

AS LEVEL

Moderators' report

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

H155

For first teaching in 2016

H155/04/05 Summer 2022 series

Contents

Introduction	3
General overview	4
H155/04 Performance	4
Most common causes of centres not passing.....	9
Common misconceptions	9
Avoiding potential malpractice.....	9
H155/05 EAPI	10
Most common causes of centres not passing.....	12
Common misconceptions	13
Avoiding potential malpractice.....	14
Helpful resources	14
Additional comments.....	14

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

H155/04 Performance

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 using the full mark range across all six 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 help 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 given. 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.

Although there was a need for some adjustments across the practical component this was generally in line with 2019. Overall it was felt that this aspect of the Non-Exam Assessment process was successfully managed by centres.

Paperwork Submission

The new version of the PEMIF for H155 is now the only method of providing the assessments to the moderator and this has eradicated the transcriptions 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 31 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 also need 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 and all coaching activity evidence (log book and filmed evidence).

OCR is 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 logs that the candidates have initially produced in an electronic form or the hand written copy is scanned in and saved as a PDF.

Once again, the major issue with completing the paperwork by 31 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 where PE staff do not have access to Interchange or their level of access does not help them to enter marks as such, and they need 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 updated 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.

Positives

Paperwork Submission

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, for 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 improves 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 of how to submit a centre's 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 31 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 could lead to candidates being disadvantaged. It is recommended that where the inputting of the IMS1 marks is completed by the Examinations Officer, a member of the staff directly involved with the PE process also be present to spot errors at the point of entry. This year many entries were made for sub sections of marks rather than at the overall mark point.

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 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 as such have invested in encrypted USBs. Centres need to make sure that any such encryption can be accessed 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 for centres to provide filmed evidence was increased from the 2019 level 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 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, which identifies that centres should, in addition to the 'off-site' activity filmed evidence requirement, keep as a minimum a record of six candidate performances, across two activities for 'on-site' activities. Centres should look to make sure that this 'on-site' evidence

Filmed Evidence and Log Book Submission

encompasses the range of marks given 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 moderators' decision-making process, especially with the 'off-site' activities. Centres are reminded that they are responsible for the production of appropriate footage. For candidates offering Coaching for assessment, the two 40 minute sessions that are filmed need to be continual in nature. Much of the 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 with a main 'in-competition' season in the summer such as Athletics and Cricket then it is acceptable that a candidate records their performances from 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 31 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 order to provide these to the moderator when requested. Best practice was identified where centres used 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 relying 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 is 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/candidate conversations around the camera need to be made. Much of the filmed evidence viewed was marred by poor

Filmed Evidence and Log Book Submission

sound quality.

7. Best practices 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. 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 reference the competitive performances a candidate has undertaken for the past two years and should help 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 with enough detail about the level of performance.

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 that 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-19 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 a candidate's performance against the five 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 unexpended 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 use the full range of marks within the specification and use the reference points around Grade Award; however please recall these mark points have built in the effect of COVID-19 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 of 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.
5. Centres were well prepared to provide filmed evidence of both 'on-site' and 'off-site' practical activities by 31 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 candidates 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.

Most common causes of centres not passing

Very few candidates do not pass the performance component of the specification; however, those that do have often not been playing any form of sport for the duration of the course. 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 given an A grade; this is incorrect as an A grade has been set in Level 5.

A 'highlights reel' or one individual performance (100 m) 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 'Park Run' or any Cross Country course can be used to assess a candidate in Cross Country; this is incorrect as there are specific course requirements that must be met, these are in line with the ESAA specifications.

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 lead sessions are provided as evidence and do not meet the assessment.

H155/05 EAPI

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 utilising the fully mark range across all six levels within the EAPI component.

It is fully appreciated that for some centres the assessment process this year has been challenging, that being 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. Although this did mean 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 that centres once again became more comfortable with the assessment process and developed their own deeper understanding of how to submit candidate marks.

It is clear that the assessment of the EAPI is still causing centres the most challenges 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 could still 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 candidates and centres to assess. The introduction of a candidate notes sheet was very well received with the vast majority of centres using this.

The new assessment grids focus the assessment process to the three main elements: 'Evaluation of Performance', 'Action plan' and 'Application of Theory', each of which carries an equal weighting; while 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 split the task into two distinct sections; the Evaluation & Analysis and the Action 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 both a good range of identification, description and linking to overall success of performance shown as well as applied theory. The 'Action plan' continues to be the weakest area of candidate's responses as these are often too 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 and as such 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 Action 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

1. Candidates were well prepared for the task and were familiar 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.
2. Centres found the process of completing the assessment grid with a line of best fit accessible and familiar.

