# GCSE Examiners' Report

Physical Education (Full Course)

GCSE

Summer 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 unit.

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 | WJEC 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.wjec.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 WJEC subject page |
| Grade boundary information | Grade boundaries are the minimum number of marks needed to achieve each grade.<br>For unitised specifications grade boundaries are expressed on a Uniform Mark Scale (UMS). UMS grade boundaries remain the same every year as the range of UMS mark percentages allocated to a particular grade does not change. UMS grade boundaries are published at overall subject and unit level.<br><br>For linear specifications, a single grade is awarded for the subject, rather than for each unit that contributes towards the overall grade. Grade boundaries are published on results day. | For unitised specifications click here: Results, Grade Boundaries and PRS (wjec.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 | WJEC 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.wjec.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 WJEC 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 \| WJEC |

**Contents** **Page**

## Executive Summary

The overall qualification performed as expected, due to the stable entry of over 7000 candidates. The performance in Unit 1, the written examination, produced a higher mean than in previous series which demonstrated that the written paper was more accessible to candidates.

The performance in Unit 2, the non-examination assessment (NEA), was similar in mean to that of 2023 and 2024 series.

### Unit 1: Written Examination

The paper follows a similar structure from series to series. However, the Principal Examiner indicated that the paper was more accessible to candidates this year. Candidate performance across the unit was generally good, with most demonstrating:

- Good AO1 knowledge.
- Improving ability to apply and justify answers at AO2.
- Encouraging development in AO3 responses, particularly in structuring extended answers and attempting balanced discussion.

Overall, AO2 questions still prove most troublesome for candidates. This is where the lowest means were produced across the cohort.

Notable area of strength:

- Skill classification: responses in this area were notably stronger this series, with clearer justification and terminology evident.

However, some candidates still showed gaps in knowledge and understanding:

- Biomechanics: understanding of planes and axes in practical contexts remains inconsistent.
- Physiology: confusion between the cardiovascular and respiratory systems was noted across multiple responses.

### Unit 2: Non-Examination Assessment (Practical performance and written NEA)

Assessment of practical activities was generally accurate with the mean stable and similar to previous series. However, improvements are still needed in:

- Documentation and administration.
- Internal standardisation across assessors and activities.
- Uploading of practical evidence.
- Audio-visual recording quality on moderation day.

A wide variety of practical activities were performed, consistent with previous years. Mountain walking, weightlifting, and athletics increased in popularity, but require enhanced video evidence and more accurate assessment to meet standards.

**Personal fitness programme (PFP):**

- More emphasis is needed on developing candidates' understanding of future performance and factors that may strengthen or hinder performance.
- Annotation should be detailed and specific, guiding moderators through the rationale for awarded marks. Annotations should also link clearly with assessment criteria.
- Internal standardisation must be prioritised in larger centres to ensure consistency in assessment across different assessors.

## PHYSICAL EDUCATION (FULL COURSE)

## GCSE

## Summer 2025

## UNIT 1: INTRODUCTION TO PHYSICAL EDUCATION

### Overview of the Unit

This Unit assesses AO1 (knowledge and understanding), AO2 (application of knowledge), and AO3 (analysis and evaluation). A balance is maintained across low, mid, and higher tariff questions to assess both foundational knowledge and the ability to apply and assess sporting contexts. AO3 is targeted primarily through extended response questions, requiring candidates to demonstrate structured reasoning and the ability to weigh up arguments or effects within a performance environment.

The Unit covered a broad range of physical education content, including training methods, skill classification, guidance and feedback, media in sport, barriers to participation, and anatomy and physiology. Skills assessed included identification, explanation, justification, discussion, and evaluation, with opportunities to apply knowledge to practical sporting examples. Some items required sport-specific knowledge, while others were more general and inclusive, ensuring accessibility across the cohort.

Candidate performance across the Unit was generally good, with most demonstrating good AO1 knowledge and improving ability to apply and justify answers under AO2. AO3 responses showed encouraging development, particularly in structuring extended answers and attempting balanced discussion. Overall, AO2 questions still prove most troublesome for candidates, and this is where the lowest means were produced across the cohort.

