



A-level
Physical Education

7582/C NEA

Report on the Examination

7582
June 2024

Version: 1.0

Further copies of this Report are available from aqa.org.uk

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Overview

The moderation team would like to recognise the continued efforts made by students and centres in gathering evidence to support their practical performances in the NEA component.

Centres need to ensure they review the information in this report to support improvements in centre completion of NEA. It is imperative that centres adhere to the guidance provided by the awarding organisation into how to conduct the moderation of the NEA component.

Centres are continued to be advised to ensure they communicate regularly with their moderator, use the NEA advisory team where required, and ensure they have undertaken a process of internal standardisation using the OLS platform (via Centre Services on the AQA website).

Administration

Overall, centre administration of the NEA seems to be completed well. As per 2023, centres have submitted Veo / YouTube evidence onto USBs (downloaded) and not sent links. Centres have improved in sending encrypted USBs (using the generic AQA encryption code) and are encouraged to continue doing so to maintain a seamless moderation process.

As recommended, centres continue to use Level of Response grids to show how the marking of each student was awarded across practical and written NEA, as well as commentary timelines (detailed) to signpost moderators to the relevant Areas of Assessments. This is good practice and supports the moderation process.

Centres generally observed the submission of evidence within 2 weeks of centre marks being shared with AQA. Generally Centres seem to be opting for a later moderation date, which can be problematic should any issues arise with IT (equiv.).

Practical Performance

For the 2024 series, there were no changes in the scoring of marks, and centres should be commended for continuing to work hard to ensure they could provide the best evidence available to the moderator. The vast majority of centres chose a remote moderation, with live performance decreasing overall. The vast majority of evidence for practical is still in the role of performer rather than coach. Where students were clearly identified, and the footage supported this identification, the moderation process was straightforward and centre marks were more clearly observed.

Centres' marking of practical was generally accurate, as they produced a range of evidence to cover both core and advanced skills. However, centres still need to ensure they have more than one event or match to cover the range. When only submitting one half/quarter/match, this is often resulting in marks being adjusted (this is similar to 2023). There is a tendency to accurately assess the team sports, with greater adjustments being observed in individual sports.

Centres are reminded to check individual sports requirements from the specification, as evidence was sometimes lacking expectations, eg golf (repeatedly, across a variety of centres) failing to have continuous footage between shots on every hole (only footage between holes can be edited out).

Students are not expected to present their practical evidence. This is something that has become more frequent, often placing undue stress on students. For Area of Assessment 1 and 2, moderators are reviewing the accuracy of marking of the student's technical execution in a performance context. In Area of Assessment 3 there are elements of decision making that could be covered by additional detail in the commentary form. Students cannot gain marks through the quality of the presentation.

Centres who reported to have accessed and used TOLS were observed to be more accurate in their assessment of students across the sports evidenced.

In the role of a coach, generally marks were lower than that of performers and it was observed that the rubric was not always followed, limiting the number of marks a student could access. All details relating to this role are within the specification and the NEA Guide.

Analysis of Performance

Most centres chose to submit in written format with a limited number combining basic written information with a verbal power-point presentation. Good practice was evident in centres who clearly and correctly structured their work using sub-headings (often from the level of response grids).

Good clear links to competitive contexts were evident, to enable the moderator to fully appreciate the sporting context in which the weaknesses occurred. When diagrams of an actual situation were included, this often made the impact and explanation clearer. That said, it was still apparent that stand alone technical models/elite performer descriptions were inappropriately used, and weaker analysis sections tended to include too much on theory (eg causes of weaknesses) and on what could or might happen as opposed to describing what actually happened and what the ongoing impacts of this were. This continues to occur from previous series.

Awarding of marks by centres tended to be more accurate for Area of Assessment 2 than Area of Assessment 3. In Area of Assessment 2, stronger students are analysing performance well and identifying weaknesses well. For Area of Assessment 3, students made the mistake of focussing on technical aspects of a skill/s rather than the interaction with opponents and analysing matching and mismatching with an ideal model or scenario. The level of depth of analysis in Area of Assessment 3 is often less than Area of Assessment 2.

Evaluation of Performance

Good practice was evident with centres who clearly identified the theoretical aspect of the specification (using the specification code to identify in learner work too) chosen as a focus for the evaluation sections. There was also a wider variety of topics chosen across centres and their cohorts.

The level of depth is particularly important in the evaluation section. A focus on one or two causes and corrective measures (to help overcome the causes) was the best approach to take. Centres were again more frequently adjusted due to taking a breadth approach involving a range of causes and corrective measures, with varying degrees of depth, which negatively diluted overall achievement.

Fitness components are still being used as causes, despite not being in the specification. Stress management techniques are commonly used as corrective measures, but invariably lack detail (as per

previous series too). Far more detail on their application to help solve causes (such as anxiety and stress) is required, as well as a methodical approach into exactly how the skills programme would be carried out, much like a training programme.

The marking of causes tends to be more accurate. Strong students apply the knowledge to their performance to gain the higher marks, but centres are incorrectly awarding higher marks when they do not.

The correction section continues to improve with students now relating back to the cause and not to performance. Stronger students include both theory and corrective practices which link. The main issue tends to be associated when students are evaluating Area of Assessment 3 and this was often the weak link in their submissions (in line with the analysis section too), again lacking the depth in detail included.

Overall, centres should not be afraid to be more concise (at times) in the completion of the analysis and evaluations, as some of the written work is exceeding word counts reflective of what the piece is worth (as a percentage of the overall qualification).

Key learning for centres to consider from this series:

1. Clearly identify their students within the video OR commentary timeline for an accurate assessment / moderation.
2. Check and confirm the specification requirements of practical. The specification and NEA Guide highlights what is / is not permitted for each sport.
3. The analysis should be a technical overview of the weakness/es of their performance, linked to specific performances and not a generic discussion about what the performer 'should/could/would do.'
4. Standalone sections on elite performers are not credited as students should be drawing direct comparisons as part of their analysis.
5. The development of depth of analysis within Area of Assessment 3 to support students accessing higher mark bands, including further detail to outline the strategy/tactic (equiv.) and the weakness of the student within that particular context.
6. In the evaluation section, centres must observe the expectations of depth and applied knowledge evident through the application of the corrective measure, such as a training plan, or stress management strategy plan. A detailed, methodical approach on how the measure would be carried out will enable students to access higher mark bands.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results Statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.