

A-LEVEL PHYSICAL EDUCATION

7582C / Non-examined assessment Report on the Examination

7582 June 2022

Version: 1.0



After the disruption to the delivery GCE A level Physical Education, the moderation team would like to recognise the efforts made by students and centres in gathering evidence to support their practical performances in the NEA component.

Centres do now need to ensure they review the information in this report to ensure that there are improvements in centre administration. It is imperative that centres adhere to the guidance provided by the awarding organisation into how to conduct the moderation of the NEA component.

Centres are additionally advised to ensure they communicate regularly with their moderator, use the coursework advisory team where required, and ensure they have undertaken a process of internal standardisation using the OLS platform.

Administration

It has been clear that the disruption caused to examinations over the last two years has affected this part of the process more than any other. Many centres attempted to provide their evidence on cloud platforms or performance analysis software systems. In these cases, the moderator could not take material away from the centre as clearly stated in the guidance for moderation. Until guidance changes, centres must ensure that there is evidence to take away from the centre or receive via postal moderation.

Postal moderations increased this year. However, in many of these cases additional communication was needed to clarify the performance context of the students as centres had not completed the centre marksheet correctly. In addition to this the moderator team regularly had to clarify student identification in performance evidence. Centres should ensure that the appropriate form is completed and accompanies the evidence.

Practical Performance

There has been little variance in the work submitted this year across the NEA. With the incorporation of practical adjustments for COVID-19, there were no significant changes in the scoring of marks, and centres should be commended for working tirelessly to ensure they could provide the best evidence available to the moderator.

During this series the main aspects that impacted the scoring of marks were:

- 1. Centres not following the expectations laid out in both the specification and NEA guide on providing evidence that was highlights of performance and not un-interrupted evidence.
- 2. Centres need to ensure that practical performance provides evidence to support the mark awarded by the centre and that the timeline accompanying this clearly covers the Area of Assessment selected by the moderator. Centres should remember that evidencing a range of skills repeated in the performance is what they are aiming for.
- 3. Where centres were using alternative performance levels as part of the COVID-19 adjustments, centres often did not make this clear on the centre marksheet at submission.
- 4. Centres are reminded that students are not expected to present their evidence. This is something that has become more frequent, often placing undue stress on students. For Area of Assessment 1 and 2, moderators are reviewing the accuracy of marking of the students technical execution in a performance context. In Area of Assessment 3 there are elements of decision

making that could be covered by additional detail in the commentary form. Students cannot gain marks through the quality of the presentation.

Analysis of Performance

The volume of this piece of work is continuing to increase in size. Centres should take some guidance from the work provided on OLS. In addition to this there are a large number of centres where all students are using the same causes and corrective measures. Whilst this is not a rubric infringement, it causes some concerns as to the authenticity of students' work when many of the sections are very similar. Additionally, students are trying to 'fit' a theory to a weakness rather than select something more appropriate.

During this series the main aspects that impacted the scoring of marks were:

- 1. Students are making the error of completing Area of Assessment 1 in the analysis section. The A-level work requires the completion of analysis of Area of Assessment 2 and 3.
- 2. There are still inaccuracies in marking of the evaluation section. This occurs where centres are unclear about depth and or breadth. Centres should ensure that they familiarise themselves with the materials on OLS, and the guidance provided in the NEA guide.
- 3. In the analysis section centres are still crediting large amounts of information about the technical model/elite performance, as opposed the quality of performance analysis and errors observed. Additionally, students need to be clearer on the impact on technical execution and performance outcome.
- 4. In the evaluation section, centres should ensure they recognise the theoretical coverage provided by the students. Students must be clear about the theoretical aspect they wish to use to explain their weakness(es). Centres should use the information provided in the NEA guide to ensure that students clearly identify the topic and provide the appropriate specification coverage.
- 5. The issue of depth and breadth has also provided an issue for centre marking this year. Students must ensure that each cause/corrective measure that is discussed is done so consistently.
- 6. In the evaluation section students need to ensure that the corrective measure has an impact on the cause. For example, stress management techniques have been selected a lot this series by students but very few explain how it will affect the cognitive and somatic aspects or arousal, ie how it will physiologically and neurologically reduce muscle tension, lower heart rate etc.

Key learning for centres to consider from this series:

- 1. Centres must follow the guidance provided when producing evidence to send to the moderator. At this time online sharing of evidence is not permitted.
- 2. Students should be clearly identified in a document accompanying all centre evidence.
- 3. If annotating the Analysis and Evaluation work, use the headings on the level of response grids to highlight where work should be credited.

- 4. Centres should only show evidence of the Area of Assessment selected by the moderator. When preparing for the moderation visit it is important that centres use the specification to ensure they understand the skills/tactics required in that area of assessment, and avoid discussions about others.
- 5. In the analysis section ensure that weakness(es) are taken directly from the skills/tactics in the specification (v1.2).
- 6. The analysis should be linked to specific performances and not a generic discussion about what the performer 'should do'. The analysis should not include strengths in performance.
- 7. Standalone sections on elite performers are not credited as students should be drawing direct comparisons as part of their analysis.
- 8. In the evaluation section centres must ensure that they are fully conversant with the expectations of depth. This should include the depth of theory knowledge as well as applied knowledge evident through the application of the corrective measure such as a training plan, or stress management strategy plan.
- 9. The students must explain the link between the cause and the weakness as well as the link between the corrective measure and the cause. This latter aspect should see students explain how the corrective measure will change or address the theoretical cause, rather than how it will improve the performance which is not credit worthy.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the <u>Results Statistics</u> page of the AQA Website.