



Course report 2022

Subject	Physical Education
Level	Higher

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 appeals.

Grade boundary and statistical information:

Statistical information: update on courses

Number of resulted entries in 2022	11850
------------------------------------	-------

Statistical information: performance of candidates

Distribution of course awards including grade boundaries

A	Percentage	30.2	Cumulative percentage	30.2	Number of candidates	3580	Minimum mark required	70
B	Percentage	33.3	Cumulative percentage	63.5	Number of candidates	3945	Minimum mark required	59
C	Percentage	24.3	Cumulative percentage	87.8	Number of candidates	2880	Minimum mark required	49
D	Percentage	9.6	Cumulative percentage	97.4	Number of candidates	1135	Minimum mark required	38
No award	Percentage	2.6	Cumulative percentage	N/A	Number of candidates	310	Minimum mark required	N/A

You can read the general commentary on grade boundaries in appendix 1 of this report.

In this report:

- ◆ 'most' means greater than 70%
- ◆ 'many' means 50% to 69%
- ◆ 'some' means 25% to 49%
- ◆ 'a few' means less than 25%

You can find more statistical reports on the statistics page of [SQA's website](#).

Section 1: comments on the assessment

Question paper

The question paper performed as expected.

Section 1 of the paper sampled from all four factors impacting performance and included a 6-mark question which enabled candidates to demonstrate depth in their response.

In Section 2 there were opportunities for candidates to reflect on work they would have carried out as part of the performance development process in the course. The majority of candidates were able to use this information to answer all questions in relation to their personal experience when working on development needs. Overall, this section performed well.

The final section of the question paper presented a line graph requiring analysis. Most candidates attempted this section and feedback from markers was that this section was, overall answered poorly. The questions required analysis of the information given relating to goal setting during a performance development plan.

Performance

The performance component performed as expected. The live assessment verification was generally welcomed in centres. A range of activities was verified and information from centres show a wider range of activities being assessed than in previous sessions. The centres that were sampled appear to have embraced the chance to allow personalisation and choice.

Section 2: comments on candidate performance

Question paper

In Section 1, question 3 allowed candidates to provide depth of knowledge when evaluating performance development approaches. While most candidates provided a judgement as to the effectiveness of the approach, few candidates provided the required evidence to support their judgement.

In Section 2 of the question paper, question 7 was answered poorly. This question asked candidates to explain why they would prioritise their development needs at the start of the Personal Development Plan. Many candidates failed to explain why they chose one area over another and why addressing specific development needs may be more impactful on performance overall.

In section 3, most candidates attempted this section and feedback from team leaders and markers was that it was answered poorly. There was a lack of in-depth analysis of the information provided. Many candidates provided a descriptive commentary of the graph without attempting to apply this to the impact on the development of physical and emotional factors.

Performance

Candidates performed very well in the performance component with many achieving full marks.

Verifiers reported that they observed some excellent performances. They also gave feedback on the high motivation shown by candidates and those other performers who were also involved in some of the performance assessments to give appropriate context. It was clear that centres knew their candidates' capabilities and, on the whole, were able to provide suitable contexts for assessment.

Candidates provided information on their composition, tactics or roles in a variety of ways including discussion and written information. Personalisation and choice led to strong performances in this component of the course. Centres had put in great effort to ensure that as many candidates as possible could be assessed in their chosen activity.

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

Section 3: preparing candidates for future assessment

Question paper

There was evidence that many candidates were using writing frameworks for explaining and analysing. This enabled them to structure their answers more effectively and ensured their answer demonstrated both the required knowledge and the appropriate skills.

Teachers and lecturers should ensure that candidates understand the reasons for prioritising different development needs at the start of a Personal Development Plan. Candidates should be determining the development needs which are most pressing while devising the Personal Development Plan. This area of content will be part of the focus of SQA's Understanding Standards activities in the coming session.

Additionally, when analysing the data provided candidates should have the ability to shed new light on the information and provide insight into the possible impacts they may have. It is not enough to provide a commentary of the information.

Performance

A key aim of the Higher course is to enable candidates to develop and demonstrate a broad and comprehensive range of complex movement and performance skills in challenging contexts through a range of activities. The modification of assessing candidates in only one activity, will continue in the next session.

To set it apart from normal learning and teaching activities, the assessment of this single performance must take place in a context which is suitably challenging for a Higher-level candidate allowing them the opportunity to access the full range of marks. Guidance can be found on SQA's website to help teachers, lecturers and assessors decide which activities are acceptable for assessment.

Appendix 1: general commentary on grade boundaries

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

For most National Courses, SQA aims to set examinations and other external assessments and create marking instructions that allow:

- ◆ a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional grade C boundary)
- ◆ a well-prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70% of the available marks (the notional grade 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 for each course to bring together all the information available (statistical and qualitative) and to make final decisions on grade boundaries based on this information. Members of SQA's Executive Management Team normally chair these meetings.

Principal assessors utilise their subject expertise to evaluate the performance of the assessment and propose suitable grade boundaries based on the full range of evidence. SQA can adjust the grade boundaries as a result of the discussion at these meetings. This allows the pass rate to be unaffected in circumstances where there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been more, or less, difficult than usual.

- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been more difficult than usual.
- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been less difficult than usual.
- ◆ Where levels of difficulty 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 on year. This is because the specific questions, and the mix of questions, are different and this has an impact on candidate performance.

This year, a package of support measures including assessment modifications and revision support, was introduced to support candidates as they returned to formal national exams and other forms of external assessment. This was designed to address the ongoing disruption to learning and teaching that young people have experienced as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, SQA adopted a more generous approach to grading for National 5, Higher and Advanced Higher courses than it would do in a normal exam year, to help ensure fairness for candidates while maintaining standards. This is in recognition of the fact that those preparing for and sitting exams have done so in very different circumstances from those who sat exams in 2019.

The key difference this year is that decisions about where the grade boundaries have been set have also been influenced, where necessary and where appropriate, by the unique circumstances in 2022. On a course-by-course basis, SQA has determined grade boundaries in a way that is fair to candidates, taking into account how the assessment (exams and coursework) has functioned and the impact of assessment modifications and revision support.

The grade boundaries used in 2022 relate to the specific experience of this year's cohort and should not be used by centres if these assessments are used in the future for exam preparation.

For full details of the approach please refer to the [National Qualifications 2022 Awarding—Methodology Report](#).