Responses to skill classification questions were notably stronger this series, with clearer justification evident. However, some candidates still showed gaps in biomechanical understanding, especially when linking planes and axes to practical examples. Misconceptions between cardiovascular and respiratory systems were also apparent. Compared with previous series, there was a notable improvement in the interpretation of command words, especially for ‘discuss’ reflecting positive centre preparation. Candidates showed stronger alignment between content and question demands, especially in mid to higher tariff items. The extended response question was handled more confidently by many candidates, although some responses lacked balance or depth to access the top band.

Overall Observations from Item Level Data:

The theory paper covers a wide range of questions with varying maximum marks, from 1 mark up to 8 marks (Question 3e).

- Across all questions, the Facility Factor (accessibility) ranges from a low 0.24 2(g) to a high 0.99 2c(ii). This wide range suggests good differentiation in question difficulty within the paper.
- Most questions were attempted by a very high percentage of candidates (above 90%), with many nearing 100%. The lowest attempt rates are 89.0% for questions 5(d) and 5(h), suggesting these might be less accessible or potentially at the end of the paper where time constraints became an issue.

**Comments on individual questions/sections**

**Q.1** Questions 1(a), 1(b), and 1(c) were all AO1 'identify' command word questions, with a facility factor of 0.80, 0.96 and 0.60 respectively, indicating they were highly accessible to candidates. Candidates demonstrated good recall of key terms and knowledge, with many responses aligning closely with mark scheme expectations.

Questions 1(d), 1(e), and 1(f) assessed AO2, requiring candidates to apply their knowledge. These items had a facility factor of 0.46, 0.49 and 0.60 respectively, indicating that overall candidates found them more challenging. Most candidates were able to attempt application to the relevant sporting contexts, although depth of explanation varied. Stronger responses clearly demonstrated applied understanding (e.g., justification of a tee shot as a closed skill or explaining the role of technology in providing feedback). However, some responses lacked clarity or development, particularly in distinguishing between types of feedback and skill continua.

**(d)** This question used the AO2 command word justify, requiring candidates to demonstrate understanding of why a tee shot in golf would be placed at a specific point on a skill continuum. In such questions, marks are awarded for a reasoned justification that considers why the skill is classified as it is, often by explaining why it is not classified as the opposite. e.g. not heavily influenced by external factors and is under the control of the performer, which aligns with the characteristics of a closed skill.

**(e)** This question required an AO2 response, asking candidates to explain how technology can be used to provide Knowledge of Performance (KP) and Knowledge of Results (KR) in golf. To achieve full marks (4), candidates were expected to make accurate references to specific technologies and clearly explain how each provides either KP or KR.

**(f)** To ensure accessibility for all candidates, responses were credited regardless of whether they referred specifically to golf. The focus of the question was on identifying and explaining the benefit of participation across the specified categories. It is important to note that candidates were not credited for repetition, particularly where similar or identical responses were provided under both the social and mental categories. Distinct and relevant benefits were required in each section to achieve full credit.

**Q.2** **(a)** A high attempt rate of 99.6% but only a mean of 0.51. Greater awareness of specific terminology associated with muscular contractions is needed.

**(b)** Candidates were able to apply a basic justification (1 characteristic) predominantly focusing on either intensity or duration. For 2 marks a detailed justification of 2 characteristics was required.

**(c)** **(i-v)** These were well answered with facility factors above 0.80 in all except one item.

**(d)** This question used the AO3 command word assess and was assigned a facility factor of 0.58 indicating that candidates found it relatively challenging. Overall, candidates demonstrated greater understanding when assessing the importance of cardiovascular endurance in comparison to coordination. Responses relating to cardiovascular endurance frequently included the definition “the ability to exercise for a sustained period of time,” which served as a solid foundation for further development. However, responses addressing coordination were often underdeveloped. Many candidates struggled to fully assess its impact on performance, with limited explanation of how coordination contributes to successful execution of skills or movement efficiency in sport. This suggests a need for further emphasis on linking theoretical components to performance-related outcomes when evaluating their significance.

**(e)** Most candidates were able to correctly identify relevant bones in the arm, such as the radius, ulna, and humerus. However, those who were awarded 1 mark typically confused upper limb bones with those found in the lower limb, incorrectly naming bones such as the femur or tibia. This indicates some misunderstanding of basic skeletal anatomy and highlights the need for continued reinforcement of anatomical terminology and location.

