

GCE A Level Examiners' Report

Physical Education
A Level
Summer 2025

© WJEC CBAC Ltd. 2025



Introduction

Our Principal examiners' report provides valuable feedback on the recent assessment series. It has been written by our Principal Examiners and Principal Moderators after the completion of marking and moderation, and details how candidates have performed in each component.

This report opens with a summary of candidates' performance, including the assessment objectives/skills/topics/themes being tested, and highlights the characteristics of successful performance and where performance could be improved. It then looks in detail at each unit, pinpointing aspects that proved challenging to some candidates and suggesting some reasons as to why that might be.¹

The information found in this report provides valuable insight for practitioners to support their teaching and learning activity. We would also encourage practitioners to share this document – in its entirety or in part – with their learners to help with exam preparation, to understand how to avoid pitfalls and to add to their revision toolbox.

Further support

Document	Description	Link
Professional Learning / CPD	Eduqas offers an extensive programme of online and face-to-face Professional Learning events. Access interactive feedback, review example candidate responses, gain practical ideas for the classroom and put questions to our dedicated team by registering for one of our events here.	https://www.eduqas.co.uk/home/professional-learning/
Past papers	Access the bank of past papers for this qualification, including the most recent assessments. Please note that we do not make past papers available on the public website until 12 months after the examination.	Portal by WJEC or on the Eduqas subject page
Grade boundary information	Grade boundaries are the minimum number of marks needed to achieve each grade. For linear specifications, a single grade is awarded for the subject, rather than for each component that contributes towards the overall grade. Grade boundaries are published on results day.	For unitised specifications click here: Results and Grade Boundaries and PRS (eduqas.co.uk)

¹ Please note that where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report.

Exam Results Analysis	Eduqas provides information to examination centres via the WJEC Portal. This is restricted to centre staff only. Access is granted to centre staff by the Examinations Officer at the centre.	Portal by WJEC
Classroom Resources	Access our extensive range of FREE classroom resources, including blended learning materials, exam walk-throughs and knowledge organisers to support teaching and learning.	https://resources.eduqas.co.uk/
Bank of Professional Learning materials	Access our bank of Professional Learning materials from previous events from our secure website and additional pre-recorded materials available in the public domain.	Portal by WJEC or on the Eduqas subject page.
Become an examiner with WJEC.	We are always looking to recruit new examiners or moderators. These opportunities can provide you with valuable insight into the assessment process, enhance your skill set, increase your understanding of your subject and inform your teaching.	Become an Examiner Eduqas

Contents	Page
Executive summary	5
Component 1 – Exploring Concepts in Physical Education	7
Component 2 – Evaluating Physical Education	12
Component 3 – Improving Personal Performance in Physical Education	15
Supporting you – useful contacts and links	18

Executive Summary

Centre and candidate entries for the qualification are similar in size to previous series. Components 1, 2 and 3 are similar in structure and are assessed in line with assessment objectives (AOs) of previous years. Overall, both examination papers were accessible and offered candidates a broad range of questions across AO1, AO2 and AO3 assessment objectives. In general, evidence suggests that candidates understood the specification content and what was required of them.

Component 1: Exploring Concepts in Physical Education

Candidate performance showed strong understanding of areas such as muscles and movement, leadership styles, guidance, the 'golden triangle', and technology in sport. Most candidates accessed AO1 marks but struggled with AO2 (application) and AO3 (analysis/evaluation), particularly in extended response questions. Common weaknesses included vague or list-like answers, misuse of command words (e.g. contrast, assess), and limited application.

Challenging questions included Q3b(i), Q4b(i), Q4c, and Q5d, where candidates failed to show depth or theoretical understanding. High-performing questions such as Q1a, Q2a, and Q5a revealed good knowledge recall.

To improve performance, centres should focus on strengthening examination technique, interpreting command words accurately, and encouraging detailed, applied responses. Embedding theory into practical examples and using past paper practice will help candidates access higher marks.

