



## Course Report 2017

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 the tasks to be completed for course assessment. 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 Physical Factors which impacted their performance.

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.

## **Section 2: Comments on candidate performance**

### **Component 1: Performance**

Candidates performed well in the performance component. During visiting verification, a number of candidates scored full marks in their performance and some of these were being verified in an activity different from the one used for their course assessment.

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, were able to identify a factor that impacted their performance, and developed this factor throughout the assessment.

- ◆ Candidates have a better understanding of how the factors impact performance.
- ◆ 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) candidates showed some 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 planning and evaluation part of the assessment, 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 giving an evaluation of their planning and preparation for 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, then a different activity must be considered.

Centres must ensure that candidates complete the planning, preparation and evaluation in relation to their own single performance, not generically. The evaluation in Question 3(a) must relate to the planning and preparation for the two challenges from Question 1.

Centres should encourage candidates to take notice of the command words and structure their responses 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) no marks should be awarded 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.

## Component 2: Portfolio

Have a clear understanding of the command words 'explain' and 'describe'.

- ◆ 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. For example, candidates must select two out of the four factors, from Mental, Emotional, Social or Physical.
- ◆ Each factor must be different, for example 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.
- ◆ In Question 2(c) candidates should summarise what the method of data collection told them about their performance. This would usually link to strengths and development needs, which should be identified and expanded. This must link to the method of data

collection attached. Candidates should also make a direct link to how the strengths and development needs impact their performance.

- ◆ In Question 2(d) the training programme must be attached to access all marks. Candidates should explain why the particular programme of work was used — for example why they used the types of practices and why the programme was varied.
- ◆ For Question 3(c) Candidates must identify the decision made and why they made it, for example 'bored with practices so I added some new drills to give more variety'.
- ◆ In Questions 3(d) and 3(e) the factor selected must be different from the factor selected in Question 1. For example, if a candidate has selected Physical and Social factors in Question 1(a), they must choose from Mental or Emotional in part 3. Question 3(d) is based on the knowledge and understanding the candidate has on this third factor; Question 3(e) requires the candidate to apply their knowledge of the factor to their own personal performance in the future.

Whilst it was pleasing to see that the conditions of assessment for coursework were adhered to in the majority of centres, there were a small number of examples where this may not have been the case. Following feedback from teachers, we have strengthened the conditions of assessment criteria for National 5 subjects and will do so for Higher and Advanced Higher. The criteria are published clearly on our website and in course materials and must be adhered to. SQA takes very seriously its obligation to ensure fairness and equity for all candidates in all qualifications through consistent application of assessment conditions and investigates all cases alerted to us where conditions may not have been met.

## Grade Boundary and Statistical information

### Statistical information: update on Courses

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

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

### 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	48.3%	48.3%	7350	74
B	29.6%	78.0%	4510	64
C	16.5%	94.4%	2505	54
D	3.0%	97.5%	463	49
No award	2.5%	-	385	-

## 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.