**(f)** This was a 2-mark AO1 identify question. It was generally well answered, with most candidates demonstrating a clear understanding of how to apply the principles of progressive overload. Common correct responses included phrases such as “increase the intensity,” “raise the difficulty,” “extend the duration,” and “perform the exercises more frequently.” These answers aligned well with the mark scheme and reflected knowledge of training adaptations.

**(g)** This was the weakest performing question on the paper, achieving the lowest facility factor of just 0.24, with a mean mark of 0.5 out of 2. It was an AO2 explain question, assessing candidates' ability to apply knowledge and understanding. The expected response was to identify that both heart rate and stroke volume increase. While most candidates correctly noted an increase in heart rate, fewer referenced stroke volume, which weakened the overall quality of responses. This suggests a partial understanding of the cardiovascular response to exercise. A notable number of candidates also referred incorrectly to respiratory measures such as increased tidal volume, indicating some confusion between the respiratory and cardiovascular systems.

**(h)** Well answered with candidates drawing a line to the correct example for the body. Candidates that put two lines to the same example, gained no marks.

**Q.3** **(a)** This question produced a mean mark of just 1.8 out of 4 marks It was generally, well answered in relation to the identification of the muscle responsible for arm extension (triceps) and the type of synovial joint involved (hinge joint). However, many candidates continue to find it challenging to accurately link planes of movement and types of axes to the sporting examples provided. This suggests a continued need for reinforcement of these biomechanical concepts through applied, sport-specific contexts.

**(b)** This question produced a low facility factor of just 0.36 suggesting that candidates found it difficult to provide an amplified explanation. It required candidates to explain why long-distance cycling is predominantly aerobic, with specific reference to the intensity and duration of the activity. Stronger responses clearly expanded on both aspects, linking low to moderate intensity and extended duration to the use of oxygen, often supported by reference to time or distance (e.g., "over 30 minutes" or "over long distances").

**(c)** This question was generally well answered, with many candidates referencing commonly recognised technologies such as VAR, TMO, Hawkeye, or goal-line technology. While these responses were valid and credited, it is considered good practice to expose learners to a broader range of current and emerging technologies, as reflected in the mark scheme. This ensures candidates can access the highest marks by demonstrating up to date and applied knowledge.

**(d)** This AO1 identify question was supported by a mark scheme that allowed for a wide range of acceptable responses, resulting in a broad spectrum of valid answers. As such, the question was generally well answered. The majority of candidates successfully identified relevant strategies such as increasing the number of role models, providing more PE in schools, offering female only sessions, and enhancing media coverage of women's sport. These responses demonstrated a sound understanding of factors that can help increase participation in sport.

**(e)** This question required an AO3 'discuss' level response. Historically, many candidates have struggled to meet the demands of the discuss command word, often presenting one-sided arguments. It was encouraging to see that centres have clearly addressed this, with increasing numbers of candidates demonstrating awareness that a balanced discussion, presenting both sides, is required. The inclusion of connective terms such as 'however' and 'but' often helped signal where discussion was being attempted. This pushed the mean up to 4.3 out of 8 marks.

**Q.4** **(a)** This was a low-tariff AO1 identify question, and it was generally well answered by most candidates. A wide variety of valid responses were seen, indicating a secure understanding of the characteristics associated with a skilful performer. Although a straightforward question, the breadth of accurate answers demonstrated that candidates are familiar with the core qualities of skilful performance, such as consistency, coordination, and efficiency.

**(b)** This was an AO3 'analyse' question, requiring candidates to explore 'why providing the correct type of guidance improves performance'. To access the higher-level marks, candidates needed to consider the impact of different types of guidance in relation to the stage of learning and performance development. Candidates generally found it difficult provide excellent, balanced analysis resulting in a facility factor of 0.38.

**(c)** AO3 6-mark question that produced a mean mark of 2.1. When responding to an AO3 evaluation question, it is essential that candidates focus on explaining the 'why' rather than simply stating the 'what'. In this instance, the question required candidates to evaluate the benefits of correct nutrition for a sports performer, with emphasis on the importance rather than just listing dietary components.

