

A LEVEL

Moderators' report

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

H555

For first teaching in 2016

H555/05 Summer 2022 series

Contents

Introduction	3
General overview	4
Most common causes of centres not passing.....	11
Common misconceptions.....	11
Avoiding potential malpractice.....	11
Helpful resources.....	12
Additional comments.....	12

Introduction

Our moderators' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on candidates' performance in the examinations. They provide useful guidance for future candidates.

The reports will include a general commentary on candidates' performance, identify technical aspects examined in the questions and highlight good performance and where performance could be improved. The reports will also explain aspects which caused difficulty and why the difficulties arose, whether through a lack of knowledge, poor examination technique, or any other identifiable and explainable reason.

Where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report.

Advance Information for Summer 2022 assessments

To support student revision, advance information was published about the focus of exams for Summer 2022 assessments. Advance information was available for most GCSE, AS and A Level subjects, Core Maths, FSMQ, and Cambridge Nationals Information Technologies. You can find more information on our [website](#).

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).

General overview

It was clear that although there has not been a moderated series for two years much of the feedback given during the 2018 and 2019 series had been taken on board and centres were more adept at utilising the full mark range across all 6 levels within the practical element.

It is fully appreciated that for some centres the assessment process this year has been challenging. That being said, moderators, host centres and all attending centres worked extremely well this year in order to enable the moderation process to occur and to make sure that alongside the assessment process detailed feedback was provided as to the reasons for the marks awarded. It was felt that through providing continual feedback that centres once again became more comfortable with the assessment process and developed their own deeper understanding of how to submit candidate marks.

Paperwork submission

The new version of the PEMIF for H555 is now the only method of providing the assessments to the moderator and this has eradicated the transcription errors from one sheet to another. However, this has not completely eliminated transcription errors as many errors were still found when entering data onto the IMS1 form.

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

Centres are also required to provide the additional evidence to their moderator at this time. The additional evidence required is all filmed evidence of 'off site' practical activities and a sample of 'on site' practical activities, all coaching activity evidence (log book and filmed evidence) and formal evidence of any times or distances recorded against a performance table (Athletics, Cycling, Swimming and Triathlon). It should be highlighted that this final element relating to performance table marks does need improving and centres need to make sure that this is included and not just part of the candidate's log book.

We are extremely keen to reduce the amount of physical paper centres need to forward on and would like centres to provide their candidate log books in electronic form on the USB stick along with their other filmed evidence. This can either be that the candidates have initially produced their logs in an electronic form or the hand written copy is scanned in and saved as a PDF version.

Once again, the major issue with completing the paperwork by 31st March was the provision of the IMS1 form. Centres should be aware that the marks on the Final Practical Activity form also need to be forwarded to the board via an IMS1, which can be accessed via the OCR Interchange system. As before this was an issue as many PE staff do not have access to either the OCR Interchange system or that their level of access does not enable them to enter marks as such, they require time with their Exams Officer to complete the process. The majority of the transcription errors identified were in relation to activities that have component marks where the initial component mark was submitted rather than the overall mark.

We are also aware that centres have concerns over the storage and movement of their candidates' evidence by USB and many are now using encrypted USBs. This is a fully justified approach but it is requested that if such a process is used then please can centres make sure that the type of encrypted USB can be opened on both Windows and Mac operating systems as in many cases moderators were not able to access the evidence. We would also suggest that centres take time to compress both their filmed and EAPI evidence so that there is not the need to purchase multiple large capacity USBs.

Centres should also note that the Special Considerations process has been revamped at OCR with a department now dealing with centre applications and it is therefore essential that they inform their moderators of any application they have made under this system.

Paperwork submission

Positives:

1. On the whole the deadline for paperwork was met and centres were able to provide both the EAPI and additional filmed evidence as required.
2. The majority of centres provided component marks where appropriate, i.e. Cricket. Centres should be aware that on the new PEMIF when you select an activity that has component marks two or more pink boxes are highlighted for mark entry, whereas an activity that only has one mark requirement one pink box becomes highlighted.
3. Most centres are now compiling all the evidence onto one USB stick for submission to the moderator. This might require some compression of the filmed evidence but does both reduce cost for the centre as well as improve the process for the moderator.

