

**Moderators' report**

**AS LEVEL**

# **PHYSICAL EDUCATION**

**OCR Level 3 Advanced Subsidiary GCE  
in Physical Education**

**H155**

For first teaching in 2016

**H155/04/05 Summer 2025 series**

# Contents

|                                                 |    |
|-------------------------------------------------|----|
| Introduction .....                              | 3  |
| General overview .....                          | 4  |
| Most common causes of centres not passing ..... | 10 |
| Common misconceptions .....                     | 10 |
| Avoiding potential malpractice .....            | 11 |
| H155/05 EAPI .....                              | 11 |
| Most common causes of centres not passing ..... | 14 |
| Common misconceptions .....                     | 14 |
| Avoiding potential malpractice .....            | 15 |
| Helpful resources .....                         | 15 |
| Additional comments .....                       | 15 |

## 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 > Export to** 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).

## Introduction

Our Moderators' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on centres' assessment of moderated work, based on what has been observed by the 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 comment on the quality of centre assessment decisions against individual Learning Objectives. The 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 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.

### Online courses

We have created online courses to build your confidence in delivering, marking and administering internal assessment for our qualifications. Courses are available for Cambridge Nationals, GCSE, A Level and Cambridge Technicals (2016).

#### Cambridge Nationals

All teachers delivering our Cambridge Nationals suite are asked to complete the Essentials for the NEA course, which describes how to guide and support your students. You'll receive a certificate which you should retain.

Following this you can also complete a subject-specific Focus on Internal Assessment course for your individual Cambridge Nationals qualification, covering marking and delivery.

#### GCSE, A Level and Cambridge Technicals (2016)

We recommend all teachers complete the module on Online courses – NEA for their subject. These courses provide subject-specific information about course content; how to prepare for planning, marking and submitting; and support with understanding the marking criteria.

#### Accessing our online courses

You can access all our online courses from our teacher support website [Teach Cambridge](#).

These free online courses currently cover the end-to-end NEA process for teachers. You'll find the link to the **Online courses** under the **Assessment** or **Training** tab – hover over **Assessment** or **Training** on the horizontal menu and select **Online courses** from the dropdown.

These self-paced online courses are intended for any teachers. During the course, you will engage with interactive content on subjects such as guidance on unit content, structure and administrative processes.

If you have any queries, please contact our Customer Support Centre on 01223 553998 or email [support@ocr.org.uk](mailto:support@ocr.org.uk).

## General overview

It was again pleasing to see that candidates attended moderations with a positive approach and that centres were accomplished at utilising the full mark range across all six levels to make their practical assessments.

The host centres and all attending centres enabled the moderation process to run smoothly, with positive discussions held and feedback provided to centres as to reasons for marks awarded. Through these continued discussions and feedback, it was felt that centres were comfortable with the assessment process and developed their own deeper understanding of how to award candidate marks. The moderating team is very grateful to all centres, teachers and candidates for their contributions to the moderation process.

| Candidates who did well generally:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Candidates who did less well generally:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>H155/04</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>played regularly in the activity they were being assessed in and kept a detailed log of competitive scenarios.</li> <li>were able to demonstrate a range of core and advanced skills both in isolation and within competitive situations.</li> <li>produced filmed evidence that was in line with the guidance as to what was required and thus supported the mark submitted.</li> <li>Included evidence all from within the one year AS Level course.</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                  | <b>H155/04</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>were not able to demonstrate a range of core and advanced skills consistently in isolation or within competitive scenarios</li> <li>completed Log Books with training sessions rather than competitive situations</li> <li>produced filmed evidence that did not include all core and advanced skills in isolation or competitive scenarios or was in limited duration to demonstrate their range of core and advanced skills, therefore failing to support the higher levels</li> <li>included evidence not within the one year AS Level course.</li> </ul>                                 |
| <b>H155/05</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>in the Evaluative Comments, identified a range of strengths and weaknesses, justified why and linked these to how they impacted the overall success of the performer</li> <li>in the Action Plans, justified why they chose the weakness and produced a plan for this weakness with realistic practices for the level of the performer being observed and duration of sessions for the practices stated</li> <li>completed Action Plans on either a Skill or Fitness component</li> <li>applied a range of Physiological and Psychological concepts within both the Evaluative Comments and Action Plan</li> </ul> | <b>H155/05</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>in the Evaluative Comments, only identified the strengths or weakness, did not justify why, or how they impacted the overall success of performance, but instead tried to justify by using theory</li> <li>in the Action Plans, did not justify why they had chosen the weakness to improve, practices were too basic for the level of performer being observed, lacking in any competitive element and practices stated were not realistic to the duration set for the sessions</li> <li>within the Action Plans, included warm ups, cool downs and testing; these have all been</li> </ul> |