**(d)** This was an AO3 'assess' question (facility factor = 0.53) requiring candidates to apply their knowledge of weight training and fartlek training in the context of a footballer's performance. To access the higher-level AO3 marks, candidates needed to demonstrate how the physiological outcomes of each training method translate into performance improvements during gameplay. Overall, candidates responded well to the weight training element, often providing strong, applied examples. High-quality responses included links such as, 'Weight training improves power, allowing a player to strike the ball with force when taking a penalty,' or 'Developing muscular strength helps in shielding the ball from an opponent during physical challenges.' In contrast, responses relating to fartlek training were generally weaker. While many correctly identified that fartlek improves cardiovascular endurance and includes varying intensities (e.g., walking, jogging, sprinting), fewer candidates expanded on how this mirrors movement patterns in football or enhances in-game stamina.

**Q.5** **(a)** A well answered tick box response with a high mean of 0.9 out of 1 mark.

**(b)** This was an AO2 'justify' question worth 2 marks (mean = 0.7), requiring candidates to give a reasoned justification for the placement of Boccia on the skill continuum. To achieve full marks, candidates needed to provide two distinct, valid points explaining the rationale for its placement or a detailed amplification of one point. Credit was also awarded for justifying why the skill was not positioned at the opposite (basic) end of the continuum, an approach that often helped to strengthen candidate responses. A common and valid point made by many candidates was the need for tactical thinking, particularly in terms of placing the ball strategically in relation to the opponent's position. This demonstrated sound understanding of the decision-making and precision required in Boccia, supporting its classification as a more complex skill.

**(c)** A well answered AO1 question where candidates showed their understanding of why Boccia is self-paced, with popular responses being 'no external time pressure,' 'you control when to take the shot,' 'it is played indoors, so no factors like the weather'.

**(d)** This question was generally not well answered (facility factor = 0.36), with many candidates demonstrating a limited understanding of the concept of varied practice. As a result, they were unable to effectively explain its impact on performance. Responses often lacked clarity or confused varied practice with other types of practice (e.g., fixed or massed), indicating a need for further teaching on the characteristics, purpose, and application of different practice types within skill development.

**(e)** Candidates responded fairly to this question with a mean of 2 out of 4 marks. Most able to demonstrate a basic explanation of how fitness testing data can be used to support performance and training. Many responses included relevant examples, with the majority correctly identifying uses such as setting targets, tracking progress, and providing motivation. These answers reflected a strong grasp of the practical applications of fitness testing within a sporting context.

**(f)** Almost all candidates were able to correctly identify the missing stage of the information processing model.

**(g)** This question was generally well answered, with most candidates able to correctly identify examples of both input and decision making within a sporting context. It is important to note that the question required examples from a sport, not exclusively from Boccia. As such, valid examples from a range of sports were credited, provided they accurately reflected the stages of information processing. This approach allowed candidates to draw on familiar sporting contexts to demonstrate their understanding effectively.

**(h)** The final AO2 question in the paper produced a mean mark of 1.2 out of 4. Candidates were able to access 3-4 marks for 2 detailed explanations. Where candidates achieved lower marks, they mostly described intrinsic motivation but failed to explain why this was beneficial.

**(i)** This question was answered effectively, with most candidates demonstrating understanding of the benefits of goal setting in a sporting context (facility factor = 0.68). Responses commonly referenced key benefits such as maintaining motivation, providing focus, and offering direction. These points were well expressed and aligned with the expectations of the mark scheme, reflecting understanding of the psychological advantages associated with structured goal setting.

**(j)** This question was well answered (mean = 1.3 out of 2 marks), with the majority of candidates successfully identifying two potential barriers faced by disabled athletes. Common responses included references to the lack of equipment, the high cost of specialised equipment, and limited access to appropriate facilities. These examples demonstrated a clear understanding of the practical challenges that can impact participation for disabled individuals in sport.

**PHYSICAL EDUCATION (FULL COURSE)**

**GCSE**

**Summer 2025**

## UNIT 2: THE ACTIVE PARTICIPANT IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION

### Overview of the Unit

The assessment objectives for Unit 2 are as follows:

- AO2 (5%) - Applying knowledge and understanding of the factors that underpin performance and involvement in physical activity.
- AO4 (45%) - Demonstrating and applying relevant skills and techniques in physical activity and sport as well as the ability to analyse performance.

