



A-LEVEL

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

7582/C: Non-examined assessment
Report on the Examination

7582
June 2019

Version: 1.1

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

Copyright © 2019 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

In this second sitting of the qualification, it is clear that centres have responded on the whole to feedback provided by the moderating team. Alongside a revised [NEA Guide](#), centres have been better prepared for the process of moderation. Centres are also able to access a range of AQA CPD opportunities that will provide additional guidance for improving delivery and support to students for all aspects of the A-level qualification.

Administration

This series saw an improvement in the administration by centres which certainly helped the efficiency of the moderation process. This has been valuable for the moderating team as many centres have opted for a 'late moderation' (ie one close to the final deadline) or a postal moderation. Centres are reminded that it is their prerogative to have a centre visit, regardless of how the evidence will be presented. They may find this valuable for many reasons, for example: articulating the performance context, clear identification of students on footage or explaining where and how they allocated marks in line with the headings on the level of response grids. Centres are fully conversant with the fact that little dialogue will take place and no feedback about the marking will be provided at this point. In future series, if the allocated moderator is unable to agree a date then the centres should contact AQA to enable the moderating team to reach a solution which meets the requirements of the centre.

There were few instances this series where centres provided the marks to the moderator too close to the moderation visit. This helped centres to prepare effectively for the visits or ensure that DVD evidence was sent to the moderator by the agreed date on the spreadsheet. International centres should be commended for their ability to manage this.

It has been pleasing to see an increase in the number of centres that are using the level of response grids for both the practical performance and the analysis and evaluation piece of work. Where postal moderation is chosen, it is vitally important that the level of response grids are included with the audio visual (AV) material. This enables the moderator to see how the marking criteria has been applied and is helpful when constructing feedback if there are discrepancies between the centre mark and mark of the moderator. Whilst it is not an expectation, some excellent practice has been observed this year where the students' analysis and evaluation work has been annotated using the headings on the level of response grids to identify where students have demonstrated creditable content.

Candidate Record Forms and Centre Declaration Sheets were provided by the vast majority of centres.

Centres are reminded to follow the clear guidelines for encryption of media devices. Devices should only include material to be marked by the moderator.

Practical performance

During this second sitting of the A-level series, the majority of centres opted to provide AV evidence at the level the student performed at, allowing the students to be shown in their best light. There have been some excellent examples of footage taken at the highest levels of competition, where students and centres have overcome some of the logistical challenges in gathering performance evidence. Where centres opted for live performance, this did not always provide sufficient challenge or enable students to demonstrate advanced skills or their full potential.

Centres have made use of the opportunity to allow invasion game players (eg football, netball, hockey, etc) to provide multiple unedited halves or quarters of different matches, enabling students to demonstrate a range of both core **and** advanced skills/tactics repeatedly through the performance(s). During visits, it has also been pleasing to hear how many centres have undertaken internal standardisation of marking by using the Teacher Online Standardisation (TOLS) materials, which can be accessed via the Secure Key Materials section of [e-AQA](#). These two factors combined have contributed to the improved accuracy of practical marking of areas of assessment 1 and 2 during this series.

Where centres have been inaccurate when marking either area of assessment 1 or area of assessment 2 (ie the technical aspects of performance) it has mostly been in bands 2 and 3. Teachers need to ensure that they fully understand what is required by the level of response grids. Students who marked in these two bands often lacked the evidence of advanced skills demonstrated repeatedly throughout the performance, or in many cases the performance was inconsistent. Some centres have provided inaccurate timelines or during visits not shown the full involvement of the student for the area of assessment selected by the moderator. It is important for centres to understand the ramifications of this practice and that, during standardisation, moderators are informed to watch extended periods of footage away from the centres. This could be the case if the moderator has been taken through the performance highlights by the teacher/student during the visit too quickly or where one match may be used for a number of students in the centre and there are discrepancies with timelines and game involvement.

Many centres have used performance analysis software to compile evidence for the moderation visit (in order to speed up the visit process) for the area of assessment selected. At times, both centres and students have failed to provide enough time prior to the execution of the skill or shown the outcome of the skill. Centres have met the requirements for AV evidence by providing the moderator with the unedited version of the footage to take away from the centre, which has been subsequently watched. During many visits this year, the moderation team have recognised that centres have not always shown evidence of the area of assessment selected. When preparing for the moderation visit, it is important that centres use the specification to ensure they understand the skills/tactics required in that area of assessment. Some examples that have occurred have include positioning to receive a pass in area of assessment 1 for football, where this is in fact area of assessment 3, or running between the wickets when batting in cricket in area of assessment 1, which again is area of assessment 3.