Areas for Improvement:

1. Many centres still had not fully recognised the need for all marks to be submitted electronically via the IMS1 marks which cause this element of the paperwork to arrive late to moderators. Exams Officers should be fully aware how to submit a centres' marks and print a confirmation copy that must be sent to the moderator. Centres are reminded that the IMS1 needs to be submitted at the same time as the PEMIF documents before 31st March.
2. There were some transcription errors between the PEMIF and the IMS1. Centres need to make sure that this process is carefully checked as errors often lead to candidates being disadvantaged. It is advised that where the inputting of the IMS1 marks is completed by the Exams Officer a member of the staff directly involved with the PE process also be present to spot errors at the point of entry as this year many entries were made for sub sections of marks rather than at the overall mark point.
3. Where a centre has submitted a candidate for either Athletics, Cycling, Swimming or Triathlon there is a need for a performance related mark, which is derived from the Performance Tables within the Guide to NEA. Here centres should also provide hard copy evidence of the recorded time/distance to the moderator via an official results sheet from the event. Within the PEMIF centres should first enter the Skill / Technique mark out of 30 (1/3rd of mark) then the time / Performance Table mark out of 30 (2/3rds of mark) in order to make sure that the candidate obtains the correct final score. The PEMIF automatically input the words Skill and Time for you but the ideal way of transcribing this would be for example: Skill - 800m in the first box & Time = 1.52.4 in the second this way the moderator is clear on both the event and the performance record.

Filmed evidence and log book submission

It was greatly appreciated by moderators that most centres were well prepared for the submission of both filmed practical and log book on 31st March. Centres are reminded that all the evidence they pass on to the moderator should be a copy as these will no longer be returned to the centre after the assessment process.

Many centres are rightly concerned about GDPR and the sending of filmed evidence by post and have invested in encrypted USBs. While the board commend this process, centres need to make sure that any such encryption can be access by both Windows and Apple products as many moderators were not able to open some encrypted sticks due to the differing operating systems.

We are trying to reduce the amount of physical paper within any centre submission and would strongly recommend that centres either create their log books electronically or scan in the paper copies and submit these as a PDF on their USB.

Although the requirement of centres to provide filmed evidence was increased from 2019 to account for the potential of a moderation being disrupted by Covid this was ultimately not needed and it is expected that the requirement of provision will fall back to the 2019 reduced level for the 2023 submission.

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 a moderation with the accompanying form. This was carried out by many more centres this year and although it does provide some logistical issues not only on the day but also in submitting to the board either as an individual centre or as a cluster, 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'.

Most centres followed the guidance on filmed evidence that was issued in the previous Moderation Reports and issued via the OCR website, where it identifies that centres should in addition to the 'off site' activity filmed evidence requirement keep as a minimum a record of 6 candidate performances, across 2 activities for 'on site' activities. Centres should look to make sure that this 'on site' evidence encompasses the range of marks awarded by a centre, ideally top, middle and lowest with each of the two activities filmed.

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 formal competitive situation. Although there was some leniency this year in terms of competitive situations due to the Covid pandemic this was often a significant barrier to the moderator's decision making process, especially with the 'off site' activities. Centres are reminded that it is their responsibility for the production of appropriate footage. For candidates offering Coaching for assessment then the two 40 minutes sessions that are filmed need to be continual in nature. Much evidence viewed had clips from a session which did not enable an appropriate assessment to occur.

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 two years of the A Level course. For those practical activities where the main 'in-competition' season is the summer such as Athletics & Cricket then it is acceptable that a candidate records their performances from the 1st July before their entry to Year 12.

Positives:

1. Centres were well prepared to provide filmed evidence of both 'on site' and 'off site' practical activities by 31st March.
2. Many centres are following good practice of filming a range of marks so that they can provide additional evidence to a moderator if they feel it is required, but also to use this footage for future EAPIs.
3. Many centres had collated their candidate log books in advance of the submission of marks in

Filmed evidence and log book submission

order to provide these to the moderator when requested. Best practice was identified where centres utilised a 'shared' document between the candidate and the member of staff to record the log; this way the live document could be regularly checked and printed as needed by the centre rather than a reliance on the candidate to provide the printed copy.

4. Most centres are providing filmed evidence in a format that can easily be played by the moderator; centres are reminded that it must be accessibly by a VLC player.

Areas for Improvement:

