

Chief Examiner and Chief Moderator Report

**NCFE Level 1/2 Technical Award in Health and
Fitness
QN: 603/7007/5**

Series: Summer 2025

EA paper number: P002854

NEA paper number: P002856

EA assessment date: 20 May 2025

NEA assessment date: 30 April 2025

Introduction

This report contains information in relation to the examined assessment (EA) from the chief examiner and non-exam assessment (NEA) from the chief moderator, with an emphasis on the standard of learner work within this assessment series.

The aim is to highlight where learners generally performed well, as well as any areas where further development may be required.

Key points:

- grade boundary information
- administering the examined assessment (EA) and non-exam assessment (NEA)
- evidence creation
- standard of learner work
- responses to the assessments.

The qualification is linear, meaning both assessments must be taken in the same assessment series and cannot be combined across different assessment series. Learners are allowed one attempt at each assessment, and there are no resit opportunities.

Grade boundary information

This qualification consists of two assessments: the examined assessment (EA) and the non-exam assessment (NEA).

After both assessments are completed and marked or moderated, the marks are combined to give a final mark for each learner. Where the raw marks do not reflect the required weighting of the assessment, a scaling factor is applied. For further information on grading information and scaling factors, please see the Qualification Specification.

Qualification scaled mark boundaries in this series are:

	Overall	Notional boundaries*	
		EA	NEA
Scaling factor		1	1.364
Max	200	80	88
Level 2 Distinction*	173	67	77
Level 2 Distinction	146	56	66
Level 2 Merit	118	45	53
Level 2 Pass	90	34	41
Level 1 Distinction	70	26	32
Level 1 Merit	50	18	23
Level 1 Pass	31	11	15

*The grade boundaries given for each assessment are known as 'notional grade boundaries', as they are for illustrative purposes only. Grade boundaries are the lowest mark with which a grade is achieved.

Administering the examined assessment (EA) and non-exam assessment (NEA)

The EA is invigilated and must be conducted in line with our [Regulations for the Conduct of External Assessment](#) document. The NEA is moderated and must be conducted in line with our [Regulations for the Conduct of NEA – Non-Exam Assessment](#) document.

Learners must be given the resources to carry out the tasks and these are highlighted within the [Qualification Specific Instructions for Delivery](#) (QSID) document.

Evidence creation

Examined assessment (EA)

Learners should use the space provided to answer questions. Where answers are typed or additional pages included, the learner's name, centre number, centre name and task number must be clearly visible. The additional paper must then be securely attached to the workbook.

Where assessments are completed online, centres must ensure they are familiar with the Surpass platform and have completed all testing and preparation before the assessment, to ensure learners are unaffected by technological issues.

Non-exam assessment (NEA)

Learners should ensure they approach each task in order, ensuring adherence to time requirements and specified controlled conditions. Learners should produce their response to each task and associated evidence independently, without guidance, instruction or feedback from centre staff.

Most evidence was completed well and presented in keeping with the expectations of the NEA. It would appear learners are generally well prepared to complete the NEA following adequate teaching of the course content by centres.

Learner evidence was presented in a variety of formats, mainly word-processed documents, PDFs, PowerPoints and some hand-written evidence.

Centres generally made appropriate use of the provided Record of Learner Observation template to record their evidence. Centres should ensure that the contents of Record of Learner Observation Forms are individualised to the learner and support the moderation process by detailing how learners have met assessment objectives (AOs). There should be a clear differentiation seen between Record of Learner Observation Forms for learners awarded marks in different marking bands.

Most centres uploaded learners' submissions to the NCFE portal in an appropriate format. Centres are reminded to utilise the correct naming structure of files and to ensure that the learner upload checklist is completed for all learners and uploaded to the portal. It was noted that some centres did not initially submit all required evidence and documentation including the Assessor Feedback to Learner Form. This can lead to delays in the moderation process and the issuing of learner results.

All centres should refer to their final moderation report prior to the next delivery of the NEA. This provides areas of strength and areas of development for the centre on the topics of administration, assessment and learner responses.

