

AS AND A LEVEL

Moderators' report

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

H155/H555

For first teaching in 2016

H155/03 and H555/04 Summer 2019 series

Version 1

Contents

Introduction	3
General overview	4
Administrative and Mark Submission Comments	5
Common Errors	6
Avoiding potential malpractice.....	10
Helpful resources.....	10




Would you prefer a Word version?

Did you know that you can save this pdf as a Word file using Acrobat Professional?

Simply click on **File > Save As Other ...** and select **Microsoft Word**

(If you have opened this PDF in your browser you will need to save it first. Simply right click anywhere on the page and select **Save as ...** to save the PDF. Then open the PDF in Acrobat Professional.)

If you do not have access to Acrobat Professional there are a number of **free** applications available that will also convert PDF to Word (search for *pdf to word converter*).





We value your feedback

We'd like to know your view on the resources we produce. By clicking on the icon above you will help us to ensure that our resources work for you.

Introduction

Our Moderators' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on centres' assessment of moderated work, based on what has been observed by our moderation team. These reports include a general commentary of accuracy of internal assessment judgements; identify good practice in relation to evidence collation and presentation and comments on the quality of centre assessment decisions against individual Learning Objectives. This report also highlights areas where requirements have been misinterpreted and provides guidance to centre assessors on requirements for accessing higher mark bands. Where appropriate, the report will also signpost to other sources of information that centre assessors will find helpful.

OCR completes moderation of centre-assessed work in order to quality assure the internal assessment judgements made by assessors within a centre. Where OCR cannot confirm the centre's marks, we may adjust them in order to align them to the national standard. Any adjustments to centre marks are detailed on the Moderation Adjustments report, which can be downloaded from Interchange when results are issued. Centres should also refer to their individual centre report provided after moderation has been completed. In combination, these centre-specific documents and this overall report should help to support centres' internal assessment and moderation practice for future series.

General overview

June 2019 was the second year of assessment for the new A Level Physical Education specification, with many centres now clearly much more comfortable with the slightly changed assessment protocols. The focus of assessment remains the same, with the two elements of Performance or Coaching and the Evaluation and Analysis of Performance for Improvement (EAPI) each generating 30 marks.

Following the introduction of the new specification, June 2018 resulted in a significant amount of mark adjustments for centres, both in the Performance or Coaching element and the EAPI. While there was still evidence in the June 2019 series that some centres had not made adjustments to their assessment methodology and application of the assessment criteria, others had clearly taken on board the comments raised by moderators in 2018 both at live moderation and on the centre's Moderator's Report Form (ModRep) and made significant adaptations to their assessment process. The most common mark adjustment in the June 2019 series again coming from over assessment in the EAPI component.

There were significantly less centres entering candidates for AS certification this year, perhaps reflecting a lesser need by centres to 'test the waters', as had been the case for some centres in previous sittings of this specification.

Grade boundaries for both H555/04 and H155/03 June 2019 illustrate a more even distribution of marks across the mark range of 60. This more balanced distribution clearly reflecting that despite A Level Physical Education being a specialist subject, only top level candidates have the technical, tactical and performance expertise to access marks at the upper end of the highest assessment levels.

Administrative and Mark Submission Comments

Hard copies of the PEMIF should be received by the moderator no later than March 31st and while most centres adhered to this deadline some still continue to submit their centre's documentation after this deadline. This has a significant knock on effect as moderators cannot finalise the activities, candidates and timings required at live moderation until all marks have been received. Centres should make sure that Macros are enabled once the PEMIF has been opened; otherwise the data entered will not total and will not carry through to populate the areas at the end of this form.

Centres are reminded that activity submissions for each candidate should contain not only the candidate's final mark but also an identification of the position/role/genre that they have been assessed in. There should also be clear indication on the activity form within PEMIF of the performance time and/or distance achieved for Athletics, Swimming and Cycling. The candidates log book is useful here and should contain copies of times achieved. An 'official' hard copy of times/distances or a link to evidence found in Power of 10 can also be supplied to the moderator. In other activities, for example cricket, where marks are given for both fielding and/or batting, a mark for each of these components must also be included on the PEMIF. The PEMIF will then total the two marks into one final mark for you.