1. Centres need to be aware of the range of filmed evidence they need to provide to the moderator for 'on site' and 'off site' practical activities and coaching.
2. Centres need to be aware of the live filming requirement. This incorporates all practical activities their candidates are involved in as viewed by the moderator on the day.
3. When videoing the live practical activities it's very important that each candidate presents to the camera before the sessions starts so that they can easily identified at a later date if required. Many moderators reported that they struggled to clearly identify the performer from videos submitted.
4. Filming should include a range of shooting styles, i.e. a wide angle shot so all participants can be seen as well as closer up elements focusing on a smaller number of candidates so exact technicalities can be observed.
5. Centres need to make sure that candidates in video evidence provided to the moderator present to the camera at the start of a video so it is clear who they are and what their identifying bid/number is.
6. Greater consideration of the environmental conditions, i.e. teacher / student conversations around the camera need to be made. Much of the filmed evidence viewed was marred by poor sound quality.
7. 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.
8. Provision of filmed evidence needs to be clearly labelled and must be a copy as this will not be returned to the centre after the assessment process. Moderators find it easiest if the evidence can be provided on a USB memory stick rather than multiple DVDs.
9. Centres need to check the quality of the filmed evidence they provide to their moderator. Much of the centre filmed evidence was of a low quality which could affect a candidate's marks as a thorough analysis of the assessment criteria cannot be made by the moderator. Centres should make sure that their evidence is not just a highlights reel of the candidate but also shows them in continuous game situations. In all aspects of the evidence the candidate must be clearly identifiable. It is also suggested that the candidate is filmed in the most appropriate situation in order for them to display their core and advance skills.
10. 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 the moderator. This is most prevalent in those sports that a centre itself does not offer 'in house'.
11. Centres need to make sure that the log books need to reference the competitive performances a candidate has undertaken for the past two years and should enable the moderator to have a good insight into both the candidate's level of performance as well as their overall influence on the competitive situation, including the final outcome. Many logs contained training sessions and did not provide the moderator enough detail about the level of performance.
12. Although centres are better at producing log books, we feel that best practice in terms of providing these to the moderator is in electronic format either through the original document or a PDF scan of the hand written document. These can then be placed onto the main USB submitted to the moderator.

Assessment of practical performance

On the whole the performance aspect of the specification continues to be a welcome aspect for centres who felt that assessing a candidate in one activity is more appropriate to all candidates. It should be highlighted the ability of a candidate to focus on their strongest activity is also reflected in the expectations of the assessment process.

Even through the lack of an assessed NEA component for two years due to Covid there has been a noticeable positive shift in the manner in which staff now interpret the assessment criteria and it is clear that centres are much 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.

Centres are now much clearer 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 2 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.

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 are encouraged to utilise the full range of marks within the specification and use the reference points around grade award (A at 20/30 and E at 9/30); however please recall these mark points have built in the effect of Covid on performance levels. 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.

Positives:

1. Centres had taken on board the advice given in the previous (2018/19) assessment cycles and there was evidence that most centres had a better understanding of the rigours required for each assessment level.
2. Most centres had spent a great deal of time working through the assessment criteria and were working to the line of best fit.
3. 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.
4. 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 also enables our 'elite' performers the recognition.
5. Centres were well prepared to provide filmed evidence of both 'on site' and 'off site' practical activities by 31st March.

Areas for Improvement:

1. Staff 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 many students being generously assessed especially at the lower range of marks submitted.
2. Many centres assessed their performers too narrowly across the mark range and as such did not allow the differentiation between candidates to be achieved. Centres are encouraged to use the full mark range appropriately; by applying a careful focus on the wording in the assessment criteria we are confident that centres will place their candidates appropriately.
3. It was disappointing that most centres did not always provide supporting evidence for

Assessment of practical performance

assessments that are directly linked to a performance table; Athletics, Cycling, Swimming and Triathlon. Centres are expected to provide a hard copy of the time or distance a candidate is putting forward as part of their assessment. It is felt the easiest form is a printout of the events result sheet which identifies all the relevant details such as candidate name, event, date and time/distance recorded and is then counter-signed by a member of the centre staff to authenticate the performance.

Assessment of coaching

Although the assessment of coaching is not new to OCR A Level PE, as with the Practical the line of best fit across the assessment criteria is. Here there is a focus around the Planning & Organisation, Delivery, Evaluation & Reflection and the Technical Knowledge of the candidate. These categories are further expanded by identifying the candidate's performance as a coach against the 6 sub categories (Range & Quality, Planning & Organisation, Delivery, Technical Knowledge, Evaluation & Reflection and Coaching Plan). It is this latter 6 sub categories that enable the line of best fit to be established and as such a final assessment mark identified.

The majority of centres over assessed their candidates and many centres will have had their marks amended. The major area of concern was the lack of standardisation between the assessed level of a coach and a practical performer; many 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. It is felt that through the moderation process it was made clear to all centres the reasons why these alterations would occur and once the rationale was explained and the assessment criteria was revisited it was felt that the assessments were accurate, fair and in line with the practical assessments previously agreed during the moderation day. It is felt that these adjustments and their rationale have been fully justified when looking at the placement of the grades identified earlier.

Positives:

1. Most centres followed the rubric for the number and duration of sessions as identified in the Guide to NEA.
2. All candidates produced a log of coaching which encompassed most of the areas required.
3. It is pleasing to see that many candidates are viewing coaching as a viable assessment process where they are looking to develop their knowledge of an individual sport and help others often within a school or club setting.