Component 2: Evaluating Physical Education

Component 2 assessed candidates' understanding, application, and evaluation across core topic areas including physiology, biomechanics, skill acquisition, and sport psychology. Most candidates engaged well with the paper. Stronger responses demonstrated clear understanding of command words, accurate data interpretation, and detailed application of theory. However, some candidates struggled with misinterpreting questions, applying knowledge vaguely, or confusing command terms such as identify, outline, explain, and analyse.

Performance was broadly consistent with previous years, with a slight improvement in AO3. Centres are encouraged to further develop examination technique, reinforce understanding of command words, and emphasise concise, structured responses matched to question demands.

Component 3: Improving Personal Performance in Physical Education

Most centres submitted marks on time and assessed candidates appropriately, using the full range of marks across activities. Performance was the dominant pathway, with assessments largely accurate and aligned with specification expectations. However, some centres used drills or modified games instead of full competitive environments, limiting candidates' ability to showcase full performance capabilities as per the specification. Internal standardisation is essential to ensure assessment consistency across activities. Where video evidence was used, quality and candidate identification were generally strong, though clarity in team settings remains an area to improve.

Coaching was selected by fewer students, with variation in assessment accuracy. Stronger submissions demonstrated planning, progression, and technical understanding. PPAE was well structured across most centres. Sections 1–3 were consistently assessed well; however, Section 4 (evaluation) often lacked depth. Candidates should use quantitative data and structured reflection to access top marks.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

GCE A level

Summer 2025

COMPONENT 1: EXPLORING CONCEPTS IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Overview of the Component

Questions with the lowest facility factor included 4b(ii), 3b(i) and 5d. Question 4c had the lowest attempt rate by candidates (97.1%).

Questions that were widely accessed by the majority of candidates included 1b, 2a, 3c, 5a and 5d. Question 5a had the highest facility factor on the paper (0.99).

Most candidates demonstrated good subject knowledge when accessing AO1 marks with sound knowledge on the topics of muscles and movement, guidance, leadership, the 'golden triangle', the World Anti-doping Agency and technology within sport. However, some candidates failed to gain marks due to not matching their responses to the command word at the start of the question or creating a relevant response that answered the whole question. Paying attention to the mark weighting in AO1 questions may help candidates to gain full marks in their response and applying the level of detail expected at advanced level.

Nearly all centres would benefit from developing the candidates understanding of the command words in relation to the assessment objectives. Some candidates missed out on marks for vague responses or responses that failed to demonstrate good or excellent levels of description, justification, explanation, application, analysis, assessment and evaluation. Centres would benefit from advising to students that application of knowledge as well as demonstrating the correct terminology would allow them to access higher marks in higher order questions.

Nearly all candidates would benefit from improved examination technique such as carefully reading and answering the question that they are asked and this would facilitate access to higher marks in the written examination.

Comments on individual questions/sections

- Q.1 (a)** Facility factor = 0.60, mean mark = 1.2/ 2. This question was answered well by most candidates as shown in the facility factor and average mark for the question. The most common reason for a loss of marks was due to candidates' inability to correctly use the unit of measurement for cardiac output.
- (b)** Facility factor = 0.63, mean mark = 2.5/ 4. This question was well attempted (100%) but is the first instance of candidates not fully applying their responses to the whole question or demonstrating excellent levels of justification in the topic area. Some candidates offered listed responses or described general points and at times did not link appropriately to sports clubs within their justifications.

