



# NQ verification 2023–24 round 1

## Qualification verification summary report

### Section 1: verification group information

<b>Verification group name:</b>	<b>Physical Education</b>
<b>Verification activity:</b>	<b>Event</b>
<b>Date published:</b>	<b>July 2024</b>

### National Units verified

<b>Unit code</b>	<b>Unit level</b>	<b>Unit title</b>
H252 73	National 3	Physical Education: Performance Skills
H254 73	National 3	Physical Education: Factors Impacting on Performance
H252 74	National 4	Physical Education: Performance Skills
H254 74	National 4	Physical Education: Factors Impacting on Performance

### Section 2: comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

Centres set up a variety of activities to allow candidates to perform a range of skills at both levels for Performance Skills (National 3) and Performance Skills (National 4) units.

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 have been given the option of submitting other evidence, including footage of performances or, as an alternative, submitting evidence of the candidates' work for the Factors Impacting on Performance unit.

For the Factors Impacting on Performance unit, 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 candidates to be prompted in order to provide an appropriate response through the use of illustrations or graphics.

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

### **Assessment judgements**

For Performance Skills (National 3) and Performance Skills (National 4) units, 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 pass Performance Skills (National 3) and Performance Skills (National 4) units 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.

Overall, centres applied the national standard correctly for Factors Impacting on Performance units at both National 3 and National 4. Centres are reminded that in order to achieve assessment standard 3.4, candidates must identify two future development needs. 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 SQA's 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.

### **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.

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 pens 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.

There are examples of candidate evidence and commentaries in the Understanding Standards section of SQA's secure website for these units.



# NQ verification 2023–24 round 2

## Qualification verification summary report

### Section 1: verification group information

<b>Verification group name:</b>	<b>Physical Education</b>
<b>Verification activity:</b>	<b>Visit</b>
<b>Date published:</b>	<b>July 2024</b>

### National Course components

<b>Course code</b>	<b>Course level</b>	<b>Course title</b>
C756 75	National 5	Physical Education — Performance
C756 76	Higher	Physical Education — Performance
C756 77	Advanced Higher	Physical Education — Performance

### Section 2: comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

Each centre provided a range of activities which allowed the majority of candidates to perform at their best and access all assessment items. Centres set up each assessment task to provide the appropriate challenge and context for all candidates at each level.

In most cases, centres submitted clear video evidence for Advanced Higher candidates, provided accurate labelling, and 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 and challenging contexts, showing centres knew their candidates' abilities well.

Centres ensured that each activity covered during the verification was planned to allow the verification to run smoothly. For example, each candidate was clearly identifiable, and tactics, roles and composition were shared with the verifier before the assessment.

## **Assessment judgements**

In the majority of cases the centre assessment judgements were in line with the national standard, and were reliable and accepted. The centre assessors in most cases used appropriate comments with activity-specific exemplification which were thorough, accurate and useful. The centre assessors showed a full understanding of the national standard and applied it fairly and correctly.

In some cases, centres did not apply the national standard appropriately. These centres fully engaged in discussions and any issues identified were resolved during the visit.

## **Section 3: general comments**

The context and verification planning were carried out successfully by most centres. Centre staff knew their candidates well and this showed during the verification visits. Verifiers reported that candidates conducted themselves well and were a credit to their centres during the visits.

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.

There are examples of candidate evidence and commentaries in the Understanding Standards section of SQA's secure website.