



Questions & Answers

Advanced Higher Physical Education Webinar

Project

If a student is having a focus on power (speed + strength), are they allowed to develop both speed and strength in their project or is this deemed as two separate projects?

A candidate whose project proposal is specifically on power must continue to maintain power as the focus throughout all sections. The candidate might find research which suggests the benefits of developing speed and strength in isolation in order to develop power and subsequently might develop these in isolation in their Personal Development Plan. However, all actions in this way must remain linked to the benefits each has on improving power and not remain separate as this would most likely read as a project with multiple focuses and not all closely enough linked to the initial project proposal.

My question would be seeking clarification about the linking of factors within a project. For example, improving accuracy (physical) and anxiety (mental) in a tennis serve or lineout throw. It seems some candidates did not make these links clear, could clarification and/or examples be provided to illustrate how this should be approached.

Your chosen performance topic should focus on a single performance issue. (Course assessment task – Instructions to candidates)

Although multiple factors can link towards such a performance issue, considering as a performance issue rather than multiple factors should support candidates to ensure their Project remains tightly focused throughout.

Examples included in early stages of webinar presentation, including one detailed example of project proposal and excerpts from section 1(b) analysis. Further examples are also included in the 2022 webinar.

In the example included in the question, the performance issues would be 'tennis serve' or 'line out throw'. If both factors listed – accuracy and anxiety – contribute towards the performance issue, then this must be evident throughout all stages of the Project and in a manner continuously linked to the performance issue rather than as separate factors only.

Are the pupils penalised for doing 2 separate sub factors.... i.e. anxiety and speed in 1500m

Your chosen performance topic should focus on a single performance issue. (Course assessment task – Instructions to candidates)

Examples included in early stages of webinar presentation, including one detailed example of project proposal and excerpts from section 1(b) analysis. Further examples are also included in the 2022 webinar.

If anxiety and speed were included within a Project to develop performance in a 1500m event and these done separately and not towards a single performance issue, this would not follow the direction in the Course assessment task – Instruction to candidates. As a result, only one single focus could be credited with marks.

Concerned about the parameters on single performance issue. For example, Would 'Improving Leg strength in Basketball' be a specific enough focus? Analysis would then include negative impact of poor leg strength on a range of things such as rebounding, lay-ups, setting screens, blocking, jump shots

Your chosen performance topic should focus on a single performance issue. (Course assessment task – Instructions to candidates)

Examples included in early stages of webinar presentation, including one detailed example of project proposal and excerpts from section 1(b) analysis. Further examples are also included in the 2022 webinar.

The example included could be presented by a candidate as a specific enough focus. Including the impacts on such a range of different parts of performance must be evidenced and analysed to be included throughout the Project.

I have a gymnast whose focus is the consistency of her middle tumble pass (round off back handspring back tuck somersault) this is sometimes meaning that her impact sections are talking about various parts of the tumble. Can I check this is OK?

The wording of this focus suggests the candidate does have a single performance issue focus and varied impacts could be included within this.

There was a suggestion in the report from last year that pupils at the same school were doing similar activities/performance issues. I'm assuming they will not be penalised for this. We have nearly 50 student presenting- most of whom do hockey and rugby.

Selection of project focus - Candidates should be encouraged to make a personal choice by selecting an authentic issue impacting on their performance. Stage 1 should be utilised to gather detailed information on performance and to identify the specific focus of the project.

Note:

- ◆ Selecting a topic from previous courses and undertaking a familiar Personal Development Plan can deprive a candidate of an opportunity to advance their learning and address an authentic issue.
- ◆ It is inappropriate to have several candidates from the same centre producing near identical work.

(Course Report 2023)

The information included in the Course Report in 2023 highlights the approach all centres must take, encouraging personalisation and choice towards an authentic performance issue. Although many centres have candidate's completing Projects on the same activity, it is the centre's responsibility to ensure candidates are not producing and submitting near identical work across any stage of the Project.

How can students have a clear focus before 1a, when gathering data has not yet happened?!

