



General Certificate of Secondary Education

Physical Education 3586/C Short Course *Specification A*

Practical Assessment

Report on the Examination *2007 examination - June series*

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

Copyright © 2007 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.

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
Dr Michael Cresswell Director General.

Coursework

There have been a number of incidents reported by moderators where centres have submitted marks for their candidates in activities that are not included within the specification. It is imperative that teachers responsible for the delivery of GCSE Physical Education within their centre contact the Subject Officer within the PE department at AQA to ascertain whether or not a particular activity is acceptable before the candidate embarks upon the course.

Moderators have reported seeing practical performances of a high standard throughout the country, with many reporting a slight adjustment upwards. This occurred most frequently where an exceptional candidate was awarded full marks and other candidates were subsequently compared to a standard beyond the expectations of GCSE. The high standards seen have been endorsed by moderators and many note that teachers within the centres have had four years experience with the delivery of the course and have prepared their candidates successfully, secure in the knowledge that they understand the assessment criteria. The quality of delivery has definitely resulted in higher standards of attainment by candidates. Many moderators have commented that the range of tasks enabled candidates of all abilities to respond successfully and display the full range of their skills.

Centres have been accurate in their assessment of Assessment Objective AO1 – The ability to perform effectively – where candidates are assessed on their ability to perform effectively under applied conditions in their selected activities by using tactics and compositional techniques and observing the rules of their activities as they both link clearly with the requirements of the national curriculum. The theoretical components of the practical course have also been accurately marked by staff for AO2 the ability to analyse performance to determine its strength and weaknesses and improve its quality and effectiveness with most centres utilising the proformas provided with the Teachers Guide.

Centres have made every effort to ensure the moderation visits have run smoothly, and more and more centres have suspended the timetable to maximise the time available. Increasingly, members of staff within the centres have a contingency plan prepared in advance in case of inclement weather so that candidates know the precise format that the moderation visit will take and where it will take place and have been prepared appropriately by their teachers so that they are not put under any undue stress.

An increased range of activities have been seen by moderators with many seeing outdoor and adventurous activities including orienteering, sailing and canoeing. Increasingly centres are providing video evidence of less popular activities; the standards of these have varied. It should be noted that any video evidence submitted should include all of the assessment objectives for the activity and be of sufficient length and quality to enable the moderator to clearly identify the candidate and assess the standard of their performance.

If new centres are not entirely sure of the process or expectations it would be advisable to contact their moderator beforehand rather than wait until the day of the visit to clarify any areas of uncertainty as this will not only delay proceedings but often place additional pressures on the candidates themselves.

Paperwork continues to improve and the information received on arriving for a moderation visit has been of a very high standard. Evidence has been ready for the moderator to look at and they have reported that it has been of a high standard.

The marking of the practical components has been accurate and fairly consistent, with rare occasions when marks have had to be adjusted downwards. Staff need to ensure that they refer to the criteria especially when confronted with very high scoring candidates – if they have exceptional candidates that have gone off the scale there is a tendency to preclude other candidate from attaining the maximum of 10 – there have been a number of incidents reported where very able candidates have been overshadowed by their exceptional peers.

Fitness Training Programmes

Moderators have reported an improvement in the annotation of the training programmes however some centres remain unaware of the importance of ticks to indicate a creditworthy comment by candidates. It is apparent that an increasing number of centres have studied the examples provided by AQA and are aware of the standard required and have guided their candidates with the process. The weakest areas continue to occur in the planning stage where candidates make generalised statements rather than a more personal application of their knowledge and apply it to their training programme.

The majority of Fitness Training Programmes have been completed using the AQA template and this has continued to enable candidates to have access to the full range of the marks available.

Candidates have fared best when staff within the centre have provided opportunities for them to evaluate the programme in stages appropriate to the implementation of the programme itself – they have evaluated the planning of the programme after the planning and prior to actually undertaking the programme. They have then been given the opportunity to evaluate the performing and monitoring of the programme during the performance and immediately after carrying out the programme, with the final evaluation being undertaken after completing the whole of the programme.

Moderators have reported some over marking of the HRF programmes which have often been linked to an apparent lack of standardisation within centres or where centres have particularly large entries – including those with whole year groups entered. This problem is particularly apparent when a number of teachers are involved with the delivery of the course. Where problems have been reported by moderators it has additionally occurred in centres where there has been a change of staff.