Centres should refer to the correct process for entering marks, ensuring that if learners have attempted the NEA producing some evidence, but have achieved no awardable marks, the mark should be entered as zero. If they have not attempted the task, this should be marked as DNA. If all tasks for NEA have not been attempted, all tasks should be entered as DNA giving an overall mark of DNA for the assessment.

Standard of learner work

Examined assessment (EA)

Holistically, learners performed well on this EA. Average scores increased in comparison to the previous session and performance was consistent across the paper. Performance across multiple-choice questions (MCQs) was mostly positive, with no real outliers in terms of any of the questions.

Like previous assessment windows, learners tend to find anatomy and physiology content more difficult than other elements targeted within the assessment. Specifically, energy systems and muscle contractions continue to be topics in which learners struggle to achieve maximum marks. Learners are encouraged to ensure they read all elements of a question, and ensure they respond to the specifics outlined within each question. Where there are health and fitness examples within the question, learners should be encouraged to ensure their responses are targeted towards answering the question in full.

In addition to the above, command verbs should also be noted to ensure that the responses provided by learners actually answer what the question is asking for. A common error appeared when learners were tasked with defining or naming aspects within their response, but this was not provided. Improvements within this paper in comparison to previous papers were the accuracy in which learners were applying some of their responses within context. Learners tend to provide accurate examples of health and fitness activities, or accurate examples of where content can be applied within context. This demonstrates a better understanding of the content and enabled learners to access higher marks.

Moving into future assessments, further consideration should be applied to the extended-response questions. Questions within this assessment required learners to provide three other examples to those that were identified from the question stem. Commonly, learners either included the example from the question stem, or did not include three other examples, which had an impact on the ability to access marks in levels two and three.

Non-exam assessment (NEA)

This was the second delivery of the Model 5 Level 1/2 Technical Award in Health and Fitness. The NEA followed a similar project brief with changes in the specified components of fitness. The NEA was divided into seven distinct tasks. Each task had associated marking grids containing banding descriptors for each mark band. The layout of the assessment was in line with that demonstrated in exemplar materials and confirmed at Prepare to Teach events. The assessment was marked and quality assured internally by centres, with a sample of work externally moderated by NCFE.

Learners were assessed by a non-exam assessment (NEA) which is a formal synoptic assessment that requires learners to demonstrate that they can identify and use effectively, in an integrated way, an appropriate selection of techniques, theories and knowledge.

A total of 88 marks was available across the assessment. Each task was allocated a range of marks against stated assessment objectives (AOs). In each task, it was expected that assessors would provide a mark for each AO assessed (with due reference to the weighting of AO level marks within each task), with the addition of these awarded marks providing an overall task mark. This methodology was also applied in the moderation process.

Most learners had attempted all tasks within the NEA, with a distribution of achievement across the cohort.

Generally, learners across the cohort performed strongly in AO4 with the practical application of their testing and session planning being evident. Centres must ensure when awarding marks for AO4 that the mark being awarded to the learner is supported and evidenced through either robust use of the Record of Learner Observation Form (where specified) or that detailed justification of marking is made on the Assessor Feedback Form (Tasks 2 and 6). Centres may wish to submit an additional Record of Learner Observation Form for tasks 2 and 6 to evidence sufficiently marks awarded for AO4.

It was noted by moderators that assessor feedback to learners was generally useful, positive and individualised to the learner. Assessor feedback did not always include marks and commentary at AO level, which on occasion made assessor decisions unclear for both the purposes of accurate feedback to learners, and external moderation. Centres should ensure that they provide marks at AO level. These should be added together to produce a final mark for each task.

Responses to the assessments

Examined assessment (EA)

Question 1

Learners' responses to this question were evenly divided. There was a clear distinction between those who understood the content and those who did not.

Question 2

Learners performed well on this question, with most learners answering correctly.

Question 3

After review, it was decided that this multiple-choice question could be seen as ambiguous, and that all four responses could be deemed to be correct. Therefore, all students who attempted the paper were awarded a mark for this question, regardless of their response.