- (c) Facility factor = 0.62, mean mark = 2.5/ 4. This question is one of many with the second highest attempt rate of 99.7%. As with question 1(b), many candidates showed good knowledge of the topic area but again some fell short in fully explaining their responses to the whole question and linking it to endurance events. Some candidates offered listed responses or described general points missing out on the level of AO2 explanation required.
 - (d) Facility factor = 0.62, mean mark = 5/ 8. Many candidates were able to access this question and pick up marks from the mark scheme. The candidates scoring higher excelled by showing the level of detail and knowledge expected in at GCE level allowing them to access the top band.
- Q.2**
- (a) Facility factor = 0.85, mean mark = 3.4/ 4. This question was answered well by most candidates as shown in the facility factor and mean mark. Common errors were muscles correctly identified but in the incorrect boxes, and flexion used instead of extension.
 - (b) Facility factor = 0.54, mean mark = 3.2/ 6. One of the more difficult questions based on the responses from candidates. Although many were able to achieve marks for correctly explaining Magnus forces, some failed to maximise the marks available with incorrect application of the direction of force and at times not commenting on how the forces can influence the flight path of a ball.
 - (c) Facility factor = 0.78, mean mark = 1.6. One of the higher performing questions on the paper. Most of the candidates understood bilateral transfer and used an appropriate example when responding to the question.
 - (d) Facility factor = 0.70, mean mark = 5.6/ 8. Evident in the numbers above for this question many candidates were able to access the question and pick up marks from the mark scheme. With Whiting's information processing model provided, it was the expectation that candidates should be able to explain the majority of the model and then apply the examples throughout for higher marks. Candidates not achieving the higher bands often demonstrated a lack of application or showed gaps in knowledge of some elements of the model.

- Q.3**
- (a)** Facility factor = 0.77, mean mark = 6.2/ 8. This question was answered well by the majority of candidates. Many had good knowledge and were able to explain the styles of leadership, though they found it more difficult to access AO3 evaluation marks. For example, applying leadership styles to various situations/ different groups or stages of learning and evaluating how well it could influence performance.
 - (b)**
 - (i)** Facility factor = 0.52, mean mark = 3.1/ 6. One of the more challenging questions based on candidates' performance. The mark scheme was quite broad with the indicative content available to candidates, and those that picked up marks on the lower bands, were given credit where knowledge was shown but explanation was perhaps lacking. As in some previous questions some candidates listed or identified and could not access the marks for explanation. Where candidates scored higher, indicative content points were elaborated on and applied based on the explain command word.
 - (ii)** Facility factor = 0.65, mean mark = 2/ 3. This question was answered well by the majority of candidates. Those achieving less than 3 marks, often failed to outline three strategies by either covering the same point(s) within their responses or outlining an incorrect strategy.
 - (c)** Facility factor = 0.76, mean mark = 6.1/ 8. This is another question that was answered well by the majority of candidates. Many picked up AO1 marks with the knowledge and explanation of the various methods of guidance, though some struggled to access the AO3 analyse mark allocation. Analysis was needed of the methods of guidance, and it had to be applied to the cognitive stage of learning. For example, all methods can be used with cognitive learners, and each method presents various pros and a cons which needed to be formulated and presented in the response.

- Q.4**
- (a)** Facility factor = 0.58, mean mark = 3.5/ 6. It is apparent here that the 'contrast' command word is not as well understood/ practiced by centres compared to other AO2 command words. Often answers were list like for one type of performer and simply opposites identified for the other. AO2 command words are asking candidates to apply knowledge which is where many candidates fell short on this question, particularly in the 5–6-mark banding.

 - (b)**
 - (i)** Facility factor = 0.62, mean mark = 0.6/ 1. This question required correct knowledge of hostile aggression specifically. Aggression in general was often used, with candidates not achieving the mark for only stating that it was to cause harm. This showed a lack of distinction in the two types of aggression that appear in the specification.

 - (ii)** Facility factor = 0.88, mean mark = 1.8/ 2. This question was broader than the previous question and it showed in the candidates' responses, allowing more candidates to achieve maximum marks when outlining the strategies a coach could use to reduce aggression.

