

Assessment Report

Scholarship, 2008

Physical Education

COMMENTARY

The examination paper provided candidates with the considerable opportunities to critically evaluate physical activity based on a typical year 13 programme of work. There was a significant increase in the number of candidates sitting the scholarship physical education examination.

The best-performing candidates most commonly demonstrated the following skills and/or knowledge:

- ability to respond to each part of the question – e.g. Question 4 had four parts, Video/ Biomechanical Analysis, Game Versus Skill Learning, Factors Affecting Learning and Own Experiences; where candidates worked through the scaffolded parts of the questions they gave the best answers
- ability to critically evaluate the issue or topic by looking at both sides of the situation, to make judgments supported by subject knowledge, quotes/references and own experiences, to challenge assumptions, to make creative suggestions, and to reach a justified position
- ability to provide evidence of depth and breadth of subject knowledge – e.g. in the obesity question looking at Body Mass Index (BMI) as the measurement tool for obesity as problematic showed evidence of academic reading at Scholarship level
- ability to allocate their time effectively to provide three comprehensive answers ability to effectively use their own experiences and practical knowledge to support their answers; this was especially evident in Question 1 Planning and Implementation and Question 4 Video and Biomechanical Analysis
- ability to critically evaluate the scenarios, statements and positions that the questions involved
- ability to respond with depth and breadth of subject content knowledge; they were able to display evidence of wide reading and to use this to support their argument with references
- ability to structure an essay, provide a coherent argument and justify a position.

In Question One, the best candidates demonstrated:

- ability to evaluate the process and outline potential outcomes of the process
- good understanding of the nature and types of risk and risk management systems as a process
- ability to discuss the benefits of Outdoor Education experiences
- ability to portray the importance and provide detail of Safety Management Systems for Outdoor Education
- understanding of the level of swimming required for a three kilometre ocean swim and the limitations of the five-week programme for swimmers lacking in confidence
- ability to critically evaluate the scenarios given, demonstrating a high level of understanding of planning and implementing programmes
- ability to draw on their own learning experiences of planning and implementing programmes.

In Question Two, the best candidates demonstrated:

- ability to integrate and synthesise knowledge when critically evaluating
- depth and breadth of subject knowledge around an issue, trend or event
- ability to format relevant arguments and to justify a position on a clear well defined issue, trend or event
- ability to sustain critical evaluation throughout the essay regarding the actual impact on New Zealand society.

In Question Three, the best candidates demonstrated:

- understanding of health promotion

- knowledge of a taking-action process and ability to link to Mission On and their own experiences
- high level of knowledge around physical activity, wellbeing and health promotion.

In Question Four, the best candidates demonstrated:

- ability to critically evaluate the value of a video and biomechanical analysis prior to embarking on a performance improvement programme
- ability to answer the question comprehensively and succinctly
- ability to apply critical thinking/critical evaluation skills throughout the essay and to justify a position
- ability to critique a situation or a scenario and in addition offer suggestions for improvements
- ability to write succinctly and to apply theoretical knowledge to their own situation.

Candidates who did NOT achieve scholarship lacked some or all of the skills and knowledge above and in addition they showed:

- superficial use of critical thinking tools – e.g. using all parts of S.P.E.E.C.H. superficially rather than selecting the most appropriate parts to discuss using content knowledge related to the issue
- a use of general knowledge from the public domain rather than evidence of academic subject knowledge
- inability to respond appropriately to the questions as stated; they used prepared answers to attempt to answer the questions
- a tendency to make assumptions - e.g. “all working parents feed their children takeaways because both parents are working” rather than suggesting that it might be a possible factor
- a lack of depth across three questions
- an inability to pace themselves for the three hours; they did not attempt all questions or did not complete the last essay
- a lack of breadth of knowledge across three essays
- inability to link specifically to the scenario or resource provided and own Physical Education experiences
- a failure to reference quotes.

In Question One, candidates who did not reach scholarship level showed:

- inability to evaluate the process
- superficial knowledge of the subject
- a lack of discussion of the purposes of Outdoor Education or why the group might be going to the rock face
- little or no knowledge of the use of RAMS or SAPS in planning and programming Outdoor Education experiences
- a lack of specificity of training by only training in a pool rather than the ocean
- no linking of knowledge specifically to scenario to critique the programme – e.g. no specific ocean swimming in training, five- week programme to build up to a three kilometre swim
- inability to discuss a major factor of how a “one size programme fits all” would meet the requirements of the participants in the programme.

In Question Two, candidates who did not reach scholarship level showed:

- inability to demonstrate critical evaluation; this was especially evident in the obesity essays
- a superficial coverage on the impact on New Zealand society in their essay
- evidence of re-writing a large part of the resources rather than responding to the question

- a tendency to make assumptions throughout the essay.

In Question Three, candidates who did not reach scholarship level showed:

- lack of understanding of Health Promotion and a taking-action process
- failure to critique assumptions
- an inability to reach a position.

In Question Four, candidates who did not reach scholarship level showed:

- irrelevant biomechanical and or anatomical knowledge
- a failure to read the actual question and to focus only on the suggested bullet points
- inability to critically evaluate and to reach a justified position
- evidence of a one-sided argument and failure to back up statements with references; a number of assumptions were often made in the socio-cultural essays
- repetition throughout the essay
- inability to apply theoretical knowledge.