Question 4

Learners' performance was varied for this question. Typically, learners either achieved two marks or zero marks due to them either knowing and understanding the content, or not. Common errors were providing responses the wrong way around or providing incorrect answers.

Question 5 (a)

Learners performed well on this question with a significant proportion of learners receiving two marks. A common error was using the bone type that was already provided within the question.

Question 5 (b)

Learners performed reasonably well on this question by achieving at least one mark for correctly identifying how the function of a long bone would affect an individual playing rugby. Often, the second mark was not awarded due to a lack of an accurate description being provided.

Question 6 (a)

Learners performed well on this question by providing a range of different, suitable exercises. Typically, marks were not awarded due to incorrect responses, or responses which were too vague and not appropriately linked to circuit training, for example, sprint, as opposed to shuttle runs.

Question 6 (b)

This question provided a range of mixed responses from learners. Where marks were awarded, this was due to learners providing accurate responses. Common errors were where learners provided responses more suited to the aerobic energy system or provided responses that were too vague / not linked to the question.

Question 7

Learners tended to struggle with this question. Where this was answered well, learners answered specific elements in the question (identifying a muscle in the lower leg and its primary function) and explained how it helped the client perform a squat. Where it was not answered well, it was either left blank, incorrect muscles were identified or the response was too vague.

Question 8

Responses to this question were often too vague (no concentric muscle identified), or wrong muscles were identified. In some cases, this was answered very well, with accurate identification of which muscle contracted, and a description how this helps the movement to be completed.

Question 9 (a)

Learners' performance on this question was mixed. Common errors were providing responses the wrong way around or providing incorrect answers.

Question 9 (b)

The question tasked learners with analysing how one feature of the alveoli would help the performance of a runner. If no feature was provided, no marks were awarded. Where learners correctly identified a feature, they typically went on to be awarded an additional one or two marks.

Question 10

Learners performed well on this question, with most learners answering correctly.

Question 11

Learners' responses to this question were evenly divided. There was a clear distinction between those who understood the content and those who did not.

Question 12

Learners' responses to this question were evenly divided. There was a clear distinction between those who understood the content and those who did not.

Question 13

Most learners achieved the one mark for this question. Where zero marks were awarded, this was due to the response being too vague and not being an actual definition.

Question 14

This proved to be a difficult question for learners. Responses provided were either incorrect, or they did not name a principle of overload. In some cases, learners attempted to describe a principle, as opposed to name the principle.

Question 15

Much like previous assessment windows, learners' performance was mixed when tasked with providing definitions. Some definitions were excellent. Where marks were not awarded, this was

typically due to definitions being incorrect, too vague, or providing an example of where the component of fitness is used / utilised, as opposed to an actual definition.

Question 16

Like question 15, there was a mixed response when completing this task. Where marks were awarded, responses were specific to the question. Where marks were not awarded, responses were often too brief, and not specifically linked to a 100m sprinter. Learners are reminded to ensure that their responses are direct and linked to the information included within the question.

Question 17

Much like some of the other questions, where learners achieved two marks, responses were clear and concise, breaking the response down into two parts to meet the question. Where marks were not awarded, responses were often too vague, and did not focus on the exercise being completed (plank) and how it can improve the performance of the gymnast.

Question 18

The task required learners to identify and analyse one component of skill related fitness and explore how it would benefit an individual in a triathlon. Often, learners did not identify a correct component of skill related fitness, or did not apply it to triathlon. Where this was answered well, the responses were structured and addressed all aspects of the question.

Question 19 (a)

Learners performed well on this question, accurately providing short-term effects of exercise on the body. Some responses used the correct terminology throughout. Common errors consisted of using the effects that were already in the question or were long-term effects as opposed to short-term effects.

Question 19 (b)

Learners generally performed well on this question, with the strongest answers providing a logical response, focussing on the short-term effect (why it happened), and then linked this to the individual taking part in the netball match. Most often, learners did not access the additional marks as they did not accurately reflect the benefit this could have on the individual taking part in the netball match.

Question 20

Learners performed well on this question, with the majority of learners answering correctly.

