

Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2012

GCE Physical Education (6PE02)
Unit 2: The Critical Sports Performer

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information, please visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

Our website subject pages hold useful resources, support material and live feeds from our subject advisors giving you access to a portal of information. If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

www.edexcel.com/contactus

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2012

Publications Code US032765

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

GCE Physical Education 8PE01

Units 6PE02

Advanced Subsidiary Tasks: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4

This report will review the moderation of coursework tasks for the examination series 2012. This will be for centres that either submitted coursework for the purposes of moderation for component 1A - through cluster moderations or E-portfolios and for all centres submitting component 1B - external moderation. Centres are thanked for their support and punctilious administration this examination series.

General Comments:

It is pleasing to report that for this examination series the majority of centres completed all the specification requirements in terms of administration successfully. Issues still exist on an individual basis concerning the completion of specific examination forms and the adhering to established word counts. In virtually every case the exam board deadlines were met.

The quality of the e-portfolio evidence is improving but some centres are repeating the errors of previous series such as the of depth and quality of the evidence being provided, but this is diminishing. The best quality submissions came from centres where staff have been on training courses, had a working knowledge of the IAG and ICE documents and the rubric requirements. Therefore understanding in detail what was required of their candidates.

The majority of candidates were well prepared for units 2 practical elements when performing in a cluster moderation. They were enthusiastic and committed to producing their best performances when undertaking their practical activities. Centres and candidates were punctual for the cluster moderations and the majority were dressed appropriately.

The word count had been omitted on some CRAF sheets for written tasks and there is still leniency shown by centres to comply with this directive. Throughout the process it was clear that several centres were not aware of all of the compulsory supporting evidence that was needed to accompany a personal performance and therefore as mentioned it is imperative that centre staff read the IAG, scan the Edexcel website for updates and centre guidelines as well as liaising with their moderator at all stages.

Experience in the delivery of the course seemed to be a key element in the organisation of the centre. Where the teacher assessors had little or no experience of delivering the A-level course mistakes were made in administration, presentation of the E-portfolio and on the cluster moderation day.

Tasks 2.1 Personal Performance

Overall, performances ranged from above average to excellent in the mainstream sports such as football, rugby, cricket, hockey and netball as well as in those less mainstream sports. In some cases it was possible to raise marks in sports such as rugby and football.

It has been pleasing to also see the wider range of sports/activities being presented by candidates such as dance. The range of dance was extensive, ranging from hip hop, street, ballroom, Latin to ethnic Indian and it is pleasing to see sports/activities ranging from skiing to horse riding. Video evidence is still the most complete way to present a candidate's performance abilities - if unable or not required to perform at a live cluster moderation, and while not compulsory requirement for both on and off site sports/activities it should be used where it is impractical to see a live performance. Individual activities, while assessed with some accuracy, were littered with centres which failed to ensure that the student had completed 3 competitive performances within that year. Gymnastics, dance, swimming and athletics were all activities where some students failed to have competitive (and in some cases a complete participation log) evidence for the appropriate period.

In addition, centres are reminded of the need to keep a Performance Log for each candidate. Candidates are required, as with the E-portfolio, to keep a log of the rubric requirements of 3 formal performances and a minimum of 8 weeks participation. Compulsory evidence in general though was well documented.

In the main, students were highly motivated at cluster moderation days and it was obvious they were eager to achieve the best possible marks. Feedback from moderators has indicated that well planned and differentiated sessions also enhanced the student's performance. There was a correlation between the well organised and well differentiated sessions and a student's performance and the least well organised sessions where lower marks were awarded to candidates. This could also be a reflection of the expertise of individual staff in centres.

E-portfolio submissions are still experiencing some issues where centres fail to supply the depth of evidence to judge the quality of a candidate's performance. It is relatively easy to compile the rubric of the course but more difficult to present evidence that will enable the moderation team to make judgements on the quality of the performer.

The resulting difficulty is that where no video evidence was on offer it was extremely difficult to differentiate at times between the mark range of candidates. Practical marks tended to be lower than live moderation because of the lack of evidence to support marks. Compulsory evidence again was well documented not so other forms such as video. Some centres offering E-portfolio evidence still did not follow the guidelines on submissions and as result requests for more evidence were issued eg dance. Identifying candidates on DVD/video was still a concern with some centres.

