NQ Verification 2014–15

Key Message Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verification group name:</th>
<th>Physical Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td>N3 to Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date published:</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Report combines all Verification Key Messages for the academic session 2014-15.
NQ Verification 2014–15
Key Messages Round 1

Section 1: Verification group information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verification group name:</th>
<th>Physical Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verification event/visiting information</td>
<td>Event and visiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date published:</td>
<td>March 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Courses/Units verified:

National 3 Physical Education: Performance Skills
National 3 Physical Education: Factors Impacting on Performance

National 4 Physical Education: Performance Skills
National 4 Physical Education: Factors Impacting on Performance

National 5 Physical Education: Performance Skills
National 5 Physical Education: Factors Impacting on Performance

New Higher Physical Education: Performance Skills
New Higher Physical Education: Factors Impacting on Performance

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Physical Education: Performance Skills
Centres used the judging evidence table from the Unit assessment support packs or had constructed their own version for different activities. In all cases, centres set up appropriate conditions for the verification to take place. In most centres, there was evidence of internal verification allowing consistency of approach.

Physical Education: Factors Impacting on Performance
Centres showed good practice in the use of the assessment support packs provided by SQA. Some centres had given candidates a template to help with their responses. Other centres provided a list of questions/prompts from the assessment support packs and allowed candidates to attach their responses on lined paper. Centres obviously know how to get the best from their candidates.
Centres must make it clear to the candidates what the command word requires. An example can be taken at Higher level where Assessment Standard 1.1 requires candidates to **analyse** methods used to identify factors impacting on a performance. Some centres had detailed explanations of methods but did not analyse the method. Analysis requires breaking down the methods into component parts and ascertaining the relationship that these parts have with the method, the factor and the underlying purpose.

For example, a candidate might use a preparation/action/recovery checklist as a method and mention the number of subroutines used on the checklist. To have an accurate breakdown of the skill, the number of subroutines would have to depend on the expertise of the observer. Too many, and the observer might not give exact feedback because of lack of understanding.

If the layout of the checklist is not clear, for example the boxes are too small or there is no guide to whether a tick, cross or question mark should be entered, then filling in the checklist might cause problems. Trying to understand the information from the checklist could be difficult and mean the interpretation is not accurate. Clear guidance would have to be given before the checklist is filled in. (This would be enough to achieve a pass for one method — another method from a different factor would have to be analysed to achieve Assessment Standard 1.1.)

**Assessment judgements**

**Physical Education: Performance Skills**

A range of activities and performance standards were seen. As last year, not all candidates performed at the level at which they were to be presented for the Course. Some were above, some below. This did not affect the verification process as the assessor and centre agreed on the standard on the day. Feedback from centre staff indicated that they felt the process to be supportive. Verifiers were very positive in their reports about how visits had been set up.

**Physical Education: Factors Impacting on Performance**

On the whole, centres made the correct judgements. As detailed above in the approach section, care must be taken to ensure that the response matches the command word. Some centres gave detailed justification of their judgements. This was helpful to the candidates and to the verification process. Centres must ensure that all Assessment Standards are met in full. In Assessment Standard 1.2 at National 4 and National 5, and Assessment Standard 1.1 and 1.2 at new Higher, it should be noted that two **different** factors must be used.

Centres should make it clear where each Assessment Standard is achieved. An example is in National 5, Outcome 2. Assessment Standard 2.2 states ‘Candidates must be observed implementing part of the development plan.’ The assessor must acknowledge observing the implementation. Assessors might use the candidate’s three sessions from Assessment Standard 2.4 to ‘sign off’ Assessment Standard 2.2.
Assessment Standard 2.3 might also be achieved within the three sessions of Assessment Standard 2.4. If the candidate’s response contains two different approaches, within the three sessions, then the assessor could acknowledge that Assessment Standard 2.3 has been met within Assessment Standard 2.4.

This is also the case for Assessment Standard 3.1. The candidate might record feedback from others when writing out their three sessions for Assessment Standard 2.4. As long as there are two different examples of feedback then the assessor could acknowledge that the candidate has achieved Assessment Standard 3.1 within Assessment Standard 2.4. Clear labelling of where each Assessment Standard is achieved is very important.

Examples of responses to the Factors Impacting on Performance Unit are available with commentaries and information on whether the response has achieved a pass or not. These documents are available from SQA’s secure website and can be accessed by the SQA Co-ordinator via the following link: https://secure.sqa.org.uk/login.html.