 - (c)** Facility factor = 0.51, mean mark = 4/ 8. This was the question candidates found the most difficult, with the lowest facility factor and the lowest attempt rate. For the candidates that attempted the question, though many could correctly identify the model and explain its use, the majority struggled to assess (AO3) the use of attribution theory in sport. Candidates accessing higher bands referenced correct and incorrect attributions and assessed how attribution can differ between sports people, stage of learning and gender. Some candidates also successfully assessed potential problems attributing performances in the various ways.

- Q.5**
- (a)** Facility factor = 0.99, mean mark = 1/ 1. This was the highest performing question on the paper. Candidates were able to successfully identify three aspects of the 'golden triangle'.
 - (b)** Facility factor = 0.69, mean mark = 2.8/ 4. Like many of the explain questions, candidates were clearly knowledgeable on the topic of the question (evident in the mean mark), though some candidates lacked the level of application required for full AO2 marks. Those achieving lower marks found it difficult to get beyond identifying or describing.
 - (c)** Facility factor = 0.61, mean mark = 2.5/ 4. As above, candidates were clearly knowledgeable on the topic of technology. Some candidates lacked the level of AO2 application required and often failed to explain the developments in technology in enough detail or struggled to apply it to making sport safer in enough detail for maximum marks. Some candidates missed the point and focused their attention on technological advances and their impact on other areas of sport.
 - (d)** Facility factor = 0.53, mean mark = 8.4/ 16. One of the more challenging questions on the paper. Many candidates were able to demonstrate knowledge of the topic area and access AO1 marks. Further to this, the mark scheme also allowed for some basic assessments to be made without necessarily making direct reference to some of the theories of social facilitation and inhibition. The higher scoring responses were able to utilise their knowledge of theories and use them to provide accurate and varying assessment on how they created either facilitation or inhibition. Top band candidates were able to provide higher levels of detail and more in-depth assessment of the theories whilst also supporting their answers with evidence of the audience affecting performance in different ways, for example, the situation, personality of the performer, the level of skill of the performer, the knowledge/ importance/ relationship of the crowd to the performer.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

GCE A level

Summer 2025

COMPONENT 2: EVALUATING PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Overview of the Component

Component 2 is designed to assess candidates' understanding and application of theoretical knowledge across all three Assessment Objectives (AO1, AO2, AO3). Candidates are required to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of physical education concepts, apply their knowledge and understanding to a range of sporting contexts, and analyse and discuss to make informed decisions and judgements.

Compared with previous series, candidate performance in Component 2 was broadly consistent, with a slight improvement in AO3 responses. The accessibility of the paper was in line with expectations, and the spread of marks suggests the paper effectively differentiated across the ability range. There remains a continued need for centres to reinforce not spending too much time on questions only requiring identification, understanding of command words and the weighting of assessment objectives.

Component 2 places a significant emphasis on the higher-order skills of AO3, especially in the extended response questions and there is an expectation that candidates can apply their knowledge in practical sporting contexts at AO2. This component also assesses candidates' quantitative skills through their ability to interpret and use data within a sporting context. These skills were assessed through questions requiring candidates to read and interpret data from tables and images related to performance. Candidates were therefore required to perform calculations and analyse movement and sporting performance to apply their findings.

Overall, the examination was well received, with most candidates engaging confidently with the content and structure of the paper. Stronger candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of command words, applied knowledge appropriately to practical examples, and produced analytical and evaluative responses in line with AO3 requirements. Weaker responses often reflected misinterpretation of questions, limited application of theory, or lack of precision in addressing the demands of AO1 and AO2. Overwriting for low-mark questions also persisted in some cases and a misunderstanding of the differences between the command words 'identify' and 'outline' and 'explain' and 'analyse'.

The percentage of questions attempted by all candidates was very high in all but one question 3c, nutritional performance aids, (92.4%) and the mean was on or above 50% in 16/ 20 of the questions. The highest attempted questions, all above 99% were 1(b), 1(c), 2(b), 2d(i), 3(a), 3(e) and 4. The questions with the lowest facility factors (ff) were: 2c(i) = 0.39; 2c(ii) = 0.49, 3b = 0.37 and 3c = 0.48.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Q.1 All seven items in question 1 were highly accessible to candidates with attempt rates between 98-99%.