Question 21

Learners' responses to this question were evenly divided. There was a clear distinction between those who understood the content and those who did not.

Question 22

Learners performed well on this question, with most learners answering correctly.

Question 23 (a)

Learners performed reasonably well on this question, with many learners accessing at least one mark. Where learners answered this well, responses were focussed on the readiness for participation element of the question. Where responses were less positive, this was because they were too vague / not linked to the question.

Question 23 (b)

Very similar to question 23 (a), learners performed reasonably well on this task. Where this was answered well, learners focussed on why regular health and fitness assessments should be part of a training programme.

Question 24

Similar to 23 (a) and 23 (b), most learners accessed at least one of the marks on this question. Where this was answered well, learners correctly identified a principle of dynamic stretching and then applied this in context to a gymnast. Common errors were the principle of dynamic stretching being too vague.

Question 25

Learners performed well on this task, with most learners accessing two or more marks. Again, where this was answered well was due to addressing each component of the question in a logical manner. Marks were awarded for correctly identifying an aspect in each section and then explaining its importance to aid recovery.

Question 26 (a)

Typically, learners either achieved two marks or zero marks due to them either knowing and understanding the content, or not. Common errors were providing responses from within the question, or responses that were not appropriate.

Question 26 (b)

Learners performed reasonably well on this question with the majority achieving one or more marks. Learners that did not achieve marks either provided responses that were too vague and not linked to the context, or did not understand the task presented to them.

Question 27

This was a high performing question where learners accurately identified / described the important of hydration in a tennis tournament. Learners struggled more on the analysis element, where they needed to explore different impacts and benefits of hydration for Donna. Some responses were well structured, detailed and provided justified reasons for hydration.

Question 28

Learners performed reasonably well on this question, but there is some scope for improvement within future assessments. Higher level responses saw learners provide three accurate principles of training, and discussed these in context, providing accurate descriptions of their benefit, and how this would help Erin in relation to the upcoming World Weightlifting Championships.

In weaker responses, three accurate principles were not provided, or, where they were provided, they tended not to be discussed and / or applied in context, meaning some learners did not access the higher bands available.

Question 29

Similar to question 28, learners performed reasonably well on this question, but improvements can still be made. In higher level responses, learners provided three correct training methods, and discussed these in context, giving accurate descriptions of their benefit, and how this would help Yusuf in relation to training for a marathon.

In lower-level responses, three accurate training methods were not provided. These tended not to be discussed and / or applied in context. Often training methods were not provided, and activities that were provided were not always appropriate.

Non-exam assessment (NEA)**Task 1**

This task required learners to demonstrate and administer two relevant fitness tests to their client (AO4) and produce an analysis and evaluation of their results (AO5). Aspects of AO4 were generally strong with learners demonstrating and administering appropriate fitness tests to their clients. Most learners utilised the handgrip dynamometer for muscular strength and the 30-meter sprint test for speed. A small number of learners adopted one rep max testing for strength which was acceptable. AO5 varied in responses with some learners lacking depth in their evaluation. Learners should evaluate their client in comparison to normative data making suggestions such as how much the client would need to improve to reach the next level in comparison to normative data. Additional elements mentioned may include environmental or equipment factors that may have impacted their client's performance, or individual aspects (such as the client's sports, activities, injuries, health or motivation) which may have influenced their proficiency at an activity. For the first time this year, AO4 required the completion of a Record of Learner Observation Form by centres. These were generally completed well and helped to support moderation. Centres should ensure that commentary is individualised to the learner in all Record of Learner Observation Forms and that the commentary sufficiently reflects the mark band and final mark awarded to the learner.