The two previous examples are indicative of a continued misunderstanding of area of assessment 3. This has resulted in the most marking adjustments for practical activities this series. Students are required to demonstrate a range of both core and advanced strategies/tactics repeatedly throughout the performance. In aesthetic events such as dance, trampolining or gymnastics, students are expected to provide details of their routines and tariff information. In the most well-prepared centres this year, students wrote a brief narrative explaining the reasons for building the routine in a specific order or why they selected skills of a particular tariff within their routine linked to the context of the competition. Alongside this, centres should familiarise themselves with the level of response grids for this area of assessment as it differs significantly from area of assessment 1 and area of assessment 2. Students are expected to show how they use knowledge of rules to enable success (eg a quick free kick in football), demonstrate levels of motivation (eg bowling 4 good balls in cricket after being hit for a boundary) as well as showing a range of skills used to implement the tactics. Where centres have not marked this area accurately, they should ensure they use the training materials on TOLS to improve their practice and develop their understanding of expectations in this area of assessment.

Successful centres have approached this in a variety of ways, such as: providing a detailed commentary timeline that explains decision making when a pass is executed in netball, for example, teachers have talked over footage whilst recording it, or have enabled students to use voiceover software, or on many occasions allowed students to talk over their footage during a live moderation. Centres are reminded that this is their prerogative to do this and not an expectation of the exam board or individual moderators, as it can be a stressful experience for some students. Centres should ensure also that this is not a led discussion by the teacher and understand that moderators will not undertake a question and answer dialogue with students. However, they may seek clarification of the performance context being observed.

Activities where AV evidence has not been provided in accordance with the requirements include: athletic sprints/field events in area of assessment 3 where qualifying rounds/all throws in competition must be provided; cricket batting - where not all deliveries from an innings have been shown or the outcome of shots have not been evident in areas of assessment 1 and 2; golf - where footage does not show 18 holes; and centres providing multiple examples of performances in activities which clearly state performance 1 and 2 in the criteria. For example; rowing (race 1 and 2), dance, swimming (same stroke race 1 and 2), skiing (race 1 or 2) or climbing (climb 1 or 2). In activities such as these, the centre should provide footage from the most appropriate performance to support the mark awarded.

There was a significant improvement in the demonstration of both **core** and **advanced** skills/tactics in their performance(s). This was one of the key limiting factors in the previous series to the awarding of practical performance marks. Where students are generally performing at high levels, it is important for centres to demonstrate this. Whilst providing additional contextual information about performance such as tennis rankings, gymnastic scoring sheets from competitions, golfers' handicaps, or Power of 10 rankings can be helpful, centres are reminded that the student's work is assessed based on the evidence shown and not the accompanying materials. These materials merely provide background to the performance context. It is much better to see the performers produce their skills under pressure against good opposition than to be seen in a competition against weaker opposition where they are not forced to cope with the challenge provided by the context.

It has been clear that the centres who allocate some time at the start of the course showing what video evidence is required and showing examples of what constitutes good video evidence and what does not were better prepared. This was evident in the quality of the footage.

Coaching role

Whilst still a minority role, the coaching role was marked very generously with centres struggling to meet the expectations for this piece of work. Rarely were examples seen where students followed the coaching process that is outlined in the NEA guide, with many not including the competitive context which the coach had observed to form their analysis. Students led sessions but failed to analyse, modify and refine techniques/tactics for an individual in the fully competitive situation and in subsequent planned practices.

It was clear that they could lead sessions but they often lacked the skill to see how the performers' techniques/tactics were developing throughout the session, failing to respond to changes that were evident ie progress being made at a quicker rate, or the reshaping of an activity to enable improved rates of success. Students often stuck to a predetermined plan for the session regardless of the progress of the performer being coached. This had a limiting effect across the modification and refinement aspects to the coaching. Students following the coaching role are reminded of the rubric

outlined in the specification requiring the coaching of one **core** and **advanced** skill/tactic per area of assessment.

Analysis and evaluation

It was pleasing to see that the majority of centres understand the requirements and there were very few instances of not meeting the rubric. Sadly, some centres did not follow the rubric and produced work from area of assessment 1 instead of areas of assessment 2 and 3. Where discrepancies were evident, more often it was the use of theoretical aspects within the analysis section, or causes and corrective practices suggested with limited links that are explicit in the level of response grids.

This series saw an unexpected increase in the number of students who submitted this work using a presentation. Centres met all recording requirements during visits. There was a wide range of practice which on occasions went away from the structure of the work. Where students did this work well, they followed the same structures as written examples on TOLS, discussing AV footage as part of the analysis and then providing an appropriate evaluation. Where students failed to meet the requirements of this work, they often discussed strengths at length in the analysis (which gains no credit), they read through pre-written notes verbatim, they introduced a large number of causes whilst not displaying the depth of knowledge required or the teacher regularly questioned them throughout the footage to prompt responses, which is not permitted. Examples will be included in the TOLS materials for 2020 of this approach.

The first part of the analysis requires students to identify and explain the weakness(es). Students are expected to provide detail of the performance context, behaviour of other performers that have an impact on the weakness(es) and impact upon the overall performance. Centres should ensure that the analysis focuses on technical or tactical weakness(es) only, not strengths, and that they come from a competitive performance context, not a generalised discussion of a weakness in their game. Students who did this well often extracted still images from their own practical performance footage to exemplify technical errors for area of assessment 2, as opposed to students who did not do well who included still images taken from practice sessions.

