



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report
Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2022

Pearson Edexcel GCSE
In Physical Education (1PE0)
Paper 03: Practical Performance

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2022

Publications Code 1PE0_03_2206_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

Introduction

Centres are to be congratulated for their hard work and effort in completing the moderation process this year following the two-year break from formal assessments due to the COVID pandemic, and associated restrictions. Most candidates were highly motivated to succeed and responded positively to their teachers' demands, support and encouragement, and with a desire to display the marks awarded to them during the moderation process.

The purpose of moderation is to assess the centre's ability to award marks accurately and consistently across all activities, using the published assessment criteria. The JCQ guidance stipulated that this year, all Non-Examined Assessments (NEA) should be marked in the same way as before the pandemic disruption. This is important as it will ensure that all candidates' work is marked to the same standard, therefore maintaining rigour and fairness.

There was a relaxation of the requirements for the provision of evidence in competitive sport to support centres where there may have been difficulties in providing evidence for moderation, such as the reduction in the number of activities that were moderated, and the number of candidate performances being moderated. Centres were required to show two activities, rather than the usual three activities this series – either two team activities, two individual activities or one team and one individual activity – from the approved activity list in the specification. Fifteen candidate-performances were sampled for moderation this series as opposed to thirty candidate-performances.

It is necessary that centres provide evidence of **all** elements of the assessment criteria – skills in isolation and the application of skills in a formal/competitive situation – to justify the marks that have been awarded to candidates and so that those marks can be moderated. Mixed reports were received from moderators who visited centres and who moderated work that was submitted by video evidence. The majority were able to provide perfectly adequate evidence of the skills in isolation and the application of skills, whilst some failed to provide sufficient evidence, either in terms of the number of skills in isolation that were shown and according to the criteria, or the quality of the skills in isolation, and the length of time that was provided for candidates to demonstrate their skills, particularly on video, where footage amounted to just over one minute in some cases. It was noticeable that where candidates had not had the opportunity to participate at a competitive level during the last two years the standard of some games was adversely affected. It was also reported that those who moderated centres by digital submission found that in some cases there was too much evidence submitted of candidates playing competitive games, with two or three games of football being submitted as evidence for the assessment of the application of skills, techniques and decision making.

In general protocol was accurately observed, with few centres offering forbidden practical combinations. However, there were instances where some teacher-

assessors had not used the most up to date version of the Practical Performance Assessment Criteria (PPAC) Issue 4, and who had included the assessment of heading in the football activity as one of the skills in isolation; it should be noted that this skill has been removed from the football criteria.

Marking was generally accurate with centres placing candidates in the correct level bands for both elements of the assessment criteria. Where there was moderator disagreement, this tended to be between levels four and five, where marking was lenient, or levels two and three, where marking was severe.

Although a wide range of activities was observed this year, with football, netball, badminton, table tennis, swimming, athletics, and trampolining being most popular, in addition to handball, which is becoming increasingly popular, it was noticeable that some centres had limited the number of activities offered to make the collection of evidence more controllable and to maintain the quality of evidence.

Performance of candidates in the skills in isolation:

To achieve an accurate assessment of marks during the moderation of the skills in isolation centres must ensure that practices are differential and allow those at the higher level of the marking bands to demonstrate the more advanced skills and techniques in a dynamic and contextual situation. Differentiation by grouping is very useful, however, the tasks must be planned to allow **all** candidates to justify the mark awarded. This could be achieved by candidates in the higher mark bands completing further or different practices, and that of a higher level of demand, to those who have achieved marks in the lower mark bands.

Too many centres, however, are still showing static and simple type practices which do not allow candidates to justify the marks that they had been awarded. Some are taking the requirement to show '***the performance of skills and techniques in isolation/unopposed situations***' (p.15, Specification) – too literally. Those who can access marks in the higher-level mark bands must show skills that are **more complex** as well as being **more pressured, contextual, and demanding**. A reminder has been included in the Initial Contact Questionnaire (ICQ) in point 7 for centres to show:

"Differentiated practices should be included in all activities to extend all ability levels within an activity e.g., football."