| Candidates who did well generally:                                                                                                                                 | Candidates who did less well generally:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• applied theory from an area within Socio Cultural that was from the prescribed list and linked to participation.</li></ul> | <p>removed and so are not credited for the response.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• completed Action Plans on both a Skill and a Fitness component which limited the depth and detail of the practices</li><li>• applied a limited range of theory was limited or repeated for Physiological and Psychological concepts or not from the prescribed list, so could not be credited</li><li>• did not apply theory from an area within Socio Cultural that was from the prescribed list or linked to participation.</li></ul> |

## Paperwork submission overview

This was the first year for centres to submit their marks via the Marks Submission Form on the platform Teach Cambridge, which is the only method of providing the assessments. This appeared to ensure that centres met deadlines and completed paperwork correctly.

Centres are reminded that all marks must be submitted by the revised deadline set in the latest version of the Guide to NEA.

Centres are reminded that any Special Considerations applications are now dealt with a team at OCR. It should be noted that this process can only be completed by centres with candidates with disabilities. We can adapt current activities for them to take part in. This must be applied for as early as possible and before the December of Year 12.

We are also aware that some centres had some issues with the Marks Submission Form or uploading evidence onto Submit for Assessment and we are very hopeful that all glitches/issues have been rectified and the process should be a lot smoother for the next series.

## Paperwork submission

### Positives:

- On the whole the deadline for completing both the Visiting Arrangement Form and Mark Submissions Form was met, aided by the process being completed on Teach Cambridge.
- The majority of centres provided component marks where appropriate, i.e. Cricket and Athletics.

### Areas for improvement:

- Ensuring that your Visiting Arrangement Form (VAF) is completed by 1 February, to enable you to complete your Marks Submission Form.

It is important that all centres make note of the key dates for paperwork submission and stick to them - missed marks submissions is maladministration and can mean we will not accept your marks.

## Filmed evidence and log book submission overview

This was the first year that centres were asked to upload all their filmed evidence and Logbooks onto the platform Submit for Assessment via My Cambridge, this proved to be a success with most centres correctly uploading evidence to meet the deadline of 15 March.

Most centres followed the guidance on filmed evidence that was issued in the previous Moderation Reports and issued via OCR Train, where it identifies that centres should in addition to the 'off-site' activities, send filmed evidence of 'on-site' activities. This must include filmed evidence of all 'off-site' practical activities and filmed evidence of performances in on-site activities. Filmed evidence of on-site activities must cover at least eight candidates across at least three activities and a range of marks.

**Centres are reminded that where the filmed evidence is used that it should not only meet the requirements of the individual activity as set out in the Guide to NEA but it must show the performer in a competitive situation for a sufficient amount of time.** Centres are reminded that it is their responsibility for the production of appropriate footage.

Centres are reminded that there is a need for centres to film all aspects of the live moderation and submit this to the board within 10 days of the moderation, along with the accompanying form. Again, the process of this was new this year for centres to upload this footage onto Submit for Assessment. This was carried out by majority of centres this year and although it does provide some logistical issues on the moderation day, the process is there to support centres and candidates if a review of results is requested. Centres need to continue to plan this into their moderation day going forward as it is their responsibility not the moderators'.

The production and quality of candidate log books showed significant variances across all centres. These logs are extremely helpful to moderators when making final decisions as to the appropriate assessment of a candidate. Centres are reminded that they do not carry any direct weighting towards the assessment process; they are simply there to support the judgement. **Centres are reminded that the log is there for a candidate to identify the regularity of competitive performance in their sport and show the level that they participate at.** It should not be a weekly record of their training and it must record their performances across the one year of the AS Level course. For those practical activities where the main 'in-competition' season is the summer such as Athletics and Cricket, it is acceptable that a candidate records their performances from the 1 July before their entry to Year 12.

