



GCSE

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

8582/C: Non-examined assessment
Report on the Examination

8582
June 2019

Version: 1.0

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 points

During the 2018–19 cycle of assessment for 8582/C, there was a marked improvement in the general administration and provision of evidence for moderation. The vast majority of centres took the advice from last year's report and from their own feedback form to proactively ensure that their organisation was effective in ensuring a smooth moderation process. Many centres completed a detailed plan to help the moderator understand how evidence was to be presented. This was welcomed and showed the efforts that many centres went to, to ensure moderation proceeded without ambiguity or complication. As detailed in this report, the marking accuracy of Parts 1 and 2 has improved since the previous year. The analysis and evaluation Part 3 task was the least consistent with variety seen in the marking standards.

There appeared to be a slight increase in the use of pre-recorded evidence. Although centres are wholly within their rights to use such evidence, where suitable challenge cannot be replicated live, centres are reminded the choice to evidence live or on pre-recorded media is theirs and theirs alone. Centres can, of course, evidence live performances where they feel this is appropriate.

The majority of centres suitably filmed their moderation day to allow them the right to appeal for a re-moderation if they deemed necessary. It was somewhat surprising to note that some centres chose not to do this, thus relinquishing any opportunity for a re-moderation. AQA would like to reiterate that it is strongly recommended that centres film the live evidence shown on the moderation day. Centres should ideally make every effort to ensure that the quality of this evidence, if required, could be re-moderated and thus members of staff carrying this task out should do so knowing the importance of this task.

It was good to witness that centres took advantage of the changes to some activities (from September 2018) and acknowledged the positive nature of these with the students at the forefront of thoughts. It should be noted that in June 2020, older versions of activities (specification 1.1) will not be allowed and therefore those activity pages that were updated in 2018 (specification 1.2) will become compulsory for use in 2020. It was also excellent to receive positive feedback about the Teacher Online Standardisation (TOLS) footage which is housed on e-AQA and how this helps centres to internally standardise marking. Most centres were also very proactive in making use of their designated NEA advisor to address any queries or concerns. The number of centres not using the benchmark TOLS evidence to standardise their own marking was considerably lower than in the previous year. This generally resulted in evidence being submitted in line with AQA standards and moderators more frequently recorded marks down on the spreadsheet which correlated to those originally submitted by centres. The majority of centres used the appropriate excel centre spreadsheet and submitted this to their moderator two weeks prior to the agreed date for moderation.

One issue that was encountered by many centres was the need to encrypt media prior to submission to the moderator. AQA would like to thank all centres who managed to do this and would also like to remind centres that to comply with GDPR regulations, centres should suitably encrypt any media submitted to the moderator using the unique encryption password which has been given to their centre.

Most centres were aware that the playing/performance area needed to be of an appropriate size to demonstrate marks accordingly. For example, suitable sized goals should be used and equipment should be appropriate for the age range involved. In a minority of cases, it was disappointing to witness student's evidence being negatively affected due to the use of an inappropriate playing

area. For example, when playing handball, very small gym halls do not allow suitable tactics and positional play to be performed to a high standard.

Many centres did not inform their students that they were being moderated. Whilst this is the centre's prerogative, the inclusion of large numbers of the cohort should not be at the detriment of the moderator being able to actually see and moderate the students chosen. Numbers included in activities should be conducive to fulfil the objective of moderating the students who have been chosen.

AQA would like to remind centres that 'access arrangements' enable students with learning difficulties, disabilities or temporary injuries to take our exams and assessments. Any of the listed NEA activities may be adapted to suit different needs, but the way in which they are adapted depends on the individual need or disability. AQA can make arrangements for disabled students and those with other needs to help them access the assessments, as long as the competences being tested are not changed. Access arrangements must be agreed with AQA before the assessment by using the online application service. Adapted activities will not be accepted for assessment unless approved by AQA. AQA are able to give special consideration to students who have been disadvantaged at the time of the assessment through no fault of their own – for example a temporary illness, injury or serious problem such as the death of a relative. We can only do this after the assessment. Exams officers can apply for special consideration online at aqa.org.uk/eaqa.

Centres are reminded to ensure that their internal process of disclosing NEA marks to students (as per JCQ instructions) is carried out with any appeals prior to moderation taking place. This process does not involve the exam board.

