

A LEVEL

Moderators' report

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

H555

For first teaching in 2016

H555/06 Summer 2022 series

Contents

Introduction	3
General overview/Introduction	4
Positives	5
Areas for improvement.....	5
Most common causes of centres not passing.....	7
Common misconceptions.....	7
Avoiding potential malpractice.....	8
Additional comments.....	9

Introduction

Our moderator' 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/Introduction

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

It is appreciated that for some centres the assessment process this year has been challenging. That said, it was felt that the changes to the EAPI made this academic year were on the whole widely accepted as positive in nature and provided greater clarity to some aspects of the task.

The removal of a 'live' candidate EAPI from the moderation day process was seen as a significant positive. This did mean, though, that centres did not get an opportunity to get direct feedback - there were lots of EAPI conversations over the lunch break and it was felt that through providing this style of generic feedback, centres once again became more comfortable with the assessment process and developed their own deeper understanding of how to submit candidate marks.

It is very clear that the assessment of the EAPI is still causing centres the greatest difficulty and this is where the vast majority of adjustments have been made across the national picture. It must be highlighted that on the whole centres are well versed with the structure of the 'oral response' element of the Non-Exam Assessment however, it was felt that many centres still need to look more closely at the specification to identify the changes.

During the pandemic much work was undertaken to try and streamline the EAPI task and make it more accessible to both students and centres to assess. The introduction of a candidate notes sheet was very well received with the vast majority of centres making use of this.

The new assessment grids focus the assessment process to the three main elements: 'Evaluation of Performance', 'Development Plan' and 'Application of Theory', each of which carries an equal weighting. The first column relating to 'Prompting and Timing' is there to highlight when a candidate's final assessment is restricted by either 'prompting' or 'exceeding the time allowed'.

The updated EAPI Mark Sheet now has greater subdivision with individual headers to aid centres in their assessment process. It is also double sided to fall into line with the desire to split the task into two distinct sections; the Evaluation and Analysis and the Development Plan. Centres are strongly advised to use this when deciding on what marks to submit for their own candidates.

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. The 'Development Plan' continues to be the weakest area of candidates' responses as these are often to basic in nature and lack the depth and detail to warrant the marks submitted by centres. The 'Application of Theory' has been mixed this year with many candidates applying theory that is not on the new 'prescribed list' contained within the Guide to NEA. As such they could not be credited for their comments. Centres are strongly advised to make sure that candidates are aware of this list and look to avoid repetition of Theory throughout their response.

Overall, the lack of depth and detail in the Development Plan and the provision of Theory not included on the 'prescribed list' resulted in the vast majority of centres significantly over assessing their candidates and many centres will have had their marks amended.

Positives

Candidates were well prepared for the task and were ofay with the process. 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.

It was clear that many of the elements are now being addressed in candidate responses following the feedback from the previous series. Most notable was a balance of the theory across both the evaluative comments and development plan, the linking of evaluative comments to the overall success of performance and the blocking of macro/meso/microcycles within the development plan.

The vast majority of candidates kept their responses within the approved limit of 30 minutes.

Areas for improvement

Many candidates are still focusing their response on the 'Application of Theory' rather than balancing the time across the three sections; much of the excessive time is in relation to defining theory rather than applying it.

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 centres are still not identifying the 'newer' elements within the **evaluative comments** of the EAPI, most notably:

- Level of success: this should not only relate to the individual performer but also how their observations will affect the overall performance of the team where appropriate.
- Justification of weakness: candidates should relate their selection to the level of success and the potential gains that could be found by a significant improvement.

Many centres did not identify the removal of some elements within the **development plan** of the EAPI, most notably:

- timescale justifications
- measurement of improvements
- adaptations.

Many centres did not identify the need to ensure the progressive practices within the development 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 development 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.

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 credit 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; it is felt that to help candidates, the way in which the question is posed to them should now take two parts, with the candidate responding to each one in turn:

- Part 1: comment on the observation by analysing and evaluating the performance
- Part 2: creating of a viable development plan.

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

Many responses were focused on theoretical knowledge rather than the evaluative comments and the development plan.

Centres may find it helpful to view the EAPI in the following manner: The Evaluative comments are the skeleton of the response which the Development Plan builds on, in essence the muscular system, while the Application of Theory is the skin that binds the entire response together.

Paperwork and filmed evidence submission - guidance

Centres are reminded that all assessed marks are now to be submitted to directly through their Exams Officer on Interchange by the 31 March deadline and that their moderator will have access to these remotely.

It was greatly appreciated by moderators that most centres were well prepared for the submission of their EAPI filmed evidence on the 31 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 USB's. While we commend this approach, centres must make sure that any such encryption can be accessed by both Windows and Apple products; many moderators were not able to open some encrypted sticks due to the differing operating systems.

We would also suggest that centres take time to compress both their EAPI filmed evidence before uploading to the USB so that there is not the need to purchase multiple large capacity USB's; there are many free software tools available to compress video files.

When labelling candidates' files on the USB 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. This will mean each video recording will be c.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.

Centres are also reminded that the candidate notes used within their EAPI response should be collected and included in their submission to their moderator. It is also helpful to include the centre mark sheet; we can then evaluate how a centre has assessed its candidates and we can provide more detailed feedback. Please be aware that, like the filmed evidence, the centre should keep a copy of all 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.

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 development 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. We have now introduced the prescribed theory list which we hope will 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 30 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.

Avoiding potential malpractice

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

- Candidates 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 candidates notes taken during the observation must also be included in the despatch to moderators.
- 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.

OCR support



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

Additional comments

Although the EAPI component is now separate to the performance component the moderation team would like to thank centres for their continued professional discussions at moderation days around the EAPI structure and assessment.

Centres are strongly encouraged to regularly review the Physical Education pages of the OCR website for updates and attend the free 'Ask the Moderator' online 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.