As a reminder, 'unopposed' situations refer to skills not being performed in a competitive game/situation, which has a result. If demonstrating passing in football, for example, it is expected that a candidate who has been awarded marks in the Level 5 marking band can show these skills in a pressured and more advanced 2 v 1 grid practice, as opposed to a static practice showing each individual pass with a partner being performed back and forth, which does not

necessarily require a high level of ability. That would be more acceptable for a candidate who has been awarded marks in the Level 1 and 2 marking bands. In the racket sports, such as badminton, candidates should be able to demonstrate the skills as a combination of strokes and techniques, which would require them to perform at a very good level of technical accuracy, precision, fluency and control to achieve success, such as hitting an overhead clear high and to the back of the court consistently, and then move to the net for a net shot which just tips over the net; another example is being able to end the rally of shots with a powerful and accurate smash shot (this would not mean that they would score a point at the end of the rally). This kind of scenario enables those who are being awarded marks in the higher-level band the opportunity to maximise their potential.

Many centres had obviously rehearsed the skills practices which enabled candidates to focus on the quality of their performance rather than just concentrate on what was required of them during the practice. This is good practice and recommended prior to the moderation visit, although candidates do require a reasonable amount of time in between a mock moderation and the actual moderation to allow for them to recover.

Where practices moved at a good pace and intensity, and increased in demand and challenge, candidates were able to access the full range of marks.

Centres are advised to look carefully at the activity's assessment criteria as the more advanced skills do appear in the guidelines of what skills candidates should be demonstrating to meet the requirements of a level for most activities, with the simpler skills appearing at the top of the list and the more complex skills appearing towards the bottom of the list, for example in the skiing and rock climbing activities. Alternatively, some of the skills are listed in brackets as in the netball activity, such as two-handed catching in a static position v taking a one-handed catch on the move.

In the trampolining and gymnastics activities a specific list of hierarchical skills has been included as a guide to help teaching teacher-assessors to assess the skills at the correct level.

Where a hierarchical list of skills has not been included in the activity's assessment criteria it is expected that teacher-assessors use their expertise and knowledge of an activity to make a judgement in the difference between a simple and complex skill. The appropriateness of showing the same four skills at the same level for all candidates must be carefully considered if there is a difference in the marks that have been awarded to the candidates, considering the strengths and weaknesses of the candidates, and the marks that have been awarded.

Showing the skills in isolation in athletics is very mixed, with some centres providing high quality evidence of how to present this section of the assessment, while some barely demonstrated the stated skills to justify the marks that had been awarded. It is possible to show the skills in isolation for the middle-distance events for example by planning a series of drills to highlight the arm and leg action as well as the body position, the starting position, and first few metres as well as

spacing towards the end of the race with a sprint finish. Centres are reminded that it is not necessary to show the skills in isolation over the whole distance. It is recommended that the skills are shown over approximately 10-20m depending on the skills being demonstrated and using cones to indicate the distance for candidates to run in between. When spacing this could take place from the 50m mark up to about 20m before the finish, when a sprint finish to the line could be shown.

Centres must ensure that the sampled candidates are the focus of the moderation of the skills in isolation. It is recommended that those who are being moderated are grouped together in one grid or as appropriate to their level of ability and according to the marks that they have been awarded. It is only necessary to recruit the help of additional, unassessed candidates for certain aspects of the moderation of an activity, for example if numbers are so low that a candidate who is being moderated is unable to perform a required skill or technique, or for a conditioned game or for a full competitive game/situation. It has been reported that many centres included too many candidates at inappropriate times, making it difficult to moderate the marks of those who had been assessed in an activity. This can also prove to be an unnecessary distraction for those who are being moderated.

Performance of candidates in the application of skills, techniques and decision making under pressure during conditioned practices and a conditioned/formal/competitive situation:

Most centres were able to provide an opportunity for their candidates to perform in a formal/competitive situation, which usually refers to a routine in trampolining, dance and gymnastics for example, a full performance in skiing, rock climbing, cycling, and kayaking, and a full competitive game in a team or individual sport. Centres are to be congratulated on their efforts to ensure that their candidates had the opportunity to perform to their maximum potential in this element of the assessment, by creating as realistic a situation as possible.

There were a few issues relating to what constitutes a formal/competitive situation, in activities such as boxing, athletics and swimming, as well as some of the game's activities.

