

Moderators' Report/
Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2014

Pearson Edexcel GCE
in Physical Education (6PE04)
Papers 1B/E/V The Developing Sports
Performer

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. 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 2014

Publications Code US039700

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

General Comments:

The standards seen from many students accessing marks towards the top end of the mark range has at times been outstanding particularly in Task 4.3 Personal Performance. Tasks 4.1 also saw students produce detailed Development Plans and a level of work perhaps beyond the requirements for this task. There has been no significant change in the quality of assignments for task 4.2 the international Study or task 4.4 the Life Plan. However, all the coursework submitted for the purposes of moderation reflects the guidance and direction given by centre staff and the attention paid to the detail required to support the marks awarded.

Issues still exists though – centres failing to read and act up on the previous examination series E9 centre report recommendations, reading and acting up on the updates available from the Edexcel web site and finally failing to adhere to guidance given in the IAG particularly to the rubric of assessment requirements. However, there is a general feeling that the standard of submissions seen from centres continues to improve slightly.

Most centres seem to respond to the ICQ Well organised centres are generally willing to run sessions, liaise well with other centre staff and run appropriate activities to of an appropriate standard that provided opportunities to see students at the different levels. Students approach the moderation appropriately, and appear to enjoy the opportunity to 'showcase' their talent and on the whole the centres are marking accurately.

E- Portfolio logs are still in some cases a cause for concern. Often they can contain too much irrelevant information, while supplementary evidence should be relevant to their sport and within the year of examination. International centre E-portfolios can often lack the range of evidence, and depth of evidence, that support the marks awarded. In some cases all that is entered, especially for leadership is a written testimony while the use of video has improved, and while not compulsory, it does provided a clear picture of the leaders abilities Use of the 'off-site' witness statement is variable and where it is used proves a valuable assessment record. There is also a lack at times of referencing information and a suitable bibliography for all written tasks.

Unit 4 (6PE04 1B): The Developing Sports Performer – International Study and Life Plan

Task 4.2 International Study

The international studies submitted from centres were completed on the whole to a good to very good standard but very few gained full marks. Many of tasks were marked in line with the appropriate marking band. However, on occasions there was evidence of too much generic information and a lack of specific sport information, 'pathways' being a typical example where a

generic pyramid of sport development was described. Most students included details on the topography of their chosen country but for some they failed to link this to their selected sport.

The balance of information in this task is crucial. Students must ensure they allocate a sufficient word count to each required area. For example a beautifully written and discussed content covered the areas of topography, politics, history of the country and the history of sport and the funding of sport in general leaving only 400 words to discuss the other required areas such as centres provisions. Centres are also reminded therefore that the task requires a balance between local provisions (grassroots - club/centre) to pathways and elite provisions while detailing Agencies and funding. The 'ethos' of a country was covered well by most but largely failed to represent the view of the nation on the chosen sport and tended to be descriptive in terms of culture, geography and history. Some students continue to make sweeping generalisations or unsubstantiated statements – for example when covering soccer in the USA with a definitive link to the 'Lombardi an' ethic.

The better tasks contained an appropriate level of factual detail which supported the comments being made. Often the least successful section was the detail on centres provisions and local community sport. Elite provisions are covered in better detail perhaps reflecting the ease of access to the relevant information. Some tasks completely lacked detail, facts and figures on participation.

Centres are reminded that there is a set word count limit of 1000 words and therefore exceeding this limit causing moderation to cease at this point. In addition at times the word count was not accurately presented on the CRAF form. Some centres are still encouraging students to 'box in' text essential to the task and thereby circumventing the word count limit. The use of 'boxed' text was still an issue and Edexcel have published clear definitive guidelines. Any written content which is the students own words is to be counted as part of the 1000 word count limit.

In some cases also too many inaccuracies occurred through a lack of detailed research eg there is a national rugby competition in Australia called the Super League. They do not have a national competition. This is a tough task given the word count limit and therefore students need to write succinctly. The better and higher marked tasks inevitably included greater factual detail and accurate referencing in all areas of the task.

Task 4.4 Life Plan

The overall standard of the Life Plans ranged from excellent in an increasing number of tasks seen to those of a very limited quality. Overall, those tasks that included referenced factual data as relevant to each age stage or time line band provided enough depth to secure the higher marks.