Task 2

This task required learners to administer three fitness analysis tools (PAR-Q, Lifestyle Questionnaire and Food Diary) (AO4), make judgements on the results of these tools (AO3) and

formulate a general assessment of their client through use of the tools (AO2). AO4 was generally completed well by learners. Centres took differing approaches to AO4 with some centres asking learners to source their own fitness analysis tools, while some provided learners with blank copies of the three tools. Both are appropriate and permitted within the Tutor Guidance document, but centres should note which method was used in the learner upload checklists. Some difficulty was seen in centres' interpretations of AO2 and AO3. AO3 should see the learner make an analysis of the completed fitness assessment tools. Some learners' analysis was limited to copying the client's responses from the tools whereas learners should be making an analysis of the impact of the responses for the client and their future training programme. Some centres' interpretation of AO2 was below expectations. Assessment of AO2 should take a view of how efficiently learners have utilised the fitness analysis tools including how effectively learners have utilised information contained within the tools in their analysis. This may include, for example, checking if learners have followed the correct procedure on PAR-Q forms and the level of detail and additional information noted on completed tools.

Task 3

This task required learners to produce an overview of goal setting and SMART targets (AO1), formulate two appropriate SMART targets for their client (AO2), and make appropriate use of the previous fitness assessments of their client to inform those SMART targets (AO3). Learners approached AO1 in a generally consistent manner and it was often appropriately assessed by centres. Centres should keep in mind the weighting of marks for AO1 when awarding. AO2 was approached by learners in a variety of ways. Generally, the quality of SMART targets produced met the requirements of AO2. Some targets could have had increased relevance to the client's Tasks 1 and 2 testing which increases adherence to AO3. Centres should ensure that their teaching effectively equips learners with the knowledge and understanding to achieve AO1.

Task 4 (a)

This task required learners to design a four-week training programme with at least three sessions per week, and two methods of training being utilised (AO2). Learners are also required to provide an overview of training methods they have chosen (AO1) and an explanation of their training methodology (AO3). AO1 was generally lacking evidence. Learners should produce a separate written overview of training methods that illustrates their understanding of each method. Often marks were awarded for AO1 where learners had effectively utilised training methods in their plan, however, this is awarded through AO2. AO2 was generally well evidenced with some good application of SPORT and FITT principals of training throughout. AO3 was generally appropriate with learners referring to their SMART targets from Task 3 as well as their Tasks 1 and 2 evaluation method.

Task 4 (b)

This task required learners to produce a one-week diet plan (AO2) with an associated explanation of the appropriateness of the plan to their client (AO3). AO2 was generally well evidenced with learners often completing appropriate diet plans which met the requirements of the task. AO3 was completed to a lower standard, with learners often simply focussing on the nutritional value of foods contained within the plan and they stated general benefits of these

nutrients. Learners should ensure that their explanatory comments are specific to their client. Referencing changes made in comparison to Task 2 food diary for instance, will aid in meeting the assessment objectives (AOs). When devising their diet plan, learners should ensure that repeats of individual meals without any adaptation should be kept to a minimum. Planned meals should generally be unique.

Task 5

This task required learners to deliver their 12 fitness sessions to their client (AO4) and create and analyse a training log (AO5). AO4 was generally evidenced well. Centres should ensure that the record of learner observation that covers AO4 contains individualised commentary of the learner's session. As learners need to be observed covering two methods of training, multiple observations could be combined into one record. Centre record of learner observations should be seen to differentiate between mark bands awarded. AO5 generally consisted of a table style learner log with additional analysis and evaluation by the learner. The learner's focus in completing AO5 should be on evaluating their skills as a trainee fitness instructor and the effectiveness of their training sessions for the client working towards their goals. Learners were sometime seen to focus too much on the actions of their client (attendance, behaviour, effort) rather than their actions as a trainee fitness instructor.

Task 6

This task required the learner to complete retesting of their client using the same fitness testing methodology as in Task 1 (AO4) and make conclusions about the effectiveness of the health and fitness training programme (AO5). Learners' performance in AO4 was generally aligned with that of AO4 in Task 1. Although a Record of Learner Observation Form is not mandated for Task 6, centres should ensure that the commentary given in the Assessor Feedback Form evidences the mark awarded. AO5 had mixed responses. Learners should ensure they evaluate their Task 6 data in comparison to both normative data and their Task 1 data. They should also make evaluation of the client meeting their Task 3 SMART targets and may include discussion in relation to the client's Task 2 assessments.