In the boxing activity it is necessary that candidates perform a competitive bout of 3 x 2-minute rounds, adhering to the England Boxing guidelines and being supervised by someone with specialist experience in this area. Any other 'competitive' situation, such as sparring does not meet the assessment requirements for this activity.

For the athletics and swimming activities it is necessary that candidates demonstrate a fully competitive race or event against appropriately challenging opposition. It does not reflect the higher marks seeing a candidate running a 1500m on their own or a javelin thrower performing three throws on their own.

The difficulties in being able to take part in formal athletics events is acknowledged but moving forward, if candidates are offering athletics as one of their assessed activities it is suggested that centres plan and use any of the competitive meetings/events, such as inter/intra-school/house competitions that may take place in the summer months, and film the candidates in a realistically competitive situation. This evidence can then be presented to the moderator for that element of the assessment criteria, with the skills in isolation being shown separately as either recorded evidence or as live evidence.

There were a few issues with respect to the number required to play a full sided game as well as the size of the playing area and equipment such as goals being used. Once again, a few centres had difficulties fielding the required number to allow their candidates to play a fully competitive game, and while most were able to make adaptations, some centres did not ensure that the competitive environment was appropriate for their candidates to perform at their best. Centres are advised to refer to the information in the [NEA document](#), which can be found on the Pearson subject webpage, and which are based on the appropriate National Governing Body (NGB) regulations and recommendations.

It is important that centres structure their assessment and moderation sessions to ensure that all elements of the assessment criteria for the application of skills, techniques and decision making in a formal/competitive situation are included. The centre final mark that is awarded should be one that is a 'best fit', including the assessment not only of the candidates' performance of the physical skills, but also of communication skills (where applicable in a team activity), influence on self and others during a performance, decision making during the performance, application of tactics, as well as adherence to and application of the rules and regulations and health and safety guidelines of the activity. Candidates do not benefit from 'just' playing a game in the hope that the evidence from all/most of the assessment traits occurs by default.

It is important to ensure that the competitive games are officiated correctly, which is achieved best where there are two members of staff involved in the organisation of the practical activity. This allows one member of staff to organise the activity and film, while the second member of staff officiates the game.

The standard of 'extra' unassessed candidates brought in to make up numbers is sometimes not high enough to support those who are being moderated, proving to be a disadvantage to them when attempting to justify the mark that they have been awarded. Conversely, weaker players in the badminton and table tennis activities, for example, are often matched with players who are of similar ability, when a more able opponent might offer a greater challenge. Teacher-assessors are reminded that they are in control of the moderation sessions, not the moderator, and they should be confident that what is being seen by the moderator is able to justify the marks that have been awarded to the candidates. If not, they

should reorganise the structure/numbers/players to make sure that the sampled candidates' marks are fully justified.

Candidates were generally placed in the correct level band in this element of the criteria with marking being more aligned with the performances seen. Once again, centres are reminded to make use of all marks available in the criteria, rather than the top and bottom of the level marks. In addition, it was reported that some centres are awarding their candidates full marks at the top-level band, and then marking others against those candidates rather than mark against the agreed national standards, using the published assessment criteria.

Common Issues:

- Candidates continue to take responsibility for providing their own video evidence for their off-site activities, such as equestrian, boxing, dance, cycling and golf. This is often being done with little support and guidance from centres. Some centres are failing to check the quality of the evidence that is being submitted by their candidates. A contributing factor could be that an insufficient amount of time is allowed to collect the evidence and fully scrutinise it against the assessment criteria. Of more concern is that some are relying on external coaches and instructors to mark the activities without necessarily having a thorough understanding of the assessment criteria. Centres are responsible for marking all activities using the assessment criteria as they would for any activity that is centre based. It is advised that centres take responsibility to make sure that enough evidence is presented, that it is of a good quality and that it has been accurately marked against the assessment criteria. A system of internal standardisation is also recommended where there are several different people involved in the assessment process, and especially where candidates have been filmed in off-site activities.
On the plus side, it was also reported that the quality of the video footage that was filmed by some parents/guardians/coaches was of a very high quality, including very clear evidence with captions and/or commentary included to go alongside the filmed evidence.
- Timing of sessions, and the amount of video footage that was submitted, proved to be problematic for a few centres with some spending too long, or too little, on the skills in isolation, or the application of skills in a formal/competitive situation. It is necessary, as has already been stated, that centres show all elements of the assessment criteria to be able to justify the marks that candidates have been awarded. The skills in isolation need to be demonstrated in progressively demanding situations, and appropriate to the marks that have been awarded to the candidates, followed by small sided conditioned games, followed by a competitive game/full performance or routine. The length of each will have many variables, including the number of candidates taking part in the moderation

