



**General Certificate of Secondary Education
June 2012**

Physical Education

48904

(Specification 4890)

**Unit 4: The Active Participant (Full Course and
Double Award)**

Report on the Examination

Further copies of this Report on **the Examination** are available from: aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Copyright

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.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334).
Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX.

Physical Education (48904)

General Comments

Following the annual review of GCSE PE, and based on feedback from schools, changes were made to the moderation process for this series.

Many schools expressed concern at having to provide information about their five highest and five lowest scoring students in January. Therefore, the deadline for this information to be sent to the moderator was changed to arrive with the moderator no later than four weeks prior to the moderation visit.

It is worth including a reminding note that moderators cannot assess all students in all schools due to the variety of activities/roles offered, and the time required for teachers to set up activities for moderation. Therefore, as with previous years, moderators select a sample of students that is representative of the entire cohort.

Although assessment throughout the course is encouraged, it is expected that student performances at moderation closely replicate the marks awarded by teachers. Moderators check that this is the case. Where marks cannot be closely replicated on the day of the visit, teachers may have to apply a suitable adjustment to all student marks, regardless of activity, across that assessment and role, prior to final mark submission.

To avoid any disadvantage to your students, it is crucial to ensure that marking is consistent across all activities and roles. If more than one teacher assesses students, the process of internal standardisation across the different activities and roles must be carried out prior to marks being sent to the moderator. For students performing above and beyond the maximum mark for each assessment, you can gather DVD evidence to protect their maximum marks in the event of any adjustment.

Although the vast majority of assessments should be carried out before the moderation visit, in a few instances some assessment may be necessary after the visit. Any amendments to marks need to be supported by DVD evidence to clearly justify the marks given.

The moderation visit (Key Processes A and B)

Moderation visits were most effective when students had been given the opportunity to undergo a practice run of the programme arranged for the visit. This ensured that enough time had been provided to cover a range of practices for Key Process A (KPA) and the full game/event for Key Process B (KPB) in all of the activities scheduled to be seen by the moderator.

In schools with teachers that are knowledgeable about the specification, the practice sessions for KPA were well structured and frequently utilised differentiated practices, set plays and small-sided game activities. These enabled the students to demonstrate their full potential and show a full range of skills under opposed and semi-opposed conditions, where applicable. As a result, the sessions were effectively designed to fully stretch and challenge the more able students. They also offered opportunities for students being assessed as coaches and officials to demonstrate the extent of their knowledge and understanding of the activity, and how it is regulated and controlled at the same time as the players were performing.

Where teachers were less familiar with the specification requirements for controlled assessment, moderators reported that there was not enough differentiation or graduation of practices in KPA to stretch the more able students. Practices tended to be directed at the mid-level, which meant that they were not challenging enough for the very able, attainable for the middle group and a little difficult for the less able. Practices should be set up to enable students to be shown in their best light in order to reflect the mark awarded.

The marking of students across a range of activities for player/performer has generally been accurate. The role of player/performer was marked most accurately in Group 1 activities compared with other roles and groups.

Circuit training has been the main activity where moderators have reported a variance in delivery and a tendency towards leniency when marking. In KPA, the main problem was that students failed to include specific exercises for the arms, legs, torso, combination and whole body, which are the requirements in the specification.

Some teachers had misunderstood or misinterpreted the requirements of controlled assessment for circuit training and they either prescribed a set circuit for students or set the time parameters for each exercise. It should be the student that selects the exercise to be performed at each station, the order in which they will be performed, how long each exercise should last for, as well as how each will be adapted in subsequent sessions. Where marking was lenient, competent students were being awarded high marks despite the fact that they were not able to sustain their technique or even the activity itself when performing the whole circuit at pace for KPB. The consistency, control and fluency of their technique declined as they became fatigued and in some cases the students had to stop completely and yet they were still being awarded marks of eight or nine.

The majority of schools entered most students as player/performer. Where schools offered other roles, moderators reported that the standard of these students varied.

