

**Scholarship**

**2010 Assessment Report**

**Physical Education**

## COMMENTARY

The overall quality of work from candidates in 2010 was disappointing. While the 3% threshold of candidates receiving a scholarship was reached, there appeared to be a lack of understanding of what critical evaluation actually requires. Many candidates described, explained or simply recalled information and/or experiences instead of critically evaluating – which is well below the level required for Scholarship.

The removal of scaffolding from the 2009 and 2010 examination papers may have proved problematic for some candidates. Candidates who considered the validity of the quote given the context of the question, and answered accordingly, were more successful. Quotes that may seem ‘old’, challenged candidates to consider if what held true at that time is still the case. Readings, quotes and scenarios were chosen or constructed for the assumptions they contain. Candidates who were awarded a scholarship were able to identify and unpack these assumptions and challenge them with evidentiary support.

It was apparent that candidates who performed well had read widely to develop breadth of knowledge in physical education. They were also conversant with the requirements for critical evaluation.

Teachers and candidates should make use of the exemplar papers that are published on the NZQA site and assessment reports in order to gain an understanding of what a critical evaluation is and should look like.

## SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

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

- defined terms as a basis for their critical evaluation
- critically evaluated the statements with sound reasoning and logical argument
- provided relevant quotes, references, statistics and back up material to the critical evaluation
- used their own experience to illustrate a point rather than outlining what they did, and related experiences to the question specifically
- looked at the issue or process critically and from a range of points of view, and at times with creative and/or original ideas and/or valid comments that had not been anticipated
- outlined the interrelatedness of process where necessary and made a judgement on the most important aspects of the process for their own situation or speculated on what could and should have been the most important aspects
- challenged assumptions succinctly and/or didn’t make assumptions, problematised what was being asked and not just taking it as a given
- wrote with a high level of sophistication of fluency, creativity and logic.

### Specifically Outstanding Performance candidates:

#### Question 1

- evaluated the process of goal setting and the implications for practice
- evaluated personal experiences and what worked and what did not; considered a range of perspectives by looking at other class members and some even compared with “professional training”
- considered the implication of what either did happen or could happen if there was no goal setting or planning

Author

Deleted: '

- looked at the interrelatedness of the goal setting and planning and considered what needed to come first; e.g. the importance of goal setting first, then planning first and concluded that a combination of both seemed to be a good way to go.

#### **Question 2**

- defined ‘cotton wool kids’ and what it might mean
- critically discussed what a trend might be, also considered the difference between a trend and an issue
- looked at a wide range of perspectives as to what ‘cotton woolling’ might be/mean
- did not make assumptions that ‘cotton wool kids’ was about inactivity, and developed an argument that ‘cotton wool kids’ could be about too much organisation by parents
- questioned whether or not NZ was a nation of ‘cotton wool kids’ and parents who foster it, or if there were just some aspects of it.

#### **Question 3**

- critically evaluated what it might mean to be ‘fixed’ – and discussed if ‘fixed’ meant that there was an end point
- questioned if people wanted to be ‘fixed’ or if skill learning was one of continual learning.

#### **Question 4**

- defined health promotion correctly
- critically evaluated the need for health promotion
- critically evaluated the purpose and importance of a) the process and b) each part of the process
- used examples from their experience to illustrate a point
- queried if what they had done was in fact health promotion i.e. when discussing their class plan to get year 7’s active – they discovered that they were already very active

### **SCHOLARSHIP**

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

- defined terms generically or used text definitions
- demonstrated critical thinking or critically evaluated statements, questions and processes – in many cases
- used their own experience to illustrate a point rather than outlining what they did
- considered a range of perspectives and points of view
- provided a coherent argument that was well supported with subject knowledge and experience.

#### **Specifically Scholarship candidates:**

##### **Question 1**

- defined goal setting and in many cases outlined the SMART principle
- evaluated how well their own experience met the requirements of the SMART principle.

##### **Question 2**

- looked at a range of perspectives of what ‘cotton woolling’ might be
- made comment on some impacts on New Zealand society but missed the opportunity to critically evaluate whether or not this was throughout New Zealand or if it was more localised e.g. rural versus urban.

### **Question 3**

- considered whether or not skill learning achieved any better results than ‘nature’ and experience
- considered the ability/experience level of the person and what it was that they wanted to achieve.

### **Question 4**

- defined health promotion correctly
- used examples of their own experience to illustrate a point.

## **OTHER CANDIDATES**

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

- did not answer the question, often showing irrelevant subject knowledge that did not relate to the question
- told a story of what they did or their experiences but did not critically evaluate
- attempted to use prepared answers to fit the question
- addressed only part of the question
- made assumptions throughout the essay
- repeated information throughout the essay
- used subject knowledge inappropriately i.e. put in everything they could such as using terms as technocratic/scientism in the wrong places
- compiled a formulaic answer using SPEECH without considering the actual question.

### **Specifically Other Candidates:**

#### **Question 1**

- focused on either goal setting (most candidates only did this) or planning rather than considering the interrelationship between the two
- told a story of what they did rather than evaluating or critically evaluating the processes
- described subject knowledge such as SMART goals in great detail with very little relevance to the question
- focused too much on planning (especially those candidates who chose outdoor education) for safety and did not consider the purpose of outdoor education or the role that planning for the purpose has or should have.

#### **Question 2**

- did not define what ‘cotton wool kids’ might be
- immediately assumed that this meant that kids were inactive and therefore would be obese
- attempted to write an essay on childhood obesity
- did not comment on the impact on NZ society.

#### **Question 3**

- wrote about the process of skill learning and what they did rather than evaluating whether or not skill-learning theory could ‘fix’ people
- answered as a ‘nature/nurture’ prepared answer
- confused Skill Learning Theory with Motor Learning Theory
- misinterpreted Skill Learning Theory as learning theory from a text as opposed to practically.

**Question 4**

- told a story about what they did but did not provide any evaluation or critical evaluation
- did not define or have a correct definition of health promotion
- did not evaluate or critically evaluate the importance of the process, instead they went straight into a re-telling of what they did.