Learners will be assessed in:

- One major activity which will include the Personal Fitness Programme (PFP) which is worth 44 marks (22%) and is linked to AO4 and AO2.
- Two minor activities which are worth 56 marks (28%) and is linked to AO4.

This Unit will be marked out of 100 and is worth 50% of the qualification.

### Moderation process

A successful moderation process is based on:

- A significant sample to make an informed judgement.
- Articulating the process based on Performance Tasks and Assessment Criteria.
- Evidence of accurate assessment that supports the candidates' marks.

The Moderation Visit is to assess the centre's ability to assess accurately and consistently.

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. Please see guidance on the subject website.

Feedback to centres will be provided through the centre moderator report which will be available through IAMIS. No feedback will be provided by moderators on the moderation day.

WJEC, not the moderator, make the final decision on mark adjustments. This will be based on the moderators' report, recommendations and the identification of trends in the annotation of the WJPE1 & WJPE2 forms.

## Comments on individual questions/sections

### Administration

### WJPE1 and WJPE2 forms

All WJPE1 and WJPE2 forms must be completed and submitted to the moderator by **1st March**. For moderations scheduled before this date, all paperwork must be sent to the moderator **at least two weeks prior** to the moderation. Each form should be clearly annotated, with the relevant activities appropriately identified. There has been an improvement in meeting deadlines, and it is encouraging to see that **more centres are now providing clear and accurate annotations** on both WJPE1 and WJPE2 forms. This increased attention to detail is having a positive impact on the moderation process, allowing moderators to verify marks more efficiently and accurately.

**Clear annotations ensure greater transparency** and help support fair and consistent assessment across all centres. It is encouraging to note **that few centres have been reported of adapting the WJPE1 and WJPE2 forms**, indicating growing awareness of the correct procedures. However, some centres are still not fully adhering to the **specific instructions** regarding how candidate information should be presented. On the **WJPE1 form**, candidate numbers must be listed in **ascending order**. On the **WJPE2 form**, candidate numbers must be listed in rank order. Following these instructions is essential to maintain consistency and ensure the moderation process runs smoothly.

### Candidate Authentication Sheet (CAS)

There has been a noticeable improvement in the completion and submission of Candidate Authentication Sheets (CAS), with more centres ensuring that these are available to moderators alongside the WJPE forms. This progress supports a more efficient and compliant moderation process. Each candidate must have an individual CAS form, which includes a clear breakdown of their practical performance profile, individual activity marks, and overall total. The declaration section must be **signed and dated by both the candidate and the teacher**, confirming that the assessment was conducted in line with WJEC regulations. Centres are also reminded to bring to each candidate's attention the **GDPR section** of the CAS. This provides important information regarding the use of audio-visual and written coursework by WJEC/EDUQAS for training and CPD purposes, ensuring candidates are fully informed and their data is handled appropriately.

### Practical Performance

Continued progress has been evident across centres in the development of performance tasks. Centres have increasingly demonstrated the ability to produce work that not only showcases candidates' access to key assessment characteristics but also supports a consistent and efficient moderation process. This progress reflects a growing confidence and competence in delivering high-quality performance skills. Furthermore, the collaborative planning between centres and moderators has played a vital role in ensuring a well-structured and effective moderation day. However, there remain some activities that require further attention. Greater consistency is needed through **internal standardisation** to ensure accuracy in assessment across all candidates. Additionally, some candidates would benefit from more **structured support** in collecting video evidence that clearly captures the required elements of performance. It is also important that all aspects of the **performance task are fully** met to provide a valid basis for assessment and moderation.

**Mountain Walking**

Although video evidence has improved it is still felt that candidates would benefit from more **structured support** when producing evidence. To fulfil the Mountain Walking performance task, the centre must ensure that each candidate completes a **mountain walk of at least 10km** in a challenging environment, such as rugged or mountainous terrain. During the activity, candidates must **demonstrate the application of relevant skills and techniques**, including map reading, compass use, pacing, and route planning, particularly when faced with pressure situations such as poor weather, fatigue, or route-finding errors. Candidates should show emotional control, respond calmly to setbacks (e.g. losing the route), and make appropriate decisions under pressure. They must follow the accepted rules and conventions of mountain walking, including group safety procedures and codes such as the Countryside Code or Leave No Trace.

