

**AS level Physical Education (H155)**

**OCR Report to Centres June 2017**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of learners of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the examination provides information on the performance of learners which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of learners for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this report.

© OCR 2017

## CONTENTS

### Advanced Subsidiary GCE Physical Education (H155)

#### OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
H155/01 Physiological factors affecting performance	4
H155/02 Psychological and socio-cultural themes in physical education	8
H155/03 Performance in physical education	12

## H155/01 Physiological factors affecting performance

### General Comments:

There were some very good scripts offered in response to the June 2017 H155/01 examination paper, although performance overall, expectedly for this first series, varied considerably. The new format for this specification sees two examined components for AS level and more separation of topics than on the legacy AS unit G451. The H155/01 examination has a more mixed approach in terms of short answer and 4-6 mark questions, and only one levels of response question, so the overall theme is of slightly more breadth of knowledge and understanding needing to be shown, with a little less extended writing required.

Generally speaking evidence would suggest that learners understood what was required of them throughout all 4 sections and there was almost no evidence of pupils misinterpreting questions. Examination technique was encouraging for a new specification paper. Learners clearly addressed the command words in the majority of cases in the shorter answer questions but centres will need to be aware that some of the questions which require explanation, discussion or evaluation for 2 or 3 mark questions created slightly different requirements for the learner.

In response to the 10-mark question which required longer answers and different examination technique, learners continue to show evidence of knowing the five generic criteria:

1. Knowledge and understanding
2. Development of knowledge
3. Examples
4. Technical Vocabulary and
5. Good quality of written communication.

Those achieving the top level managed to balance their answer well between immediate effects and longer term effects of jogging on the CV system.

When lower mark totals were evident, the key reason was lack of fundamental knowledge. Additionally, learners on lower marks were often careless with units for answers to equations and were not attentive enough to the command words used. Difficulties in clearly expressing knowledge led to TV (Too Vague) being stamped on responses, meaning that responses may have appeared to be along the right lines but lacked the detail or precision required to gain the mark. This was particularly evident with descriptions of inspiration during exercise.

When asked to draw diagrams in the biomechanics section learners need to be advised to keep them as simple as possible. Learners should also be reminded that all additional/continuation sheets accompanying scripts must be labelled clearly and accurately so that examiners can link them correctly to answers in learners' answer booklets. It is particularly important for learners using word processed answers to label the question number accurately.

Of particular mention for the new specification is the learners' ability to respond to shorter questions with 'evaluate' or 'explain' as the command word, meaning that learners need to consider how to convey their explanation in a slightly more over-arching way for the marks available. For example Question 1dii which asks the learner to explain how neural control of breathing causes tidal volume to increase for 2 marks. In the previous specification we would have accepted reference to the receptors and what they pick up. Now we would be expecting a link between the receptors and the control centre to gain the mark. This is necessary so that the response covers enough of the topic area to 'explain' the process with only 2 marks on offer. This may require an adjustment in how the more complicated anatomical processes are taught to allow for this change.

## Comments on Individual Questions:

### Question No. 1

Overall, the question performed quite well with learners achieving a good spread of marks.

Q1ai – Responses to this question were variable. While many were able to access the marks for movement required, they were unable to correctly name the agonists or wrote them the wrong way round. Muscle names were quite often spelt inaccurately.

Q1aii - Generally answered well. Many learners achieving a BOD for fast 'glycotic' instead of glycolytic. 'Fast twitch' on its own was judged 'too vague'.

Q1aiii - Mixed responses largely due to exam technique in general for this question – knowledge was often quiet good but did not explain the point and therefore could not be credited with two marks.

Q1bi – Point one from the Mark Scheme was awarded frequently on this question and then some also gained point 3. Weaker students sometimes hit point 5 indirectly, while often some key words were used but not always in context. There were quite a lot of potential things learners could write for this answer. Learners seemed to get 0 or 2. Many were writing a lot and using extra paper for this question.

Q1bii - Was generally answered well although often learners got the planes the wrong way around. Good examples, with the large majority using star jump and bicep curl. Very often learners went into a great amount of detail with their example which became confusing and thus 'too vague.' Also some weren't accurate enough, for example 'kicking a ball'. A high proportion believed the movement occurred in the way the body was split e.g. frontal, split front and back therefore movement front to back (flexion/extension). Some got frontal/sagittal the wrong way around, or were very vague in their descriptions. A few attempted diagrams but these were usually not clear enough to score points 1 or 3.