- (f) This was the first question on the paper that assessed the candidate's ability to 'discuss' at AO3, and it was worth 12 marks in total (AO1=2, AO3=10), with a mean mark of 8.0. It required the candidates to demonstrate knowledge of deviance and discuss whether it has increased both within and outside of sport. Those candidates' achieving well above 50% of the marks available in this question gave responses that reflected very strong knowledge of the different types of deviancies and gave very valid arguments both for and against the increase. Those candidates' achieving less than 50% of the marks available gave responses lacking clarity of knowledge and simply agreed or disagreed with the statement posed. They failed to discuss both sides and their responses lacked the evidence required of a band 3 response. Centres are reminded of the importance of reinforcing the understanding of command words and the weighting of assessment objectives.

Q.2 Five from seven items in question 2 were highly accessible to candidates. Question 2d(i) and 2e were particularly well answered, achieving (ff) of 0.82 and 0.78 respectively.

- (a) There were four AO1 marks for this question which produced a mean mark of 2/ 4 and a (ff) of 0.50. Quite clearly candidates that did not achieve the maximum marks could not describe how the cardiac control centre (CCC) regulates heart rate during exercise in detail and mainly gave basic responses that focused solely on sympathetic and parasympathetic control of heart rate. Those candidates achieving the higher end of the marks available in this question were able to describe in detail the intrinsic, hormonal and neural control of heart rate during exercise.
- (b) This was the second question of the paper that assessed candidates' ability to 'analyse' at AO3, and it was worth 10 marks in total (AO1=2, AO3=8). It required the candidates to demonstrate knowledge of the Drive and Inverted-U theories of arousal and analyse these theories. With a mean mark of 4.6. Those candidates' achieving well above 50% of the marks available in this question gave responses that reflected a sound knowledge at AO1 of the two theories in question and gave detailed analysis of the positives and negatives of these theories. Those candidates' achieving less than 50% of the marks available; gave responses lacking clarity of knowledge and simply explained the theories rather than offering any analysis and were therefore unable to access the marks available in band 3. Again, centres are reminded of the importance of focusing on the understanding of command words and the weighting of assessment objectives to ensure their candidates are 'analysing' and not 'explaining'.
- (c) (ii) This question required candidates to 'outline' the physiological adaptations to the musculo-skeletal system as a result of strength training and it was worth 4 marks at AO1; with a mean mark of 1.5. Those candidates' achieving 3-4 marks gave a detailed outline of the adaptations to strength training programmes. However, those achieving 1-2 marks gave a basic outline and those that achieved 0 marks failed to understand the command word 'outline' and simply listed or identified adaptations.

Q.3 Three from five items in question 3 were suitably accessible to candidates, producing (ff) over 0.50. Question 3d and 3e were particularly well answered, achieving (ff) of 0.88 and 0.67 respectively.

