
A-LEVEL PHYSICAL EDUCATION

7582/C Non-examined assessment
Report on the Examination

7582/C
June 2023

Version: 1.0

Further copies of this Report are available from aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2023 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.
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.

Overview

After the return to a 'normal' delivery of 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 need to ensure they review the information in this report to support improvements in Centre completion of NEA. 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 continued to be advised to ensure they communicate regularly with their moderator, use the NEA advisory team where required, and ensure they have undertaken a process of internal standardisation using the OLS platform (via Centre Services on the AQA website).

Administration

Overall, Centre administration of the NEA seems to be completed well. Increasingly Centres have submitted Veo / YouTube evidence onto USB's and not sent links (compared to previous series), although there are still technical issues with this (ie downloading from Veo when not the licence holder). Centres are, however, still sending unencrypted USB's (this has an impact on the safeguarding of the materials shared with moderators).

As recommended, more often Centres are using Level of Response grids to show how the marking of each student was awarded across practical and written NEA, as well as commentary timelines (detailed) to signpost moderators to the relevant Areas of Assessments. This is good practice.

Practical Performance

With the practical component back to pre-2019 expectations, there were no significant changes in the scoring of marks, and Centres should be commended for continuing to work hard to ensure they could provide the best evidence available to the moderator. The vast majority of Centres chose a remote moderation, with live performance decreasing overall. The vast majority of evidence for practical is still in the role of performer rather than coach.

Centre's marking of practical was generally accurate for Area of Assessment 1 and Area of Assessment 2, as they produced a range of evidence to cover both core and advanced skills. However, Centres still need to ensure they have more than one event or match to cover the range. When only submitting one half/quarter/match, this is often resulting in marks being adjusted. There is still a tendency to over-mark Area of Assessment 3 as there is often a lack of evidence of tactics/strategies (signposted in the commentary timelines, equiv.) and a tendency to match marks awarded for Area of Assessment 1 and Area of Assessment 2.

Centres are reminded to check individual sports requirements from the specification, as evidence was sometimes lacking expectations such as an audience in dance (at least 10) or evidence of judging (equiv.) in aesthetic sports. This also continues into golf (having continuous footage between shots; only between holes can be edited out) and cricket (submission of scorecards etc. for bat/bowl).

Students are not expected to present their practical 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 student's 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

Most centres chose to submit in written format with a limited number combining basic written information with a verbal power-point presentation. Good practice was evident in Centres who clearly and correctly structured their work using sub-headings (often from the level of response grids).

Good clear links to competitive contexts were evident to enable the moderator to fully appreciate the sporting context in which the weaknesses occurred. When diagrams of an actual situation were included this often made the impact and explanation clearer. That said, it was still apparent that stand alone technical models/elite performer descriptions were inappropriately used, and weaker analysis sections tended to include too much on theory (eg causes of weaknesses) and on what could or might happen as opposed to describing what actually happened and what the ongoing impacts of this were.

Awarding of marks by Centres tended to be more accurate for Area of Assessment 2 than Area of Assessment 3. In Area of Assessment 2, stronger students are analysing performance well and identified weaknesses well.

For Area of Assessment 3, students made the mistake of focussing on technical aspects of a skill/s rather than the interaction with opponents and analysing matching and mis-matching with an ideal model or scenario. Whilst this section is generally being completed better than in previous series, the level of depth of analysis in Area of Assessment 3 is often less than Area of Assessment 2. Students involved in writing about individual sports could make more use of timing data and positional data than they currently do.

In response to the previous series, students are not making the error of analysing and evaluating Area of Assessment 1. The written NEA work requires the completion of analysis of Area of Assessment 2 and 3 only.

Evaluation of Performance

Good practice was evident with Centres who clearly identified the theoretical aspect of the specification (using the specification code to identify in learner work too) chosen as a focus for the evaluation sections.

The level of depth is particularly important in the evaluation section. A focus on one or two causes and corrective measures (to help overcome the causes) was the best approach to take. A number of Centres were adjusted due to taking a breadth approach involving a range of causes and corrective measures, with varying degrees of depth, which negatively diluted overall achievement.

Fitness components are still being used as causes, despite not being in the specification. Stress management techniques are commonly used as corrective measures, but invariably lack detail. Far

more detail on their application to help solve causes (such as anxiety and stress) is required, as well as a methodical approach into exactly how the skills programme would be carried out, much like a training programme.

The marking of causes tends to be more accurate. Strong students apply the knowledge to their performance to gain the higher marks but Centres are awarding higher marks when they do not.

The correction section is improving on previous years with students now relating back to cause and not to performance. Stronger students include both theory and corrective practices which link. The main issue tends to be associated when students are evaluating Area of Assessment 3 and this was often the weak link in their submissions (in line with the analysis section too), again lacking the depth in detail included. At times, there are still students focussing on drills for the corrective measures which should only be used when discussing practice types.

Key learning for Centres to consider from this series:

1. Centres must follow the guidance provided when producing evidence to send to the moderator (using the NEA Guide for reference).
2. The analysis should be linked to specific performances and not a generic discussion about what the performer 'should/could/would do'. The analysis should not include strengths in performance.
3. Standalone sections on elite performers are not credited as students should be drawing direct comparisons as part of their analysis.
4. The development of depth of analysis within Area of Assessment 3 to support students accessing higher mark bands, including further detail to outline the strategy/tactic (equiv.) and the weakness of the student within that particular context.
5. In the evaluation section, Centres must observe the expectations of depth. This should include the depth of theory knowledge (cause of weakness) as well as applied knowledge evident through the application of the corrective measure, such as a training plan, or stress management strategy plan.
6. Students must continue to explain the link between the cause and the weakness as well as the link between the corrective measure and the cause. This latter section 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.
7. In corrective measures, a detailed, methodical approach on how the measure would be carried out will enable students to access higher mark bands.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results Statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.