Leader / Officiating

The vast majority of performers submitting roles as either leader or official were accurately marked and gained top band marks. Leaders and officials were generally well prepared with accurate logs available, although these were of varying standards. Candidates continue to perform better as participants than as officials or leaders. Centre staff are reminded that if guiding candidates through the leadership and officiating roles then documentary evidence of the training they have undergone is a compulsory requirement as well as the minimum of 3 formal opportunities to display their abilities in these roles.

The better leadership and official candidates had practical activities well planned, but only those with wider experience were able to adjust their sessions when required. Candidates dressed appropriately and acting assertively justifying good marks. Although some centres did not always provide supporting information for their marks. Students did tend to have participation logs and session plans, and included their own evaluations of their progress, however very few had peer/teacher/coach evaluations related to the specification which would have provided stronger support for the marks given.

The best centres include a qualitative assessment which included statements on: organisation, motivation, communication, knowledge of the sport and appropriate development of the session to the strengths and weaknesses of the group in the environment of that moment. Although welfare and safety were referred to centres need to ensure their candidates develop these areas giving examples from their experience during the 8 weeks of Leadership. E.g. there should be evidence that consideration has been given to the difference between a 17 year old playing rugby and introducing tag rugby to a mixed gender group of 11 year old pupils – this would also demonstrate an understanding of safety and child protection and welfare issues which is not only paramount but also compulsory.

There is some feedback to suggest that a greater inconsistency in leadership which tends to be marked leniently by a higher margin. Inconsistency comes from schools using a variety of either sports specific leadership or general leader training. A number use NGB or CSLA awards as entry to higher mark bands but fail to fully support this with a range of evaluative means. Sessions led tend to be written up and have the leader's evaluation but rarely that essential staff member/coach's validation.

Task 2.2 Local Study

This task was fairly well completed and in most cases this task was accurately marked and centres are using a content check list when assessing tasks.

In some cases though there is little evidence shown or reported on the actual 'local provision'. Tasks are often too general without research of the

'nuts' and 'bolts' that make the sports work locally. The absence of an element of provision was often accepted by centres as sufficient to award a mark e.g. "there aren't any provisions for disabled people to play..... in my local area". If this is the case then the next step is to critically analyse why this might be the case rather than accept that a brief 'search' had failed to yield any results.

Some centres still do not ensure that their candidates explain grass root development of their sport for a performer, coach and official from FUNdamentals with appropriate provision (facilities and mini game or games), resources and equipment, opportunities in local clubs – both private and public, and the co-operation that had been developed through PESSCLs and the CSCs provisions. The difference between public, private and voluntary provision is often misunderstood by many candidates and too few offer any evidence of primary research that should be key to the local study.

Often candidates are awarded 15 marks for the volume of evidence produced rather than the quality of critical analysis provided. The appendix section now seems to grow and grow and centres are reminded that is not part of the moderation process. There still exists some confusion apparent with the term 'first level elite' which sometimes led to the inclusion of irrelevant information best saved for task 2.3. A criticism of some candidate's tasks is that they did not confine their research to the local area, but chose to cover the entire county. This seemed acceptable for sports like korfbal, but not football.

The best candidates did this task very well and after reading their efforts one felt that you had really been informed about provision in the locality. Candidates in foreign centres found it difficult to obtain information in these areas and centre staff must provide a closer level of tutoring to candidates in order to complete this task. The funding for these facilities and opportunities - access should relate to the present economic situation. Only the top band students included information on LTAD and a critical conclusion on their findings.

Task 2.3 National Study

The national tasks were fairly well presented and completed to a good standard in many centres with appropriate sports/activities being selected. Where this task was not completed to a high level it was normally the result of the information researched being presented in general terms with little critical analysis offered. 'Mainstream' sports with clear pathways, academies and representative structures were common and the information was accessed by large numbers of students but this was not the case in minority sports/activities. The majority of candidates chose 'performing' as the role in this task without fully examining what structures existed or LTAD pathways in the sport at the elite levels.