- (a) This AO2 4-mark question required candidates to use figure 4 to explain how the performer in question had increased their stability, not simply explain how stability can be increased. Those candidates therefore achieving 3-4 marks gave a detailed explanation using the figure of how stability had been increased.
- (b) This was the lowest performing question on the paper with a (ff) of just 0.37. Many candidates struggle to offer effective AO2 explanation as to why lactate accumulation causes muscle fatigue.
- (c) This AO3 6-mark question with a mean mark of 2.9 required candidates to analyse the nutritional ergogenic aids from the specification (creatine, protein and caffeine). Those candidates achieving the higher marks at AO3 were able to analyse the benefits and risks of the use of the ergogenic aids in question. Candidates achieving lower marks at AO3 were referring to incorrect aids such as carbo-loading, sport and energy drinks and nitrates and offered little to no analysis and simply explained their use.
- (d) This question required candidates to 'identify' three types of practice and it was worth 3 marks at AO1; with a mean mark of 2.6 Those candidates' achieving 3 marks gave a list of three correct types of practice. However, those achieving 0 marks identified methods of training by mistake. Centres are also reminded to reinforce that their candidates simply need to list points for 'identification' questions as a pose to wasting time describing and explaining types of practice.
- (e) This was the fourth question of the paper that assessed candidates' ability to 'discuss' at AO3, and it was worth 12 marks in total (AO1=2, AO3=10). It required the candidates to demonstrate knowledge of the concepts of 'mass participation' and 'elite performance' or 'excellence' and discuss whether a focus on one is more important than the other. It achieved a mean mark of 8.1. Candidates' that achieved marks at band 3 gave responses that reflected a sound knowledge at AO1 of the two concepts in question and gave a detailed two-sided discussion that explored the positives and negatives of placing more emphasis on one concept over the other. Those candidates' that achieved marks in bands 1 and 2, gave responses lacking clarity of knowledge and simply offered no discussion or only considered one side of the debate.

Q.4 This was the fourth and final question of the paper that assessed candidates' ability to 'analyse' at AO3 and it was worth 20 marks in total (AO1=4, AO3=16). It required the candidates to demonstrate knowledge of the concepts of 'globalisation' and analyse whether the impact of this concept has been positive or negative. With a mean mark of 14.3. Candidates' that achieved marks at band 3 gave responses that reflected a sound knowledge at AO1 of Cashmore's stages of globalisation and gave a detailed and well-evidenced two-sided analysis of the impacts of globalisation on sport. Those candidates' that achieved marks in bands 1 and 2, gave responses lacking clarity of knowledge and simply offered no analysis or only considered one side of the debate.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

GCE A level

Summer 2025

COMPONENT 3: IMPROVING PERSONAL PERFORMANCE IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Overview of the Component

Component 3 is the Non-Examination Assessment (NEA), worth 30% of the final grade. It is designed to assess the following:

- Practical performance in one activity as a player/performer or coach
- Analysis and evaluation of personal performance

Candidates are expected to:

- Demonstrate and apply relevant skills and techniques in physical activity and sport.
- Analyse and Evaluate performance.

The (NEA) is internally assessed and externally moderated. Most centres submitted their marks on time (first Friday in March). The range of activities assessed continues to demonstrate the diversity available within the subject. Centres predominantly assessed students following the performance not coaching pathway. Most centres undertook a live moderation, with a small number opting for remote moderation/ supplementary video evidence.

Centres are reminded of the requirement to film the live moderation day in its entirety and then submit this film within a week of the moderation taking place. Centres continue to be accurate with their assessment, and it was evident that centres had prepared their students thoroughly for practical moderation.

There is only a short window of time for centres to generate evidence and in particular summer-based activities need careful management to make the start of March submission deadline. For summer activities e.g. athletics and cricket, evidence should be sourced early in the academic year to support the students. Please note evidence should be of the student performing or coaching within the academic year for which the candidate was entered.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Practical

Most centres submitted their marks on time. The range of activities assessed continues to demonstrate the diversity available within the subject. Centres predominantly assessed students following the performance not coaching pathway and the number of candidates entered is in line with the previous year.

Centres are generally placing candidates in the correct band and using the full range of marks available within each assessment band. It is essential to create a competitive environment during live moderation to allow performers to demonstrate their ability to perform under pressure. Good practice is to prepare supplementary video evidence to support the candidates mark if required following live moderation. Assessment must be in a competitive environment and as the specification indicates, for the majority of activities this is a full sided game or in a competitive event. Some centres continue to use drills and modified games that do not allow the candidate to demonstrate their true ability.

Centres are encouraged to use internal standardisation across practical activities to ensure consistencies in assessment. Where video evidence is being used to support the assessment process centres are encouraged to use extended footage to provide parity with candidates assessed in live moderation. Most centres provided good supportive visual evidence using the new platform on IAMIS. However, it is important to accurately identify individual candidates particularly in team or group activities to support the moderation process.

