



General Certificate of Education

**Physical Education 1580
PHED2**

Report on the Examination

2010 examination – June series

Further copies of this Report are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2010 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres 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 centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

PHED2

Analysis and evaluation of physical activity as a performer and/or in an adopted role/s

General

On the whole, the standard of assessment in schools and colleges improved from last year with more centres taking on the guidance from AQA. Centres who attended support/standardisation meetings tended to follow the marking criteria much better than those who didn't. The importance of having attended such meetings cannot be emphasised enough.

There is still a need to emphasise the importance of internal standardisation within centres prior to moderation as many centres use a large number of colleagues both from within their own department and from external sources. The members of staff responsible for the assessment of activities actually being watched on moderation day should be present on the day. Centres should expect that a moderation visit will last at least half of the school day.

Centres followed the new moderation procedures with varying success and most implemented the correct processes of submitting information to their moderator in December and marks for all of their students two weeks before the moderation visit.

DVD evidence, where necessary, varied in quality and quantity but was often suitable in justifying students' marks, particularly for the highest scoring candidate out of 50 or someone at that level.

Administration of paperwork was largely done well, although the punctuality of submitting centre mark forms to moderators varied considerably.

Adoption of roles

It should be noted that QCDA finally approved the proposal to allow candidates to adopt the same role twice (eg two performances) in December 2009. Thus the decision was made to inform centres immediately and offer them the opportunity to submit their candidates in two of the same role this academic year rather than waiting until next year. This was at the request of centres and a very positive step forward.

Performance

Due to the changes in the specification allowing candidates to adopt the same role twice, performer was by far the most popular role. On the whole, centres covered this role well. However, there must be an improvement in the standard and complexity of drills used to allow the best students to access the higher marks. It is often the case that the drills used do not allow the best candidates to gain the marks they could possibly achieve. Centres tended to adopt the concept that full sided situations should not be shown at PHED 2 and conditioned practices should incorporate a competitive element, albeit not in a full context. Smaller centres often struggled to recruit enough students to show the drills required. Such centres must endeavour to continue to make arrangements to 'borrow' students from other areas on the day of moderation to ensure that those being watched are able to suitably demonstrate their ability level.

The standard of analysis of performance varied considerably, with many candidates highlighting strengths and weaknesses in their performance, but not identifying a detailed programme of improvement for the future. This was evident in all three roles.

Coaching

The standard of coaching shown did not vary much from that seen last year. Unfortunately, many candidates still demonstrate excellent leading skills, but do not follow the criterion which focuses on actual coaching. Coaches did not always adopt the concept of ANALYSE, MODIFY and REFINE and too often made vague comments about either strengths or weakness without exploring the finer points of technique. Many coaches attempted to lead the whole session with a large group and this leading could in fact have been done by another person, eg a teacher, etc. Coaches tended to do better when focusing on individual coaching, concentrating on the analysis, modification and refinement of one individual's performance. Where coaching was done well, the coaches tended to stand out as particularly successful candidates due to the contrasting nature of their ability in that role compared to the average student.

Coaches did not always coach to the detail required of the student(s) ability level they were coaching. Often drills were too simplistic and did not progress allowing candidate refinement of the skills to be shown.

It must however be pointed out that all too often, the coaches inability to fully satisfy the criteria was due to poor advice from their centre.

Again it must be reiterated that the standard of analysis of performance as a coach varied considerably, with many candidates highlighting strengths and weaknesses in their performance, but not identifying a detailed programme of improvement for the future.

Officiating

The standard of officiating did improve slightly from that seen last year. This was particularly evident in centres that fully understood the need to allow officials to actually officiate, ie set up situations where rule infringements occurred. Some centres used their own staff or students to participate in the drills/situations shown and very cleverly allowed the officials the chance to demonstrate their prowess by deliberately breaking the rules or providing opportunities for the officials to intervene (within the obvious boundaries of health & safety consideration). Unfortunately many centres still attempted to show their candidates in fully competitive versions of their sport which is PHED 4 officiating, not PHED2.

There was an improvement in explanation of rules which were appropriate to the drills/situations being used, but unfortunately safety checks continued to be vague without full explanation of what the official was actually looking for.

It must be stressed that adopting the various officiating roles must take place and it is not sufficient to merely adopt the main official's role. As an example in Badminton officiating, officials should be given the opportunity to be the net official, the service official and the line official.

It is suggested that personal preparation be demonstrated and explained by the candidate so as to fully clarify whether the candidate is actually prepared or not.

Again it must be reiterated that the standard of analysis of performance as an official varied considerably, with many candidates highlighting strengths and weaknesses in their performance as an official, but not identifying a detailed programme of improvement for the future.

In summary, the standard of assessment in PHED 2 showed some improvement in the second year of the specification. Centres were more informed and showed a greater understanding in the activities and situations they adopted to allow their candidates to respond successfully and appropriately.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results Statistics](#) page of the AQA website www.aqa.org.uk/over/stat.