In some schools performances were particularly impressive at the moderation visit and a high standard of officiating and coaching by students was seen. In other schools the standard was disappointing and students had been marked too leniently by teachers. It is essential that students who have been assessed working with younger students are given the same opportunity during the moderation visit. In some cases, students had been put into difficult situations by teachers and they had to act as a coach or official when working with their peers, which they were not always able to cope with. If it is not possible for GCSE PE students to have access to younger students for the moderation visit then it is in their best interests that they are filmed so that evidence is available for the moderator.

Some schools have been unsure of the difference between students officiating in KPA and KPB. For KPA, students are assessed on their ability to explain the rules to a player/performer and officiate/judge the core skills/techniques in small sided games/structured practices/authentic context, including set plays and dead ball situations. For KPB they are responsible for officiating the full recognised version of the game that is appropriate to the age group that they are working with. They are assessed on their control and presence, understanding of the rules/composition, judging/officiating, communication skills and consistency/effectiveness of identifying rule infringements.

For KPA the leader/coach is assessed on their ability to warm up a group of students and observe, analyse and suggest improvements to an individual, based on assessing the individual performer on their skills and suggesting ways to improve/develop the core skills.

For KPB students are assessed on their ability to observe, analyse and suggest improvements to an individual based on assessing the individual performer on their skills and techniques, and lead/coach player(s) in the full performance/activity situation.

If teachers have a specification related query, they can contact their Controlled Assessment Adviser, who should be able to offer guidance. If they have a query that relates to moderation, they can contact their moderator prior to the visit taking place.

Moderators reported that they had seen high quality work in their moderation visits throughout the country. They have also seen some outstanding performances by very talented students.

The vast majority of teachers demonstrated a good understanding of the moderation process and endeavoured to ensure that students were well prepared for the moderation visit.

In a number of schools teachers have provided useful supporting evidence to verify the marks awarded and have started to capture performances on DVD. DVD evidence must be available for those activities undertaken outside of the school's direct supervision and for those activities/events that it is not possible to replicate at a moderation visit. For example, an organiser organising a competition for local primary school students, which would not be possible to set up again.

Key Process C

Key Process C (KPC) can be submitted as either a written or verbal piece of work. Where students are assessed verbally, their responses must be recorded with a supporting commentary to show how marks have been awarded so that the work can be moderated. Teachers are reminded that when completed verbally, students must meet the requirements for KPC and be assessed against the criteria in the specification.

All aspects of the criteria need to be included in the evidence submitted.

- Evaluating performance – analysing performance and making judgements on strengths and weaknesses
- Improving performance – identifying what actions are needed for improvement, deciding on and prioritising areas for improvement, identification of nature/cause of the strength(s) or weakness(es), including possible reason(s) for problems/faults, corrective measures to help improve performance and action plans to monitor improvement.

When written work is submitted, it is the responsibility of teachers to clearly annotate work to indicate how and where the marks have been awarded to clarify to moderators exactly why marks have or have not been attained by students.

It is extremely important that schools have an effective internal standardisation process in place to ensure that the marking of KPC is standardised across different classes and is accurate.

In general the marking of KPC was accurate. However, many moderators reported that there were instances of over marking in some of the samples of work sent to them. The most common areas for lenient marking was when students were outlining strengths and weaknesses, which involved marks being awarded for lists of skills, sometimes lengthy with little or no further detail. It should be noted that students are expected to look at a

performance or consider their own, and will be marked on their ability to identify at least one strength and one weakness, which need to be fully explained. This section is concerned with analysing the performance and making judgements, and students need to show the ability to explain the reasons why they are strengths in the context of the activity. This involves demonstrating an understanding of what makes an action/skill/technique/performance appropriate/effective/ efficient/successful. In the improvement section, marks were awarded for simplistic statements lacking the required depth of analysis. When outlining corrective measures, students need to demonstrate their knowledge of suitable practice(s)/strategies/ tactics to improve performance. The student should demonstrate how they will monitor and evaluate progress towards the improved quality of performance/outcome. They should know what they are trying to achieve, what improvements they will be looking for and what stages there might be. Students often stated that the performer should film themselves and watch it back and/or carry out a training programme. Similarly, in the monitoring section students merely stated that the performer should ask their coach for feedback or repeated again that they should film the performer.