as well as the effective planning and delivery of the practices. It is **not necessary** for the moderator to see the candidates performing a warm-up although for health and safety reasons it is essential that candidates are physically and mentally prepared for a practical session. The performance of the skills in isolation should meet the requirements of the assessment criteria as listed. It is expected that each skill is repeated to show consistency of quality performance, and to show justification of the marks that have been awarded. Performing a high serve once in badminton is insufficient evidence to enable a moderator to see the quality of the performance. If a moderator does not see both and/or enough evidence of the assessment criteria it is unlikely that they will agree with the centres' marks, as they can only make their judgement based on the evidence provided.

- It is acknowledged that teacher-assessors were asked to collect a 'basket of evidence' to arrive at their Teacher Assessed Grades (TAGs) last series. However, that is not the requirement for the moderation process. It was reported that several centres submitted evidence of more than one competitive situation to justify the marks for the assessment of the application of skills, techniques and decision making, such as for the football activity. It is not necessary to submit two/three hours' worth of evidence for each candidate in their chosen activity. The assessment and moderation evidence should be based on the evidence from one performance, which should be the candidates' 'best' performance, and which includes evidence of all/most assessment traits to justify the marks that have been awarded. Similarly, to having a visiting moderator, where each activity session would be approximately one hour in length to cover both the moderation of the skills in isolation and the application of skills. Additional evidence could be provided in video format where the moderated candidate plays/performs at a higher level than the centre provides, in which case the moderator would view **one example of a competitive game/performance/routine**. The same is applicable to the swimming activity, where it is a requirement to offer **one** swimming stroke.
- It has been reported that some centres are not showing the skills in isolation separately to the competitive situation, namely in equestrian, dance, swimming, and athletics. It is a requirement that centres show candidates demonstrating the skills as listed in the assessment criteria outside of the competitive performance or routine. In the dance activity for example, candidates should perform the listed skills, as appropriate, and repeat the skills a couple of times in context and to appropriate music; for example, one of the skills could be travel, in which case they could demonstrate travelling down the room from corner to corner; the skill of elevation could also be demonstrated in this format. In swimming, there is an expectation that candidates can demonstrate all the skills listed in the criteria; they should be observed performing a length showing each of the

skills if the pool is 20m long for instance; in which case they would perform one length showing arm action, followed by one length performing the leg action, until all skills have been shown. Obviously, It is possible to combine the skills of breathing technique and body position. As in the case of athletics it is not necessary that candidates perform the skills in isolation over the whole distance of the event.

- It is only possible for centres to assess activities that appear on the approved list in the specification - it is not permitted to deviate from this list. Meeting Local Needs (MLN) is no longer applicable to the current specification.
- It is a centre's responsibility to read the assessment criteria carefully to ensure that all the requirements are being met, including the dance activity where it is a requirement for candidates who are taking part in a group dance to perform in a group of no more than five performers. Some centres are continuing to film dance performances i.e., shows where there is a large number taking part and which is more than the stated numbers. The reason why the number of five has been stipulated is so that candidates can achieve all the listed assessment traits using a best fit approach to marking. In addition, 5 v 5 competitive football games are not included in the current activity list.

Video Moderations:

Although many UK-based centres welcomed the opportunity to have a live moderation, due to the pandemic, it was not possible to offer international centres a visiting moderator this year. UK-based centres were also given the option to submit their evidence using the Learner Work Transfer (LWT) portal. This allowed centres to submit their evidence safely and securely.

Where a live visit takes place and includes the moderation of video evidence, centres are reminded that a suitable, private room should be provided for the moderator to view the video evidence.