A hard copy of the centre's iMS1 should also be submitted to the moderator by the March 31st deadline. This document is used by moderators to cross check that candidate marks entered on the Final Practical Activity Form of the PEMIF correlate with the iMS1. The mark on the iMS1 is used to generate a candidate's grade, not the PEMIF mark and so it is therefore vital that marks are transferred correctly. Centres are advised to cross check the transfer of marks and subsequent submission of the iMS1 before final submission on the Interchange. There were a number of clerical errors here this year which moderators corrected.

In conjunction with hard copies of the PEMIF and iMS1, centres should also submit video footage of ALL off-site activities, together with a sample of at least six candidates performing a range of on-site activities. Full details of the practical video footage requirements can be found in sections 3c.3, 3c.4 and Appendix B of the Guide to Non-exam Assessment (NEA). Furthermore, candidate EAPI video footage should also be included in the dispatch. Details of the EAPI sample size can be found in sections 2d.1 (AS) and 2d.2 (A Level) in the Guide to NEA.

Coaching logs, coaching videos and the coaching assessment checklist also form part of the March 31st dispatch.

Candidate competitive logs should also be included in the March 31st dispatch, either as hard copies or as a folder within the practical video footage. Competitive logs should detail the level that the candidate performs at i.e. school, club name, league name, senior/colts/1st team, etc., as well as the outcome/time/distance of the performance. Competitive logs should only contain full competitive performance information. We do not require details of their training sessions.

Dispatch to Moderator Checklist

As a check list for centres the following should be included in the dispatch to the moderator by March 31st:

- PEMIF Final Practical Activity Form
- PEMIF EAPI Form
- PEMIF Activity Forms for each activity
- iMS1 Form
- Video footage of ALL off-site activities
- Video footage of a sample of on-site activities
- Coaching logs, coaching videos and coaching assessment sheets
- Candidate competitive logs
- EAPI video footage

Common Errors

There has been evidence of excellent application of the assessment criteria for both the practical component and the EAPI, with many centres clearly taking on board the guidance provided during the June 2018 moderation process, thereby resulting in no change to the marks submitted by some centres.

Many centres had, this year, clearly addressed anomalies in the assessment of the practical component and more accurately applied the assessment criteria throughout the centre's activities, perhaps by way of more rigorous internal standardisation or meeting with other centres within their cluster to take part in a 'mock moderation'. Equally, a lot of centres had clearly adopted a more robust approach to the oral assessment and consequently more closely followed the guidelines in the Guide to Non-exam Assessment both in terms of the structure of the EAPI and the application of the assessment criteria.

However, there were still numerous instances where an adjustment to centre marks was necessary, in some cases to both the practical and the EAPI components or in other cases only with reference to the EAPI. Your individual centres moderation report this year does indicate which component there was an issue with and gives detailed feedback on the reasons for this.

The details below illustrate elements of centre assessments that might ultimately have resulted in an overall adjustment to a centre's marks.

The Practical Component

- Some centres seemed to only assess some of the five elements of the mark scheme. You must assess all of the five areas of; Range of Skills, Quality of Skills, Physical Attributes, Decision Making and Effective Performance.
- Misunderstanding of the mark scheme and what constitutes 'outstanding', or 'excellent', e.g. an outstanding standard of accuracy, demonstrates excellent awareness of and response to other performers; thereby awarding marks too generously either within a level or between levels. An outstanding level of competition for an 18 year old is not playing for a school team or a local club.
- Candidates must demonstrate both core and advanced skills within an activity profile, we must be able to see everything that they are capable of.

- A lack of 'official' supporting evidence to authenticate performance where activities are linked to performance tables i.e. Swimming, Athletics and Cycling. Again, we must be able to see that what they can do and see evidence of this.
- Limited or no differentiation between components within an activity, where each component is assessed independently, e.g. cricket, fielding and batting/bowling.

Practical Video Evidence

There were some issues which centres need to think about here, if we take the following starting points this may help clarify:

- 1) The moderator does not know your student, nor what they are capable of.
- 2) The moderator must be able to identify each student.
- 3) The moderator must be able to see everything they need to see to confirm the mark you have given.

Some of the footage this year had a number of issues with it, meaning that candidates' marks had to be adjusted.

