



A-level **Physical Education**

7582/C NEA

Report on the examination

Version: 1.0
June 2025

Further copies of this report are available from aqa.org.uk

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Overview of Moderation

- General improvements noted across centres, particularly in written work and video evidence quality.
- Moderation visits were well received, especially by centres previously unfamiliar with the process. Some centres required clarification on accepted practices (e.g. commentary sheet content, student identification).
- Moderators reported high standards in performance evidence, with many students performing at strong competitive levels. However, a few centres still marked too leniently or harshly due to misunderstanding competitive context.
- The use of level of response (LoR) grids has improved markedly across centres, aiding consistency in both practical and written assessments.
- A small number of rubric infringements occurred, mostly due to incorrect activity focus (e.g. AA1 used incorrectly) or unobservable footage (e.g. GoPro use, edited footage).
- Some administrative challenges were noted due to tight moderation timelines and late submissions, particularly affecting moderators who also teach full-time.

Administration

- Centres are largely adhering to administrative expectations, including use of LoR grids and encryption standards for practical footage.
- Annotations on written work are now common, helping moderators understand marking decisions.
- Occasional issues:
 - Centres using unsecured USBs or their own encryption.
 - Footage not downloaded from platforms like VEO, causing problems during review.
 - Late mark submissions, impacting moderator scheduling.
- Commentary sheets often lacked required depth—especially in AA3. Centres must ensure the commentary discusses:
 - Tactical decisions (e.g. formations and strategies),
 - Alternatives to actions taken, and
 - Specification-referenced skills performed repeatedly.

Practical (Performance)

- Marking is generally accurate and within tolerance across most centres.
- Centres have made strong improvements in:
 - Quality and clarity of footage (increased use of VEO and newer tools like Spiideo).
 - Timelines and commentary detail, helping link actions to assessment strands.
- Challenges still faced:
 - Some video footage lacks full view of the pitch/court.
 - Timelines sometimes out of sync with footage, particularly when converting VEO links to downloads.
 - A few centres provided only minimum evidence, which was problematic for mid/low performers.
 - Centres occasionally misinterpret competitive context, leading to over-generous practical marks.
 - In rare cases, overly edited footage or non-spec-compliant equipment was used (e.g. GoPro).

Practical (Coaching)

- (Note: Specific feedback on coaching was minimal in your reports. If applicable, you may want to gather more explicit input.)
- In general, moderation has focused more on performance than coaching plans.
- Where coaching is assessed, clarity, specification linkage, and progression tracking are key areas that should continue to be monitored.

Written NEA (Analysis)

Positives

- Improved structure and accuracy overall.
- Students increasingly use:
 - Correct technical models,
 - Specific match situations for weaknesses,
 - Visual aids (diagrams, annotated photos),
 - Clear links to performance impact.

- The use of colour coding (e.g. red for model, blue for weakness, green for impact) is becoming best practice.
- Most centres are using LoR grids effectively for assessment.

Areas for development

- Some students still:
 - Focus too much on technical models or elite performance without tying it to their own weaknesses.
 - Provide generic analysis without referencing specific performances.
 - Include theoretical content where it isn't needed.
 - Fail to embed comparison with elite performers into AA3 as required.
 - Mistakenly include strengths, which should be avoided in this section.
 - Use AA1 instead of focusing on AA2/AA3.

Written NEA (Evaluation)

Positives

- Use of theory has improved, with more variety in topics and clearer links between cause and weakness.
- Action plans are being used effectively to demonstrate how the corrective measure addresses the cause.
- LoR grids are widely used, aiding assessment consistency.

Areas for Development

- Students often attempt too many causes/corrective measures, leading to lack of depth.
- Some evaluations:
 - Link corrective measures to weaknesses, not the cause (which is incorrect).
 - Include irrelevant theories under vague headings (e.g. "Arousal" leading to inappropriate discussion of drive theory).
 - Cover too many stress management techniques without depth.
 - Use the same theory for both cause and correction (e.g. self-efficacy repeated instead of bringing in goal-setting).
- There's still a gap in AA3 evaluation quality compared to AA2. Depth and clarity vary significantly.
- Tendency to mark within one band, even when sections clearly warrant a lower band.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results Statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.