



AS

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

7581/C Practical Performance in Physical Activity and Sport
Report on the Examination

2017

Version: 0.1

Further copies of this Report are available from aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2017 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

General

Schools and colleges have generally worked hard to understand the demands of the new specification and the new moderation procedures for the non-exam assessment (NEA). There were some schools/colleges that hadn't familiarised themselves with the specification requirements and understood the new procedures. Teachers need to take time to familiarise themselves with the new specification and supporting materials that are on the [PE pages](#) of the AQA website. This will reduce issues caused at moderation and the number of questions that have been posed to the team of NEA Advisors.

A significant number of teachers have gone about delivering the NEA as they would have delivered the practical coursework in the legacy specification. With the requirements for the new specification differing in many ways from the legacy specification, this has led to many schools/colleges not supporting and guiding their students appropriately as to the requirements for the new NEA.

Administration

The centre mark spread sheet has been an improvement on procedures for the legacy qualification for both teachers and moderators. The level of response grids ([e-AQA](#)), both for the performance assessment (practical performance) and the performance analysis assessment (analysis and evaluation) have been well received and when they were included with the students' work, they clearly showed how the teacher(s) had marked the work. This was beneficial for both aspects of the component. Schools/colleges continued good practice from the legacy specification by providing moderators with a programme for the day that had sufficient time allocated to the activities. The challenge of the increased sample size was managed well in larger schools/colleges.

One of the biggest challenges faced by schools and colleges was the recording of all live activities shown during the moderation. Overall they obliged with this request, ensuring that they have footage available should a re-moderation be required during the post-results window. It was challenging at times to ensure that this footage was available to take away with the moderator. However, careful planning of the activity order (ie live activities first) enabled footage to be downloaded on the day. Moderators were happy to receive footage within a short time span after the visit in order to make this requirement as manageable as possible for teachers.

There were a significant number of schools/colleges who chose not to have a visit from a moderator this year and send all materials via post. Whilst this is their prerogative, it is beneficial in the early years of a new specification to gain an understanding of procedures at a face-to-face visit.

It has been pleasing to note that schools/colleges are investing in better quality cameras with tripods and giving greater consideration to the storage size required on devices. There have been some uses of drones, although this has been varied in its success.

Performance assessment (practical performance)

Live performances

Where live performances were offered at moderation, they were generally students in band 3 or below. The success of students replicating the level of performance on which they had been awarded marks varied. Where marking was accurate, teachers had ensured that the level of

competitive challenge in these live events was appropriate for the ability of the student. One of the key factors that led to the assessment criteria being applied unsuccessfully was the use of ‘opponents’ who did not challenge the student sufficiently. When presenting live performances, students need to cover a range of the core skills repeatedly and, where possible, teachers should do their best to ensure that they understand this prior to moderation.

The procedures for moderation in the new specification include the restriction on feedback given to schools/colleges. At no time during the visit can moderators discuss marks with teachers or students, or give feedback on the accuracy of marking. One aspect that teachers must overcome in future series is the key question to the moderator of “have you seen enough?”. The member of staff leading the moderation session needs to make this decision themselves. If they feel the marks given are reflected in the performance(s) shown, then it is up to them to stop. This applies to both live performances and audio-visual recordings.

Audio-visual performances

The gathering of audio-visual evidence this year provided teachers with many challenging circumstances, which they worked hard to overcome. However, this still proved problematic for a large number of schools/colleges who made errors with the collection of evidence.

Edited footage was the most common cause of problems for schools and colleges, and many of the issues could have been overcome if they had read both the [specification](#) and the [Non-exam assessment guide: moderation](#) on the PE pages of the AQA website, and the frequently asked questions document on the [Teacher Online Standardisation \(TOLS\)](#) system. It is clear in the documentation that merely showing the highlights of the performance(s) is not appropriate and will have a significant impact on the final mark(s) awarded.

Edited footage cannot show the highlights of performance(s). There are occasions where footage can be ‘built’ to compile as much of the performance as possible, eg a cross country event or games players showing multiple matches or halves of matches in order to show the range of core skills multiple times.