## Filmed evidence and log book submission

### Positives:

- Most centres were well prepared to upload filmed evidence of both 'on-site' and 'off-site' practical activities by 15 March.
- Many centres are following good practice of filming a continuous length of game footage and supporting this with a highlights reel/commentary to demonstrate the core and advanced skills, with candidates being identifiable throughout.
- The use of the platform Submit for Assessment eradicated any potential loss of work and centres were able to quickly upload any additional footage if required.
- Most centres uploaded Log Books which were detailed and contained evidence of competitions and level that is participated in.

### Areas for improvement:

- Centres are reminded to upload evidence of at least eight candidates across at least three activities from a range of marks for on-site activities along with all their off-site activities onto Submit for Assessment.
- Centres are reminded that evidence of participation of candidates within their activity should be a continuous process from the start of their AS Level course to the end. This is to make sure that if any injury or situation occurs where they can't attend moderation the centre can still make an appropriate assessment.
- Centres must make sure that the quantity of filmed evidence for off-site/on-site activities is appropriate. Best practice for candidates whose filmed evidence is across a range of clips is to compile these into one 'video' so that the entire assessment can be made in one viewing rather than across multiple clips.
- Centres are to make sure that Log Books only contain evidence of competitions played in within the one year AS Level course. Some logs contained training sessions and did not provide the moderator enough detail about the level of performance.
- Candidate produced filmed evidence is on the rise and here we would strongly recommend that centres check the quality and validity of this before submission to OCR. This is most prevalent in those sports that a centre itself does not offer 'in house'.

## Assessment of Practical Performance

On the whole the performance aspect of the specification continues to have a positive outcome for most centres. The majority of centres had applied the assessment criteria well, although there was still some need to amend centres marks; it is felt that through the moderation process it was made clear to all centres the reasons why any alterations would occur. While this was unexpected for some once the rationale was explained and the assessment criteria was re-visited it was felt that the assessments were accurate and fair.

Centres remain clear on the reasoning for the tapered of marks within each level; the top level (6) and bottom level (1) only being 4 marks wide in each case, with Levels 5 and two being 5 marks wide and Levels 4 and 3 being 6 marks wide each. This has certainly enabled centres to provide better differentiation between their candidates, especially in Levels 3 and 4.

Centres are encouraged to use the full range of marks within the specification and use the reference points around grade award. It is felt that the adjustments that were made have ensured that all candidate performances align to the grade award and their rationale have been fully justified.

There still continues to be positive shift in the manner in which staff are interpreting the assessment criteria and it is clear that centres are better at the process of identifying the candidate's performance against the 5 sub categories (Range of Skills, Quality of Skills, Physical Attributes, Decision Making and Effective Performance) and subsequently finding the line of best fit.

### Positives:

- Centres had taken on board the advice given in the previous assessment cycles and there was evidence that most centres had a better understanding of the rigours required for each assessment level.
- Most centres had spent a great deal of time working through the assessment criteria and were working to the line of best fit.
- 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 with ease.
- The desire to provide a more even spread of marks across the cohort was achieved. The accessibility of an A grade was achieved at the bottom of Level 5 which not only ensures accessibility but it also provides recognition for our elite performers.

### Areas for improvement:

- Centres continue to appreciate the breakdown of acquired and developed skills in to 'Core' and 'Advanced' although they did not directly correlate these to the wording within the assessment criteria, which resulted in some candidates being generously assessed.
- 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.

Some centres had inconsistent marking, therefore, it is essential that a robust internal standardisation process takes place within the centre before submitting marks to OCR to minimise this.



## Assessment of Coaching overview

For the assessment of Coaching, as with the Practical, the line of best fit across the assessment criteria is required. Here there is a focus around the Planning and Organisation, Delivery, Evaluation and Reflection and the Technical Knowledge of the candidate. These categories are further expanded by identifying the candidate's performance as a coach against the six sub categories (Range and Quality, Planning and Organisation, Delivery, Technical Knowledge, Evaluation and Reflection and Coaching Plan). It is this latter six sub categories that enable the line of best fit to be established and as such a final assessment mark identified.

Many centres are now able to align their coaching marks to the assessment criteria set out in the Guide to NEA, therefore allowing accurate assessments to take place. However, some centres are still over assessing their candidates meaning their marks have been amended. The major area of concern was the lack of standardisation between the assessed level of a coach and a practical performer and the rubric infringement of not meeting the required amount of filmed evidence of two 40 minute coaching videos. Some of the coaching candidates observed lead a session rather than coached, there was also significant concern over the level of technical knowledge displayed in many sessions and lack of evidence submitted. Along with the fact that some coaching candidates were not coaching the same participants over the course of the ten sessions. It is felt that these adjustments and their rationale have been fully justified when looking at the placement of the grades identified earlier.