Coaching

Coaching was selected by a minority of students and was assessed to varying degrees of accuracy. Better sessions focused on developing a range of skills and techniques to develop performance, emphasising progression.

Whilst it is important to demonstrate excellent organisation and communication skills throughout the session it is also important to demonstrate planning. Better coaching plans showed how the specific session observed fitted into a macro scheme and how the specific focus would benefit the subject's performance in a competitive situation. Coaching plans should be available during live moderation or uploaded to support visual evidence.

The level of the individual or group coached, and the aspect of the activity chosen to coach should also be considered. These can impact on the level of technical knowledge the coach is able to demonstrate.

When providing visual evidence of a coaching session best practice is to either film closely or use a microphone to clearly hear the instructions and feedback given by the coach.

Personal Performance Analysis and Evaluation (PPAE's)

The assessment of the PPAE is generally very good. Most centres are using the correct candidate authentication sheets to accompany their PPAE's. There are four sections to the PPAE with most candidates selecting the performance rather than coaching route. The assessment grid gives clear assessment criteria required in each section and most centres are applying these correctly and placing candidates in the correct band/section. Many centres are using electronic platforms to compose their projects and centres should be reminded that coursework should be annotated to show where students have accessed the marks that have been awarded.

Section 1: 'the initial analysis of performance' is generally very good with centres identifying both strengths and weakness using a range of quantitative data across physical, psychological, technical and tactical areas.

Section 2: 'evaluate the research, including data, to make recommendations and plan for improving performance' is an area where better candidates can synthesise the research information and apply it to their own performance. This enabled candidates to make recommendations and devise a logical plan for improvement

Section 3: 'complete the training programme and analyse its effectiveness'. Most candidates are now able to demonstrate monitoring of their training programme and justify changes to their plan. Keeping a training diary or log is an example of best practice in this section.

Section 4: 'evaluate the programme and identify strategies to improve future performance' requires a detailed evaluation of strengths and weakness of the programme. Better candidates were able to synthesise this information and apply this to their own performance. This also enabled them to make very good recommendations for improving future performance using quantitative data not subjective opinion.

Centres are encouraged to internally standardise the PPAE to ensure consistency of assessment. Sections 1, 2 & 3 are generally being assessed accurately, but it is evident that some candidates are lacking the skills and knowledge to evaluate in detail to access the higher bands in section 4.

Supporting you

Useful contacts and links

Our friendly subject team is on hand to support you between 8.30am and 5.00pm, Monday to Friday.

Tel: 02922 404271

Email: physicaleducation@eduqas.co.uk

Qualification webpage: [AS and A Level Physical Education | Eduqas](#)

See other useful contacts here: [Useful Contacts | Eduqas](#)

CPD Training / Professional Learning

Access our popular, free online CPD/PL courses to receive exam feedback and put questions to our subject team, and attend one of our face-to-face events, focused on enhancing teaching and learning, providing practical classroom ideas and developing understanding of marking and assessment.

Please find details for all our courses here: <https://www.eduqas.co.uk/home/professional-learning/>

Regional Rep Team

Our regional team covers all areas of England and can provide face-to-face and online advice at a time which is convenient to you.

Get in contact today and discover how our team can support you and your students.

[Regional Support Team | Eduqas](#)

Eduqas Qualifications

We are one of the largest providers of qualifications for schools, academies, sixth form and further education colleges across England, offering valued qualifications to suit a range of abilities. Each and every one of our qualifications is carefully designed to engage students and to equip them for the next stage of their lives.

We support our education communities by providing trusted qualifications and specialist support, to allow our students the opportunity to reach their full potential.



WJEC
245 Western Avenue
Cardiff CF5 2YX
Tel No 029 2026 5000
Fax 029 2057 5994
E-mail: exams@wjec.co.uk
website: www.wjec.co.uk