Schools and colleges that adapted to these requirements used the ‘Candidate Commentary Form’ to support the evidence gathered. They ensured that time references matched the audio-visual recording(s) and that all Areas of Assessment were covered. Unfortunately there were occasions where timelines didn’t match the recordings and it was clear that the teacher had not watched the footage themselves prior to the moderation visit. Some schools/colleges seemed to take comfort in having a significant number of recordings to see. Whilst there is no limit on this, it is worth considering the time it takes to watch these recordings in order to allocate a mark, as well as the time it takes to moderate them. This is a difficult balance to strike for many games players, as their actual involvement time (depending on position and how the game develops) can vary.

The use of students to talk through their audio-visual recording during the moderation visit is not essential. It can provide very little support to the moderation of evidence for Areas of Assessment 1 and 2, and if done poorly can put the student under undue stress. Schools/colleges may wish to consider how they support the mark awarded for Area of Assessment 3. Students may wish to talk through (not interviewed) recordings in this instance as a lot of the activities require decision making, or use the commentary timelines to explain their actions around the application of strategic/tactical awareness.

Coaching

There were a limited number of students entered for this alternative role. Coaching tended to be marked leniently. The biggest challenge for many coaches is not the running of a practice session but the clarity in which they display their ability to analyse, modify and refine performance(s). Schools/colleges are reminded that the analysis aspect of the coaching role underpins all of the other elements in the level of response grids. Additionally, coaches are still choosing to work with too many performers (as was the case in the legacy specification) to see any change in their post-coaching performance. They should consider either working with an individual, or a group such as the back row in rugby union, or short corner defenders and the goalkeeper in hockey.

Practical performance overall

There were many students where the application of strategic/tactical awareness (Area of Assessment 3) was the highest mark awarded. This was the area where most issues around the accuracy of marking occurred this year, despite the new specification providing greater clarity as to what should be assessed. Teachers should avoid using this section to inflate lower scoring students' marks. They should also be mindful not to award students the same mark for all three sections and recognise that, on the whole, they will have strengths and weaknesses in their performance that may cause variation across the areas of assessment.

The evidence shown did vary, especially for larger invasion games where the identification of the students was often very difficult as coaches are not happy with their players wearing bibs. Clubs within communities are buying in to the process and want to help students, especially as schools and colleges are supplying the players for them. This still causes challenges for some sports where identification is difficult, or restrictions are in place by governing bodies. However, there have been some creative ideas to get around this issue, including coloured socks, headbands, wearing bright gloves, bright arm bands, marking the hockey sticks and coloured boots.

Performance analysis assessment (analysis and evaluation)

Analysis

The analysis section was sometimes too descriptive and not analytical enough. In many cases, schools/colleges have failed to ensure that student analysis work was undertaken on Area of Assessment 1 only, which is a requirement of the new AS specification. There were a significant number of students discussing strengths in performance, which is not credit worthy, as well as large sections on the elite performer. These are not requirements of the new specification. However, in explaining their weakness(es), students should draw a direct comparison with successful performance(s) in some form.

Schools/colleges should ensure that technical knowledge is referenced throughout, which differs significantly from anatomical language.

Where the analysis sections have been completed well, students were able to explain the impact of their weakness(es) on their overall performance in a competitive context. Where this was not done well, students often talked about a general weakness they had but did not directly explain its occurrence in competitive context(s).

Overall, analysis was not done as well as the evaluation aspect.

Evaluation

Schools/colleges have struggled to ensure that they have a full grasp of what is in the AS specification, and as a result there were significant adjustments made to marks. The most significant of these was the use of components of fitness. Once established, students struggled to link the theory to the weakness or the impact on performance.

Analysis and evaluation overall

The analysis and evaluation has generally been marked leniently. Schools and colleges have, on the whole, not made the adjustment from the legacy specification (analysis in PHED2 or sections B and C in PHED4). Many still seem unsure how to approach the challenge of breadth and/or depth when delivering this piece of work. More students took the breadth route rather than the depth route, especially in the evaluation section. The work that is very detailed and thorough is generally marked more accurately. Those who used the levels of response grids were able to apply the criteria more accurately and thus their marking was in line with the agreed standard.

There have been some examples of schools/colleges designing their own assessment sheets that don't align with the structure and assessment of this piece of work.

Schools and colleges should continue to use the example materials on [TOLS](#) to understand how this work should be structured, as well as how it should be marked. Using the materials on TOLS will facilitate a smoother moderation process in future series.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results Statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.

Converting Marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) marks by using the link below.

[UMS conversion calculator](#)