On behalf of the team of moderators, the Lead Moderator wishes to commend the general attitude and behaviour of students who were selected as part of the moderation process. The vast majority of students were a credit to their centres and completed moderation with a positive and determined attitude.

Part 1 evidence

There was a significant improvement in the accuracy of marking for Part 1 with most centres accepting and adopting a need to show:

- progression within drills
- challenge within drills
- competition within drills.

Marking was broadly in line with AQA standards, although a small number of adjustments were required, largely due to a lack of challenge. Most issues encountered by moderators tended to be at either end of the spectrum whereby:

- lower ability students simply did not show the aptitude to justify the marks awarded
- higher ability students were not challenged enough to justify their marks.

However, it must again be reiterated that the general accuracy of marking for Part 1 has significantly improved when compared to evidence provided last year.

Centres are also reminded that for all students chosen for moderation, it is compulsory that evidence includes the student's Parts 1, 2 and 3. Part 1 drills should progress swiftly and incorporate challenge and competition. Long, isolated, static drills should be avoided to prevent students from showing evidence that does not challenge them. Equally long, isolated drills may mean that students suffer fatigue prior to completing their evidence. If centres feel that their moderation plan could cause students to suffer fatigue, appropriate rest and recovery should be built into their plan for the day. This was noticeable in this assessment cycle with some centres understandably choosing to evidence Part 1 in the morning and Part 2 later on in the moderation day, to allow students to have a suitable rest in between.

Centres are reminded that Part 1 evidence should not entail a full context (as this would constitute Part 2). This is particularly an issue with athletics where some students were simply seen completing an event rather than showing progressive drills as per the outlined core skills. It is paramount that centres realise that internal standardisation of marking is vital to ensure consistency across activities. Where several members of staff or indeed external coaches have been used, the Head of Department must endeavour to correlate and standardise marks prior to submission. It was evident that many centres had used external providers or coaches for activities like skiing, rock climbing and road cycling. Although this is welcomed to ensure the inclusive nature of the award, such external coaches may not be versed in the demands of the specification or in the standards as dictated by the TOLS evidence. On occasion, the evidence provided by centres missed out stated skills or even added in new ones in that the external coach felt should be included. Centres must stick to the demands of the specification rigidly and contact their NEA advisor, if needed, to ascertain if what they are doing is appropriate.

The Lead Moderator would like to remind centres that some skills included within the specification provide students with a choice eg in netball:

Shooting (close/distance) or rebounding (attacking or defending) or marking a pass/intercepting (centre court players).

It was disappointing to see some students not being offered such options which are designed to cater for the different positions and expectations on performers.

Part 2

Most centres showed an ability to replicate evidence in a full context environment and marking in this area of assessment was largely in line with the AQA standards as demonstrated on TOLS. Many chose to show evidence from externally pre-recorded events, often to show the high level attained by those scoring the highest marks. It was also pleasing to witness how many centres suitably and sensibly provided evidence of different halves/quarters from varying games to allow evidence to justify the marks awarded. Centres should remember that the length of evidence of Part 2 should be as long as it takes to justify the mark awarded. Evidence should not be edited as such, but different performers in different activities and different positions may require more or less evidence depending on how involved they are and how they are performing. The camera can be turned off between drills in Part 1 or during breaks or intervals in Part 2. Centres are reminded that long-duration footage should include a commentary sheet, highlighting at what time points the student is involved. This was not always provided by centres and should be provided to assist the moderator in making an informed judgement.

It was pleasing to see so many centres providing suitable supplementary evidence to help to put the evidence into context – eg signed golf cards, dressage score sheets, athletics times and

distances, skiing times, trampoline and gymnastics tariff and score sheets, swimming times etc. Those centres that have not taken advantage of this opportunity are encouraged to do so in future years.

Centres are reminded that evidence submitted is better served if the environment in which evidence has been compiled has made use of suitable officials. Although, for example, two students can self-officiate in badminton or table tennis, it is vital their knowledge of the rules is comprehensive enough to ensure the evidence is not strewn with errors and unpunished rule infringements. Centres are advised to make a professional judgement on this and to ensure that, if necessary, suitably knowledgeable officials are in place to officiate. Many examples of a 'lack of officiating' were witnessed in badminton, table tennis, volleyball and handball.