Q1c – Learners often wrote a lot for three marks. Some learners referred to the conduction system and made this the focus of their answer, ignoring the 'contractions' of the muscles and the requisite movement of blood through the system. Many did not access the marks for diastolic because they didn't mention the 'relaxation' of the heart muscle.

Q1di - While many knew the equation and thus came up with the correct numbers there was a poor use of units in this question which often saw L/m used as opposed to L/min.

Q1dii - Learners generally scored quite low marks on this question – point one awarded the most often but often lots of writing about all receptors and then no progression further down the mark scheme - again often key words were seen but these did not develop into full answers. Most learners just focused on naming the receptors and their roles and therefore scored 0 as they did not mention RCC.

## Question No. 2

Overall this was a slightly weaker topic area in terms of the quality of response. Very few learners accessed full marks for IHT; exam technique impacted on performance in question 2bii and there were mixed responses for the periodization question.

Q2a - Quite poorly answered overall. Many looked at altitude training or only addressed the benefits and risks and did not do the first part of the question. Points 2 and 5 from the mark scheme were awarded most often.

Q2bi – Generally well answered.

Q2bii - Learners found it difficult to make decent reference to the game of football. Quite poor knowledge shown here; points 1, 2 and 3 were key but only when linked to the game – which many did not do.

Q2ci – Exam technique in terms of learners' ability to link knowledge to the gymnast was the main issue here. The reference to fibre affecting a gymnast was recognised to be difficult and thus BOD was given for correct reference to the effect of fibre on an individual. Learners often did not relate to training and performance, they also wrote a lot for 3 marks, going into details of all the different vitamins.

Q2cii - Generally well answered many getting 'weight gain' and 'repair of muscle'.

Q2d – Unfortunately this was a poorly answered question – lots of responses showed some understanding but learners found it hard to explain what they knew. Point three proved hard to explain without using the term competitive. Most learners had the right idea about phases of training with some getting 6/6. Some neglected to describe the objective for each phase or didn't use a sporting example. Learners should be reminded that they can't score using a repeat of the question (e.g. 'Prepare' for preparatory phase; 'competing' for competitive phase).

Q2e

## Question No. 3

Overall the biomechanical aspects were the most successfully answered of the sections, with what proved to be several accessible questions. Much greater clarity was required for full marks on question 3ei particularly in identifying the effort and load arms.

Q3ai – Well answered question. Some learners opted for 'D' when unsure which then carried onto an incorrect answer for 3aii. Some were incorrect on 3ai but managed to explain correctly in 3aii.

Q3aii – Well answered question.

Q3bi ii iii - Many learners seemed keen to use all three of the laws as opposed to answering the ones required.

Q3ci - Points 2 and 3 on the mark scheme were most commonly awarded; Point 1 was very rarely attempted and awarded.

Q3cii– Well answered question.

Q3d – Fairly good subject knowledge with many achieving half marks on the first section. Some excellent answers were seen in the second section with excellent terminology and sporting examples. Weaker learners used surface area and often missed sporting examples. Very few accessed point 8 on the mark scheme. Points 4-8 were not well covered as students often did not give the effects on air resistance or mixed up factors and examples. Maximum marks were accessed by a few but many got bogged down with reaction forces when describing the effect of weight in the first part. Common mistakes in second part were not referring to how each factor affected AR and stating surface area (tv), size, weight, wind and clothing (tv) as factors.

Q3ei – Point 1 was achieved by many; very little knowledge of effort arm and load arm was shown. Diagrams varied quite widely and those that struggled often attempted to draw the ankle joint and apply the fulcrum, load and effort, which became very confusing to interpret. They were also then unable to include the load and effort arms.

Q3eii – Responses were often not linked to the foot or to a practical example. Quite often the example was very vague (i.e. kicking a ball). Some stated the movement e.g. plantar flexion but with no sports example and others gave sports examples but with no reference to which joint/position of the 2<sup>nd</sup> class lever. Also many did get it wrong even when they had got lever system correct; bicep curl was a popular response.