- Candidates not clearly identified on the video footage submitted, thereby rendering it almost impossible for moderators to effectively reflect on the performance viewed.
- Inappropriate performance scenarios, e.g. 5-a-side football as opposed to a full 11-a-side game, Skiing evidence not in a competitive context, only one ten contact routine submitted in Trampolining, drills only in evidence in a Netball context with no full performance footage.
- Filming positions preventing a clear view of the candidate both when 'on the ball' and/or in a tactical/positional scenario.

Overall this meant that a lot of video evidence did not supporting the mark given to the candidate by the centre.

Centres are reminded that the competitive element is compulsory and must be included, without it marks will be adjusted.

Coaching

There was evidence of some keen and enthusiastic coaching, where candidates had real rapport with their coaching group and had clearly spent many weeks committing themselves to the development of their students.

There was however, evidence of over generous assessment in this element of H555/04 for the some or all of the reasons identified below;

- Planning and organisation did not fulfil the rubric specified in the Guide to Non-exam Assessment.
- Coaching was not with the same group for the 20 week (A Level) 10 week (AS Level) duration.
- The level and or age of the students in the coaching group precluded candidates from demonstrating their knowledge, understanding and coaching expertise within the advance skills identified on the activity profile. Using very young children does not allow the candidates to demonstrate and coach advanced skills or use advanced coaching skills and this does limit the marks they achieve as a result.
- Video evidence supplied was of inadequate length i.e. the requirement of two filmed sessions of a minimum of 40 minutes duration was not fulfilled.

- Video footage was shot too far away from the coach, thereby making it very difficult, or in some cases impossible, to hear the instructions and comments given to the coaching group. We must be able to hear what they are saying as well as see them. Filming from the back also adds issues as we cannot see their expressions or gestures.
- Candidates would lead rather than coach. And while many were competent in their delivery of the coaching points, for many there were limitations in their evaluation and fault correction of the individuals within the group.
- Limited or no correlation between marks given to candidate assessments in practical performance and those offering coaching, thereby reflecting a lack of internal standardisation.
- Candidate log book evaluations did not include both self and group analysis.

EAPI

The first year of assessment of H555/04 in June 2018 resulted in a significant number of centre mark adjustments in this component and so it was pleasing to see that many centres had acted on the moderator feedback provided both at live moderation and on the Moderator's Report Form (ModRep) in readiness for this year's assessments.

There were this year however still a significant number of centres with mark adjustments. Details of areas resulting in potential mark reduction are identified below;

- All areas of the mark scheme were not applied to the candidates work i.e. Planning and Organisation, Delivery, Technical Knowledge, Evaluation and Reflection.
- Centres encouraging candidates to identify a specific number of strengths and weaknesses in skills, tactics and fitness. The number of which should actually be dictated by the candidate and based on the performance viewed.
- Limited or no justification of the impact to performance/overall success in relation to the strengths and weaknesses identified.
- Failure to justify both the reason for the weakness identified for improvement in the action plan and the selected timescale for improvement. In many instances candidates simply indicated that the selected timescale would 'allow time for improvement/physiological adaptations to take place' without adding specific detail as to why or how this might occur.
- Limited coaching points to support the weakness identified for improvement.
- Limited adaptations to the action plan in relation to progression made.
- Limited or no identification as to how the action plan could be measured.
- The main area of issue was that a significant number of centres work did not include applied theoretical comments from Components H555/ 01, 02 and 03 to both the evaluative comments (strengths and weaknesses) and the action plan. Theory must come in to both sections of the EAPI and not just in the action plan at the end.
- Comments relating to the Socio-cultural component of the specification were in many cases lacking in context or simply 'bolt on' non-applied comments relating to areas such as; progression pathways, national governing body structure and historical factors, rather than applied comments relating to the performer viewed. All theory used should relate to the performance viewed and the commentary being given by the candidate.

