



Course report 2025

Advanced Higher Physical Education

This report provides information on candidates' performance. Teachers, lecturers and assessors may find it useful when preparing candidates for future assessment. The report is intended to be constructive and informative, and to promote better understanding. You should read the report with the published assessment documents and marking instructions.

For information about the performance, which is internally assessed, please refer to the 2024–25 Qualification Verification Summary Report on the [subject page](#) of our website.

We compiled the statistics in this report before we completed the 2025 appeals process.

Grade boundary and statistical information

Statistical information: update on courses

Number of resulted entries in 2024: 990

Number of resulted entries in 2025: 953

Statistical information: performance of candidates

Distribution of course awards including minimum mark to achieve each grade

Course award	Number of candidates	Percentage	Cumulative percentage	Minimum mark required
A	141	14.8	14.8	68
B	206	21.6	36.4	58
C	287	30.1	66.5	48
D	209	21.9	88.5	38
No award	110	11.5	100%	Not applicable

We have not applied rounding to these statistics.

You can read the general commentary on grade boundaries in the appendix.

In this report:

- 'most' means greater than or equal to 70%
- 'many' means 50% to 69%
- 'some' means 25% to 49%
- 'a few' means less than 25%

You can find statistical reports on the [statistics and information](#) page of our website.

Section 1: comments on the assessment

Project

- Stages 1(b), 2(b) and 4(a) proved to be the most demanding.
- Stages 1(a), 3 and 4(b) were found to be the most accessible.
- A few candidates achieved 'connection' marks in stages 1(b), 2(b) and or 4(a).

Section 2: comments on candidate performance

Project

Candidates did not perform as well as expected in the project.

Most candidates provided a clear project proposal before stage 1(a). Most candidates included information in their project that was relevant to their performance topic, however some candidates included information which lacked depth and/or quality in different stages of their project.

A few candidates who provided a project proposal included a broad range of topics in their project proposal. This led to a lack of depth in many parts of the project.

A few candidates did not provide a project proposal before stage 1(a) and some of these investigations did not support the establishment of a clear focus. This lack of focus often led to a broad range of topics being included in the project with marks only able to be awarded for one of the topics.

Stage 1(a)

Most candidates provided relevant explanations of the appropriateness of their selected methods.

Some candidates highlighted relevant features of their chosen methods but did not establish relevant explanations.

Stage 1(b)

A few candidates provided evidence of high-quality information in stage 1(a) and were able to successfully analyse this information in depth. A few candidates included analysis of information which made connections between analytical points and established a different perspective and/or provided new insight.

Many candidates included analysis which lacked the depth required at Advanced Higher level.

Stage 2(a)

Most candidates successfully conducted research by reviewing appropriate sources.

Some candidates presented information without appropriately referring to the source(s) and, as a result, could not be awarded marks.

Some candidates presented information that lacked a focus towards creating specific areas of a Personal Development Plan. This had an impact on their ability to carry out analysis in stage 2(b).

Stage 2(b)

Most candidates found this section very demanding, often as a result of the research included in stage 2(a) lacking depth and quality. This often resulted in the required depth of analysis being inaccessible.

Most candidates included analysis which lacked the depth required at Advanced Higher level, often identifying research from stage 2(a) and how they would apply this knowledge into their Personal Development Plan without any further analysis of the research itself.

Stage 2(c)

Some candidates did not justify their targets and, as a result, could not be awarded marks.

Some candidates set targets which were linked to applying principles within their Personal Development Plan only but with no link to their performance and, as a result, could not be awarded marks.

Stage 3

Most candidates produced a summary of their Personal Development Plan in the main text and referred to a detailed record of their Personal Development Plan implementation in the appendices.

A few candidates referred to their Personal Development Plan which included incorrect approaches for their performance focus and, as a result, could not be awarded marks.

Stage 4(a)

Most candidates found this stage demanding. This was often because the data they gathered lacked depth and quality for analysis at this level.

Stage 4(b)

Many candidates successfully included generic and specific evaluative comments about the value of the process of carrying out their Personal Development Plan.

Some candidates included evaluative comments, however, they did not provide the evidence from stage 3 and or stage 4(a) to substantiate the comments and, as a result, could not be awarded marks.

Stage 4(c)(i)

Some candidates did not provide evidence of the new development need(s) being supported by information gathered from the post-Personal Development Plan analysis and /or evaluation of their Personal Development Plan and so could not be awarded marks.

Stage 4(c)(ii)

Many candidates offered explanations and showed their understanding of how meeting new development need(s) could have a positive effect on the other three factors that impact on performance.

Section 3: preparing candidates for future assessment

Project

Selection and presentation of Project proposal

Candidates should ensure their chosen performance topic allows for depth of study across all four stages of the project outlined in the course specification (available on the [Physical Education subject page](#) on our website).

Candidates should make a personal choice by selecting an issue that impacts their performance. Candidates may select a focused topic where, potentially, several factors are included, however a clear link must be established when taking this approach.

If candidates select a topic from previous courses and undertake similar Personal Development Plans they will miss the opportunity to advance their learning and address an authentic issue.

Analysis within the project

Candidates must include detailed and quality analysis within stages 1(b), 2(b) and 4(a).

Further information about the project is available in the Advanced Higher Physical Education project coursework assessment task (this includes instructions for candidates to help them complete the project). The coursework assessment task is available on the [Advanced Higher Physical Education subject page](#) on our website.

Appendix: general commentary on grade boundaries

Our main aim when setting grade boundaries is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and levels and to maintain comparable standards across the years, even as arrangements evolve and change.

For most National Courses, we aim to set examinations and other external assessments and create marking instructions that allow:

- a competent candidate to score a minimum of 50% of the available marks (the notional grade C boundary)
- a well-prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70% of the available marks (the notional grade A boundary)

It is very challenging to get the standard on target every year, in every subject, at every level. Therefore, we hold a grade boundary meeting for each course to bring together all the information available (statistical and qualitative) and to make final decisions on grade boundaries based on this information. Members of our Executive Management Team normally chair these meetings.

Principal assessors utilise their subject expertise to evaluate the performance of the assessment and propose suitable grade boundaries based on the full range of evidence. We can adjust the grade boundaries as a result of the discussion at these meetings. This allows the pass rate to be unaffected in circumstances where there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been more, or less, difficult than usual.

- The grade boundaries can be adjusted downwards if there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been more difficult than usual.
- The grade boundaries can be adjusted upwards if there is evidence that the question paper or other assessment has been less difficult than usual.
- Where levels of difficulty are comparable to previous years, similar grade boundaries are maintained.

Every year, we evaluate the performance of our assessments in a fair way, while ensuring standards are maintained so that our qualifications remain credible. To do this, we measure evidence of candidates' knowledge and skills against the national standard.

For full details of the approach, please refer to the [Awarding and Grading for National Courses Policy](#).