3. It was evident that many of the elements are now being addressed in candidate response following the feedback from the previous series. Most notable was a balance of the theory across both the Evaluative comments and Action plan, the linking of Evaluative comments to the overall success of performance and the blocking of macro/meso/microcycles within the development plan; although it should be noted that at AS Level this is an 'Action plan' as such the duration is much shorter and in turn leads itself to a much more simplistic set of practices.
4. The vast majority of candidates kept their responses within the approved limit of 20 minutes.

Areas for Improvement

1. 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.
2. Too many candidates used the observation time to repeat pre-prepared notes rather than observe the performance in front of them. This over-reliance by candidates on pre-prepared notes leads them not only to focus too narrowly on one aspect of the observation but often provide inaccurate observations. Centres are also reminded that the time provided to a candidate should be appropriate; essentially enough time for them observe a performance and make outline notes; it is suggested in the Guide to NEA that 10-20 minutes is ample.
3. Many centres are still failing to identify the 'newer' elements within the **Evaluative comments** of the EAPI. Most notably:
 - a. 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.
 - b. 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.
4. Many centres did not identify the removal of some elements within the **Action plan** of the EAPI. Most notably:
 - a. Timescale justifications;
 - b. Measurement of improvements;
5. Many centres did not identify the need to make sure the progressive practices within the Action plan must be appropriate to the frequency and duration of the practices as set out by the candidate. All too 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 get candidates 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.
6. Many centres did not identify the 'newer' elements within the **Application of Theory** of the EAPI. Most notably:
 - a. Prescribed Theory List; many candidates included areas of theory that are not on the prescribed list. Any theory not on the prescribed list cannot be credited. Pages 131-142 in the Guide to NEA provide full details of the prescribed list.
 - b. Wide range of relevant theory; most candidates identified one or two areas of theory repetitively which although applied differently can only be given credit for once, mostly muscle/movement terms and guidance. Candidates should make sure that they access a wide range of theoretical topics from Components 01 & 02 in their response; however, it is now possible to access Level 4 with no social-cultural theory applied in their response.
 - c. Lack of Application of Theory; far too much theory was simply repetition of fact rather than applying the concept to the observations or the Action plan.

7. Many candidates did not cover all of the required areas. It is felt that in order to assist candidates, the way in which the question is posed to a candidate should now take two parts with the candidate responding to each one in turn.
- Part One; Comment on the observation by analysing and evaluating the performance,
 - Part Two; Creating of a viable Action plan,
- Pages 26 and 27 in the Guide to NEA provide exact wording which we would suggest all centres follow or abridge to suit.
8. Many responses were focused on theoretical knowledge rather than the Evaluative comments and the Action plan. Centres should view the EAPI in the following manner: The Evaluative comments are the skeleton of the response which the Action plan builds on, in essence the muscular system, while the Application of Theory is the skin that binds the entire response together.

Paperwork & Filmed Evidence Submission

Centres are reminded that all assessed marks are now to be submitted to directly through their Exams Officer on Interchange by 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 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 USBs. Centres need to make sure that any such encryption can be accessed by both Windows and Apple products as 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 USBs; there are many free software tools available to compress video files.

When labelling files on the USB it would significantly help 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 around 35 minutes long and where recording equipment breaks this into two files the 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 the submission to the moderator. It is also helpful if you include the centre mark sheet so we can evaluate how a centre has assessed its candidates, so 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. 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. 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 recognise that we had probably made the task too open, and more clarity was needed hence the introduction of 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 candidates 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 gets this applied to the time limit for the EAPI; this is incorrect as often Access Arrangements linked to additional time relate to written assessments, so it should not be assumed that these remain relevant to the verbal EAPI response and can be just 'carried over'.

If a response goes beyond 20 minutes then the candidate can still be given a mark in Levels 4, 5 and 6; this is incorrect as the assessment grid clearly states that any response that is in excess of the stated time limit cannot be given 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 candidate's needs with their SENCo/SENDco to agree appropriate access arrangements and reasonable adjustments. If further advice is required, centres should contact the Special Requirements Team (srteam@ocr.org.uk) 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

Malpractice has occurred in this component and is most commonly found under three categories:

- Candidates utilising pre-planned notes in their response. Centres are reminded that candidates can have access to either the 'candidate's 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 candidate's 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 candidates 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 OCR's Compliance team.

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 thank 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 candidates 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 one year 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.