Centres appeared to be more aware of their ability to 'build footage' for activities whereby the playing or performing area is not in a set position eg road cycling, skiing, kayaking, cross country etc. There were many instances whereby such built footage gave a thorough and clear representation of the student to enable the moderator to see their true abilities.

NEA Part 3 - analysis and evaluation task

Although most centres were extremely well organised, a small minority did not have evidence of the NEA Part 3 to hand on the day. This is a requirement of the moderation procedure and should be adhered to by all centres. In general, centres managed to mark and collate analysis and evaluation evidence of the student's work for the sample chosen. There were still a significant percentage of centres that did not make use of the annotations on their student's work which are matched to the terminology in the best fit assessment grids. For those centres not using the best-fit grids, these can be found on eAQA and allow centres to break down the elements of the assessment into a manageable format to come to an overall judgement.

Of the three main areas to be evidenced, the Part 3 task was undoubtedly the one with the highest level of discrepancy within marking. The vast majority of students submit a written piece of work but centres are reminded that they have the opportunity to allow students to complete a verbal interview. Within such an interview, students can bring in brief notes and can, if necessary, complete their analysis verbally and their evaluation in a written format (or vice versa). The intention is that certain types of learners may find their submission of this area better suited to their personal attributes and abilities.

Discrepancies in marks tended to be down to centre leniency. The analysis section requires students, for example, to identify one fitness strength, not several. For this strength there should be a justification about how it affected the performer in actual recent performances (plural). Many students wrote generically about how it may affect a fictitious person's performance in future rather than how it did affect the chosen performer in actual past performances. The justification of the strengths and weaknesses in relation to recent performances plays a crucial role in the attainment of marks for this section. The key is to ensure that the analysis remains personal and focused not general and ambiguous.

The evaluation section should be completed in line with the assessment grid and therefore should include aspects like:

- personalised thoughts about safety
- personalised application of intensities which have been calculated and justified.

The evaluations were often general and not specific to the needs of the performer. For example, moderators were often left pondering questions like: how would that training type improve your fitness weakness? Why have you used that specific intensity or workload? How have you thought about specific aspects of your safety? Thus the personalised element to the training session was often lacking to justify the marks awarded.

Within the evaluation section, it was somewhat surprising to witness how many centres did not include an additional aspect of the theory of the course to eradicate the skill weakness. This was often lacking altogether and severely affected the moderated mark on such occasions. Centres are reminded to leave the choice of theoretical area open to the students and to encourage them to describe how the application of their knowledge could feasibly improve their skill weakness.

Post-moderation procedures

Where outstanding elements were required to be sent to the moderator, centres generally managed to fulfil this within 5 working days. Encrypted footage of the day itself, outstanding paperwork and Candidate Record Forms were punctually sent on.

Centres are always advised to re-assess how their moderation procedures have transpired this year. AQA are aware of the concerns raised by some centres regarding the lack of feedback given on the day itself. However, centres are reminded that this is an Ofqual requirement and one which is adhered to by all exam boards. The feedback provided to centres post-results is therefore vital in allowing centres to continue to improve and to do the best for their students.

The Lead Moderator would like to thank all moderators for their professional attitude and punctuality during this assessment cycle.

The year ahead

A timeline for the year ahead and some vital information is provided below:

- December 2019/January 2020 – contact received from moderator
- centre replies to moderator and a date for moderation is mutually agreed
- no more than two weeks before moderation, the centre submits final marks to the moderator of all students' work
- sample of students' work is chosen by the moderator
- moderation takes place in March, April, May 2020
- outcomes received on results day
- enquiries about results start from the publication of results date.

Teacher Online Standardisation (TOLS) footage:

- log in to e-AQA
- choose Teacher Services
- choose Teacher Online Standardisation (TOLS)
- choose Science/PE
- choose 8582/C GCSE PE NEA
- watch the footage in the repository.

To find out your NEA advisor, contact: teacherservices@aqa.org.uk

To find out about AQA CPD events, visit: <http://www.aqa.org.uk/professional-development>

For new/prospective centres

Any centre which has just moved or is planning to move to AQA should note that AQA will only assign a moderator when they know that the centre intends to enter students for the award. Any centres new to AQA should contact pe@aqa.org.uk as soon as possible.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

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