Q3eiii - Points 1 and 2 awarded in stronger responses; 3, 4, and 5 were rarely, if at all, accessed.

Q4 - Most learners scored between 3-6 marks. Only a handful of learners accessed Level 3; common errors included:

- having a lot of irrelevant work, particularly in the first part: discussing immediate effects on cardiac or respiratory system NOT vascular (limiting marks to Level 1)
- just listing CV diseases with limited knowledge and understanding shown
- including long term adaptations in the immediate effects section

Many wrote about the immediate effects on the cardiac and respiratory systems and not the vascular.

Very few demonstrated more developed points on CV diseases, although many did apply examples, with a handful discussing negative impacts.

Once again with an extended answer question with two parts, learners found it difficult balancing the two parts effectively.

## **H155/02 Psychological and socio-cultural themes in physical education**

### **General Comments:**

There were some excellent scripts submitted as part of the new H155/02 paper, however performance varied greatly. Overall learners showed strongest knowledge in the skill acquisition section of the paper, and were weakest in the socio-cultural element. On the whole learners interpreted the questions correctly but many struggled to show AO2 application of knowledge and understanding, especially in questions where the sporting examples or scenarios were provided in the question and responses needed to be in reference to these.

In the new format 10 mark question learners usually showed excellent AO1 (recall) knowledge but their ability to apply their response to a sporting context (AO2) restricted many to the middle grade band. Learners who achieved in the top band consistently applied sporting examples throughout their response. In the extended answer questions the guidance to Centres is to ensure that learners apply sporting examples throughout their writing, even if it is not specifically referred to in the question.

The majority of learners showed good examination technique and were succinct in their answers, particularly on the questions worth 3 marks or less. However, in the longer (5 mark) responses there was often a significant amount of repetition, which necessitated the use of additional answer sheets. Learners should be reminded that all continuation sheets or separate answer booklets must be labelled accurately with the question number so that examiners can link them correctly to the main body of their answer. Learners should also avoid writing in the margins of the page.

### **Comments on Individual Questions:**

#### **Question No. 1**

Overall learners performed best in the skill acquisition section. For the most part learners demonstrated good knowledge but their ability to apply their knowledge to sporting examples let them down. Learners found the application of Bandura's model challenging and often gave responses that included a generic description of the theory rather than applying this knowledge to the table tennis example provided.

Q1ai - Most learners identified the correct practice method.

Q1aii - Most learners performed well on this question; whole practice was the most common answer given. Learners generally provided an accurate explanation, although a number of learners gave a justification which did not match the practice type stated.

Q1aiii - Most learners were able to identify a correct practice method, some struggled to justify their chosen method in relation to the triple jump, and a large number of BOD marks were awarded. Whole practice was the most common answer.

Q1bi - Generally learners were able to give accurate definitions and examples; the most common example given was the use of swimming floats. Those who did not score well on this question tended to confuse mechanical and manual guidance.



Q1bii - Learners generally demonstrated effective examination technique and provided a good mixture of positives and negatives. There were a small minority of learners who simply repeated their answer to the previous question thus providing unnecessary repetition.

Q1ci – ‘Knowledge of results’ and ‘extrinsic’ feedback were given equally as the correct answer to this question. This was one of the weaker responses in this section as learners often struggled to identify the correct type of feedback; this meant they could not then score any marks on the subsequent question.

Q1cii - Some learners could not access any marks on this question as their answer to the previous question was incorrect. Learners who did access marks often gave very generic comments which were not specific to the type of feedback they had identified. A common mistake was also that ‘knowledge of results’ identifies weaknesses and errors in technique.

Q1di - Most learners were able to accurately identify the elements of Bandura’s model; retention and motor reproduction were the most common answers given. Explanations were not always accurate enough to gain marks, especially when describing motor reproduction and lots of BODs were awarded here. Learners often did not apply their knowledge to the example provided in the question (table tennis) and responded with generic terms such as ‘the demonstration’ or ‘the observer.’

As a delivery point moving forwards, this question is a good example of the new assessment objective requirements on these specifications. Where marks have been designated as being AO2 application of knowledge and understanding and a practical scenario or context such as this is given, learners need to be very clear in applying their response to the situation as the marks are being awarded for application of knowledge and understanding to this scenario, in line with Ofqual expectations.

