



Alternative Certification Model 2020–21: National QA Exercise Key Messages

Subject	Physical Education
Level	National 5

This report provides information on themes emerging from the national quality assurance exercise, which is part of the Alternative Certification Model for National 5, Higher and Advanced Higher courses.

A sample of candidates' assessed work from selected centres was reviewed to determine whether assessment was in line with the national standard. The evidence submitted may have been partial or incomplete and is unlikely to have represented all of the evidence that will be gathered to allow the centre to determine a provisional result.

The centres selected for review in this subject and at this level have been provided with specific feedback on the evidence that they submitted. The comments below highlight key points about the assessment approaches and instruments used and the sampled centres' assessment judgements, for all centres delivering the subject at this level to reflect upon and make any appropriate adjustments.

Section 1: Comments on approach to assessment

The range of assessment evidence that was received from centres was partially complete. Across most centres there was evidence of internal and external moderation. This was especially useful when feedback was given on individual candidate evidence explaining how judgements were made. There was also clear evidence of engagement with the Understanding Standards materials in internal moderation exercises.

The majority of centres opted to submit the National 5 course assessment task portfolio, which is in line with national standards. Also, when centres submitted video evidence for the performance component, the assessment approach was acceptable. Evidence included:

- ◆ partially completed portfolios
- ◆ completed portfolios
- ◆ performance evidence

It was clear that most centres followed recommendations outlined in the subject-specific guidance on gathering key pieces of evidence.

Section 2: Comments on assessment judgements

Across the portfolio and performance components, most centre evidence was assessed in line with national standards. However, for some candidate evidence submitted, assessment judgements were deemed to be inconsistent.

Portfolio

Section 1

Good practice was noted where some pieces of evidence demonstrated candidates' in-depth responses by using the framework 'Factor, Context, Impact' from the marking instructions for this section.

However, most candidate evidence was marked leniently. To achieve a mark, candidates must provide an accurate, real or detailed context, and the impact on performance.

Section 2

2a – To achieve the marks, the reasoning in this question must relate back to reliable data.

2c – Descriptive points that are short and concise should be allocated a mark.

2d – The reasoning must be developed fully to achieve a mark.

2e – Marks should be allocated for short and concise descriptive points of the strengths and development needs early in the response.

2g – Candidates must fully develop their explanation of why targets would be set.

2h – Short and concise definitions of methods should be allocated marks. Additionally, centres are reminded that marks should not be allocated for the set-up of the approach.

Section 3

3c – Descriptive points for timescale, comparisons or protocols should be allocated a mark. The candidate must describe the monitoring process and should not provide a description of data collection.

3d – Evaluating the personal development programme (PDP) requires a specific judgement to be made, and the value must be linked back to the PDP to achieve a mark. There was evidence of some centres using the advice given in the marking instructions, which helped candidates make a relevant judgement and value linked back to the PDP. It was encouraging that there were no responses where the candidate came back to performance.

3e – Evaluating the performance needs a specific judgement and value on performance to achieve the marks. Good practice would demonstrate before and after performance judgements.

It was also useful when candidate evidence for the portfolio was annotated to indicate where marks were allocated.

Performance

The video evidence submitted for performances was clear and of high quality. This was extremely useful when considering decisions on assessment judgements. It was excellent practice when centres provided written commentaries alongside the digital evidence showing how assessment criteria were applied.

All video evidence displayed suitable performance contexts for assessments across a range of candidate attainment. Some centres submitted evidence for a range of activities, which allowed specific feedback to be provided.