## Assessment of Coaching

### Positives:

- Most candidates produced a log of coaching which encompassed most of the areas required.
- Most candidates coached the same participants over all ten sessions.

### Areas for improvement:

- Many centres struggled to differentiate between the skills of a 'sports leader' and a 'coach' and this was reflected in many of the assessments viewed both live and by filmed evidence. **Those candidates who focused on fault identification and the resulting correction and technical development were rewarded with higher level assessments compared to those candidates who 'managed' a group of performers through a range of drills with little, if any, individual corrective measures being put into place.**
- When assessing the Coach, it would be expected that at Level 5/6 they should be delivering some of the advanced skills from their activity criteria in the Guide to NEA within their sessions and not just core skills to a very good level; this might have a knock-on effect as to the age of the group a candidate coaches. We would be expecting the candidate to use the activity criteria set out in the Guide to NEA as an illustration of the range of core and advanced skills a candidate should be delivering within their sessions.
- Throughout the moderation process we observed candidates delivering sessions to a wide range of performers. **Although the ability level, age range and number of the performers a candidate coaches is not stipulated, centres are reminded that the choice/number of groups will have a direct impact on the type and level of coaching the candidate can offer.** As such, we strongly advise centre staff to take a leading role in the initial group selection for the candidate. Better candidates had fewer participants, were able to coach advanced skills off the activity criteria in the NEA guidelines, and could provide individual feedback and fault correction to all participants.

- It was evident from viewing log books that many candidates rotated their delivery between a variety of participants over the duration of the assessment process in order to meet the requirement of ten sessions. To ensure a sustained and developmental approach to coaching, the ten sessions should be delivered to the same group of performers.
- The Guide to NEA clearly states that the duration of each coaching session should be minimum two x 40 minutes continuous footage. These filmed sessions provided must be of two sessions from their log books, stating clearly which session plan they correlate to. Centres are also reminded that it is a one year process and that a candidate might even have more than two 40 min sessions filmed across their assessment process. As a moderation team we are happy to have more than two filmed sessions submitted and if these are clearly referenced to their log book we can choose which sessions to view for the assessment process.
- Centres should also be reminded that they should cross-reference the standard of their coach to the standard of their practical performers and make sure that they have standardised across the whole specification.

## Most common causes of centres not passing

Very few candidates do not pass the performance component of the specification; however, those that don't have often not been playing any form of sport for the duration of the course. As such, centres are reminded that encouraging your lower performing practical performers to play at least recreationally on a weekly basis will make a significant difference.

## Common misconceptions

Candidates need to be in Level 6 to be awarded an A grade; this is incorrect as an A grade has been set in Level 5.

A 'highlights reel' or one individual performance (100m) is the best way to provide filmed evidence; this is incorrect as we require a range of footage including a continuous block of performance/competitive footage to fully understand the commonalities in performance. Appendix B in the guide to NEA provides full guidance on filmed evidence.

A 'Park Run' or any Cross Country course can be used to assess a candidate in Cross Country; this is incorrect as there are specific course requirements that must be met, these are in line with the ESAA specifications and can be found in the guide to NEA.

The level of performance played at dictates the mark that can be given. This is incorrect, centres need to make sure that the mark given is in relation to the five sections of the assessment criteria for the activity being assessed in. The level played at can support the mark submitted.

Some activities are easier than others to access the assessment criteria; this is incorrect the level of performance is standardised across all activities.

## Avoiding potential malpractice

Malpractice is incredibly rare in the performance component of Physical Education but there are odd occasions it occurs. This can be when rubrics are not met for the activity or when evidence submitted is not within the one year AS Level course.

## H155/05 EAPI

Overall, it was encouraging to see that the majority of centres have established clear structures for the delivery and filming of the EAPI component. Most centres are effectively using the full range of marks across all six levels, demonstrating a sound understanding of the assessment criteria. The continued use of candidate note sheets, introduced in the 2022 series, remains evident and supports structured responses.

Centres submitted marks directly via Interchange with EAPI recordings uploaded to Submit for Assessment in accordance with OCR requirements.

On the whole, centres have responded positively to the recommendations outlined in moderators' reports and there is clear evidence that many centres are applying the assessment grid more accurately when submitting marks.

