Course Report 2015

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 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: 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 assessed on three of the four factors: Mental, Emotional, Social and Physical.

Component 2: Performance

There was a wide range of activities assessed for the single performance event. Evidence presented by centres showed that candidates had provided written responses to the planning and evaluation sections of the assessment rather than presenting in any other format.

Section 2: Comments on candidate performance

Component 1: Portfolio

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

Component 2: Performance

From the verification reports, it was evident that Team Leaders (verifiers) found a range of marks in the performances that they observed. The average mark achieved for the performance component was 50.7. A range of activities was also seen.

In the centres that were visited for verification, the planning and evaluation sections were clearly laid out and marking was detailed.

Section 3: Areas in which candidates performed well

Component 1: Portfolio

Candidates performed well in the following areas:

♦ Most candidates followed the process of performance development, and were able to identify a factor that impacted on their performance, and developed this factor throughout the assessment.
♦ Question 1(a) where most candidates had a clear understanding of the way 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) candidates showed some clear descriptions of how they would monitor their programme of work.

Component 2: Performance

Generally, candidates performed well in the performance section of course assessment. Team Leaders (verifiers) noted that the planning section often scored higher marks than the evaluation.

Section 4: Areas which candidates found demanding

Component 1: 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 to 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.

Component 2: Performance

Candidates usually scored higher in the planning section of the assessment, but in question 3(a) some did not link the evaluation to their planning and preparation for their challenges from question 1(a) and so could not achieve marks.

Section 5: Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

Component 1: Portfolio

Candidates should have a clear understanding of the requirements of the command words 'explain' and 'describe', for example:

Questions that ask candidates to *describe* require them to provide a statement or structure of characteristics and/or features. It will be more than an outline or than a list. It may refer to — for instance — a concept, process, experiment, situation, or facts.

Questions that ask candidates to *explain* require them to make points that relate cause and impact and/or make relationships between things clear. This explanation may be the product of a process that includes evaluation.

Candidates should make sure for question 1 that they explain the actual impact on performance — for example, 'This led to me 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.'

Centres should 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.

For question 2(a) the 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 on 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'.

The factor selected in questions 3(d) and 3(e) must be different from the factor selected in section 1. For example, if a candidate has selected Physical and Social factors in 1(a), they must choose from Mental or Emotional in section 3. Question 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.

There is exemplification of the National 5 portfolio in the Understanding Standards section on the SQA's website.

Component 2: Performance

For the planning and evaluation sections of the performance, centres are reminded that candidates must respond giving the challenges that they will face in **their own** single performance event, plan how to overcome them, and evaluate the success of their plan in relation to each challenge. This cannot be answered generically and must be assessed under some supervision and control.

The planning and preparation must be completed before the single performance event. If a candidate wishes to use lack of fitness, for example, as a challenge, and wishes to meet this challenge with a 'training programme', then the planning and preparation section of the Course assessment must be completed before embarking on the training programme.

If the planning is completed on the day of the performance, or just a few days before, then a candidate cannot respond giving a plan of a six-week programme as it is not possible to complete such a programme in the time before the performance.

The evaluation in question 3(a) must relate to the planning and preparation for the two challenges from question 1(a) and 1(c).

Exemplification of National 5 planning and evaluation can be found in the Understanding Standards section on SQA's secure site.

Statistical information: update on Courses

Number of resulted entries in 2014	11441

Number of resulted entries in 2015	14167

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	56.0%	56.0%	7935	72
B	28.6%	84.6%	4057	61
C	11.4%	96.1%	1620	51
D	2.0%	98.1%	289	46
No award	1.9%	-	266	-

For this Course, the intention was to set an assessment with grade boundaries at the notional values of 50% for a Grade C and 70% for a Grade A.
It was felt that, as a consequence of the application of the marking instructions of the course assignment, that demand had been eased in this are, so therefore, a 2 mark shift was needed to be reflected in the Upper A, A and C boundaries.
In addition, Question 2c was intended to be accesible to all candidates; however due to wording it proved more difficult than intended. This affected C Candidates rather than A Candidates therefore the adjustment required was at the C Boundary which was lowered by 1 mark.
Net result - C Boundary raised by 1 mark, Upper A and A by 2 marks.