Respect for the environment must also be demonstrated, for example by avoiding littering, staying on marked paths, and minimising disturbance to wildlife. Centres are responsible for collecting appropriate evidence of performance, such as audio-visual, assessor observations, photographs, route maps, and reflective logs. While the walk can be completed individually or in a group, **each candidate's performance must be clearly identifiable for assessment purposes**. Once again it is important to note that evidence (images/video clip) alone of **Duke of Edinburgh expeditions is not enough to access the performance task.**

**Weightlifting**

Weightlifting has continued to grow in popularity as part of candidates' practical activity profiles during the series, with an increasing number of centres choosing to offer it. Centres have shown noticeable improvement in delivering this performance task, particularly in relation to safety considerations and providing an appropriate competitive context. Many now demonstrate an improved understanding of how to support candidates in performing lifts safely and effectively, under suitable supervision. Despite this progress, there remain areas for development. In several cases, candidates have only demonstrated one lift, which does not meet the **requirements of the performance task**.

Centres are reminded that both the *snatch* and *clean* and *jerk* must be performed and evidenced, and this should take place within a competitive environment. Doing so allows candidates to fully demonstrate the physical characteristics, technical execution, and tactical and strategic understanding expected at this level. Weightlifting is a specialist activity and, as such, requires careful planning, appropriately qualified supervision, and adherence to safety protocols. Centres should ensure that candidates are adequately prepared and that all assessment conditions support the valid and reliable demonstration of performance.

## Athletics

Centres have generally implemented performance tasks effectively, allowing candidates to demonstrate their athletic skills, techniques, and strategic awareness in competitive settings. In track events, assessment has been conducted with consistency and accuracy, enabling reliable judgments of candidates' ability to perform under pressure, maintain emotional control, and adhere to rules, such as holding their position before the starting gun or recovering composure after mid-race contact. However, there remains a notable lack of standardisation across field events. While some centres have marked generously, others have applied criteria too severely, particularly in events like javelin and discus, where technical execution, such as maintaining a controlled run-up and release in javelin or consistent form through all rounds in discus, is key to valid assessment.

To ensure fairness and comparability, it is essential that **standardisation be strengthened across all event** types, with clear benchmarks and consistent moderation to support the evaluation of performance across both track and field disciplines. It is recommended that, where possible, centres capture video evidence during Year 10 athletics competitions. This would provide a valuable reference point for assessment, particularly in demonstrating candidate performance in a live, competitive context. For those with access to such competitions video footage can offer clearer insights into technique and decision-making under pressure, helping to showcase candidates in a more accurate and supportive light. Further guidance can be found in the performance skills section in the specification.

## Personal Fitness Programme (PFP)

The Personal Fitness Programme (PFP) is structured to enable candidates to apply relevant theoretical knowledge and to collect, analyse, and present data effectively. It is important to note that assessment is not based on whether candidates demonstrate improvement in their major activity. Instead, assessment is determined by the quality of evidence produced, as defined by the criteria outlined on page 17 and further supported by the assessment criteria on pages 29–33 of the specification.

Moderators have reported that the overall standard of PFP submissions has been good, with the majority of work being assessed accurately. However, a recurring area of concern remains the section on 'Recommendations for Future Improvement.' Despite being identified as a priority in both 2023 and 2024, this element continues to be either underdeveloped or omitted entirely in many of the PFPs reviewed. Where candidates have attempted this section, the analysis tends to reflect only a basic or limited understanding of the factors influencing future performance. This ongoing issue suggests that centres may need to allocate more time to exploring these factors with candidates to support access to higher mark bands.

Another persistent issue noted by moderators relates to annotation. While centres are expected to annotate PFPs clearly to justify the marks awarded, many submissions still feature minimal or vague annotations. This lack of clarity makes it difficult for moderators to understand how and where marks have been allocated, thus hindering the moderation process. Furthermore, inconsistencies have been observed in the assessment of candidates from larger centres, particularly when different staff members assess different students. In some cases, candidates awarded the same mark have demonstrated markedly different standards of work. This trend underscores the importance of robust internal standardisation procedures in centres with large cohorts.