Q1dii - This question was generally answered well, with most learners able to access both marks; the most common answer was ‘role models.’ The question specified ‘two reasons,’ therefore only learners’ first two answers were awarded marks; some learners provided multiple answers and often required unnecessary additional answer space.

## Question 2

Throughout this section learners showed good AO1 knowledge but again struggled to apply their knowledge to the examples given in the questions. It was evident that the knowledge of the ‘Zone of Optimal Functioning’ was an area of weakness for many learners. In this response many talked about other theories of arousal or could not apply their knowledge to the given context.

Q2ai - Learners gave a wide variety of definitions, most referred to traits and characteristics in their response to gain the mark.

Q2aii - Generally this was well answered, although some learners contradicted themselves and did not gain the mark as they referred to other theories in their response.

Q2aiii - Higher level responses were able to provide accurate definitions related to an appropriate example from a team sport. Many learners showed good theoretical knowledge but did not provide the required example. Some learners’ explanations were intertwined with their sporting example often resulting in BOD being awarded.

2bi - The majority of learners identified the correct stage. Conflict within the team was the most common feature identified. Higher level learners were able to identify additional features of this stage with many providing more than was required for the 2 marks available.

2bii - Learners generally struggled with this question; most were unable to identify the correct faulty process with many stating 'communication losses' which is not a concept specific to Steiner's theory. Answers were often too vague simply stating 'motivation' as the faulty process. Higher level learners correctly identified the process and attributed their answers to individuals within the team rather than the team as a whole.

2ci - Learners often struggled with this response but some were able to identify state anxiety as the cause.

2cii - Some were able to demonstrate a good level of knowledge and apply it successfully to the example provided. A number of learners did not accurately apply their response to the example given often making irrelevant comments such as 'the other gymnast may be a cognitive level performer'. Many also responded incorrectly with other theories of arousal.

2di – This question was answered well by most learners.

2dii – The majority of learners were able to describe the basics of the theory. Higher level responses provided some evaluative points (points 6-9 on the mark scheme). A number of learners referred to catharsis in their answer but often linked this to overcoming the obstacle rather than catharsis through aggression; they were awarded Too Vague (TV) for this aspect of the question.

### Question 3

Most learners were able to show a good level of knowledge in this section of the paper. However, examination technique was a restricting factor for many, particularly on the longer answer questions where answers were often repetitive. Higher level responses demonstrated good knowledge of the media and the Olympics.

3ai - Most learners addressed both aspects of the question however, answers were often repetitive, giving the same point of the mark scheme for both social classes. Lots of learners gave correct facts related to transport and education but they did not link their answer to 'opportunity', and the lack of sporting examples often limited their ability to gain credit. Learners often wrote on additional sheets of paper and struggled to be succinct in their response.

3aai - Most learners answered well; those who did not gain the mark often had not made links to participation.

3bi - Most learners answered correctly. The most common error was to reverse William and John.

3bii - Where learners applied their answer to the names and dates provided they achieved full marks and showed an excellent level of understanding. Some learners showed a good understanding of the socio-cultural factors but did not answer with reference to the given table.

3c- Most learners answered well, higher level learners were able to provide a range of positive and negative impacts. Learners at the lower grade levels tended to provide answers that were repetitive and simply described the types of media available.

3di – A number of learners showed good recall knowledge; however it was evident this was an area of the syllabus that many had not covered in detail. The question specified 'two reasons,' therefore only the first two answers given were worthy of credit. Some learners provided multiple answers which required additional answer space but they need to be made aware that where a number is specified for the response only that number will be considered for credit.

3dii - A number of learners answered this question very effectively; however, weaker responses simply repeated the answer to the previous question and did not recall accurate names, places or dates.

#### **Question 4**

Most learners were able to provide accurate definitions of the theories of arousal, showing good AO1 skills. However, a number of learners gave definitions where the terms arousal and performance were reversed; this resulted in TV (too vague) being awarded. Many learners provided diagrams but these were often not labelled correctly (many did not identify or label the axis), or referred to in their answers. Learners rarely explained the inverted U theory in detail, failing to progress beyond a basic description of the curve. Learners at the higher level were able to discuss the impact of cognitive and somatic arousal in relation to the catastrophe theory.

