



Qualification Verification Summary Report

NQ Verification 2019–20

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Physical Education
Verification event/visiting information	Event and visiting
Date published:	August 2020

National Courses/Units verified:

H252 73	National 3	Performance Skills
H252 74	National 4	Performance Skills
H254 73	National 3	Factors Impacting on Performance
H254 74	National 4	Factors Impacting on Performance
H255 74	National 4	Added Value Performance
C856 75	National 5	Course Assessment — Performance
C856 76	Higher	Course Assessment — Performance
C856 77	Advanced Higher	Course Assessment — Performance

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

For H252 National 3 Performance Skills and H252 National 4 Performance Skills and for H255 National 4 Added Value Performance, centres set up a variety of activities to allow candidates to perform a range of skills at both levels.

Those centres that submitted clear video evidence, with accurate labelling, showed approaches that were valid and should be commended for the time and care taken in gathering the evidence. From this evidence verifiers were able to view candidates performing within appropriate levels and contexts, showing centres knew their candidates' abilities.

Some centres had submitted judgements on the candidates' performances but no other evidence. These centres were given the option of submitting other evidence, including footage of performances or, as an alternative, submitting

evidence of the candidates' work for the unit Factors Impacting on Performance H254.

For the Factors Impacting on Performance unit (H254), most centres had used the template from the unit assessment support pack. Some had added a centre-designed format prompting candidates to follow a set pattern when creating and recording their personal development plan. This format usually ensured that candidates had the opportunity to achieve the required standard. This approach also allowed for assessment standards 1.3, 2.1 and 2.2 at National 3 and assessment standards 2.2 and 2.3 at National 4 to be achieved in one ongoing response.

For National 4 candidates, assessment standard 1.1 should include a description of the method used to identify factors impacting on a performance. The data gathered should be attached or included.

Clear labelling on the candidates' responses allowed assessors and verifiers to confirm which assessment standards had been attempted.

This year IACCA visiting verification was live performance verification. The candidates verified were given the marks achieved for their performance on the day of the visit.

Most centres were notified in August that they had been selected for verification, and were then contacted to arrange when the visit would best suit the candidates and centre. Centres were advised that, where possible, the verifier should see the candidates' first performance. Where a centre was presenting Advanced Higher, this level was verified, with the centre choosing the other level to be verified. Advanced Higher performances could be submitted on video.

On the whole, centres chose the visit to coincide with the assessment of the candidates' first performance. A range of activities were seen on the verification visits. Centres set up conditions that allowed candidates the opportunity to access the full range of marks in all assessment items. It was clear that centres knew their candidates well and were able to arrange suitable contexts for all abilities. Clear identification of candidates was helpful to the verification process.

For Advanced Higher, centres had used a variety of methods to produce performance evidence. Where possible the candidates were seen in live performance. In video presentation some centres showed the performance from more than one angle. The quality of video evidence presented was mostly very clear.

For the assessment item of using and applying composition, tactics and roles, centres had a spread of approaches to allow candidates the chance to demonstrate their composition, tactic or role. In some centres, candidates were very articulate in presenting and discussing their intentions, whilst in others the information was presented in a written format. All this information was very useful for marking the performance.

Where the activity was a game, the use of a referee or umpire was helpful as it allowed the candidates to give their full attention to their performance without the distraction of, for example, line disputes.

Assessment judgements

For H252 National 3 Performance Skills and H252 National 4 Performance Skills, and for H255 National 4 Added Value Performance, centres judged the candidates' performances at the correct standard. Comments on each assessment standard for each candidate showed whether the assessor had judged the candidate as achieving the standard or not.

To achieve a unit pass for H252 National 3 or National 4 Performance Skills candidates must achieve all assessment standards in two different activities. This does not have to be assessed in one 'single event' and can take place over several sessions. H255 National 4 Added Value Performance requires a single performance in one physical activity.

Overall, centres applied the national standard correctly for H254 Factors Impacting on Performance at both National 3 and National 4. There was a mix of centres asking for too much detail and others accepting too little detail. While it is good practice to encourage candidates to put in their best work, the minimum standard must be accepted as achieving the assessment standard.

The unit assessment support packs, which can be found on the SQA secure website, have tables that give guidance on how to judge evidence. The last column in these tables gives examples of partial responses that would achieve the assessment standard. These, along with the materials on the understanding standards website, are useful tools for assessors to help judge the candidates' evidence.

For the course assessment performance at National 5, Higher and Advanced Higher, most centres showed judgement at the correct standard and were within tolerance of the visiting verifier's marks. Many centres commented that their candidates had performed above what the centre had expected and that they had not been distracted by the presence of the verifier.

Most of the centres verified used the assessment criteria correctly at the national standard for the level being assessed. Centre assessors were able to justify why they had given the mark for each assessment item.

At each level, a very small number of centres were given a 'Not Accepted' outcome or an 'Accepted*' outcome. 'Not Accepted' indicated that the centre assessor was out with tolerance. 'Accepted*' was given where at least 50% of the candidates at that level were at the limit of the tolerance.

Each assessment item mark and the overall total marks awarded by the centre assessor were compared to the visiting verifier's marks. At the conclusion of the visit, these marks were discussed during the feedback sessions, which were

reported to be very useful and, on the whole, showed the professionalism of the centre assessors.

03

Section 3: General comments

For the Factors Impacting on Performance unit at both National 3 and 4, centres are reminded that candidates may be able to achieve a number of assessment standards within a personal development plan if clear guidance is given on what part of the response is being matched to a certain assessment standard. An example might be where monitoring takes place through feedback from others. If this is recorded, it would help access assessment standards 2.2 and 3.1 at National 3, and 2.3 and 3.1 at National 4. As long as responses are clearly acknowledged as an attempt at those standards, a candidate would not have to rewrite the same information. This is only an example and not mandatory.

For the course assessment performance at National 5, Higher and Advanced Higher where a candidate involved in the verification had already been assessed in an activity, the centre was required to have the assessment records available for that candidate. Some centres employed a digital record keeping method with comment banks constructed for each activity. Others had very detailed information on what was expected for each activity at each level. Detail in these records from all those assessing candidates was seen to help consistency in applying the marks over all the assessment items.

Although there is no requirement to present information on a candidate's composition, tactics and/or roles, it was felt that candidates found it beneficial to have this information prepared. Some candidates spoke after their performance and were able to justify why their composition, tactics and/or roles had changed during the performance, thus showing their depth of understanding.

Many centres had developed internal verification procedures. When in place, these had been used effectively and successfully to ensure that assessment judgements were valid and reliable. SQA has an Internal Verification Toolkit and, although this is not mandatory, centres are encouraged to refer to it for guidance. Many centres had comprehensive evidence of rigorous internal verification. Some had comments from an assessor and an internal verifier; others had used different coloured pen to indicate that a response or assessment record sheet had been internally verified. It is important that, where an assessor and internal verifier disagree on the judgement, the outcome of the final judgement is made clear.

For the courses verified there are examples of candidate evidence and commentaries in the Understanding Standards section of the SQA secure website.