While many centres are clearly familiar with the structure of the EAPI, there is a need for closer alignment with the specification. Centres are encouraged to review the prescribed content list carefully to make sure that candidates' responses include only content that is eligible for credit.

### **Positives:**

Candidates were generally well prepared for the task and general structure of the response. It was very pleasing to see the majority of candidates with the 'notes sheets' and pen ready to take notes throughout the observation.

Centres found the process of completing the assessment grid with a line of best fit accessible and familiar.

Filming of the responses for most centres followed the required guidelines; ensuring the whole response, including the candidates' observation of the performance was one continuous video from start to end.

The vast majority of candidates kept their responses within the approved limit of 20 minutes and used clocks to make sure candidates did not exceed the time limit.

The 'Evaluative Comments' section continues to be the strongest aspect of most responses with a good range of identification, description and linking to overall success of performance shown, as well as applied theory.

### **Areas for improvement:**

Too many candidates used the observation time to include pre-prepared notes rather than observe the performance in front of them. This over reliance on pre-prepared notes leads them not only to focus too narrowly on one aspect of the observation but often to provide inaccurate observations. Centres are reminded that the time provided to a candidate should be appropriate; essentially enough time for them observe a performance and make outline notes; not complete a script to read from. It is suggested in the Guide to NEA that 10-20 minutes is ample.

Many candidates' response time across all the sections also limited their ability to access higher levels, due to many spending two thirds of their response time on the Evaluative Comments section and only one third of the time on the Action Plans. With the Application of Theory spent defining it rather than applying it throughout the other two sections.

Although generally the stronger section, in the Evaluative Comments for some, too much emphasis is put on trying to add in theory concepts, instead of justifying way they are strengths and weaknesses and how they impact the overall success of performance.

Action Plans are most notably the weaker section of the response. Many centres did not identify the need to ensure the progressive practices within the action plan must be appropriate to the frequency and duration of the practices, as set out by the candidate. Often it was one basic practice a week, which did not match either the frequency, duration or performer observed, in order to make sure progress would be achieved over the course of the action plan. Centres are advised to suggest to students to think about what they do in a training session; rarely is this one drill for an extended period of time but is significantly related to the final performance situation.

There are centres who still did not identify the removal of some elements within the action plan of the EAPI, most notably:

- timescale justifications
- measurement of improvements

Many centres did not identify the 'newer' elements within the Application of Theory of the EAPI, most notably:

- Prescribed theory List: many candidates included areas of theory that are not on the prescribed list, most notably from the 03 component. Any theory not on the prescribed list cannot be credited. Pages 131 through 142 in the Guide to NEA provide full details of the prescribed list.
- Wide range of relevant theory: most candidates identified one or two areas of theory repetitively which although applied differently can only be given credited once. The main ones were muscle/movement terms and guidance. Candidates should make sure that they access a wide range of theoretical topics from Components 01, 02 and 03 in their response; however, it is now possible to access Level 4 with no 03 Theory applied in their response.
- Lack of Application of Theory: far too much theory was simply a regurgitation of fact rather than applying the concept to the observations or the action plan.

Many candidates did not cover all of the required areas. To help candidates, centres may want to pose the question in two parts, with the candidates responding to each one in turn:

- Part 1: comment on the observation by analysing and evaluating the performance
- Part 2: create a viable action plan.

Pages 26 and 27 in the Guide to NEA provide exact wording which we would suggest all centres follow.

Centres may find it helpful to view the EAPI in the following manner:

- **Evaluative comments:**
  - Identify strengths for Skills, tactics/compositional ideas and Fitness
  - Justify why and how they impact overall success of performance
  - Apply theory
  - Identify weaknesses for Skills, tactics/compositional ideas and Fitness
  - Justify why and how they impact overall success of performance
  - Apply theory
- **Action plans**
  - State and justify why chosen weakness
  - Give duration and frequency of plan and sessions
  - Detailed practices realistic to duration of sessions/whole plan and performer
  - Coaching points
  - Apply theory.

### Paperwork and filmed evidence submissions - guidance

While centres are still able to send evidence via Postal submission on USBs the vast number of centres chose to use the digital platform Submit for Assessment to upload their EAPI's.

Centres are also reminded that all assessed marks are to be submitted directly through their Exams Officer on Interchange by the deadline of 15<sup>th</sup> March and that their moderator will have access to these marks remotely.

