessment Standard 1.2 level 74 and 75, it should be noted that two different factors must be used (see www.sqa.org.uk/files_ccc/PE_Four_factors_table.pdf).

In workbooks that have been designed for bi-level use, some candidates had to complete a great deal of extra writing. It may not have been wasted effort, but where a National 4 candidate had tried to explain why they used a certain method of data collection, some of them struggled. On the other hand, National 5 candidates had, at times, excellent descriptions but a bare minimum of explanation.

H252 73, 74 and 75 Physical Education: Performance Skills

As in Round 1, all centres used the judging evidence table from the Unit assessment support pack documents as a whole or had constructed their own version for different activities. In all cases, centres set up appropriate conditions for the verification to take place. There was much evidence of good practice in the way the candidates coped with the situation and how staff handled it.

Assessment judgements

Most centres clearly explained their judgements and a good deal of good practice was evident in the comments from assessors. Some of these comments served both as feedback to candidates and as decisions on passing or failing the Assessment Standard. Care should be taken that the candidate is not simply told the answer when being given feedback. All Assessment Standards must be judged as either pass or fail. Where all Assessment Standards have not yet been met then a candidate cannot be given an overall pass. Where interim evidence has been used for the purposes of verification, Assessment Standards not yet attempted need no judgement.

H252 73, 74 and 75 Physical Education: Performance Skills

A wide range of performance standards were seen. Not all candidates performed at the level at which they were to be presented for the Course. Some were above, some below. This did not affect the verification process as the assessor and centre agreed on the standard on the day. As in round 1, staff in the centres were accurate in their judgements and fair to the candidates. Feedback from centre staff indicated that they felt the process to be supportive. Verifiers were very positive in their reports about how visits had been set up.

03

Section 3: General comments

There was evidence from some candidates of excellent understanding. Some had produced work well above the minimum required, showing an encouraging depth of understanding.

As in Round 1, some centres did not grasp the difference between describe and explain. Reference should be made to the [Key Messages from Round 1](#).

Some candidates generated naturally occurring evidence, which covered more than one Assessment Standard fully or in part. For example, where a candidate had described three sessions from their development plan they may have

included a number of approaches, along with some feedback whilst monitoring their progress. This could fulfil Assessment Standards 2.3, 2.4 and 3.1.

Internal verification methods should be robust. Clear evidence of internal verification that has taken place should be evident. These methods must be clearly identifiable. The use of different coloured pens by different assessors is good practice but it is not helpful when photocopies of the evidence are sent in for verification.

H252 73, 74 and 75 Physical Education: Performance Skills

There was evidence of very useful internal verification where teachers had cross-marked within the centre and used video. Also, some centres had visited other centres to have wider access to cross-marking.



NQ Verification 2013–14

Key Messages Round 3

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	National Courses Physical Education
Verification event/visiting information	Visiting
Date published:	June 2014

National Courses/Units/Awards verified:

H255 74 Physical Education Performance Added Value Unit
C756 75 Physical Education Course Assessment Performance

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

H255 74 Physical Education Performance, Added Value Unit C756 75 Physical Education Course Assessment, Performance

For the single performance event at both levels, all centres showed approaches that allowed the candidates to perform in an appropriately challenging, competitive and/or demanding context. There was much evidence of good practice in the way the candidates coped with the situation and how it was handled by staff.

For C756 75 Physical Education Course Assessment Performance some centres had adapted the planning and evaluation approach. Not all centres used the template provided by SQA. Some candidates appeared to be restricted for space when answering in the boxes provided. To overcome this, some centres allowed candidates to use lined paper to answer the questions. Adaptations are acceptable as long as no change is made to the meaning of the questions. Care should be taken to ensure that candidates have the opportunity to give a sufficient depth of answer to gain the full range of marks.

Assessment judgements

H255 74 Physical Education Performance, Added Value Unit C756 75 Physical Education Course Assessment, Performance

A range of performance activities was seen. In their reports, verifiers were very positive about how visits had been set up.

As in previous rounds, staff in centres were accurate in their judgements and fair to the candidates. Some centres had made their own specific success criteria to exemplify skills, knowledge and understanding. These were in line with those produced by SQA. All judgements on performance were Accepted. When looking at the planning and evaluation for the National 5 Course assessment, verifiers found that centres had used the Marking Instructions well and annotations such as ticks on the responses helped reinforce the comments made and the marks given.

Feedback from centre staff indicated that they felt the process to be supportive.

03

Section 3: General comments

Overall, the candidates in centres performed well. Some very high standards were seen both in the performance and in the planning and evaluation. Most centres provided evidence of internal verification and detailed record keeping of the candidates' work.