Where learners discussed the stage of learning this was generally well answered and higher level learners often provided sporting examples to support their work. The best learners showed equal balance and detail for both the stages of learning and the type of skill, accurately applying examples throughout. Weaker answers often did not answer both parts of the question or showed inaccuracies in their responses; this was particularly true in their discussion of the effect of arousal on the different learning stages.

Very few learners included any sporting examples in their response, thus limiting the grade they could achieve. Given that AO2 application of knowledge and understanding is embedded in the generic levels descriptors for these extended response questions, learners need to be made aware that they should always seek to show their ability to use practical examples and apply what they know to the context of the question set.

## H155/03 Performance in physical education

Although the new H155 specification is not a radical departure from the legacy G452 & G454 units, there are enough alterations, such as a new assessment criteria across 6 levels and the introduction of application of theory within the EAPI, to ensure that we are no longer directly following the same assessment path as in the legacy specification.

Moderators, host centres and all attending centres worked extremely well this year in order to enable the moderation process to occur effectively and to ensure that alongside the assessment process, detailed feedback was provided as to the reasons for the grades awarded.

The number of candidate entries was significantly lower than in the legacy G452 specification over previous years which highlights that most centres have decided to follow the course as a full linear GCE. It is hoped that those centres who will be entering candidates in 2018 for the H555 specification were able to gather a good grounding in the new assessments at moderation.

Although there was a need for many adjustments across both the practical and EAPI sections of the Non-Exam Assessment, it was felt that the process was a successful one. The final Grade Award for an A grade was 45/60 (equivalent to Practical 23 & EAPI 22) and an E grade was 21/60 (equivalent to Practical 11 and EAPI 10).

### Paperwork Submissions

The new version of the PEMIF for H155, the Physical Education Assessment Completion Tool (PEACT) is now the only method of providing the assessments to the moderator and this has eradicated the transcription errors from one activity sheet to another.

Centres are reminded that **all** assessed marks are now to be submitted to their moderator by the 31<sup>st</sup> March deadline & that they should be aware that the ability to submit 'summer activity' marks at a later date is no longer a possibility.

Centres should be aware that the marks from the Final Practical Activity form also need to be forwarded to the board via an IMS1, which can be accessed via the OCR Interchange system.

Positives	Areas for Improvement
On the whole the deadline for paperwork was met, although many centres did not submit traditional summer activities at the required time.	Many centres had difficulty in printing aspects of the PEACT; it was found that this was often a result of the macros not being properly turned on at the outset.
<p>The majority of centres provided component marks where appropriate i.e. Cricket.</p> <p>Centres should be aware that on the new PEACT when you select an activity that has component marks two or more yellow box are highlighted for mark entry, where as an activity that only has one mark requirement one yellow box becomes highlighted.</p>	<p>The removal of the 'triplicate' MS1 form and the need for all marks to be submitted electronically caused many IMS1 marks to arrive extremely late to moderators.</p> <p>Exams officers should be fully aware how to submit centre marks and print a confirmation copy which must be sent to the moderator. Although the requirement to forward the IMS1 for is not until the 15<sup>th</sup> May it is felt that good practice would be to submit this at the same time as the PEACT documents where possible.</p>

	<p>There were many transcription errors between the Final Practical Activity Form and the IMS1. Centres need to ensure that this process is carefully checked as errors can lead to candidates being disadvantaged. It is advised that where the inputting of the IMS1 marks are completed by the examinations officer a member of the staff directly involved with the PE process also be present to spot errors at the point of entry as this year many entries were made for sub sections of marks rather than at the overall mark point.</p>
--	--

### Practical Activity

On the whole the new specification was a welcome change for centres who felt that assessing a candidate in one activity was more appropriate to all candidates. It should be highlighted that, as with the legacy G454 specification, the ability of a candidate to focus on their strongest activity is also reflected in the expectations of the assessment process and the criteria for the practical activity assessment.

Although the new assessment criteria in tabular form was initially challenging for many staff, once the process of identifying the candidates’ performance against the 5 sub categories (Range of Skills, Quality of Skills, Physical Attributes, Decision Making and Effective Performance) was outlined, finding the line of best fit was efficiently followed.

