



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

Subject	Physical Education
Level	Advanced Higher

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

Almost all centres submitted evidence from the project component. This evidence was in the form of a completed, or partially completed project, which followed the SQA course assessment task structure.

There was evidence of effective internal moderation procedures in almost all centres. Evidence of significant collaboration within centres and local authorities was frequently presented.

In most cases, centres reported engagement with SQA Understanding Standards materials and provided detailed marking instructions.

Most centres indicated the performance mark awarded or the plans in place to undertake this assessment.

One centre submitted evidence from the performance component only.

Section 2: Comments on assessment judgements

Assessment judgements were frequently in line with national standards. In particular, the quality of the assessment judgements in questions 1a, 2c and 3 was commendable. In question 1a, centres understood the requirement to explain the relevance of the method(s) selected to investigate performance. In question 2c, centres were clearly aware of the requirements for depth and detail when identifying the target, explaining why the target is appropriate, and including reference to personal reasoning. In most centres, question 3 was answered in detail. As a consequence, centres made positive assessment judgements, as they accurately recognised the comprehensive description of and comments on the Personal Development Plan (PDP).

As most centres presented partial projects, there was little evidence on how they applied assessment judgements in Section 4. Nevertheless, in questions 4b and 4c, evidence from centres demonstrated accurate assessment judgements on evaluating the process of carrying out the PDP, justifying new development needs, and explaining the impact of these new needs on the other three factors.

In some questions, candidate evidence did not adequately demonstrate the level of attainment indicated. Specifically, in question 2b, some assessment judgements did not consistently adhere to national standards, as the analysis did not include identifying the source or considering the impact on creating a PDP.

Some inconsistency with national standards was also noted in question 1a, where there were instances of duplicated information and of awarded marks exceeding the maximum available for each method. Also, in 1b, some of the analysis did not lead to a clearly identified focus for the research.

Some centres were directed to Understanding Standards material, which offers guidance on the detail candidates need to present to receive marks for examining the connection between analytical points in 2b and 4a.