**Key Process C – Examiner Report**

In general the marking of KPC was accurate. However, moderators reported that there were instances of over marking in some of the samples of work sent to them. Students were awarded credit for lists of skills that were deemed to be strengths or weaknesses, sometimes lengthy with little or no further detail. It should be noted that these need to be fully explained.

This section is concerned with analysing the performance and making judgements, and students need to show the ability to explain the reasons why they are strengths or weaknesses in the context of the activity. This involves demonstrating an understanding of what makes an action/skill/technique/performance appropriate/effective/efficient/successful rather than produce a list or bullet points.

In the improvement section, marks were often incorrectly awarded for simplistic statements, which lacked the required depth of analysis. Moderators reported that there was still replication from the weakness section within the prioritise section, and unfortunately the majority of centres failed to prioritise and instead addressed multiple weaknesses, or at times even strengths, which prevented the necessary detail being provided to meet the requirements of the higher mark bands.

When outlining corrective measures, students need to demonstrate their knowledge of suitable practice(s)/strategies/tactics to improve performance. A number of students addressed all weaknesses rather than selecting one, or they developed a multi-faceted training programme incorporating different training methods, but did not actually explain any of the suggested corrective measures in significant detail.