**PFP recommendations for Improvement**

- More emphasis is needed on developing candidates' understanding of future performance and factors that may strengthen or hinder performance in the 'Recommendations for Future Improvement' section.
- Annotation should be detailed and specific, guiding moderators through the rationale for awarded marks. Annotations should also link clearly with assessment criteria.
- Internal standardisation must be prioritised in larger centres to ensure consistency in assessment across different assessors.

By addressing these ongoing concerns and building on areas of progress, centres can improve the overall quality and consistency of PFP submissions, ultimately enhancing the accuracy and fairness of assessment outcomes.

**Use of IAMIS for Submitting Moderation Evidence – Support for Centres**

In this series, the IAMIS system has been introduced as the central platform for uploading all video evidence recorded on moderation day, as well as any additional footage requested as part of the moderation sample. Centres undertaking **live moderation** are required to record all practical activities that take place on the day of moderation. It is important that this video evidence, along with the written NEA seen on the day, is uploaded to IAMIS **within one week** of the moderation taking place. For centres **involved in remote moderation**, all requested materials must be uploaded **prior to the scheduled moderation day** to ensure smooth and timely access for moderators. To streamline the process, it is advised that all paperwork be uploaded as a **single consolidated file**.

This file should include:

- WJPE1 and WJPE2 forms
- Candidate authentication sheets
- Candidate identification sheets
- Any other relevant materials/ timetables/ candidate identification used on the moderation day
- Samples of the written NEA presented

All audio-visual recordings must comprehensively capture **every activity undertaken during the moderation**, with each activity recorded in its entirety. The quality of the recordings must be **clear and high definition**, ensuring candidates are easily identifiable throughout.

**Audio Visual Recording for Practical Moderation**

As part of the regulatory requirements for practical moderation, all centres are reminded of the expectation to submit high-quality audio-visual recordings of all practical performance's activities seen or requested by the moderator. These recordings serve as critical evidence for activities observed on moderation day and are an essential part of the assessment process. In preparation for the 2026 series, centres must ensure that **every activity is fully and clearly captured on video**. This is not only a regulatory obligation but also a key element in ensuring accurate and fair assessment of candidates. It is imperative that each recording meets the highest quality standards to support effective moderation.

**Expectations and Best Practices:**

- **Comprehensive Coverage:** each video must clearly capture the **entire context of the activity**, for example, a full 15 v 15 Rugby match. Footage must clearly identify the characteristics of the marks awarded by the centre for each candidate being moderated in the video.
- **Candidate Identification:** each recording must be accompanied by a **Candidate Identification Sheet**. The footage should allow for easy and consistent recognition of each candidate throughout the performance. This enables moderators to confidently attribute performance to the correct individual.
- **Video Quality:** the video must be of **sufficient resolution and clarity** to allow moderators to observe key performance details. Blurred or pixelated recordings, as well as poor lighting or excessive background noise, can severely hinder the moderation process and may result in the evidence being deemed unusable.
- **Camera Positioning:** strategic camera placement is essential, particularly for activities with fixed camera setups such as Badminton. For example, if courts are distant from the camera, candidates may become indistinguishable. Moderators have highlighted ongoing issues with visibility and identification on such recordings, making accurate judgments difficult.
- **Consistency Across Centres:** While some centres have submitted exemplary video evidence in previous series, this **level of quality is expected from all centres** going forward**.**

By adhering to these expectations, centres will help ensure a fair and efficient moderation process, upholding the integrity and quality of practical assessments.

## 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@wjec.co.uk
Qualification webpage: GCSE Physical Education (Full Course) | WJEC

See other useful contacts here: Useful Contacts | WJEC

### 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.wjec.co.uk/home/professional-learning/

### WJEC Qualifications

As Wales' largest awarding body, WJEC supports its education community by providing trusted bilingual qualifications, specialist support, and reliable assessment to schools and colleges across the country. This allows our learners to reach their full potential.

With more than 70 years' experience, we are also amongst the leading providers in both England and Northern Ireland.

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