It was greatly appreciated by moderators that most centres were well prepared for the submission of their EAPI filmed evidence by the deadline. Centres are reminded that all the evidence they pass on to the moderator should be a copy, in case of any issues in accessing it during the moderation process.

When uploading responses onto the platform it would be helpful to avoid using MTS and allow easy playback for the moderator

When labelling candidates' files on Submit for Assessment it would help hugely if both the candidate's number and name was included i.e. 1234 A. Surname EAPI – Football.

Centres are reminded that the entirety of the EAPI process should be recorded; the observation/note taking and then the response as one continuous video. This will mean each video recording will be approximately 45 minutes long and where your recording equipment breaks this into two files, each centre should make sure this is pieced together into one file before submitting to the moderator.

A large number of centres used Submit for Assessment, it is important to make sure that the responses have been uploaded correctly, there were a number of incomplete uploads so it is vital this is checked following submission, these should also include the candidates notes sheets and the video observed.

It is helpful to include the centre mark sheet; it would be useful to use the updated mark sheets which split the EAPI into the three assessed areas ; we can then evaluate how a centre has assessed its candidates and we can provide more detailed feedback. Please be aware that the centre should keep a copy of all filmed evidence, candidate notes and mark sheets.

## Most common causes of centres not passing

Candidates who have not prepared or fully understood the task are most at risk of not passing this component. As such centres are encouraged to make sure their candidates are fully versed with the task and how to manage their response.

Action Plans being too basic and lacking a competitive element to the practices until the later weeks of the plan.

## Common misconceptions

The response is about a candidate showing their theoretical knowledge to the moderator. This is incorrect as the Application of Theory is one of three assessed elements. We feel that the theory is there to support the observations, which in turn provide the stimulus for the creation of an appropriate action plan. It was felt that the EAPI task had become too dominated by trying to put in theory wherever possible, to the detriment of the actual evaluation and analysis of performance. The prescribed theory list continues to allow the task to be a bit shorter and more tightly focused from previous years.

All pieces of theory on the prescribed list have to be covered. This is incorrect - the prescribed list covers a range of topic areas across the theory components from which students should select appropriate things to apply in their EAPI. The list does not need to be covered in full.

A candidate who receives 'extra time' in relation their exams automatically get this applied to the time limit for the EAPI. This is incorrect as often Access Arrangements linked to additional time relate to written assessments, so it should not be assumed that these remain relevant to the verbal EAPI response and can be just 'carried over'.

If a response goes beyond 20 minutes then the candidate can still be awarded a mark in Levels 4-6. This is incorrect as the assessment grid clearly states that any response that is more than the stated time limit cannot be awarded above the top of Level 3, assuming that the other aspects of the criteria also meet at least the Level 3 requirements. Candidates with a documented and evidenced need may require more time than the maximum stated for the EAPI response. In such cases, centres should in the first instance discuss the particular student with their SENCo/SENDco to discuss appropriate access arrangements and reasonable adjustments. If further advice is required, centres should contact the Special Requirements Team in advance of the assessment taking place.

Candidates can observe the performance for as long as they wish. This is incorrect the candidate should start their response as soon as an appropriate range of analysis opportunities has been viewed within the performance. While this will vary between different activities, in general between 10 and 20 minutes should provide the candidate observing with enough material to analyse and evaluate, and sufficient time to make any notes they wish to during the observation.

The prompting and timing section of the assessment grid should not be included in the consideration of the overall mark

## Avoiding potential malpractice

Unfortunately, malpractice does occur in this component and is most commonly found under these categories:

**Using pre-planned notes in their response.** Centres are reminded that the candidates can have access to either the 'candidates' notes sheet' or paper, both of which must be blank, to compile their notes and the observation/note taking must be included in the filmed evidence submitted.

**The video footage was made available to the candidate beforehand.** Centres are reminded that the footage should be new to the candidate. This shows itself when a candidate simply writes without looking at the performance.

**Candidates receiving clear off-camera prompts by staff.** There are times when there is clear communication between staff and students during the assessment process which both halts the candidate in their response and acts as a prompt that is not reflected in the marks submitted by the centre.

**Use of mobile phone for timing.** JCQ rules for conducting examinations apply. If a candidate is using their own phone or watch to monitor the time, the centre must manage any risks around access to other information which may be helpful to the assessment via the device (e.g. smart phones/watches). Evidence at moderation that there may be a risk that candidates accessed information via such a device may be referred to OCRs Compliance team.

