

Physical Education Verification Summary 2025–26

Verification information

Subject	Physical Education
Verification activity	Mixed
Round	Round 1 and Round 2
Date published	July 2026

National Units verified

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

National Course components verified

Course code	Course level	Component title
C856 75	National 5	Physical Education — Performance
C856 76	Higher	Physical Education — Performance
C856 77	Advanced Higher	Physical Education — Performance

Comments on unit assessment

Assessment approaches

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

Some centres used a variety of approaches to allow their candidates to understand the task that was being asked of them — this included high quality resources that had been developed for visual learners.

For the Factors Impacting on Performance (National 4) unit, most centres had used the template from the unit assessment support pack. Some centres had added a centre-devised 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.

Assessment judgements

For Performance Skills (National 3) and Performance Skills (National 4) units, most centres judged the candidates' performances at the correct standard. Thorough discussion took place between the centre assessor and the visiting verifier, and guidance and support allowed centre staff to continue to be confident in their assessment judgements.

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, most centres applied the national standard correctly for National 3 and National 4 Factors Impacting on Performance units. 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 on our 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 tables, along with the materials on our Understanding Standards website, are useful tools for assessors to help judge the candidates' evidence.

General comments

For the Performance Skills units centres knew their candidates well and ensured that an appropriate context was created so they could access each assessment standard.

Factors Impacting on Performance unit (National 3 and National 4)

Candidates may be able to achieve a number of assessment standards in their personal development plan if they have clear guidance on what part of the response is being matched to a certain assessment standard. An example might be if monitoring takes place through feedback from others. If this is recorded, it would help achieve 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. These had been used effectively and successfully to ensure that assessment judgements were valid and reliable. It is also good practice to use the [NQ internal verification toolkit](#) on our website.

Most centres had comprehensive evidence of rigorous internal verification. Some centres had comments from an assessor and an internal verifier. Other centres 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.

For the units verified, there are examples of candidate evidence and commentaries in the Understanding Standards section of our secure website.

Comments on course assessment: performance

Assessment approaches

From all the centres sampled, the performance component performed as expected. A range of activities were observed by verifiers and information from the centres showed that an even wider range of activities were assessed in centres. Centres appear to have embraced the opportunity to allow personalisation and choice which led to strong performances in this component of the course. Centres had put in great effort to ensure that as many candidates as possible could be assessed in their chosen activities.

Many candidates were able to explain clearly what their composition tactics or role were before taking part in the verification exercise either by verbally telling the visiting verifier or they had prepared this information in advance which was handed to the verifier. This aided the marking of the assessment item: using and applying composition, tactics and roles safely and effectively.

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 that submitted video evidence for Advanced Higher provided clearly identifiable candidates, accurate labelling and showed approaches that were valid. These centres should be commended for the time and care taken in gathering the evidence. From this evidence, verifiers were able to view candidates performing in appropriate and challenging contexts.

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

Assessment judgements

In the majority of cases the centre assessment judgements were in line with the national standards 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 standards and applied it fairly and correctly.

Candidates performed well in the performance component of the course, with many achieving full marks. Verifiers reported that they observed some outstanding performances where some National 5 candidates were playing against, or with, Higher candidates who were introduced to enable the National 5 candidate to have the opportunity to access a full range of marks in an appropriate context. It was clear that centres knew their candidates' capabilities and so were able to provide suitable contexts for assessment.

Some centres were outwith tolerance in their judgements and needed to revisit the marks for the entire cohort and adjust the marks where necessary. Each centre in this situation received feedback and support to ensure they marked to the national standard. These centres fully engaged in discussions and any issues identified were resolved during the visit.

General comments

The context and verification planning was 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.

If centres provide video evidence at Advanced Higher level for verification they must follow the guidelines set out in the coursework assessment task. Centres must ensure that the footage is an acceptable length of the performance and that the candidate is always clearly identifiable.

Many centres had developed internal verification procedures. These had been used effectively and successfully to ensure that assessment judgements were valid and

reliable. It is also good practice to use the [NQ internal verification toolkit](#) on our website for guidance.

Many centres had comprehensive evidence of rigorous internal verification. Some centres had comments from an assessor and an internal verifier. Other centres had used different coloured pens to show 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 our secure website.