Students should be reminded that the weakness(es) **must** be taken directly from the specification. Where possible, moderators marking the work have tried to fit these weaknesses to the specification to enable the work to be marked. In the best practice, centres used the exact terminology from the specification to alleviate this issue.

In the analysis, all too often students outlined what they 'should do' rather than actually what took place in the performance context being analysed. This had a significant impact on the mark awarded for the level of their analysis. The more able students wrote in the past tense, with regular examples of the impact on the performance context in line with examples on TOLS. Some students had identified theory aspects as a weakness, eg lack of power when pushing off from blocks in sprinting. This needs to be refined to reflect the impact on the technique and therefore a technical weakness such as lack of knee extension during the drive phase would be considered an appropriate technical weakness.

One of the aspects that many centres continued to include was a standalone elite performer section. As a standalone section this does not get any credit. Centres should ensure their students discuss the successful technical/tactical execution in a direct comparison to their weakness(es). This could be in the form of what an elite performer would do, in the form of the correct technical model or in the form of when the performer being analysed completed the skill/tactic correctly.

There were some good examples of this where students had used annotated images of performances to highlight the weakness(es) and then provided more detail through discussion. Students made this comparison obvious by using phrases such as ‘when compared to’ or ‘my performance differs to that of by’ Students who do this well show an excellent understanding of the technique/tactics required.

The biggest variance in marking the evaluation section still came as a result of students providing insufficient depth of knowledge. The NEA guide provides clear exemplification on how to meet the requirement of this part of the work. There is no expected number of causes or corrective practices that will lead to gaining a certain mark. However, students that fail to provide sufficient depth of coverage to this discussion will not be able to access the higher mark bands. The depth should match that of the specification requirement. Some students still chose theory that is not on the specification - mainly fitness components, eg power. This could easily be adapted to suit specification content, such as poor motor unit recruitment, for example.

Within the evaluation section students often chose drills and practices with no reference to theory from the specification. The linking of the sections provided students with the biggest challenge. It is not the responsibility of the marker to deduce if weakness(es), cause and corrective practices are linked but that of the student to demonstrate their understanding by providing this through their explanation. Students must ensure in the evaluation that they link the corrective measure to how it will change the cause, and **not** how it will have an impact on performance.

There were some very common areas selected by students from the specification for both the cause and corrective practices. Whilst there is nothing to prevent them from doing this, they need to be mindful of how similar pieces of work tend to appear, and also how students sometimes struggle to link these to the weakness as they are probably not appropriate. Stress management techniques is one aspect that is done poorly. This is because students tend to do a paragraph on several techniques and most of this is the theory of the technique not specifically how it will be undertaken and how it will correct the arousal or anxiety cause that is likely to have been stated as a cause of the weakness. This is a typical example of students still covering breadth in the evaluation section as opposed to depth, which is the requirement.

Key learnings from this series

1. It is the prerogative of the centre to have a centre visit, regardless of how the evidence will be presented. If the allocated moderator is unable to agree a date then the centre should contact AQA to enable the moderating team to reach a solution which meets the requirements of the centre.
2. All AV material must be encrypted, as outlined in the guidance for moderation.
3. Where postal moderation is undertaken, it is vitally important that the level of response grids are included with the AV material.
4. If annotating the Analysis and evaluation work, use the headings on the level of response grids to highlight where work should be credited.
5. Teachers need to look carefully at bands 2 and 3 when marking areas of assessment 1 and 2 to ensure that their students’ footage includes appropriate evidence of advanced skills demonstrated repeatedly throughout the performance, and the degree of consistency shown.

6. Some centres provided inaccurate timelines or during visits have not shown the full involvement of the student for the area of assessment selected by the moderator. It is important to understand the ramifications of this practice. Centres should only show evidence of the area of assessment selected by the moderator. When preparing for the moderation visit it is important that centres use the specification to ensure they understand the skills/tactics required in that area of assessment, and avoid discussions about others.
7. Some activities (eg dance, rowing, skiing, climbing) in the specification are clear about the number of performances that should be submitted and multiple examples should not be provided. They should provide footage from the most appropriate performance to support the mark awarded.
8. Whilst providing additional contextual information about performance such as tennis rankings or Power of 10 can be helpful, students' work is assessed based on the evidence shown and not the accompanying materials. Such materials merely provide background to the performance context.
9. In the analysis section, ensure that weakness(es) are taken directly from the skills/tactics in the specification (v1.2). The analysis should be linked to specific performances and not a generic discussion about what the performer 'should do'. The analysis should not include strengths in performance.
10. Standalone sections on elite performers are not credited as students should be drawing direct comparisons as part of their analysis.
11. In the evaluation section, centres must ensure that they are fully conversant with the expectations of depth. This should include the depth of theory knowledge as well as applied knowledge evident through the application of the corrective measure such as a training plan or stress management strategy plan.
12. Students must explain the link between the cause and the weakness as well as the link between the corrective measure and the cause. This latter aspect should see students explain how the corrective measure will change or address the theoretical cause, rather than how it will improve the performance, which is not creditworthy.

Use of statistics

Statistics used in this report may be taken from incomplete processing data. However, this data still gives a true account on how students have performed for each question.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

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