Moderators also reported that a minority of schools were providing too much guidance and assisting students with the content rather than with the process. It should be remembered that this is controlled assessment and the work should be solely that of the student and any assistance given must be to the group as a whole and not to individuals.

The updated template has been used in a number of schools but there were still many students submitting work on the old template. The newer version of the template is available in the Teacher Resource Bank on the AQA website. There is also some exemplar material available on e-AQA.

Moderators have reported that they have also seen exceptionally good work submitted by students for KPC that has clearly met the criteria.

Administration

Pre moderation visit

The majority of schools submitted their initial documentation promptly (ModB and ModBX forms). Schools are reminded to complete these forms in their entirety and ensure they provide full contact details of the teacher responsible for GCSE PE, including a telephone number and email address.

Teachers must send the rank order of students' marks for all activities being assessed and a completed ModD form to show the marks and activities of the five highest and five lowest scoring students at their school to arrive no later than **four weeks before** the visit. Upon receipt of the marks the moderator will be in contact within five working days to inform the teacher which roles and activities they wish to see for KPA and B.

Teachers need to be aware that if they do not send this information in the timescale given, students will not have time to prepare in advance of the visit and their performance may be affected. It was particularly helpful to moderators when all of the required information was sent on time and especially when sent electronically.

Teachers are reminded that, on the day of the moderation visit, they are responsible for:

- the organisation and presentation of the activities to be moderated
- ensuring an appropriate number of students are present to run drills, conditioned practices for KPA and to enable students to play the full recognised version of the game/event as required in the specification for KPB
- adequate time and facilities being available
- clear identification for all students (ie coloured/numbered bibs).

This will ensure that your students are shown in their best light.

Final submission of marks

Most schools submitted their Centre Mark Forms (CMF), Candidate Record Forms (CRF) and Centre Declaration Sheets (CDS) to the moderator by the 31 May deadline.

The most common administrative errors included:

- CRFs not sent for all students
- student signatures missing from CRFs
- failure to supply a CDS
- teacher signatures missing from CDS
- failure to send both the pink and yellow copies of the CMF to moderators
- failure to write the mark for each student for Key Process C to the left of the 'Total Mark' box on the CMF. This is detailed in the 'instructions for submitting controlled assessment/coursework marks and samples'.

Errors such as these delayed the process as moderators had to send follow up letters, emails or make phone calls to chase up missing forms.

It was clearly evident to moderators that many schools checked through all of the CRFs to check that they were signed by the student, that the marks had been transposed from the school database correctly, that all additions were correct, the mark for KPC was written to the left of the total mark box and that the CRFs were submitted in the order that the students names appear on the CMF.

It was also apparent that in most cases teachers had checked that the assessments were also acceptable. The requirements of the specification for Unit 4 (Full Course) are that students must complete four assessments, of which at least two must be as player/performer. Furthermore, the assessments must include activities from at least two groups/ways of thinking. Moderators have reported that some teachers were confused about the different 'ways of thinking'. This refers to the different groups of activities and not the performance of different roles. In some instances marks were submitted for four Group 1 activities, with students being assessed as a coach or an official, or even both, in the same category of activity. As this does not meet the requirements of the specification an alternate activity and mark had to be submitted.

Moderators would like to express their gratitude to those schools that submitted accurate paperwork and whose administration was exemplary. These schools expedite the whole moderation process from initial contact through to the final submission of marks.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the Results Statistics page of the AQA Website: <http://www.aqa.org.uk/over/stat.html>

UMS conversion calculator www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion