

GCE

Physical Education

Advanced GCE A2 **H554**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS **H154**

OCR Report to Centres June 2016

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates 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 candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates 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 2016

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Physical Education (H554)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Physical Education (H154)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
G451 An introduction to Physical Education (Written Examination)	4
G453 Principles and concepts across different areas of Physical Education	8
G452 Acquiring, developing and evaluating practical skills in physical education	13
G454 The improvement of effective performance and the critical evaluation of practical activities in physical education	13

G451 An introduction to Physical Education (Written Examination)

General Comments:

There were some excellent scripts offered in response to the Summer 2016 G451 examination paper, yet performance overall, once again varied greatly. Generally-speaking evidence would suggest that candidates understood what was required of them throughout all 3 sections and there was almost no evidence of pupils misinterpreting questions. Examination technique was very encouraging. Candidates clearly addressed the command words in the majority of cases in the shorter answer questions but at times failed to include examples when asked.

In response to the 10-mark questions which require longer answers and different examination technique, candidates 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 each parts of the question. Overall guidance for centres for the extended questions would be to focus on providing balance across the different elements to the answer.

Improvements in exam technique for the shorter answer questions (a-d), were similar to those of June 2015 however we still encountered candidates who included unnecessary padding in their answers. When lower mark totals were evident, the key reason was lack of fundamental knowledge. For example in question 1ai (A&P), few candidates achieved full marks, many missing the antagonistic pairs and knowledge of the intrinsic mechanisms in 1c were particularly weak. Also, lack of clearly expressed knowledge is still an issue, leading to 'TV' (Too Vague) being stamped on responses (no marks). This was evident with descriptions of inspiration during exercise. Unfocused responses to a-d questions continues to lead to overuse of additional objects (continuation sheets). Candidates should be reminded that all additional objects (continuation sheets) must be labelled accurately so that examiners can link them correctly to answers in candidates' main answer booklets.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No. 1

Overall, the Anatomy and Physiology question performed quite well with candidates achieving a good spread of marks. The trend was for candidates to lose marks by not relating their answers to changes during exercise. This section proved to be the most challenging for candidates with 3 quite demanding questions within 1a-1d. This was counterbalanced by a relatively straightforward part 'e' question which is very close to the wording of the specification.

Q1ai – Responses to this question were variable. It is evident that the type of joint at the ankle is not as well-known as for other joints. However, a large number of candidates correctly chose hinge joint. Many candidates confused the agonist and antagonist, a common mistake was to get them the wrong way round! Candidates need to be reminded that only the first response in each box will be marked

Q1aii - This question was answered accurately by a high percentage of candidates with many achieving maximum marks. The most common error was repetition of "warm up" from the question. Once again, candidates' attention should be drawn to the question command – 'give **three** ways' and thus only the first three attempts will be marked here. The main points hit were 2 and 3. Lots of candidates went for increased viscosity and not reduced. Temperature was often not linked to muscle. Weaker candidates commenting about heart and blood flow.

Q1b - This question was not well answered with the majority of candidates struggling to relate their responses to 'during exercise'. Therefore many referred to, for example, "diaphragm contracts" without saying "with greater force". It is clear that the majority knew the anatomical information well but were unable to apply it to the specifics of the question. Many managed to include the additional muscles (Sternocleidomastoid etc...) but didn't go on to include the **increases**. So there were a lot of candidates who described the process correctly but did not highlight an increase in the various points at exercise as opposed to rest and were therefore deemed too vague.

Q1c – Once again this question was not well answered. Many candidates had difficulty interpreting this question, being unsure of what intrinsic control was and going on to make reference to medulla oblongata and sympathetic and parasympathetic nervous systems. Temperature increase was regularly identified but not always related to increasing heart rate. There was a lot of irrelevant theory in answers for this question, usually about chemoreceptors and baroreceptors or how nerve impulses travel down and through the heart. Candidates that did score often got points 1, 6 and 7 on the mark scheme. Lots referred to Starlings law but did not explain it.

Q1d - There were mixed responses in this question but only a small percentage managing full marks. Most candidates scored 2 or 3 out of 5 on this question – a lot of responses were too vague or repeated the same point on the MS. Again not much reference to exercise and rest (hence greater and increase etc...) with the main points from the mark scheme which were accessed being 3, 5, 8 and/or 9 but not always in context. Many candidates stated the muscles needed or demanded rather than 'uses' more O₂. Another common error was speaking of increased O₂ dissociation from blood (repetition of question) instead of haemoglobin.

Q1e – This question was generally well answered. Most candidates were able to provide a solid level 2 answer with the higher end able to hit level 3 and provide a balanced answer for both positives and negatives of physical activity on both the skeletal and muscular systems. Responses showed a wide range of knowledge but were sometimes poorly structured. The best candidates structured their response into four parts – positives and negatives on skeletal system and positives and negatives on muscular system. There was some misunderstanding on exercise causing osteoporosis. Candidates need to be encouraged to include practical examples.

Question No. 2

Overall the Acquiring Movement skills question performed much better than previous years. Candidates did particularly well with the Schema question which has caused previous cohorts problems in the past. The memory model was generally well understood but few knew the strategies in any detail.

Q2a - Most candidates were able to identify all three phases correctly. In relation to associative phase – a common answer, not credited was for candidates to state that some learners never leave this phase.. Good exam practice was seen in the naming and describing of the stages but a high proportion of candidates did not provide valid practical examples which meant that they could not access the full range of marks.

Q2bi – Generally well answered. A small number of candidates failed to identify the type of skill so as a result could not score across 2bii. Most candidates managed to link a skill correctly to its place on the complexity continuum, but the then struggled to gain full marks for the justification.

Q2bii - Most candidates were able to correctly state and describe practice methods, although linking the correct practice method to the correct skill classification was clearly a challenge for quite a few candidates. Many candidates embedded their answers with practical examples.

Quite often the wrong practices were identified, especially if complex skill given. Eg golf swing complex. use Whole practice and Fixed = no marks but a reasonable answer for that skill. Mental practice came up a lot as well. Many chose their practice type based on the skill not necessarily the continuum thus scored 2/4.

Q2c – This was generally well answered. Most candidates identified memory items and described them. For response outcomes students were often too vague in stating that it was about knowing what should or would happen as opposed to what did happen. Most candidates who answered correctly managed to mention recall and recognition schema, and there were some good answers with examples when describing the various stages. Lots of candidates were able to name the model but not explain it, those that could explain accessed full marks well. Knowledge of parts of schema good – explaining them sometimes vague

Q2d – Less well answered. Many candidates failed to apply modelling to healthy lifestyle behaviour as the question required. Many correctly identified attention, retention, motor reproduction and motivation but did not give a description. A lot of answers were too vague – there were not many 5 out of 5 candidates! Main points hit were 1,4,5,12. Very weak use of BAH examples therefore often hitting sub max of three. A lot of repetition with age and gender.

Q2e – Candidates' attention needs to be drawn to the question – “using practical examples” is key here. Failing to do so meant they were unable to access the higher levels. The first part of the question (multi-store model) was generally better answered than the second part. A pleasing number were able to link the different elements of the model so accessed top band accordingly. The most common strategies for improving memory that were mentioned were chunking and practice / rehearsal. Many omitted practical examples. Strategies were often named but not developed well. Most accessed band 2.

Question No. 3

Overall the socio-cultural studies was the most successfully answered of the three sections. There were several quite accessible questions, particularly 3a, c and d. Candidates performed well on the part 'e' question but fewer managed to attain Level 3 as anticipated.

Q3a – Very well answered question. Most candidates were able to mention a good number of reasons why sport has a high status in Australia. Main points hit were 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 12.

Q3bi – Most accessed point 1 but went on to repeat it, rather than access other areas of the mark scheme. Some thought that the National Lottery and government were involved in private funding. Lots of candidates simply explained all three types of funding.

Q3bii – Poor knowledge of the National Institutes was demonstrated. Many thought they provided funding or encouraged participation. Those who scored general accessed point 5 (medical support) but went on to list a range of types of medical support, rather than moving on to another point thus there was a lot of repetition. A large proportion of students mentioned the lottery or UK sport or Sport England.

Q3c – Generally answered well. Some did not read the question carefully enough and referred to bans. Those that failed to hit maximum marks often repeated information about point 3 or point 4 to do with physiological and psychological damage.

Q3d. – Once again, this was answered well, with most candidates mentioning both positive and negative effects and scoring relatively highly.

Q3e – Probably the best answered 10 mark question with a wide range of points made, though many did not develop these, and simply listed. Candidates should be encouraged to write in greater depth. The better responses included specific examples. In the ‘barriers’ section most candidates identified opportunity, provision and esteem as key areas they needed to discuss. A common misunderstanding was that fast food caused a sedentary lifestyle. Some candidates confused Opportunity with Provision in their descriptions and examples, likewise some were clearly considering barriers as reasons for sedentary lifestyles and visa-versa. Often there was not an equal balance in the way in which responses addressed the different aspects of the question.

G453 Principles and concepts across different areas of Physical Education

General Comments

In this series, the vast majority of candidates who sat this examination were very well prepared by centres, although there still remains a need for candidates to ensure that they manage their time effectively when answering each question. A minority of candidates seemed to run out of time, with their last response rushed and at times incomplete. The majority of candidates fulfilled the requirements of the paper's rubric.

This A2 paper is designed to test not only the knowledge and understanding related to Physical Education theory but also applied knowledge, including the ability to critically analyse and evaluate Physical Education material from each of the studied topic areas. Once again, the majority of candidates chose the questions on Historical Studies, Sports Psychology and Exercise and Sport Physiology and relatively few candidates attempted the Comparative Studies and Biomechanics questions.

The quality of written communication was again good, with many candidates writing effectively for the extended 20 mark questions, often showing a good understanding of the requirements of each question. The handwriting was poor for a significant minority of candidates and this makes it difficult for examiners to make sense of what has been written. Some candidates who scored less well on the extended questions, as in previous series, showed a lack of effective planning and often including material irrelevant to the requirements of the question.

Comments on Individual Questions

1 Historical Studies

a.

This question required candidates to link the characteristics of popular recreation to the physical competence, health and opportunities for participation. Some candidates merely described the characteristics of popular recreation and did not explain how these characteristics affected the participants. The most successful candidates outlined each characteristic and then explained how each made an effect on participants in a structured and coherent way.

b.

Most candidates scored few marks for their description of the influences of the Clarendon Report. Some merely related the report to an Ofsted style inspection or simply left this section unanswered. The most successful candidates described improvements made as a result of the report but very few scored the maximum marks available for this part of the question. In the second part of this question candidates were more able to explain how public schools were central to the development of team games in the nineteenth century, with candidates' responses explaining well the 'melting pot' of the varied activities that the boys brought to their schools and also explaining how the house system helped with the development as well as the influence of head teachers such as Thomas Arnold.

c.

Most candidates scored well by describing accurately the objectives, content and methodology of the 1950's publications. Centres have prepared candidates very well for this part of the specification and candidates had a good understanding of these 20th century developments. The responses to the second part of this question was more mixed with some candidates leaving this part unanswered. Candidates are reminded to check that they have answered all parts of each question before moving to the next question. The better candidates described well how the building of gymnasias resulted in more varied activities being available but few recognised the importance of this indoor type facility or the use of apparatus within the gymnasias to stimulate the learning of the children.

d. Many candidates responded extremely well to this extended question and showed a high level of preparation for such a question on swimming. Candidates are assessed on their quality of communication and most candidates wrote with clarity and coherence. This twenty-mark question demands an extended answer and the levels mark scheme includes a judgement on the quality of written communication.

The best candidates explained in a structured form how swimming developed as a popular recreation, then turned their attention to rational recreation and then finally a few paragraphs at the end that discussed well the factors that impacted on contemporary participation and performance. The candidates that covered all the variables in the question - popular recreation, rational recreation, contemporary participation along with relating this to participation and performance did well. These candidates not only made each point clear, they also developed each point and often gave valid practical examples. Candidates are reminded that effective planning for these extended questions should include all of the variables in the question to score well on the levels mark scheme.

2. Comparative Studies

a.

This question proved difficult for a significant minority of candidates. Many were confused by the terms inter-mural and intra-mural and gave incorrect definitions and comparisons. Candidates are reminded that key terms such as these are required to be thoroughly understood so that they can be applied to the relevant country - in this case the USA. The better candidates were clear with their understanding of the terms and then went on to compare clearly using terms used in the question - in this case organisation, status and ethos. Candidates should use the structure of each question to structure their answer thus ensuring that all aspects of each question are answered.

b.

This was answered well by many candidates but few scored the full five marks available because although they outlined the aim of Title IX well, they did not then fully discuss the benefits and drawbacks. The question asks for both benefits and drawbacks so candidates who left one of these out would not have had access to all the marks available - another example of the need for all elements of each question to be answered to score well.

c.

Although some candidates clearly had knowledge of Rugby league in Australia and the UK, many were unable to make appropriate comparisons. This topic area demands that candidates compare factors relating to either Australia or the USA with those found in the UK. Relatively few marks are given for factors relating to any single country. The question is clear about the need to make comparisons and those that made these comparisons directly between the growth and development of Rugby League in Australia and Rugby League in the UK scored well.

d.

In this 20-mark question, many candidates showed good knowledge and understanding of schools in Australia compared with those in the UK and could show how each help prepare young people for lifelong participation in physical activities. The better candidates made comparisons as they progressed throughout their answer. These candidates wrote in clear paragraphs and followed a plan that not only linked each country but also made comments related to the effectiveness of each system. In critical evaluation-type questions, the more successful candidates identify and explain both strengths and weakness in each system. Some candidates wove their evaluation within their comparisons of each country - others wrote separate paragraphs at the end of their response critically evaluating each system. Either of these two approaches is acceptable and the differentiation between candidates becomes clear when candidates give examples of differences or similarities clearly naming each country as they write. It was clearly evident this year that candidates were better prepared to discuss school provision in Australia and this resulted in many candidates scoring well for their comparisons between the school system in Australia with that of the UK.

3. Sports Psychology

a.

Candidates generally scored very highly on this question with a good understanding shown by many of the importance of goal setting to sports performers. The best candidates made clear points with a good explanation for each. Those that simply wrote single word answers were unable to score marks for the explanatory-type question.

b.

Overall, candidates showed a good understanding of the peak flow experience associated with the zone of optimal functioning. Many recognised that different individual performers in sport experience this peak flow at different levels of arousal, depending on the type of activity undertaken. Those that made separate points scored separate marks, with some repeating the same point and scoring fewer marks. Candidates are reminded that for full marks to be scored, different point should be made. The question demands that candidates use practical examples to exemplify their answer and some candidates were unable to access the full range of marks because they used few if any practical examples.

c.

Although many candidates showed some understanding of social facilitation and social inhibition, many did not explain fully how each was affected by the separate factors such as skill and personality variables. This that scored well made clear links between how each factor causes either social facilitation or social inhibition. For example one high scoring candidate identified that playing either at home or ways affected the performer and that playing at home often facilitated or helped performance, whereas playing away often inhibited or hindered performance in sport.

d.

Most candidates could explain the trait, social learning and interactionist theories identified in the specification. The better candidates made clear points, developed them well and then gave relevant practical examples that linked personality to sports performance and to following a healthy lifestyle. Part of the question asks for a critical evaluation and the best candidates gave answers that explored both the pros and he cons of each theory, again often using practical examples to illustrate their points. Clear planning helped most candidates who explained each theory clearly and then followed with clear advantages and disadvantages. Those that scored fewer marks only superficially explored each theory or got the theories confused. Others did not give practical examples that covered both ports performance and healthy lifestyles. Candidates generally had a more comprehensive understanding of the trait theory but less so for social learning and interactionist theories.

4. Biomechanics

a.

Many candidates could describe well the three axes of rotation. The question requires a practical example for each and a few candidates omitted practical examples and were unable to score marks. This topic area of the specification requires not only knowledge and understanding of biomechanical theory, but also the application of these theories to practical situations. Centres who have taught the topic using regular applications to performance in sport produce candidates who are able to answer well these applied questions.

b.

Most candidates answered this question well. Diagrams this year were clearly drawn and showed good knowledge of the effort arm and the load arm for this class two lever system. Most were able to complete the calculation accurately and then went on to explain one advantage and one disadvantage of this lever system. A minority of candidates did not answer this last part of the question or only identified and advantage or a disadvantage and not both.

c.

This question was less well answered by many candidates. The term friction was not described fully, with many making only a brief comment and thus not covering the sliding, direction or that fact that friction acts parallel to the two surfaces. Candidates were too superficial with their descriptions of how different factors can change the amount of friction generated, with too many concentrating solely on surface on to ground friction. Candidates should be reminded that when a question demands that different factors are required that answers must reflect this and not to concentrate on one factor alone. The better candidates, however, did describe well the different factors changing the amount of friction and some gave an excellent account related to the roughness of the surface, the down force of the object and even the temperature of the surfaces involved. Again practical examples are required and only those using practical examples were able to access the full range of marks available.

d.

This was well answered by many candidates who were able to accurately sketch a free body diagram clearly showing all the forces acting on the table tennis ball with backspin. These successful candidates then clearly explained how backspin causes deviation both in the flight path and the bounce of the ball. The best candidates gave an excellent critical evaluation of the use of backspin in sport using a range of practical examples - often using tennis, football and golf as relevant sports.

Those that scored less well did not address all aspects of the question, for example explaining how backspin affects the flight path but omitting the bounce of the ball. Others did not include a critical evaluation or who were too descriptive in this part of their answer and not identifying clearly the advantages and disadvantages of the backspin.

5. Exercise and Sport Physiology

a.

Most candidates answered this question extremely well and were able to identify the appropriate (aerobic) energy system. Candidates had obviously been prepared well for such a question and wrote with clarity and clearly explained the resynthesis of ATP in a systematic manner. The small minority who scored few marks identified the wrong system or confused some elements of the resynthesis process.

b.

This proved to be a high scoring question with most candidates able to give one appropriate method of flexibility training. Most then went on to explain the physiological adaptations that would take place following such training. The candidates who scored less well gave only one or two adaptations and therefore could not score the four marks available for the explanations.

c.

Most candidates identified two types of ergogenic aids that would benefit an aerobic athlete, although a minority of candidates gave ergogenic aids more suited to anaerobic performers and therefore could not score the marks available. Many correctly identified blood doping, cooling aids and dietary manipulation as ergogenic aids as well as other aids such as gene doping. The better candidates then went on to explain how each of the two aids identified could enhance performance. The lower scoring candidates explained how each of their ergogenic aids but did not explain how they might benefit the aerobic performer.

d.

This question requires an extended answer and is marked using a levels mark scheme that takes into account the quality of written communication. The top-level candidates' responses were characterised again by some brief planning notes and their answers covered all areas of the question thoroughly. Those that scored high on the levels mark scheme gave a clear and accurate definition of body composition and then went on to explain how different body compositions could benefit two different types of sports performer - often marathon runners and sumo wrestlers were used to contrast the different body compositions. These top candidates then identified several different methods of measuring body composition, described each in detail and then evaluated their effectiveness - explaining both advantages and disadvantages for each. Those that scored in the middle of the level mark scheme bands were less thorough in their approach and were less accurate in their explanation. Those that scored few marks often

left out part of the question or gave superficial descriptions rather than explanations or their evaluation was non-existent or merely identified expense or simplicity of use as evaluations - these often being accurate but rarely expanded upon.

G452 Acquiring, developing and evaluating practical skills in physical education

G454 The improvement of effective performance and the critical evaluation of practical activities in physical education

Excellent teamwork by moderators and centres ensured that moderations were implemented, were successful and candidates fairly treated.

The many centres who hosted moderations are to be thanked for their hospitality and for ensuring that the candidates and teachers involved had a positive and beneficial experience. The moderating team are once again very grateful for these centres' involvement and commitment to making moderations so successful.

As in previous years moderators were fortunate and privileged to be able to view outstanding performances by many talented candidates and interact with many committed and well informed teachers.

The new documentation, the PEMIF, was again used by many centres. Unfortunately whilst some of last year's faults have been eradicated one or two issues remain. Hopefully for future series' the remaining issues can be addressed. However, whilst it is not without its faults and frustrations, it does aid centres and reduces the number of arithmetical errors made by centres. It is important given that some occasional issues have still be found that centres do check the output of the forms prior to submission.

There are still a large number of errors made when transferring marks to the MS1 form and centres need to ensure that this process is carefully checked as errors often lead to candidates being disadvantaged.

Practical activity assessments continue to be fairly accurate although there is still a tendency to be a little generous at the top end of the mark range by some centres. Many centres have taken the advice given in previous reports and are being more realistic in their assessments at the top of the mark range. Because of most centres' acceptance of the advice given by moderators and the report to centres, grade boundaries were unaltered this year.

It is, however, still worthwhile repeating the guidance given in previous years for both G452 & G454. We are in the situation where in G452 candidates who are assessed at 24 or 25, which is the top of band 2/bottom of band 1 are A grade candidates. Candidates marked at 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30 are very good candidates. In G454 the A boundary is now at the equivalent of the bottom of band 1 for the practical performance, 33, and this allows us to use band 1 to differentiate amongst our Grade A and A* candidates. This year the A * boundary is the equivalent of 36/40. Centres should therefore be aware that candidates marked at 36, 37, 38, 39 or 40 are exceptional candidates. This is indicated in the banded assessment criteria which state that candidates in this range will be gaining, where appropriate, representative recognition at national level. It is of concern, however, that centres appear to be reluctant to differentiate amongst these most able candidates and simply award them 40. The statistics still indicate that centres are less likely to use the marks 37, 38, 39 and tend to move straight to 40/40 where they see what they feel is a very high level of performance

This often appears to be the case for candidates being assessed in activities where they may be the only candidate assessed by the centre in that activity and which does not form part of the centre's core activities. This reinforces the need for centres to implement a robust internal standardisation process to ensure that candidates assessed in these activities are awarded marks in the same way as candidates in other activities.

It is worth noting here that in some activities, notably in the Outdoor & Adventurous category, it is unlikely that candidates will meet the descriptors of Bands 1 & 2 if their level of experience and the assessment itself is based upon occasional activity and expeditions, i.e.

Band 1

The candidate demonstrates **a very high level of acquired and developed skills** that show a **consistently high standard of accuracy, control and fluency** under performance pressure.

There is **consistent successful selection and application of a wide range of advanced techniques** which, under performance pressure, maintain their accuracy, fluency and control.

Band 2

The candidate demonstrates **a high level of acquired and developed skills** that show a **consistently high standard of accuracy, control and fluency** under performance pressure.

There is consistent successful selection and application of a range of advanced techniques which, under performance pressure, maintain their accuracy, fluency and control when they have only learned and applied these skills on a 3-5 day course. The likelihood of candidates being 'consistent' is low as in some instances they will only have implemented the skills once. In these instances candidates themselves know that they are not at the same standard in these activities as they are in their main activity which often they have been practising for years yet they are awarded the same mark.

Some centres for their G454 candidates have included with their assessments candidate 'profiles' outlining their level of performance/competition, successes and level of representation. This has proved to be extremely useful to moderators and centres will be encouraged to do this for each G454 candidate in future assessments.

Centres should be aware that statistically the subject does reasonably well with 31% of candidates achieving an A grade in G452 whilst in G454 19.4% achieve A* and a further 28.1% an A in 2016.

The routes of Coaching and Officiating are now firmly embedded in the specification with centres comfortable and accurate in their assessment. Again these routes were, in the main accurately assessed and it was once again pleasing to see excellent, talented candidates selecting these routes and capitalising on the time and effort they have invested in developing their skills.

Log books which form part of several practical activities, as well as Coaching and Officiating, continue to be over assessed. Centres need to ensure that they use the assessment criteria for the activity which can be found in the Coursework Guidance Material and the front cover sheet which can be found on the OCR website. The main causes of over assessment are candidates not including all the aspects required and not going into sufficient depth and detail for work at GCE level.

Oral responses are becoming, for most centres, accurately assessed and the process implemented well. However for some centres they continue to be a challenge. There is a need for these centres to ensure that they adhere more closely to the rubric in the Coursework Guidance booklet.

Centres are reminded that the rubric for oral responses states that ‘candidates should observe the live performance of a fellow candidate.’ This situation is replicated at moderation when candidates are expected to observe and comment on a live performance. It is a disappointment that many candidates have not developed their skills within this ‘live’ environment and are not confident in them and therefore do not perform the skills well at live moderation.

Whilst it is acceptable for centres to create classroom situations for candidates to produce their oral responses for filmed assessment evidence, they should not lose sight of the fact that the skills which are being assessed are those of evaluating a **live** performance and creating an action plan to improve that performance. Candidates need to be better prepared in order to do this at moderation as many produce responses which do not warrant the marks which they have been given.

It should also be noted that the Coursework Guidance material indicates that ‘Candidates are assessed in their ability to produce and oral response in which they evaluate and appreciate the live effective performance of a fellow candidate (rather than that of a team.....)’ Centres should therefore note that candidates need to focus on one performer and that performer must not be an elite performer.

For the centres who continue to find the oral response and its assessment a challenge it is worthwhile repeating the guidance given previously.

As indicated above whilst it is acceptable for candidates to perform their oral response in the classroom situation for the purposes of producing filmed evidence, we should not lose sight that the rubric indicates it should be a live performance and therefore access to teaching aids e.g. white boards etc. is not really compatible with the intended context of the evaluation and response. It is also not permissible for candidates to receive visual prompts/stimuli via powerpoint or whiteboards.

Candidates need to ensure that they describe both the strengths and weaknesses of the performance in the areas of skills, tactics/compositional ideas and fitness and to justify their evaluations. The banded assessment criteria for the evaluation aspect of the response indicate:

Band 1 Accurately describes **all** the major strengths/weaknesses in relation to the skills, tactics/compositional ideas and fitness of the performance observed.

Band 2 Accurately describes **most** of the major strengths/weaknesses in relation to the skills, tactics/compositional ideas and fitness of the performance observed.

Band 3 Describes **some** of the major strengths/weaknesses in relation to the skills, tactics/compositional ideas and fitness of the performance observed.

Candidates who in their responses describe only one strength and one weakness in each of the three areas are therefore likely to be placing themselves in Band 3 for this aspect of their response. Centres who adopt a strategy of advising candidates to focus on one of each aspect are denying them access to the full range of marks.

Action plans, whatever aspect the prioritised weakness is from, need to include detailed coaching points, progressive practices and a timescale. If the prioritised weakness is a fitness element then it is realistic to expect the action plan to include factors such as the exercises, repetitions, sets, weights, rest intervals, intensities etc. as well as progressions.

Centres should ask the suggested opening question, which is identified in the coursework guidance material, as this reminds candidates of the structure and content of the response.

Whilst it is perhaps understandable that centres encourage candidates to apply relevant theory in their oral responses it should be made clear that at AS, within the EPIP, the only theory required is the participation and progression and health and fitness benefits of the activity observed. Other theoretical aspects applied within the EPIP, whilst not disadvantaging the candidate, **will gain them no credit and can make the response more difficult for the candidate.**

Centres should also note that the rubric for the G454 response. Evaluation & Appreciation (E & A) indicates that ' candidates should support their evaluative and appreciative comments and their strategy with the **application of relevant** principles and concepts from the disciplines they have studied. ' They should be selective in the theory they include and ensure that it both applied and relevant. Too often candidates regurgitate most of the theory they have learned which is often neither relevant nor applied. It is often the case that candidates include theory which is neither relevant nor applied in their response and extends the response beyond the recommended 15-20 minutes.

Centres should also be aware that in both the responses, EPIP and E & A, the assessment criteria indicate that candidates who require supplementary questioning will be placed in band 3 or band 4. This has particular implications for centres who structure their candidate responses as a question and answer session. Centres should however, be aware that using a question to redirect a candidate to an area of the response which they have missed is not construed as being supplementary questioning and should be used to help candidates meet the criteria.

Centres are also reminded that when candidates are undertaking their oral responses, particularly when filmed evidence is being produced, it is essential that the environment the response is carried out in is free from interruptions e.g. phone calls, people knocking on doors, people walking in, caretakers cleaning the room etc. This continues to be an issue when viewing centres' filmed evidence of oral responses.

When filmed evidence is being produced the quality of the sound is also an essential consideration. The moderator will need to hear as well as see in order to form a judgment as to the accuracy of the centre's assessments.

Centres should also note that when the candidate is being assessed or filmed evidence is being produced it should be carried out under examination conditions and therefore it is essential that a member of staff is present and it is done within the centre environment.

Centres should be aware that an integral part of the filmed evidence for oral responses is footage of the performance the candidate has observed which enables the moderator to form a realistic opinion of the accuracy of the candidate's response.

The oral response is a demanding aspect of the specification. **Whilst it is difficult to place a time frame on oral responses as candidates talk and think at different speeds, we need to be realistic about it. Good candidates can produce a response which contains all the aspects required in sufficient depth and detail in fifteen to twenty minutes.** Centres should advise candidates that, similarly to the extended answer questions in G451 & G453, there is a need to be accurate and concise as it is the quality of the response and not the length which determines the mark awarded. Centres who allow candidates to produce responses that extend to 30 – 45 minutes are placing undue pressure on candidates which is both unfair and unrealistic. In most cases where responses are this sort of duration, candidates are repeating most of the information given rather than using the whole of the time to provide new material which is gaining credit.

Centres should note that candidates are encouraged to make notes as they observe the performance. The oral response is part of the examination process and therefore examination conditions apply meaning that candidates should be provided with a blank piece of paper. Pre-prepared notes are not permitted.

The process is continuous. Candidates should indicate when they feel they have observed the performance for long enough and be allowed a few moments to collect their thoughts before commencing their response. They should not write out their response.

In terms of assessing the oral response centres should take into account that the A boundary is nominally at 16 for both G452 & G454 with the A* boundary for G454 being nominally at 18. This again indicates that candidates being marked at 18, 19 & 20 are exceptional candidates. It was noticeable this year that many well prepared candidates were delivering responses which placed them in band 1.

As mentioned in previous reports filmed evidence is becoming increasingly important to the moderation process. It is essential, therefore, that centres are aware of their responsibilities in relation to this aspect of assessment/moderation. These responsibilities can be summarised as follows:

- The need to produce and submit filmed evidence for:
 - Each and every activity assessed; evidence at the top, middle and bottom of the mark range; this should also include activities which would normally be expected to be viewed at moderation.
 - EIPs and E & A's; evidence at the top, middle and bottom of the mark range: The number of candidates recorded should relate to the size of the centre's cohort but should be sufficient to enable the moderator to form a sound opinion as to the accuracy of the centre's marking. The Coursework Guidance material indicates that there should be evidence of 2 candidates at each of the points in the mark range.
 - all candidates offering coaching or officiating; 40 minutes for each candidate.
- This evidence needs to be submitted according to the following deadlines:
 - EIPs and E & As by 31 March; along with the assessments;
 - other practical activities – as requested by the moderator;
 - coaching and officiating by 31 March;
 - AS seasonal activities by 15 May along with the assessments.
- This evidence needs to show:
 - candidates in the appropriate assessment situation for the unit and the activity ie for AS invasion games competitive skill drills and small sided conditioned games (not the full game situation);
 - evidence should last long enough for the full range of skills to be viewed and a reliable decision to be made as to the accuracy of the centre's assessments;
 - it is essential that for activities which have component parts e.g. circuit training, swimming, cricket, Olympic weightlifting, that the filmed evidence contains footage of all those component parts.
 - candidates must be clearly identified, numbered bibs or shirts, and either introduced on the film or identified in accompanying documentation. This is essential as if candidates cannot be easily identified and linked to their assessment it renders the filmed evidence worthless
 - It continues to be a significant problem that centres produce filmed evidence particularly for team games that the candidate being assessed cannot be identified by the moderator.

The filmed evidence needs to be in the appropriate format i.e. playable on Windows Media Player or on a DVD player, as per the guidance on the OCR Website (http://pdf.ocr.org.uk/download/forms/ocr_63501_form_gce_form_cwi771.pdf?).

As mentioned earlier in this report significant progress has been made in bringing the documentation closer to that which is relevant to the 21st century. We recognise that it is not perfect but reduces the workload for both teachers and moderators. It has also led to a significant reduction in the number of errors which often disadvantage candidates. I make no apologies for repeating again that the most significant cause of errors now is the transferring of marks from the Final Practical activity sheet to the MS1 form. The MS1 form is OCR's method of entering the candidate's mark onto their system and therefore errors made transferring marks from the Final Practical Activity form to the MS1 form can affect the candidate's grade.

When completing documentation it is essential that for activities with component part marks e.g. cricket, swimming, athletics, outdoor and adventurous activities, circuit training, that all the component part marks are entered on the forms. These marks enable the moderator to relate the specific mark for that component to what they view at moderation.

The Visiting Arrangement Form VAF which centres complete early in the academic year enables moderators to start the planning process for moderations and it is therefore essential that centres complete and submit this form by the appropriate date.

Moderation is part of the examination process and centres are reminded that candidates who are requested, by the moderator, to attend moderation are required to do so. Whilst it is recognised that there may be valid reasons why candidates cannot attend it is essential that moderators are informed and that the appropriate supporting documentation is forwarded to the moderator.

Centres should note that candidates who are injured or ill and therefore cannot perform in, or attend, moderation need to submit their medical evidence to the moderator. Centres should not apply to OCR for special consideration if a candidate has been assessed but cannot attend moderation. Centres should also note that the Special Considerations process has been revamped at OCR with a department now dealing with centres applications and it is therefore essential that they inform their moderator of any applications they have made for special consideration for candidates.

Centres are also reminded that they are responsible for their candidates whilst at moderation. It is, therefore, a requirement that candidates are accompanied by a teacher from their centre at moderation. Centres should also ensure that their candidates are appropriately attired and that they have the necessary safety equipment for the activities they are participating in. Candidates should be aware that part of the assessment criteria relates to the knowledge, understanding and application of the rules and regulations of the activity and not complying with these may affect the moderator's judgement of the accuracy of their centre's assessment. Moderators may refuse to allow candidates without appropriate equipment to participate in activities. It is disappointing that at some moderations this continues to be an issue. It should also be noted that it is the centre's staff who are responsible for their candidates at moderation.

The moderating team for G452 & G454 would like to take this opportunity to thank candidates, centres and teachers for all their help in making the moderation process so successful in 2016.

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

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 2016

