



Course Report 2016

Subject	Physical Education
Level	National 5

The statistics used in this report have been compiled before the completion of any Post Results Services.

This report provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers, lecturers and assessors in their preparation of candidates for future assessment. It 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.

Section 1: Comments on the Assessment

Component 1: Performance

Both elements of the task were the same as in the previous two years, and results were as before. Most candidates understood what was to be completed.

A range of activities were used as a means of assessing the single performance and creating challenges. In the centres that were verified, candidates' evidence for the planning and evaluation was presented in written format.

Component 2: Portfolio

Centres carried out the assessment in a variety of ways. Some centres followed an approach where candidates were directed to the activity and the factors that impacted their performance. Other centres selected a more flexible approach, where candidates selected from a range of activities and different factors. Both approaches are acceptable. Most candidates decided to follow a performance development process for the Physical Factor.

A range of methods of data collection and programmes of work were attached. This is a mandatory piece of evidence for the assessment.

The assessment requires the candidate to be examined on three of the four factors: Mental, Emotional, Social and Physical

In general, the candidates performed well in this assessment, with an average mark of 22 out of 40. The design of the portfolio allowed the candidates to follow a performance development process in the selected factor that impacted their performance. Most candidates followed a fitness or skill development programme in relation to an activity of their choice.

Section 2: Comments on candidate performance

Component 1: Performance

Candidates performed well in the performance element. During visiting verification over 15% of candidates scored full marks in their performance. (This was as seen on the day of the verification visit so was not the mark used for their course grade but it would give an indication of what was achieved in the single performance.)

In the planning and evaluation, candidates, on the whole, were able to describe and explain the significance of their challenges

Component 2: Portfolio

Most candidates followed the process of performance development, and were able to identify a factor that impacted their performance and develop this factor throughout the assessment.

- ◆ Question 1(a) was done well. Most candidates had a clear understanding of how the two factors selected had an impact on performance in two activities. However, it did lead to repetition of responses, depending on the activities selected.
- ◆ In Question 2(a) clear descriptions of a method to gather information were evident.
- ◆ In Question 3(a) candidates had a clear understanding of why it is necessary to monitor their performance.
- ◆ In Question 3(b) some candidates showed clear descriptions of how they would monitor their programme of work.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Component 1: Performance

There were no reports of candidates struggling with the single performance part of this component. However, in the evaluation part some candidates did not link their evaluation response in Question 3(a) to the planning and preparation used in part 1.

Some responses were descriptive and gave a narrative of what had happened rather than an evaluation of their planning and preparation in relation to the single performance.

Component 2: Portfolio

- ◆ Candidates found the wording of Question 2(c) challenging. Many did not link their response to what the method of data collection told them about their performance. Some candidates did not link the data gathered back to the impact on performance.
- ◆ For Question 2(d) some candidates had difficulty explaining why they chose their particular training programme.
- ◆ In Question 3(c), some candidates found it difficult to explain the decisions they had made about their performance development. This also led to repetition in some responses from Question 2 (d).
- ◆ Questions 3(d) and 3(e) led to some repetition in responses. Candidates found it difficult to 'explain' this factor and apply the knowledge required for this question, and then to apply this knowledge to the impact that this factor may have on future performance.

Section 3: Advice for the preparation of future candidates

Component 1: Performance

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

Throughout, candidates must be able to demonstrate a broad performance. Skills should be controlled and fluent, with appropriate decisions being made effectively. Candidates should conform to the required rules and etiquette. 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, a different activity must be considered. There are clips on the SQA secure site which exemplify the standard. There is guidance on which activities are acceptable for assessment in Physical Education at:

www.sqa.org.uk/sqa/files_ccc/Activities_for_Assessment_in_PE_guidance.pdf.

Centres must ensure that candidates complete the planning, preparation and evaluation in relation to their own single performance, not generically. The evaluation in Question 3a must relate to the planning and preparation for the two challenges from Question 1. Centres should encourage candidates to take notice of the command word and structure their response appropriately. When marking the responses, centres too must take note of the command word and not give marks inappropriately. For example, in Question 3(a) do not give marks for description if there is no evaluation. The Understanding Standards section of the SQA secure site has examples of marked responses that illustrate the standard.

Assessors are reminded that the planning and evaluation sections should be conducted under some supervision and control. Assessors must be able to authenticate the work as being the candidate's own. While it is acceptable to allow candidates to give an evaluation immediately following the single performance and then revisit the response after some time for reflection, it is not reasonable to have numerous redrafts. Once work has been marked by the assessor, it should not be returned to the candidate for amendment.

Component 2: Portfolio

For Question 1, make sure that candidates explain the actual impact on performance, for example, 'This led to the performer being unable to keep up with my marker during a game, which allowed them to get free to receive a pass and have an opportunity to score.'

Make sure that candidates have a clear understanding that they must select a **different** factor, ie candidates must select two out of the four factors, from Mental, Emotional, Social or Physical.

Each factor must be different — eg the candidate could choose to explain Physical and Social factors.

For each of these factors it is acceptable for the candidate to explain a different example for each activity. For example:

- ◆ Factor 1, Physical — the candidate could explain CRE for one activity and Speed for the other.
- ◆ Factor 2, Social — the candidate could explain Communication for one activity and Co-operation for the other.

Grade Boundary and Statistical information:

Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2015	14167
------------------------------------	-------

Number of resulted entries in 2016	14415
------------------------------------	-------

Statistical information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark -				
A	51.4%	51.4%	7403	74
B	28.8%	80.2%	4158	64
C	14.6%	94.8%	2106	54
D	2.7%	97.5%	394	49
No award	2.5%	-	354	-

General commentary on grade boundaries

- ◆ While SQA aims to set examinations and create marking instructions which will 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.
- ◆ Each year, SQA therefore holds a grade boundary meeting for each subject at each level where it brings 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.
- ◆ An exam paper at a particular level in a subject in one year tends to have a marginally different set of grade boundaries from exam papers in that subject at that level in other years. This is because the particular questions, and the mix of questions, are different. This is also the case for exams set in centres. If SQA has already altered a boundary in a particular year in, say, Higher Chemistry, this does not mean that centres should necessarily alter boundaries in their prelim exam in Higher Chemistry. The two are not that closely related, as they do not contain identical questions.
- ◆ 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.