Many centres had not noticed that the marks had been tapered within each band; the top band (6) and bottom band (1) only being 4 marks wide in each case, with bands 5 and 2 being 5 marks wide and bands 4 and 3 being 6 marks wide each.

The majority of centres over-assessed their candidates and many centres will have had their marks adjusted. It is felt that through the moderation process it was made clear to all centres the reasons why these alterations would occur and although it was a shock to the system for many, once the rationale was explained and the assessment criteria was re-visited it was felt that the new assessments were accurate and fair.

<b>Positives</b>	<b>Areas for Improvement</b>
<p>Most centres had spent a great deal of time working through the new assessment tables and were working to the line of best fit.</p>	<p>Staff appreciated the break down of acquired and developed skills in to ‘Core’ and ‘Advanced’ but did not always directly correlate these to the wording within the assessment criteria bands, which resulted in many students being over-assessed.</p>
<p>Many staff spent a great deal of time working through the range of acquired and developed skills listed under each individual activity and found that when assessing candidates this enabled them to place them into a level relatively easily.</p>	<p>Many centres struggled with only working with 30 marks when thinking of a legacy G454 performer. It would be appropriate to advise centres to think of Level 6 marks as the upper half of the old Band 1 at G454.</p>

<p>The desire to provide a more even spread of marks across the cohort was achieved.</p>	<p>Many centres assessed their performers too narrowly across the mark range and as such did not allow the differentiation between candidates to be achieved. Centres are encouraged to use the full mark range appropriately; by applying a careful focus on the wording in the assessment criteria we are confident that centres will place their candidates appropriately.</p>
<p>The accessibility of an A grade was achieved in mid-Level 5 which not only ensures accessibility but also enables our 'elite' performers the additional recognition they deserve.</p>	<p>It was disappointing that most centres had not recognised that <u>all</u> candidates must now produce a 'log of competitive participation' detailing their competitive performances over the duration of the A-level course. These log books must be present at moderation for all candidates &amp; a moderator may request to see them at any time.</p>

### Evaluation and Analysis of Performance for Improvement (EAPI)

Centres were very pleased that the 'oral response' element of the Non-Exam Assessment process closely followed that of the legacy G452 & G454 specification; however it was felt that many centres had not looked closely enough at the specification to identify the changes, which resulted in significant over-assessment by some centres.

Centres adapted to the new assessment criteria in tabular form quickly and were able to identify which elements of the oral response fell into each of the 5 sub categories (Range & Quality, Planning & Organisation, Delivery, Technical Knowledge, Evaluation & Reflection).

Although no tapering within the Levels is found in the EAPI assessment table, centres did struggle to move from assessing an oral response out of 20 as per G452 & G454 to assessing out of 30. As such the majority of centres over-assessed their candidates and many centres will have had their marks amended.

It is felt that through the moderation process it was made clear to all centres the reasons why these alterations would occur and although it was a shock to the system for many once the rationale was explained and the assessment criteria was re-visited it was felt that the new assessments were accurate and fair.

Positives	Areas for Improvement
<p>A lot of continuity from legacy G452 &amp; G454 specification and as such centres felt comfortable with this process.</p>	<p>Understandably many centres complete their own assessments inside a classroom as this aids filming; however it is felt that if this is the only experience a candidate has of the process they struggle with the live process at moderation. It is felt that best practice would be to ensure that all candidate complete at least one EAPI 'pitch side'.</p>

<p>Candidates were well prepared for the task at moderation and were familiar with the process. It was very pleasing to see the majority of candidates arriving with a clipboard and pen ready to take notes throughout the observation,.</p>	<p>The duration of candidate responses are in general far too long. It is appreciated that the task is complex and multi-faceted however centres should ensure that candidates are not speaking for excessive periods of time; it is felt that an appropriate response is possible inside 15 minutes and candidates who are exceeding 30 minutes are possibly creating more issues for themselves.</p>
<p>Centres found the process of completing the assessment grid with a line of best fit accessible and familiar.</p>	<p>Too many candidates used the observation time to regurgitate rote-learned notes rather than observe the performance in front of them. This over-reliance by candidates on pre-prepared notes leads them not only to focus too narrowly on one aspect of the observation but often provide inaccurate observations in relation to the actual performance being evaluated.</p>
	<p>Many centres did not identify the ‘new’ elements within the <b>evaluative comments</b> of the EAPI from the legacy specifications. Most notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Level of Success</u>; this should not only relate to the individual performer but also how their observations will affect the overall performance of the team where appropriate.</li> <li>- <u>Justification of weakness</u>; candidates should relate their selection to the level of success and the potential gains that could be found by a significant improvement.</li> </ul>
	<p>Many centres did not identify the ‘new’ elements within the <b>action plan</b> of the EAPI from the legacy specifications. Most notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Timescale justifications</u>; most candidates identified a timescale but lacked the reasoning why this was appropriate in length for the action plan to follow</li> <li>- <u>Measurement of improvements</u>; some candidates identified a pre-test and post-test within their actions plan which is a successful way of incorporating this element. Candidates are reminded that excellent conclusions need to be drawn from the potential results of the tests in order to access the higher levels.</li> </ul>

