Course report 2019

Subject	Physical Education
Level	National 5

This report provides information on candidates' performance. Teachers, lecturers and assessors may find it useful when preparing candidates for future assessment. The report 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 assessment documents and marking instructions.

The statistics used in this report have been compiled before the completion of any post-results services.

Section 1: comments on the assessment

Portfolio

The portfolio performed largely as expected. Feedback indicates that it was felt to be fair and accessible for all candidates. There were comments suggesting questions within the assessment were suitable for the C candidates, as well as questions to challenge the A candidates. The majority of candidates understood what was required and were able to complete the whole portfolio.

Question 3(f) still did not perform as expected, despite clear guidance being given at understanding standards events.

Performance.

From all the centres sampled, the performance component performed as expected. A range of activities were observed by verifiers and information from the centres showed that an even wider range of activities were assessed in centres. Centres appear to have embraced the opportunity to allow personalisation and choice.

Some centres were outwith tolerance in their judgements and were required to revisit the marks for the entire cohort and adjust the marks where necessary. Each centre in this situation received feedback and support to ensure they marked to the national standard.

Section 2: comments on candidate performance

Areas that candidates performed well in

Portfolio

Questions 2(b), 2(f)
Candidates were able to identify methods of data collection and targets.

Question 2(c)
Descriptions were clear and most candidates achieved marks for the process and the data collection method.

Question 2(e)
Some candidates only **identified** strengths and development needs and did not describe.

Question 2(h)
Candidates clearly understood how to describe approaches to performance development.

Performance

Statistics show that candidates performed well in the performance component of the course with many achieving full marks. Verifiers reported some excellent performances where some National 5 candidates were playing against, or with, Higher candidates to enable the National 5 candidate to have an appropriate context for their assessment. Personalisation and choice contributed to strong performances in this component of the course.

Areas that candidates found demanding

Portfolio

Question 1
Candidates found it challenging to give a specific context and then impact. Candidates continue to find it challenging when using 'sadness', 'happiness' and 'etiquette' to explain the actual context and impact on the performance.

Question 2(i)
Candidates found it challenging to justify their decisions.

Question 3(c)
Candidates continue to find it challenging to describe the monitoring process.

Question 3(d)
Candidates found it challenging to make a judgement of an identified aspect of their Personal Development Programme (PDP) and determine the value of its effectiveness on the PDP.

Question 3(e)
Candidates found it challenging to make a judgement of an aspect within performance and determine the value of its impact on performance.

Question 3(f)

Candidates found it challenging to refer to a current performance, provide an action and a personal reason for their future plans. There was still evidence of some candidates responding through impact on performance, despite understanding standards events clarifying the demands of the question. As set out in the 2018 Course Report, this was not accepted this year.

Performance

There were few, if any, reports of candidates having difficulty accessing marks from any particular area of the marking instructions.

Section 3: preparing candidates for future assessment

Portfolio

Question 1(a)

Candidates are doing well when their responses either demonstrate breadth or depth of knowledge across the factors. Candidates need to make sure that they have an understanding of the factor, the specific context within the performance, and the actual impact it can have on performance. For example, 'in basketball my agility allowed me to turn and move quickly. When dribbling the ball down the court, I was able to turn and move quickly to get past defenders, allowing me to open up the court for a successful pass to one of my forwards'.

Centres should be aware that 'confidence' is an emotional factor and marks will not be awarded in this type of question if candidates use 'confidence' as a mental factor.

Centres should be aware that candidates will not be awarded marks if they 'flip' their response from positive to negative under the same body of knowledge.

Question 2(a)

Candidates must link their explanation of the challenges faced back to the reliability of the data.

Question 2(i)

Candidates must state what they would consider, in addition to the approaches used, and then give personal reasoning as to why they have made this decision. Candidates cannot use approaches in their response. The justification in 2(i) must give a decision, explanation and reason to access each mark.

Question 3(c)

Candidates must describe the monitoring process, not another method of data collection. Candidates should describe the timings of the monitoring and a description of how they used the information, for example to make comparisons.

Question 3(d)

Candidates must make a judgement about an aspect of their PDP and then determine the value of its effectiveness on the PDP. Responses must relate to **PDP not performance.**

Question 3(e)

Candidates are required to make a judgement about an aspect within their performance and then determine the value of its impact on performance.

Question 3(f)

Candidates must state their current performance, the action they will take, and their reason. Personal reasoning as to why they have considered this aspect must be evident to access marks.

Performance

A key aim of the National 5 Physical Education course is to develop candidates' ability to perform in physical activities by enabling them to acquire a comprehensive range of movement and performance skills in a variety of activities.

Centres are reminded that candidates must choose two activities which allow them opportunity to display a significantly different range of movement and performance skills. The assessment of these performances must take place in a context which is suitably challenging for a National 5 Physical Education candidate to set it apart from normal learning and teaching activities.

For a number of years guidance has existed on SQA's website to help teachers and lecturers decide which activities are acceptable for assessment and which combinations of activities are acceptable. Following views expressed at the Understanding Standards events in 2018 and the National PE survey (May 2019) we have inserted additional information on acceptable and unacceptable activities in the coursework assessment task.

A revised model for verification of the performance component is being introduced in session 2019/2020. This is available on the subject pages of SQA's website.

Grade boundary and statistical information:

Statistical information: update on courses

Number of resulted entries in 2018	15397

Number of resulted entries in 2019	16771

Statistical information: performance of candidates

Distribution of course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of course awards	Percentage	Cumulative %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum mark				
A	45.9%	45.9%	7700	87
B	31.1%	77.0%	5208	75
C	16.9%	93.9%	2842	63
D	5.0%	98.9%	844	51
No award	1.1%	-	177	-

General commentary on grade boundaries

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.

SQA aims to set examinations and create marking instructions that allow:

♦ a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional C boundary)
♦ a well-prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70% of the available marks (the notional A boundary)

It is very challenging to get the standard on target every year, in every subject at every level.

Therefore, SQA holds a grade boundary meeting every year for each subject at each level to bring 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. Members of the SQA management team chair these meetings. SQA can adjust the grade boundaries as a result of the meetings. This allows the pass rate to be unaffected in circumstances where there is evidence that the question paper has been more, or less, challenging than usual.

♦ The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the question paper is more challenging than usual.
♦ The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the exam is less challenging than usual.
♦ Where standards are comparable to previous years, similar grade boundaries are maintained.

Grade boundaries from question papers in the same subject at the same level tend to be marginally different year to year. This is because the particular questions, and the mix of questions, are different. This is also the case for question papers set by centres. If SQA alters a boundary, this does not mean that centres should necessarily alter their boundary in the question papers that they set themselves.