There was a surprising lack of structure in a number of centres with work presented as a block of text with few if any headings to guide towards

where marks had been awarded. Only a few candidates really examined the provision for the 'disabled' or other 'gender' depending on the sport and a critical analysis was limited. Candidates also need to include a paragraph on the alternative gender provisions (male v. female/female v. male). Centres are advised to follow the check list as this provides candidates with a framework for the completion of the task. For both the local and national tasks factual evidence can often lift a task as it provides specific data support for the points being made and the inclusion of cases studies can also aid the quality of the task.

2.4 Performance Analysis General Comments:

This year has produced another successful series of moderations with the vast majority of centres providing correctly formatted work, and with relatively few problems in terms of administration and deadlines.

All centres are politely reminded that they must be diligent in ensuring all CRAF, OPTEMs forms and electronic storage mediums are sent to the moderation teams by the deadlines identified by Edexcel.

All centres are strongly urged to read carefully their own E9 report and to consider the advice available in the Ice document, the IAG and seek additional clarity of assessment through the 'Ask The Expert' Service or via Edexcel provided training.

The application of marking remains variable; some centres assess work both accurately and consistently across the ability range, others less so.

A number of centres are still too generous when awarding top marks (five or six out of six) for work which does not include sufficient analytical detail, appropriate technical language or evidence of research.

Centres are encouraged to review the exemplar material available on the Edexcel website which should have additional material by the end of November (2012).

Introductory remarks about the work submitted for task 2.4

Many candidates appear to recognise the potential benefits to their own performance of undertaking these tasks in a thorough way. Undertaken in a careful and methodical way, the tasks provide an appropriate tool for candidates of all abilities to consider key aspects of their own performance profile and consider ways in which this work might allow them to modify and improve their own practice and performance.

There has been an increasing tendency for candidates to use pictures and diagrams throughout this work to illustrate key points or for analysis purposes. Some students use video clips but this is sometimes not particularly well contextualised and therefore, in these circumstances, adds little to the quality of work.

Moderators reported that a few candidates had used more than one activity for this work – Edexcel encourages candidates to undertake all the tasks for one activity and centres are asked to check with Edexcel in advance of any likely deviation in this practice so as to ensure that the consideration of additional activities is appropriate.

Overall for these tasks there is still not enough evidence to suggest that candidates are doing serious research in order to enhance existing knowledge and understanding. There is often a tendency merely to describe aspects of performance based on existing (often rather limited) knowledge.

Task 2.4.1 Technical Analysis

This continues to be the best produced of the five tasks. Moderators commented that candidates identified the appropriate four core skills and often produced very detailed work, to cover suitable core skills, which included annotated diagrams, links to perfect models and, occasionally, video clips - although as in previous years these were often not well contextualised and therefore added little to the analysis.

Most of the work focused on the technical and mechanical elements of performance with many also referring to the physiological elements. Occasionally there was insufficient detail on the tactical application of the core skills. Candidates should therefore be reminded of the need to offer a tactical application of each skill and to work through the three phases of preparation, execution and recovery.

The majority of the work was of a good to high standard and centres had clearly spent considerable time on this task and candidates had been well advised.

Much of the marking for this task was accurate, although occasionally centres were still a little generous.

Task 2.4.2 Tactical Analysis

The tactical analysis tasks were less well completed than the core skills, in the sense that much of the work presented was descriptive and lacked serious analytical detail. Visual evidence was often used but rarely referenced properly.

At its best this work was well researched and written, but where no reference was made to technical journals, nor elite level performances, candidates struggled to produce work of sufficient quality to justify the marks awarded by a number of centres; the work was sometimes over marked.

There were strong submissions of work from candidates that dealt with specific tactical preparation for known opposition and which included high quality use of diagrams, technical language and links to elite level performance.

However, there were occasions when candidates had spent too much time simply describing rules and regulations of the sport and failed to deliver a real appreciation of what tactics are and how they can shape outcomes.