	<p>Many centres did not identify the ‘new’ elements within the <b>justification of evaluation</b> of the EAPI from the legacy specifications. Most notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Placement of theory</u>; all candidates provided theory however the vast majority either provided this only within the action planning section or as a ‘bolt-on’ at the end of their response. However it must be noted that the specification required that a candidate justifies their <u>evaluative comments and their action plan</u> with theory.</li> <li>- <u>Wide range of relevant theory</u>; most candidates identified one or two areas of theory repetitively which although applied differently can only be given credit for once. The main culprits here were muscle / movement terms and guidance. Candidates should ensure that they access a wide range of theoretical topics from Components 01 &amp; 02 (H155) and 01, 02 &amp; 03 (H555) in their response.</li> <li>- <u>Lack of application of theory</u>; far too much theory was simply a regurgitation of fact rather than applying the concept to the observations or the action plan.</li> </ul>
	<p>Many candidates did not cover all of the required areas as such it is felt that in order to assist candidates the way in which the question is posed to a candidate should now take 2 parts with the candidate responding to each on in turn.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Part One</u>; Comment on the observation by analysing and evaluating the performance</li> <li>- <u>Part Two</u>; Creating of a viable action plan</li> </ul> <p>Pages 25, 26 &amp; 27 in the NEA provide exact wording which we would suggest all centres follow or abridge to suit.</p>

### Filmed Evidence

Although the requirement of centres to provide filmed evidence was reduced there is now a need for centres to film all aspects of the live moderation. Centres welcomed the former, as it was one less task however the latter provided many logistical issues not only on the day but also in submitting to the board either as an individual centre or as a cluster. Centres need to plan this into their moderation days going forward as it is their responsibility, not the moderators. Access to a moderation review requested by a centre will only be possible on H155/03 and H555/04 where filmed evidence of the centre at the live moderation is available.



The lack of centre-held evidence outside of the moderation visit did provide a problem for moderators, as it proved extremely difficult in some situations to provide an appropriate assessment of the centres marks due to small numbers of candidates being available in activities suitable for live moderation. As such new guidance has been issued via the OCR website (<http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/support-and-tools/siu/alevel-pe-nea-250817>)

<b>Positives</b>	<b>Areas for Improvement</b>
Many centres are still following good practice of filming a range of marks so that they can provide additional evidence to a moderator if they feel it is required and also to use this footage for future EAPI's.	Centres need to be aware of the live filming requirement. This incorporates all practical activities and all EAPI's listened to live by the moderator on the day.
Centres are on the whole ensuring that candidates in filmed evidence present to the camera at the start of a video so it is clear who they are and what their identifying bid/number is.	When videoing the live practical's, it is very important that each candidate presents to the camera before the session starts so that they can easily identified at a later date if required.
	Filming should include a range of approaches, e.g. for shooting in football a wide angle shot so all participants can be seen as well as closer up elements focusing on a smaller number of candidates so exact technicalities can be observed.
	Consideration of the environmental conditions i.e. teacher / students conversations around the camera.

The moderation team would like to express its thanks to all centres that participated in the H155 moderation process; we full appreciate that the first year of a new specification will never be straight forward, however the professionalism and pragmatism shown by all highlights the range of exceptional Physical Education staff delivering the subject as well as the calibre of the students themselves.

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
1 Hills Road  
Cambridge  
CB1 2EU

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
Head office  
Telephone: 01223 552552  
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2017