Section 3: General comments

Many centres used the Factors Impacting on Performance Unit to help candidates to develop the skills, knowledge and understanding that is contained in the Course assessment. This is good practice. Centres should be aware that the minimum standard to achieve each Assessment Standard is all that is needed. However, to ‘stretch’ candidates it is acceptable to go well beyond the standard — always remembering that, for verification purposes, minimum is acceptable. If a candidate achieves the minimum standard in each Assessment Standard then that candidate must be acknowledged as having passed the Unit — no matter how much more detail other candidates in the cohort have included.

Most centres had identified procedures for internal verification. Some were comprehensive in their use of cross-marking. Most single-teacher departments had arrangements in place for working with neighbouring centres.
Section 1: Verification group information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verification group name</th>
<th>National Courses Physical Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verification event/visiting information</td>
<td>Visiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date published:</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Courses/Units verified:
- H254 74 Factors Impacting on Performance Unit
- H254 75 Factors Impacting on Performance Unit
- H254 76 Factors Impacting on Performance Unit
- H255 74 Physical Education Performance Added Value Unit
- C756 75 Physical Education Course Assessment Performance
- C756 76 Physical Education Course Assessment Performance

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

H254 74 Factors Impacting on Performance Unit
H254 75 Factors Impacting on Performance Unit
H254 76 Factors Impacting on Performance Unit
The centres that were verified used approaches which were acceptable. A variety of approaches were used ranging from posters to formal booklets. Care must be taken to ensure that candidates have the opportunity to access all the Assessment Standards. Centres must allow candidates access to the command words in each of the Assessment Standards. It is not acceptable to change the command word, although extra prompts may be added to guide candidates to respond appropriately.

H255 74 Physical Education Performance Added Value Unit
C756 75 Physical Education Course Assessment Performance
C756 76 Physical Education Course Assessment Performance
For the single performance, all centres used approaches which allowed the candidates to access marks/Outcomes in all areas. Candidates were given the opportunity to perform in a context that was suitably challenging. To allow candidates to complete the planning and evaluation element in C756 at levels 75
and 76 most centres used the template provided by SQA. It is important that, in C756 at levels 75 and 76, centres ensure that candidates respond to the planning and preparation element by using personal challenges related to the single performance and then evaluate that performance in relation to the challenges for which they prepared.

In the Added Value Unit H255, all centres set up a fair context in which candidates could perform.

**Assessment judgements**

**H254 74 Factors Impacting on Performance Unit**  
**H254 75 Factors Impacting on Performance Unit**  
**H254 76 Factors Impacting on Performance Unit**

On the whole, centres showed that they were judging at the national standard. Comments justifying why the standard had been passed or failed were helpful for the purposes of verification and could have been helpful as feedback to candidates. Centres must ensure that for each level and each Assessment Standard both assessors and candidates know exactly what is required to achieve the Assessment Standard. There appears to be some confusion where a candidate has dropped from National 5 to National 4 — if that candidate has given an inadequate explanation at National 5 in Assessment Standard 1.1 then that explanation response does not achieve an automatic Assessment Standard 1.1 at National 4. No matter how good an explanation is, to achieve Assessment Standard 1.1 at National 4 there must be an adequate description. Care should be taken with all such Assessment Standards. Centres are advised to read previous Verification Key Messages which contain some examples of appropriate responses.

**H255 74 Physical Education Performance Added Value Unit**  
**C756 75 Physical Education Course Assessment Performance**  
**C756 76 Physical Education Course Assessment Performance**

The judgements made during verification were on the whole at the correct standard. There was the opportunity to discuss the judgements and this led to many worthwhile professional discussions. The use of the detailed marking instructions ensured that centres were able to award marks at the correct standard.

In the planning and evaluation element of the performance some centres were lenient in question 3a at National 5. Marks had been awarded for description rather than the required evaluation of the performance relating to the planning. It is important that candidates use the plans from question 1 to evaluate their single performance.

Many centres used the template provided by SQA for National 5 and took the same style to Higher. This allowed candidates to structure their responses. Care must be taken where the response is split into point A and point B — if a candidate has given two points of exemplification in point A, and none in point B, then 2 marks can still be awarded. Care should be taken to check how many
marks can be awarded for each part — this is made clear in the marking instructions. The split is different for National 5 and Higher.

### Section 3: General comments

Feedback from centre staff indicated that they felt the verification process to be supportive.

Centres are reminded that there are examples of candidates’ work on SQA’s website. The Higher DVD, produced in 2011 has been given a new commentary. This can be found on the [Higher Physical Education web page](#). Other examples of materials can be found on the secure site, which can be accessed through the centre SQA Co-ordinator, including materials for the Factors Impacting on Performance Units and Course performance at all levels. These examples along with commentaries can prove useful in helping to judge the national standard.