



NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Message Reports

Verification group name:	Physical Education
Levels	N4 – Advanced Higher
Date published:	October 2016

This Report combines all Verification Key Messages for the academic session 2015-2016.



NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Messages Round 1

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Physical Education
Verification event/visiting information	Event and visiting
Date published:	March 2016

National Courses/Units verified:

H252 73, 74, 75, 76 and 77 Physical Education: Performance Skills

H254 74, 75 and 76 Physical Education: Factors Impacting on Performance

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

H252 73, 74, 75, 76 and 77 Physical Education: Performance Skills

Centres either used the judging evidence table from the Unit assessment support pack (UASP) documents or had produced their own version of a table for different activities, putting in specific skills, movements and decisions relating to the given activity. A variety of activities was seen and in all cases centres had set up appropriate conditions for the verification to take place. In most centres there was evidence of internal verification allowing consistency of approach.

H254 74, 75 and 76 Physical Education: Factors Impacting on Performance

Centres showed use of the workbooks from the UASP documents at National 4 and National 5. At Higher, some centres had given 'prompts', allowing the candidates to access the Assessment Standards — others had given the candidates free rein. The candidates who had the more structured approach appeared to achieve the Assessment Standards more directly. Clarity in the command word helped candidates achieve the standard.

Assessment judgements

H252 73, 74, 75, 76 and 77 Physical Education: Performance Skills

A range of activities and performance standards was seen. As last year, not all candidates performed at the level at which they were presented for the Course — some were above, some below. This did not affect the verification process as, on the day, the assessor and centre agreed on the standard achieved. 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.

H254 74, 75 and 76 Physical Education: Factors Impacting on Performance

On the whole, centres made the correct judgements. Some centres gave detailed justification of their judgements. This was helpful to the candidates and to the verification process.

It should be noted that, for Assessment Standard 1.2 at level 76, care should be taken not to 'flip' the response between positive and negative factors. For example: the positive impact of speed — allows a performer to beat an opponent to the ball and so deny possession and perhaps give the performer a chance to set up a scoring opportunity. If this is followed by the negative impact of speed — lack of speed means that a performer cannot beat an opponent to the ball and so cannot deny possession and perhaps gives the opponent a chance to set up a scoring opportunity — this shows a 'flip' of the response and is not what is required to meet the standard.

At Assessment Standard 2.5 at level 76, candidates must be able to identify and justify at least two future personal development needs in relation to each of two different factors impacting on performance, ie four development needs.

03

Section 3: General comments

Clear labelling of where each Assessment Standard is achieved is very important. Candidates do not have to fill every box they are given. Some candidates fulfil the requirements for more than one Assessment Standard in one response.

For example, at National 5 a candidate has a training diary and in that diary puts in that they used conditioned games to improve their lay-up:

- 1 *Today I used conditioned games where I got extra points for attempting a lay-up (1 point for hitting the backboard and 5 points for scoring with a lay-up).*
- 2 *I used conditioned games because it forced me to use my lay-up and so it would become more automatic and give me more time to be more aware of what is happening in the game so that I can maybe pass rather than shoot or draw out an opponent and help my team.*
- 3 *I scored 3 baskets today — not so good as 4 the last time!*

- 4 *The teacher told me that I was getting higher in my lift to the basket and to push more off my right foot.*
- 5 *I enjoyed the conditioned games because I wanted to do well and I went in for the lay-up more often so I am getting more comfortable with how the rhythm should feel. The conditioned games motivated me to try harder.*

These five statements go towards a number of the Assessment Standards at National 5:

- Statement 1 Could be used as one approach for AS 2.3.
- Statement 2 Could be used as an explanation of one approach for AS 1.3 and along with statement 5 would meet part of the requirements for AS 3.2.
- Statement 3 Shows monitoring and could be considered towards AS 2.4.
- Statement 4 Shows monitoring and could be considered towards AS 2.4 and also meets AS 3.1 as part of the response for ‘feedback from others’.
- Statement 5 Along with statement 2 would meet the requirements for AS 3.2.

If a centre recorded clearly where each Assessment Standard was met then the candidate would not have to take time to repeat evidence already covered in their work.

At Higher, often candidates had written a great deal, giving description and extra information where it was not necessary. Candidates should be encouraged to be succinct which could help them in their approach to the question paper.

Where cross-marking has taken place and there is not agreement as to whether the evidence meets the required standard, then a final decision must be made one way or another.

Centres are reminded that there are examples of candidates’ work on SQA’s website. Other examples of material can be found on the secure site, which can be accessed through the centre SQA Co-ordinator — including material for the Factors Impacting on Performance Units. These examples along with commentaries can prove useful in helping to judge the national standard.



NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Messages Round 2

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Physical Education
Verification event/visiting information	Visiting
Date published:	June 2016

National Courses/Units verified:

H255 74	National 4	Performance (added value unit)
C756 75	National 5	Performance (course assessment)
C756 76	Higher	Performance (course assessment)
C756 77	Advanced Higher	Performance (course assessment)

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Most centres were fully prepared for their verification visit. The candidate evidence was available and clearly organised. Live performances allowed candidates to show their abilities in an appropriate context.

H255 74 Physical Education: performance (added value unit)

There was a range of individual and team activities seen in centres. All centres set up an approach to allow the candidates to access all the assessment standards. Some centres had provided written evidence of warming-up along with rules and etiquette in addition to the live performance.

C756 75, 76 and 77 Physical Education: performance (course assessment)

For the live performance part of verification, centres provided a context to allow candidates to perform in appropriately challenging situations. For planning and evaluation at National 5 and Higher most centres provided written evidence, on templates, using the set questions. Where centres used a different format,

problems arose with justifying where marks were awarded. Centres using the original questions for Higher were reminded that in future the amended questions and marking instructions should be used.

Assessment judgements

H255 74 Physical Education: performance (added value unit)

In all cases judgements made during verification were at the correct standard.

C756 75, 76 and 77 Physical Education: performance (course assessment)

For the performance element of the course, most centres used the national standards reliably making valid and consistent judgements, awarding candidates the correct marks. In the planning and evaluation element most centres were accurate in their awarding of marks. Where there were discrepancies, most were in the evaluation part where centres had not ensured that in 3a, the evaluation (National 5) and the analysis (Higher), were linked to the plans from question 1. In a number of centres marks were awarded incorrectly for description. Care must be taken to ensure that the command word is noted. The marking instructions for planning and evaluation show clearly how many marks can be awarded for each part. The split of marks is different for National 5 and Higher.

03

Section 3: General comments

In the evidence for the planning and evaluation element some candidates' responses were very lengthy. Some had detailed description which gained no marks, others had detailed responses which would have gained well above the maximum marks possible. When preparing for the question paper, candidates should be encouraged to be succinct.

There was clear evidence of internal verification procedures in most centres. Many single-person departments had gone out of their way to work with neighbouring centres to ensure that internal verification was carried out. The mark agreed by the internal assessor and internal verifier for each section should be clearly recorded. The agreed mark should be arrived at through discussion and reference to the marking instructions.

Centres should make use of the exemplars for National 5 and Higher. These can be found on SQA's secure website, which can be accessed through the centre's SQA co-ordinator, where there are examples of all elements of internally assessed components of course assessment along with commentaries.