

# **Scholarship**

## **2013 Assessment Report**

### **Physical Education**

## COMMENTARY

This was the first year in which New Zealand Scholarship examinations were set against *The New Zealand Curriculum* (NZC) up to and including Level 8. Consequently, a wider range of questions from which candidates could select three to respond to was presented allowing for the possibility of schools using any combination of aligned and expiring standards to assess NCEA Level 3. In future the examination will be based solely on the requirements of the NZC and the Physical Education [Performance Standard](#).

Those candidates who were awarded Scholarship or Outstanding Scholarship demonstrated a sound depth and breadth of understanding of key concepts in Physical Education and were able to critically evaluate the questions against that understanding. Of those who were not awarded Scholarship, understanding of key concepts was restricted to descriptions and recall rather than critical evaluation. The candidature continues to have difficulty satisfying fully the requirements for *critical evaluation*, the single most important component for achieving Outstanding Scholarship.

Those candidates who received Outstanding Scholarships demonstrated a wide range of knowledge and, increasingly, the ability to integrate and synthesise key concepts from across Level 8 of the Curriculum, rather than remaining within the perceived confines of the question.

Generally, 2013 candidates were able to discuss the pros and cons in their critical evaluation, but few, if any, made assumptions explicit, challenged them, or questioned the validity of issues. Candidates are encouraged to access the New Zealand Scholarship exemplar responses that are published on the NZQA website. These provide annotated examples of responses across the marking range. As a result, candidates can see what is and what is not expected at Scholarship level.

Given the time available to complete three responses, candidates are encouraged to recognise the breadth of the issue/question and then focus on critically evaluating in depth a few key points that arise from that initial consideration. This is a valuable learning point for students preparing for New Zealand Scholarship. Many candidates who did not achieve Scholarship produced responses that covered as much information as possible without sufficient depth.

A number of candidates made good use of the resources provided. Resources are provided as a starting point for a response and often contain information that can be used to scaffold a response. The resources are also used to represent one or more viewpoints and therefore should be used as part of the response. Resources should be accepted, challenged or refuted as part of the candidate response. This was put to particularly good use in Question 2 in which students addressed the validity of allowing the open use of drugs in sport (based on the arguments of the author), then challenged that view with evidence from other sources before arriving at a conclusion.

Candidates awarded Scholarship or Outstanding Scholarship continue to be well read and made good use of research material they had engaged with to justify their responses. Further, this research material was referenced within the body of the response.

## **SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE**

### **Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:**

- developed a cohesive and logical answer throughout the essay
- showed obvious planning of their essay
- used examples/quotes/references which supported and enhanced their answer/argument
- understood the content material pertinent to each question and were able to use it in a way that demonstrated deep knowledge and ability to apply knowledge correctly
- showed evidence of having developed knowledge through a range of sources that demonstrated depth and breadth of understanding
- wrote fluently and coherently
- linked succinctly to the extracts in the questions i.e. used the supplied extracts within their response
- showed depth of understanding and integration of ideas
- evaluated the question with a sophisticated critical perspective
- explored limitations with a range of alternative views points
- questioned and challenged accepted wisdom with insightful judgements
- answered the question with high level subject knowledge
- answered all aspects of the question comprehensively
- created an argument that reflected a clear understanding of Physical Education
- backed up points made with evidence and personal experience
- made valid points which not only answered the question, but also showed a depth or breadth of understanding on the topics covered.
- produced the best response possible given the time available.

## **SCHOLARSHIP**

### **Candidates who were awarded Scholarship but not Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:**

- planned and developed an answer
- were able to identify and challenge assumptions
- used quotes/references/own experiences to support judgements/arguments
- demonstrated depth and breadth of subject knowledge
- used knowledge and experiences judiciously to support statements
- linked to the extracts in the question
- recognised and made explicit the biophysical and sociocultural aspects of Physical Education
- demonstrated the ability to critically evaluate concepts and issues detailed within each question
- addressed key aspects of the question.

## OTHER CANDIDATES

### **Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship or Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:**

- did not answer the question
- did not develop an answer but provided paragraphs of knowledge that did not relate to each other
- provided irrelevant or incorrect knowledge
- did not sustain a discussion or argument i.e. lacked depth of response. Made a good judgement but did not explain further, or back up with supporting evidence
- misinterpreted the question, and/or gave an answer that did not relate to the question
- did not link Question 2 to New Zealand society as required
- lacked ability to allocate time for three questions over the three hours of the examination
- described what they did rather than using the experience to back up points
- used inaccurate subject knowledge.
- lacked critical thinking related to the question
- had prepared answers that did not “fit” the question i.e. reproduced a pre-planned essay or paragraphs that were not adequately linked to the question
- told the story of their performance improvement programme with little reference to the question
- confused the terms *biomechanics* and *biophysical* e.g. a number of candidates stated that biomechanical principles were specificity, overload, fitness components etc.