Recording of Oral Assessment

- It should be noted by all centres that candidates should not have the need to exceed a maximum of 30 minutes for the H555/04 EAPI and 15/20 minutes for the AS EAPI.
- It is a requirement for all centres that the video/live footage viewed by the candidates is available to the moderator. A number of centres allowed the viewing of a live performance and did not record this for the moderator.
- Candidate oral responses should take place immediately after the observation of an appropriate performance. Centres will be referred for malpractice should there be evidence that this does not happen.
- Further clarification of the control requirements for the oral assessment can be found in section 2d.3 of the Guide to Non-exam Assessment.
- Centres are reminded that this is an exam and as such pre-prepared notes are not permitted. Candidates may not type up their answers and simply read it out to camera – this is malpractice and will be treated as such.
- Candidates may only take in blank paper and a pen; they make notes while they are watching their performance and they then do their talk.

Avoiding potential malpractice

In order to avoid issues relating to potential malpractice, centres should be mindful of the following;

- Clear visual identification of candidates on video footage, before the commencement of their performance should be available.
- Availability and adherence to the video evidence sample requirements in both the practical and EAPI components.
- The inclusion of supporting 'official' authentication for activities where performance tables form part of the assessment.
- The use of pre-prepared notes in the EAPI oral assessment is prohibited. This includes the taking in of textbooks, class notes and anything other than blank paper and a pen.
- Candidate responses in the EAPI oral response should take place immediately after the performance has been viewed. Viewing a game at night and then doing the talk the next morning is not allowed.
- The amount of time given to candidates to view and record comments relating to the performance observed for the EAPI must not infringe reasonable timescales, e.g. viewing an entire 90 minute football game is not acceptable.

Helpful resources

The OCR website currently contains exemplar material relating to H555/04 with further updates and exemplar material being available in September 2019. Which can be found here;

<https://www.ocr.org.uk/qualifications/as-and-a-level/physical-education-h155-h555-from-2016/assessment/>

A subject information update informing centres of any changes will be available in September 2019

INSET opportunities can be found on the OCR website, here;

<https://www.ocr.org.uk/qualifications/professional-development/upcoming-courses/?subject=Physical%20Education,%20Sport%20and%20Leisure&type=AS%20and%20A%20Level&qualification=Physical%20Education%20-%20H155,%20H555>

Supporting you

For further details of this qualification please visit the subject webpage.

Review of results

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our review of results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#). If university places are at stake you may wish to consider priority service 2 reviews of marking which have an earlier deadline to ensure your reviews are processed in time for university applications.



Review students' exam performance with our free online results analysis tool. Available for GCSE, A Level and Cambridge Nationals.

It allows you to:

- review and run analysis reports on exam performance
- analyse results at question and/or topic level*
- compare your centre with OCR national averages
- identify trends across the centre
- facilitate effective planning and delivery of courses
- identify areas of the curriculum where students excel or struggle
- help pinpoint strengths and weaknesses of students and teaching departments.

*To find out which reports are available for a specific subject, please visit ocr.org.uk/administration/support-and-tools/active-results/

Find out more at ocr.org.uk/activeresults

CPD Training

Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear exam feedback directly from a senior assessor or drop in to an online Q&A session.

Please find details for all our courses on the relevant subject page on our website.

www.ocr.org.uk

OCR Resources: *the small print*

OCR's resources are provided to support the delivery of OCR qualifications, but in no way constitute an endorsed teaching method that is required by OCR. Whilst every effort is made to ensure the accuracy of the content, OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions within these resources. We update our resources on a regular basis, so please check the OCR website to ensure you have the most up to date version.

This resource may be freely copied and distributed, as long as the OCR logo and this small print remain intact and OCR is acknowledged as the originator of this work.

Our documents are updated over time. Whilst every effort is made to check all documents, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, therefore please use the information on the latest specification at all times. Where changes are made to specifications these will be indicated within the document, there will be a new version number indicated, and a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource please contact us at: resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk.

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR, or are considering switching from your current provider/awarding organisation, you can request more information by completing the Expression of Interest form which can be found here: www.ocr.org.uk/expression-of-interest

Please get in touch if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support delivery of our qualifications: resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk

Looking for a resource?

There is now a quick and easy search tool to help find **free** resources for your qualification: www.ocr.org.uk/i-want-to/find-resources/

www.ocr.org.uk

OCR Customer Support Centre

General qualifications

Telephone 01223 553998

Facsimile 01223 552627

Email general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

OCR is part of Cambridge Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge. *For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored.*

© **OCR 2019** Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA. Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.



**Cambridge
Assessment**