Areas for Improvement:

1. 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 high 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.
2. When assessing the coach for their 'Technical Knowledge' centres are reminded that we are looking at them being able to "demonstrate outstanding knowledge of the correct technical models for the skills and analytical phases of the activity and of the progressive practices" (Level 6) then we would be expecting the candidate / centre to utilise the 'performance' element of the Guide to NEA as an illustration of the range of core and advanced skills a candidate should be delivering within their teaching. It would be expected that a Level 5/6 coach should be delivering some of the advanced skills within their sessions and not just core skills to a good level; this might have a knock-on effect as to the age of the group a candidate coaches.
3. 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 be stipulated centres are reminded that the choice of group 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, and could provide individual feedback and fault correction as well as to their entire group..
4. It was evident from viewing log books that many candidates rotated their delivery between a variety of groups over the duration of the assessment process in order to meet the requirement of 20 sessions. The aim of the Guide to NEA is that the 20 sessions are delivered to the same group of performers so that a sustained developmental approach to coaching is achieved.

Assessment of coaching

5. The Guide to NEA clearly states that the duration of each coaching session should be 40 minutes and that a minimum of 2 are filmed. These filmed sessions provided to moderators should be start to finish and not clips of one session; it is also advised that centres make sure that the two coaching sessions filmed are the best coaching sessions the candidate has delivered both in terms of their coaching and the delivery of the most advanced skills thus enabling the moderator to award marks in the higher levels. Centres are also reminded that it is a 2 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 2 filmed sessions submitted and if these are clearly referenced to their log book we can choose which sessions to view for the assessment process.
6. 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 weaker practical performers to play at least recreationally on a weekly basis will make a significant difference.

Common misconceptions

- A candidate needs 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 both a range of skill footage as well as a continuous block of performance footage to fully understand the commonalities in performance.
- A 'Personal Best' for a candidate in a performance table activity (Athletics, Cycling, Swimming and Triathlon) can be used as their mark regardless of the date it was achieved; this is incorrect as the time must be achieved within the duration of the A Level course. We do allow marks from 1st July preceding the start of Year 12.
- A 'ParkRun' 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.
- Some activities are easier than others to access the assessment criteria; this is incorrect the standard 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, more often than not with 'off site' activities, where significant instructor led sessions are provided as evidence as such do not meet the assessment criteria.

Helpful resources

OCR support



It is strongly recommended that centres visit the 'OCR Train' section of the OCR website to take advantage of supporting assessment exemplars.

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 encouraged to continue to monitor, log and film candidates throughout the two years of the assessed course to make sure adequate footage is available.

Centres are strongly encouraged to regularly review the Physical Education pages of the OCR website for updates and attend the free "Ask the Moderator" on-line sessions throughout the year to clarify aspects of the assessment process.

Supporting you

Post-results services

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](#).

Keep up-to-date

We send a weekly roundup 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 CPD 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 on the relevant subject page on our [website](#) or visit [OCR professional development](#).

Signed up for ExamBuilder?

ExamBuilder is the question builder platform for a range of our GCSE, A Level, Cambridge Nationals and Cambridge Technicals qualifications. [Find out more](#).

ExamBuilder is **free for all OCR centres** with an Interchange account and gives you unlimited users per centre. We need an [Interchange](#) username to validate the identity of your centre's first user account for ExamBuilder.

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

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.

It allows you to:

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

[Find out more](#).

Need to get in touch?

If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our customer support centre.

Call us on
01223 553998

Alternatively, you can email us on
support@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit

 **ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder**

 **ocr.org.uk**

 **/ocrexams**

 **/ocrexams**

 **/company/ocr**

 **/ocrexams**

We really value your feedback

Click to send us an autogenerated email about this resource. Add comments if you want to. Let us know how we can improve this resource or what else you need. Your email address will not be used or shared for any marketing purposes.



I like this



I dislike this

Please note – web links are correct at date of publication but other websites may change over time. If you have any problems with a link you may want to navigate to that organisation’s website for a direct search.



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

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2022 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA. Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

OCR operates academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers including A Levels, GCSEs, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals.

OCR provides resources to help you deliver our qualifications. These resources do not represent any particular teaching method we expect you to use. We update our resources regularly and aim to make sure content is accurate but please check the OCR website so that you have the most up to date version. OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these resources.

Though we make every effort to check our resources, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, so it is important that you always use information in the latest specification. We indicate any specification changes within the document itself, change the version number and provide a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource, please [contact us](#).

You can copy and distribute this resource freely if you keep the OCR logo and this small print intact and you acknowledge OCR as the originator of the resource.

OCR acknowledges the use of the following content: N/A

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR or are thinking about switching, you can request more information using our [Expression of Interest form](#).

Please [get in touch](#) if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support you in delivering our qualifications.