Candidates could have a clear topic focus prior to starting data gathering, however if this is not the case candidates can use an initial broad analysis before progressing to more focused analysis.

As candidates progress into section 1(b) and beyond in their Project, more focused analysis is required to provide in-depth analysis opportunities.

Many Advanced Higher Physical Education candidates have high levels of experience in their chosen activity for Project and are able to begin the course with a clear focus based on existing knowledge of their performance levels.

In 1a can a student that uses a Four Factors Questionnaire state that they used this to determine their strongest and weakest factors AND also say that they used a Match Analysis to determine their strongest and weakest skills? Are these two different points?

The methods must enable candidates to investigate key aspects of their stated performance topic. (Course assessment task – marking instructions)

You should ensure your chosen methods provide information that is valid and enables analysis. The methods should focus clearly on the key aspects of your chosen topic. More focused methods will make it easier for you to analyse in 1(b). (Course assessment task – Instructions to candidates)

Although these two methods would be able to access marks as separate methods in section 1(a), the information they will gather being so broad is highly likely to be self-limiting as the candidate progresses into section 1(b) and beyond in their Project.

Could you please share some examples of connection marks for 1b, 2b and 4a.

Further examples are included in webinar presentation of connections marks for section 1(b) and 2(b) analysis. Connections marks in section 4(a) could be similar to how these presented in examples for section 1(b) with differences only being the analysis of pre and post-PDP data.

What happens if you don't find a new insight?

Different perspectives and/or new insight are required in order to be awarded marks for connections in analysis in sections 1(b), 2(b) and 4(a). If no different perspective and/or new insight is found, this is likely as a result of the information gathered, review of sources or post-PDP data lacking quality and depth to allow for this.

Are their specific headings that students must use (or encouraged to use) in their literature review? i.e. Approaches, Training Principles etc.

No. Various styles of presentation are evident each year with no specific requirements included in course assessment task – Instructions to candidates.

How did the candidate find out his finger strength was poor in 4a if all of the post PDP re-tests have to be inked to performance focus

The example included within presentation is a standalone example for section 4(c)(ii) and not a follow on from any examples in previous slides in the presentation. As a result of this, the performance issue and subsequent methods used to gather information on performance have not been disclosed, however this Project did provide the required evidence whilst focusing tightly on the performance issue throughout.

The candidate presented and analysed a 'self-reflection overview' of strength in various areas of their performance before identifying and progressing with a performance issue of leg strength. In section 4(a) this 'self-reflection overview' allowed for analysis points towards their development of leg strength and impact this was now having on their performance. This post-PDP 'self-reflection overview' also included information on their strength in various areas of their performance and from this their answer in section 4(c)(i) was both evidenced and relevant.

Does the new development need in section 4(c)(i) have to be from the same factor as the original project focus?

No. The development need must be evidenced, however than can be from any factor.

If no marks are awarded for 4ci, perhaps their new area for development is not linked to 4a or 4b. Can they still access marks for 4cii if explanation makes sense?

Section 4(c) is marked together albeit with this section split across two more specific parts. If a candidate has been awarded 0 marks in section 4(c)(i) as a result of the new development need(s) not being evidenced, no marks can be accessed in section 4(c)(ii). If a candidate has been awarded 0 marks in section 4(c)(i) as a result of the justification of the new development need(s) not meeting the standard required to be awarded marks but they have evidence of these new development need(s), marks can still be awarded in section 4(c)(ii).

Thanks for your time - is there any scope for having the webinars earlier in the school year i.e. June/August?

All SQA Understanding Standards event dates are set by the SQA. The initial marking process is not fully concluded until June with appeals concluded most often in September. The focus of Understanding Standards events most often comes from the full marking period and means these can't be planned for delivery until later in the academic year, most often starting from October.

It should be noted that there is vast volume and variation of Understanding Standards materials, as well as SQA documentation such as the course assessment task – Instruction to candidates and these can be utilised before any updates from new Understanding Standards events.