

2015 NZ Scholarship Assessment Report

Physical Education

Part A: Commentary

Comment on the overall response of candidates to the 2015 examination.

The report mode of assessment provided candidates with the opportunity to explore a topic of individual interest in more detail in comparison with the examination mode of assessment. Those candidates who selected topics founded on their passion developed greater insight within their reports. The diverse range of topics was evidence of candidates having taken advantage of the opportunity to explore their interests. Many candidates conducted research and used it to inform their report, with questions and results, sometimes as graphics, attached as an appendix.

Candidates needed to carefully select topics to ensure they were suitable for unpacking to successfully enable them to meet the requirements of the performance standard. Many selected topics which provided only a narrow focus and which could not be developed to the high level of scholarship.

The guidance for maximum length of the report was taken by some candidates to be a target. It was evident that many candidates were trying to fill space up with discussion to reach the 30 pages, not recognising that this was an upper limit, a maximum. This was counterproductive and often resulted in excessively long reports that had diverged away from the candidate's intended focus. In some cases repetition proved the difference for between Outstanding Scholarship and Scholarship level. It was also evident that some candidates were trying to build a report to the maximum length by layering a broad range of theories and concepts without the essential integration and synthesis required in the Performance Standard.

The maximum length has been reviewed in the Assessment Specifications update published in March 2016. A specific requirement for referencing has also been given in these specifications.

At this level it is expected that candidates will research a topic/issue and use their findings, in conjunction with personal experiences, to present a critical report. Opinion based reports with unsubstantiated arguments will not be successful at scholarship level. Unfortunately there were significant number of candidates who approached the report in this manner.

The report structure was a big stumbling block for many candidates. Despite selecting an engaging topic, some candidates did not logically develop an argument or coherently link their analysis, discussion and conclusions. Successful candidates often adopted the use of headings and sub-headings within their report and this ensured the candidate kept all analysis and discussion pertinent to the focus of the report.

A concerning factor was the submission of a number of reports that did not relate the application of biophysical or sociocultural factors to human body movement. These reports often originated from health achievement standards, with little further development. There is significant potential for candidates to produce health related reports that examine connections to learning in, through, and around movement and some very good reports making these connections were submitted.

Part B: Report on performance standard

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance	<p>Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> constructed reports with logical development of their argument/ideas. This allowed for coherent, convincing and interconnected discussion, analysis and evaluation clearly articulated the focus of the debate/angle from which they were communicating their ideas, and explicitly kept this at the forefront of all discussion, analysis and evaluation applied knowledge across the report to show exceptional breadth and depth of understanding. This was always relevant and pertinent to the argument that had been foregrounded at the front of the report showed a sophisticated level of critical thinking, which was sustained across the report articulated ideas/theory/arguments were well substantiated and well referenced challenged existing literature and research, often with a unique opinion
---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrated a strong understanding of their topic through sophisticated and refined use of terminology and examples • integrated their own experiences as examples to draw together different theories • synthesised highly developed knowledge, concepts and ideas in a complex manner • balanced their argument and formed a justified and persuasive opinion • demonstrated deep content knowledge which was congruent with the underlying concepts of the curriculum at level 8 • demonstrated insight and perception in their challenging of assumptions and stereotypes • provided a balanced view – explored the different perspectives – but were able to state a position and justify it on the basis of reasoned argument and supporting evidence • demonstrated a clear balance of theory and practice that drew on their own experience • produced a report that was clearly linked to their learning in, through, and about body movement • extrapolated divergent ideas and independent views from current theory and research to include logical judgements and conclusions around likely future outcomes • produced a report that demonstrated sophisticated abstraction of concepts and ideas through the application of appropriate knowledge and examples that supported the focus of the discussion or argument.
Scholarship	<p>Candidates who were awarded Scholarship commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • selected a topic that allowed the opportunity to explore both biophysical and sociocultural aspects at a deep level, but also enabled them to interconnect theories and links to the underlying concepts of Health Physical Education (HPE) • constructed a logically structured report that often followed a format that encouraged them to research, present a range of ideas, challenge assumptions and reach substantiated conclusions • consistently applied a strong critical perspective to appropriate issues, theories, practices and learning experience • questioned and challenged issues, theories, and practices with insight and perception • communicated clearly, coherently, and convincingly with relevant referenced evidence • included personal experiences, where relevant, to support/challenge relevant research/concepts • showed logical syntheses of highly developed knowledge, concepts and ideas • applied a theoretical basis to the report which often included a review of literature and research, and subsequent questioning and challenging of common held beliefs • integrated own experiences and evidence from research, books, newspaper articles or empirical evidence through the report • related the report to learning, in, through and about movement • included a theoretical and practical balance. • included relevant and cohesive judgements. For example through conclusions around likely future outcomes in relation to the selected focus • theories and concepts were well understood and accurately applied.
Other candidates	<p>Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lacked a coherent report structure • produced a report with an unclear focus and/or ambiguous argument • lacked depth, often favouring breadth over depth • wrote reports that were largely a review of an issue, or else contained a predominance of account based writing • submitted reports that were Achievement Standard assessment tasks • lacked referencing • did not relate their report to learning in, through and about movement • did not apply a critical perspective and/or a theoretical grounding to discussion, analysis, and evaluations • wrote from a position of opinion rather than using evidence from a range of sources to support personal reflections

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• repeated ideas throughout the report• did not develop their ideas logically and/or did not structure the report with logical headings or sections• included assumptions and generalisations and did not sufficiently substantiate judgments• showed minimal integration and abstraction of concepts and ideas• did not logically synthesise knowledge, concepts and ideas• demonstrated superficial understanding of the underlying concepts of HPE. |
|--|---|