Course Report 2014

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 in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. 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 and marking instructions for the examination.

Section 1: Comments on the Assessment

Component 1: Performance

Centres showed evidence of having allowed candidates a wide choice of activities for the assessment of the single performance event. Most candidates wrote their responses to the planning and evaluation parts of the assessment, rather than presenting the information in an alternative format, such as oral presentation.

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 which impacted, while others allowed more flexibility and choice of activities and factors impacting. Both approaches are acceptable.

Most candidates attached a method of data collection and programme of work, which 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

Reports from verification showed that there was a range of marks for performance. The average mark achieved for performance was 50.2. A variety of activities was seen and evidence from the centres indicated that many different activities had been used.

Evidence, in the centres visited for verification, for the planning and evaluation parts of the performance was, on the whole, written work by the candidates. Some candidates had given their responses orally and this had been recorded in detailed notes by the assessor. Verifiers reported that the planning part of the assessment usually scored higher marks than the evaluation.

Component 2: Portfolio

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 respond logically to their performance development in the selected factor that impacted their performance.

Section 3: Areas in which candidates performed well

Component 1: Performance
Most candidates performed well in the practical part of the single performance event.

Component 2: Portfolio
Candidates did well in the following areas:

♦ Most candidates followed the process of performance development, and were able to identify a factor which impacted their performance and develop this factor throughout the assessment.
♦ Question 1(a) was done well, where most candidates had a clear understanding of how the factors selected had an impact on performance in two activities.
♦ 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.

Section 4: Areas which candidates found demanding

Component 1: Performance

In Question 3(a) some candidates did not always relate back to the challenges, (question 1(a)), and their planning, (question 1(c)), and gave a report of what happened in the performance. Whilst this is acceptable for question 3(b), candidates must evaluate their performance in relation to the challenges and how these were to be overcome as described in questions 1(a) and (c).

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 their response to the method of data collection attached. It was felt that this had impacted negatively on 'C' grade candidates, so the 'C' grade boundary was lowered by one mark.

For question 2(d) some candidates had difficulty explaining why they chose their particular training programme.

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

Some candidates did not use a different factor from the one explained in question 1(a). This led to candidates being unable to access marks.

Section 5: Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

Component 1: Performance

Centres are reminded that the challenges identified by the candidate must be personal and must impact on the performance that is graded for their final mark. If a candidate wishes to go down a route which requires the implementation of a development programme lasting a number of weeks, the planning part of the assessment must be completed well in advance of the performance to allow the programme to be effective.

Component 2: Portfolio

Centres should:

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

♦ Be clear in the four factors impacting performance — Mental, Emotional, Social and Physical.

♦ For **Question 1**, make sure that candidates explain the actual impact on performance, eg '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 – eg the candidate could choose to describe Physical and Social factors.

For each of these factors it is acceptable for the candidate to describe 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.

♦ For **Question 2(a)** Method of data collection must be attached to the Portfolio to access marks. Only one method of data collection should be used. Centres should direct candidates to data collection methods that allow them to complete the follow-up question in 2(c), strengths and development needs.

- 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, eg 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, eg '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 1(a), they must choose from Mental or Emotional in part 3. 3(d) is based on the knowledge and understanding the candidate has on this third factor; 3(e) requires the candidate to apply their knowledge of the factor to their own personal performance in the future.

Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2013	0

Number of resulted entries in 2014	11441

Statistical information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of Course awards	%	Cum. %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark 100				
A	62.2%	62.2%	7119	70
B	25.6%	87.8%	2926	59
C	9.0%	96.8%	1033	49
D	1.6%	98.4%	181	44
No award	1.6%	-	182	-