It is acknowledged that filming any activity is challenging, although the importance of providing clear and adequate evidence to justify the marks that have been awarded by the teacher-assessors cannot be underestimated.

The full list of guidelines and requirements concerning the recording of the practical performances can be found in the specification in **Appendix 4: Recording practical performances**. Furthermore, a document entitled '[Guidance on Video Recording](#)' is available to download from the Pearson subject webpage.

Mixed reports were received about the quality of videos viewed this year. There are still several issues which prevent moderators from seeing the justification of marks that have been awarded to candidates, at the higher levels.

These are as follows:

- Candidates are not introducing themselves at the beginning of every activity or wearing sufficiently clear forms of identification throughout the activities. The latter can be achieved **by candidates wearing coloured and/or numbered bibs with numbers being worn on the back and front of the bibs/shirts**. White numbers/letters on red bibs appears to be very clear on film. This is also applicable to centre visit's live moderations.
- In some cases, candidates introduced themselves at the beginning of an activity wearing one bib i.e., the skills in isolation, and then wore a different bib when participating in another part of the film i.e., the application of skills, which made it very difficult for the moderator to identify them.
- Video evidence should not be submitted as a series of clips, especially from different times. Rather it should be presented as one piece of continuous footage, although the skills in isolation and the application of skills can be filmed separately.
- Some centres are showing either too little or too much footage as evidence. Just as in the case for a live moderation, all evidence must be shown from both elements of the assessment criteria. Where it is a requirement that candidates demonstrate 4 skills in isolation, it is necessary only to show that number – no more and no less. The skills should be performed in progressively and increasingly demanding and challenging situations and shown in context of the activity being performed. **The application of skills should be shown as one game** (as has previously been stated) – if football, netball, hockey, handball, basketball, rugby, for example, and consist of two halves of approximately a minimum of 10-15 minutes. If showing rock climbing the three best climbs on a wall of appropriate level of difficulty should be shown, or in skiing the candidate should be filmed 'attacking' a range of increasingly challenging and difficult terrain such as moguls and narrow corridors, on red and/or black slopes – if they are accessing the higher-level marks.
- The product should be very clear evidence of a candidate's performance in an activity and include all elements of the assessment criteria. This is unlikely to be achieved using a mobile phone to capture the required level of quality of evidence, as it limits the moderator's view of the candidate's performance.
- The skills in isolation should be assessed based on the preparation, execution, and recovery of a skill/technique. The camera therefore needs to capture the whole performance of a skill, such as in badminton, tennis, and table tennis, where the shuttle/ball lands on court or on the table. Similarly, in athletics it is a requirement when filming a competitive situation such as a running event, to see the start as well as the finish.
- It is obvious that some centres are not checking the quality of the video that is being submitted, which is a pity as the moderator can only mark on what evidence they are able to see. If all evidence is not available to the moderator and it is unclear as to who or what they are watching it is likely that they will recommend an adjustment of centre marks. Centres should check the quality of the video that is viewed by or sent to the moderator

and ensure that the evidence suitably justifies the marks that have been awarded. This could also be carried out during the internal moderation stage.

Administration:

- Communication between centres and moderators was generally very good. Considering problems with submitting evidence on LWT, which some experienced, most deadlines were met. Quite a few centres left their moderation until very late in the window; whilst this is acceptable, if the submission of evidence, or visit is left until the very end of the window, there is unlikely to be much time to deal with any issues such as any requests from the moderator to provide missing evidence of any element of the assessment before the deadline date. This invariably has a knock-on effect with the other components that are assessed and moderated soon after the moderation window.
- There were several clerical errors with the transference of centre marks from the PE2MS to the Edexcel Online mark page and centres are advised to carefully read the NEA document and additional guidance for uploading evidence to the LWT platform.

It is hoped that this report will prove to be constructive in helping to raise achievement in future series.

This series has presented many challenges due to the COVID pandemic and associated restrictions. Centres are to be congratulated on playing their part in navigating their way through the challenges, by making the necessary adaptations to manage the moderation process to ensure that their candidates have had every opportunity to perform to their maximum potential and complete the practical performance component this year.

Thank you to all for your positive contribution and hard work in making a success of this moderation series.