## Helpful resources

Teach Cambridge – offers many resources and has all the links to PE forms.

Official OCR INSET – Please be aware we cannot guarantee the content of non-OCR training that is on offer.

Latest version of the Guide to NEA.

## Additional comments

The moderation team would like to express its thanks to all centres that participated in this year's moderation process; their continued professionalism and pragmatism shown within discussions at moderation days and the way in which they support their students in advance of these days highlights the range of exceptional Physical Education staff delivering the subject.

Centres are now required to film candidates throughout the one year of the assessed course to make sure adequate footage is available to allow for accurate assessments at the end of the course or to support candidates in case of an injury.

Centres are strongly encouraged to regularly review the Physical Education site on 'Teach Cambridge' for updates and attend the free 'Ask the Moderator' online sessions throughout the year to clarify aspects of the assessment process.



---

# Supporting you

---

## Teach Cambridge

Make sure you visit our secure website [Teach Cambridge](#) to find the full range of resources and support for the subjects you teach. This includes secure materials such as set assignments and exemplars, online and on-demand training.

**Don't have access?** If your school or college teaches any OCR qualifications, please contact your exams officer. You can [forward them this link](#) to help get you started.

## Reviews of marking

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our post-results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#).

## Access to Scripts

We've made it easier for Exams Officers to download copies of your candidates' completed papers or 'scripts'. Your centre can use these scripts to decide whether to request a review of marking and to support teaching and learning.

Our free, on-demand service, Access to Scripts is available via our single sign-on service, My Cambridge. Step-by-step instructions are on our [website](#).

## Keep up-to-date

We send a monthly bulletin to tell you about important updates. You can also sign up for your subject specific updates. If you haven't already, [sign up here](#).

## OCR Professional Development

Attend one of our popular professional development courses to hear directly from a senior assessor or drop in to a Q&A session. Most of our courses are delivered live via an online platform, so you can attend from any location.

Please find details for all our courses for your subject on **Teach Cambridge**. You'll also find links to our online courses on NEA marking and support.

## Signed up for ExamBuilder?

**ExamBuilder** is the exam paper builder platform for a range of our qualifications. [Find out more](#).

Free for all OCR centres with an Interchange account, it allows unlimited users per centre. We require an [Interchange](#) username to verify your centre's users for ExamBuilder.

If you do not have an Interchange account, please contact your centre administrator (usually the Exams Officer) to request a username.

Once you have an Interchange username, use the form on [this page](#) to sign up for ExamBuilder, or ask an existing user at your centre to create an ExamBuilder account for you.

## Active Results

Review students' exam performance with our free online results analysis tool. It is available for all GCSEs, AS and A Levels and Cambridge Nationals (examined units only).

[Find out more](#).



# Tell us what you think

Your feedback plays an important role in how we develop, market, support and resource qualifications now and into the future. We want you and your students to enjoy and get the best out of our qualifications and resources, but to do that we need your honest opinions to tell us whether we're on the right track or not.

You can email your thoughts to [resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk](mailto:resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk) or visit our [feedback page](#) to learn more about how you can help us improve our resources.



Designing and testing in [collaboration with you](#) and your students



Helping young people develop an [ethical view of the world](#)



Equality, diversity, inclusion and belonging (EDIB) are [part of everything we do](#)

---

Contact the team at:

☎ 01223 553998

🖥 [ocr.org.uk](https://ocr.org.uk)

To stay up to date with all the relevant news about our qualifications, register for email updates at [ocr.org.uk/updates](https://ocr.org.uk/updates)

Visit our Online Support Centre at [support.ocr.org.uk](https://support.ocr.org.uk)



OCR is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

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

We operate academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers.

We are committed to providing a fully accessible experience across all our products, platforms, and websites. Find out more about our [accessibility standards](#).

© OCR 2025. All rights reserved. We retain the copyright on all our publications. However, our registered centres are permitted to copy and distribute our material for their own internal use, in line with any specific restrictions detailed in the publication. Find out more about our [copyright policies](#).

We update our publications regularly so please check you have the most up-to-date version.

We cannot be held responsible for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and do not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

When we update our specifications, you'll see a new version number and a summary of the changes. While we do our best to reflect these changes in all associated resources on [Teach Cambridge](#), if you notice any discrepancies, please refer to the latest specification on our website and [let us know](#).

Our resources do not represent any teaching method we expect you to use. We cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in our resources.