The attention of the teacher responsible for the GCSE PE/Games course is drawn to the requirements for internal standardisation within the specification:-

“The centre is required to standardise the assessments across different teacher and teaching groups to ensure that all candidates at the centre have been judged against the same standards. If two or more teachers are involved in marking a component, one teacher must be designated as responsible for internal standardisation. Common pieces of work must be marked on a trial basis and differences between assessments discussed at a training session in which all teachers involved must participate. The teacher responsible for standardising the marking must ensure that the training included the use of reference and archive materials such as work from a previous year or examples provided by AQA. Examples of HRF programmes are available from AQA at the three different levels of attainment – highly competent, competent and moderately successful. The centre is required to send to the moderator the Centre Declaration Sheet, duly signed, to confirm that the marking of centre-assessed work has been standardised. If only one teacher has undertaken the marking, that person must sign the form.”

The standardisation requirement outlined above refers to practical as well as the written components of the practical course including the rules and regulations, analysis of performance as well as the HRF programmes.

Moderators would like to express their thanks to those centres that submitted the HRF programmes as soon as they had been completed, and they reported positively on the standard of marking with ticks clearly showing where marks were awarded and often supported by additional comments from teachers.

An increasing number of centres have demonstrated a positive move toward the inclusion of disabled candidates. Many centres have provided an inclusive curriculum and provided activities that have enabled their candidates to achieve their potential – where necessary they have contacted AQA for clarification of acceptable and permissible adaptations to the criteria. Any centres with candidates with special educational needs should contact the PE Subject Officer prior to the commencement of the course outlining clearly the particular circumstances of the candidate.

Overall moderators have reported that the process has gone extremely well and that the rapport built up with staff within centres continues to facilitate the efficiency and effectiveness of moderation visits.

Administration

Generally initial contact with centres resulted in the prompt return of paperwork concerned with prospective date for visits – however this was not always the case and the late return by some centres delayed the planning and confirmation of moderation visits. Many moderators limited the time available for visits and this proved to be very successful in providing them with a more even and manageable distribution of visits throughout the moderation period. Problems within centres, for example, the long term absence of key department members did prove problematic in some cases.

The paperwork was not always fully completed and the attention of staff responsible for GCSE PE is drawn to the requirement to identify potentially high scoring candidates. Despite clear guidelines as to the nature of the candidates that fall within this category a number of centres failed to complete this section. The section concerned can be found on the reverse of form MODB which is returned to moderators outlining convenient dates for a moderation visit.

The final submission of paperwork was also not without its problems – there were a number of centres that did not include all of the Candidate Record Forms (CRF) when they submitted the Centre Mark Sheets. It is worth reiterating that for the purposes of the PE and Games GCSE the CRF are essential as this outlines the marks awarded for each component of the practical course and without it moderators do not know the mark that each candidate has been awarded for the HRF programme. This is a necessity to enable the moderator to request a sample of candidate's marks across the full range of the marks awarded within the centre. These forms must also be signed by both the candidate and the teacher responsible for the group.

There were also a number of late submissions of the paperwork – it should be noted that the full course marks are due in on 5 May and the short courses on 31 May.

Moderators also reported a number of centres that had errors on the CRFs – particularly in relation to the activities submitted. Despite the CRF clearly stating that activities 1 and 2 should be from different groups there were many instances where this was not the case. Most inaccuracies occurred on the PE course where two games activities were named – although they were from different types of game and would have met the criteria for the games course, they were inappropriate for the PE course.

It is pleasing to report that the vast majority of CRFs were signed by the candidates. One problem continues to hinder moderators in that centres fail to put the CRFs in the order in which the candidates appear on the Centre Mark Sheet. Some centres even submitted all of the CRFs together despite candidates being entered for different courses. There were also a number of centres that failed to include a Centre Declaration Sheet or had not completed it fully to indicate whether one teacher had been solely responsible for the marking of the candidates work or to confirm that internal standardisation of marking had occurred within the centre.

Good practice has been demonstrated by centres that identify their high scoring candidates on the reverse of MODB and provide supporting comments on the Candidate Record Forms to further clarify the awarding of the marks. Many of the latter have been extremely detailed and helpful to the moderators.

Once again good practice has been demonstrated by many centres, the most common features include:

Submission of marks

- Pink and yellow copies of the Centre Mark Sheets (or two copies of the EDI printout) are included.
- Supplementary Centre Mark Sheets are completed and included for late entries or those candidates who have changed course.
- Centre Declaration Sheets are all fully completed and signed for each course entered.
- The correct Candidate Record Forms (CRF) are fully completed, signed by ALL candidates and submitted in the order that the candidates' names appear on the Centre Mark Sheets for each course.
- The CRFs are accurately completed with different activity/game areas for activities/game 1 and 2.
- The activity/game for which the training programme has been carried out is indicated.
- All swimming, athletic and gymnastic activities are clearly identified e.g. personal survival and life saving.

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