



Course Report 2018

Subject	Physical Education
Level	National 5

This report provides information on the performance of candidates. 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

Summary of the course assessment

Component 1: portfolio

The portfolio largely performed as expected. Feedback indicates that it was felt to be fair and accessible for all candidates, with comments suggesting that there were questions within the assessment for 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.

Component 2: performance

A range of activities was used as a means of assessing the single performance events within challenging contexts. Centres appear to have embraced the chance to allow personalisation and choice. Many candidates were awarded full marks in the performance component.

Section 2: comments on candidate performance

Areas in which candidates performed well

Component 1: portfolio

The candidates performed well in the following areas:

- Questions 2b, 2f candidates identified methods of data collection and targets
- Question 2c descriptions were clear and most candidates achieved marks for the process and the data collection method
- Question 2h candidates clearly understood how to describe approaches to performance development

Component 2: performance

Candidates performed well in the performance. Through visiting verification it is clear that centres offered a wide range of activities for the single performance event.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Component 1: portfolio

- Questions 1 Candidates found it demanding to give specific context and then impact. Candidates found it demanding when using 'sadness' and 'happiness' to explain the actual context and impact on performance.
- Question 2e Some candidates only identified and did not describe their strengths and development needs.
- Question 2i Candidates found it demanding to offer personal reasoning when justifying. Candidates cannot use approaches in their response.
- Question 3c Candidates found it demanding to describe the monitoring **process**.
- Question 3d Candidates found it demanding to make a judgement of an identified aspect of the Personal Development Programme (PDP) and determine the value of its effectiveness on the PDP.
- Question 3e Candidates found it demanding to make a judgement of an identified aspect of performance and determine the value of its effectiveness on performance.
- Question 3f Candidates found it demanding to offer personal reasoning of their future plans. Some candidates responded through impact on performance. Whilst this was accepted this year, in future candidate's responses must relate to planning in the future.

Component 2: performance

There were no reports of candidates struggling with the performance component.

Section 3: advice for the preparation of future candidates

Component 1: portfolio

Question 1a — 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, enabling them to score an easy lay-up'.

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

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

Question 2e — Candidates clearly identified their strengths and development needs; however, they must describe them in relation to their performance. A clear descriptive response would be; 'I am unable to clear the shuttlecock high and to the back of the court'.

Question 2i — Candidates must state what else they would consider and then give personal reasoning as to why they have considered this aspect. Candidates cannot use approaches in their response.

Question 3c — 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 3d — Candidates must make a judgement of an identified aspect of the PDP and determine the value of its effectiveness of the PDP. Responses must relate to PDP **not performance**.

Question 3e – Candidates make a judgement of an identified aspect of performance and determine the value of its effectiveness on performance. Responses must relate to **performance on both factors and** not PDP.

Question 3f — Candidates must state where they are in their current performance and then consider what they would plan for in the future. Personal reasoning as to why they have considered this aspect must be evident to access marks.

Please note that if candidates directly copy responses from the specific marking instructions which are contained within the coursework assessment task they will not be awarded any marks for the extract they have copied.

Component 2: performance

Centres must ensure that the activities chosen allow candidates to access marks in all the sections, and that there is the necessary expertise available to assess that activity.

Throughout the performance, candidates should have the ability to apply a broad performance repertoire, including complex skills. Skills should be controlled and fluent, with appropriate decisions being made effectively.

Candidates should be able to show that straightforward composition, tactics or roles can be applied safely and effectively. The candidates should conform to the required rules and etiquette whilst controlling their emotions. All of this must be demonstrated in a context which is challenging, competitive and/or demanding. If centres cannot provide a context in which to allow candidates the opportunity to access these marks, then a different activity must be considered.

Centres should read the guidance on acceptable activities document available on the Physical Education subject page of SQA's website.

Grade boundary and statistical information:

Statistical information: update on courses

Number of resulted entries in 2017	15213
------------------------------------	-------

Number of resulted entries in 2018	15397
------------------------------------	-------

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	45.6%	45.6%	7022	87
B	31.2%	76.8%	4798	75
C	17.6%	94.4%	2708	63
D	4.8%	99.2%	739	51
No award	0.8%	-	130	-

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 which allow a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional C boundary) and 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 Business Manager and Statistician to discuss the evidence and make decisions. The meetings are chaired by members of the management team at SQA.

- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the exam is more challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.
- ◆ The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the exam is less challenging than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance.
- ◆ Where standards are comparable to previous years, similar grade boundaries are maintained.

Grade boundaries from exam 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 exams set by centres. If SQA alters a boundary, this does not mean that centres should necessarily alter their boundary in the corresponding practice exam paper.