Systems of play are a popular source for tactical description / analysis, but sometimes the work lacked depth and detail and failed to consider the application of key principles of play within such tactics.

Many candidates did not address the full variety of different tactics available in their activity. Some approached the task inappropriately; for example, including only match analyses or only focusing on one type of tactic or included a simple tactical match review.

In many cases there was a significant lack of comparative analysis to elite tactics which prevented candidates gaining the higher marks. Candidates should avoid a straight forward description of tactics at their own level and ensure that technical journals or similar resources are used to explore elite level performance.

Marking was sometimes generous for this task with the main concern being the lack of analysis.

Task 2.4.3 Notational Analysis

There were very few candidates who had not completed the required three notations. Most offered two notations of themselves, or their peers, and another at elite level. This often provides an ideal opportunity to analyse and compare performances. Moderators reported that some of this work was of high quality with some completing notations at live elite events.

Too frequently though candidates merely summarised / described the outcome – relatively offered serious analysis of the notations nor outlined an action plan.

Although most candidates understood what the task involved, few scored in the top band as the work lacked depth and technical language.

Centres need to provide better support to candidates of how to analyse the data collected and, in turn, how that might support improving individual /unit / team performance. Candidates need to offer more depth to their analysis. For example, in several strong pieces of work for hockey and football, candidates had compared accuracy of distribution of varying lengths and then suggested practices to improve areas of relative weakness.

Marking was variable for this task. A final summative review with a proposed action plan based on the findings from their notations is always required.

2.4.4 Training Analysis

As in previous years, much of this work comprised primarily of descriptions of training sessions. There was little in the way of detailed analysis of training programmes, nor the consideration of fitness components, training methods / application of principles and testing; candidates should refer to these factors and consider two or three in some depth.

Many did not compare their own training to that of elite performers which also provides an excellent vehicle for analysis.

Centres and candidates need to appreciate that this task provides an opportunity to consider the concept of training in a broader sense rather than merely outlining a few training sessions. Contextualisation of the factors which shape an effective training programme needs consideration for high / maximum marks.

Few candidates scored really well on this task, a number of moderators thought this was the weakest of the five tasks and many centres over-marked this work.

6PE02 -1B Task 2.4.5 Analysis of Strengths and Weaknesses

Although a number of candidates did well here, using personal profiles and evidence from peer / coach assessments and covered a full range of technical, mechanical, physiological, psychological and tactical components, It is acceptable for some of this task to be subjective in nature as inevitably it is the candidate's opinions and analysis that is sought. However many candidates just gave personal descriptions without the use of supportive objective information. Although many candidates gave full, lengthy and worthwhile descriptions of their strengths weaknesses, others lacked depth and detail. The use of data gained from fitness profiles, sports standards and performances outcomes are essential for a more objective and therefore logical and rationalised account of their strengths and weaknesses is paramount.

Relatively few candidates included a clear strategy to enhance areas identified as weaknesses and even fewer linked this task to the A2 Development Plan. Weaker candidates often produced work that was thin and lacking in technical language.

All analysis tasks are open-ended thus enabling each candidate to develop the tasks as they wish while being guided by the expected core content thus the use of data and / or the views of well qualified coaches are needed to add depth and verified context this section of work in particular.

Summary Section:

- Ensure all centre assessors have read the appropriate ICE document, The IAG and Edexcel guidelines
- When submitting E-portfolio evidence include sources that support the quality of a candidates performances for Tasks 2.1
- Through monitoring of Task submissions is required to ensure candidates do not exceed stipulated word count limits
- For each candidate completing Task 2.1, it is a requirement that all Performance Logs are compiled fully documenting 8 weeks training /preparation and at minimum 3 formal performances
- For all Tasks centres are required to carry out their own internal standardisation and rank order their candidates as appropriate. The transfer of clerical data to recording forms should be checked for accuracy
- For live cluster moderations ensure those staff delivering each practical session engage candidates in practices, drills and opened ended tasks that allow for differentiation and extended the performances of those candidates aiming to achieve recognition in the higher mark bands
- All written tasks should include appropriate referencing and a bibliography.

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code US032765 Summer 2012

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit
www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