Where the standard is improving more factual evidence is included and less use of the appendix. A number of centres are encouraging students to examine university provision in detail and linking this with inhibiting factors

such as the level of competition to gain a place in a University team while some centres correctly encouraged students to explore alternative local provision. Those tasks marked in the higher mark band saw students supporting decisions with socio-economic, participation rates, health statistics and injury rates. While much of the task post 18 is subjective by nature students are required to look objectively at the possible / potential areas of participation that they are more than likely to become involved in. These will naturally change over time and therefore when observations are made these changes need to be supported by referenced data. The inclusion of a time-line at the start of the task which details the suggested stages the student moves through is a necessity and provides students with a structure to which to write too.

Students must remember to include detail on their employment/career pathway, health trends and participation and crucially the reasoning behind their present and proposed future areas of participation. Elite performers may wish to include LTAD and NGB influences. In those tasks scoring the lower end marks the comments were too generic and simplistic, lacked factual data to support the points being made and as always appropriate referencing.

Time-line phases should reflect present age participation, 16–18, which should include their present state aspirations and commitment, the majority of moderators' agreed this was well covered, however, links to inhibiting factors were generally not explored at this stage.

Post centre or college 18–22 saw most students include immediate options, such as which university? What is their provision? However, many students did not research alternative provisions outside university. Most students researched sports and physical activities on offer, but failed to discuss with any purpose, what is the expected /perceived level of commitment, training, travel etc. What are the inhibiting factors of academic studies, finance and/or socialising?

When moving into the typical competition phase, 22-35, students should highlight inhibiting factors such as career, family and/or financial considerations and include strategies to overcome them. Top band students were able to use societal statistics to qualify their decisions, however in general students threw in charts statistics on marriage, family, children, finance, work, house purchase, but did not engage in analytical discussion on how this will have an effect on their performance / commitment in their chosen activity.

Post competition and when moving into the 'veterans' phase of participation, 35–45, inevitably there will be major changes with potential movement into coaching, refereeing administration and possible performance changes from those based on competition to more recreational involvement. In general this area was covered well by some and many highlighted those inhibiting factors such as injury. However in many cases this era lacked specificity to the student and in many cases became very generic- thus losing a personal feel. Some students did mention changes in attitude and physiology linked to the ageing process. Top band students did

back up their statements with national and sport specific statistics to qualify the students' decisions, but on the whole discussion and analysis was fairly weak for some.

Post 45 but for many 55 should also include physiological changes and appropriate strategies to cope. It should also include later life options and the reasons why these have been selected. This should be related to general health trends, CHD, osteoarthritis etc. At every stage students should support their work with research and statistics. The majority of life plans had charts and statistics, but again in many cases this was very generic and tended to lose the personalised plan. It should be reiterated that there is a need to research national societal, health, participation, 'drop off' and injury rates in more detail and use them to qualify decision making throughout the life plan. A number of potentially good assignments petered out after 55+ time line band by not exploring the ageing process, alternative sports activities, past times and health issues associated with age.

Some centres seem unaware aware that while there is no specific word count for the life plan - centres are encouraged to guide students away from producing very extensive appendices as essential information such as facilities cost participation trends or graphs/statistics can all be included in the plan.

Unit 4 (6PE04 1E and 1V): The Developing Sports Performer – Development Plan and Progressive Participant

Task 4.1 Development Plan

Overall, the standard is improving year on year, with centre marks becoming more accurate while there is still some concerns of over marking by a few centres. Centres are beginning to understand the level of detail required and the importance of encouraging students to relate the plan to their own personal performance. The better students understood that the fundamental principle of the development plan is that they set about a plan that is designed with, normally, a single aim of improving their own personal performance (Task 4.3) through development outside that of any on-going 'activity training'. Students when using the Edexcel checklist generally produced better planning sections. The Review and Evaluations in some cases are very perceptive – analysing success or failure of all aspects eg type of training chosen, choice of tests, highlighting issues of validity and reliability and discussing aspects of correlation/causal relationships.

However, common weaknesses are still present with a sharper focus needed as many students are trying to improve too many areas eg 3 fitness components. Where more than a single aim is identified inevitably confusion occurs and the plan becomes unmanageable resulting therefore in a lack of specificity. In some cases there is a lack of evidence on the effects to actual performance eg notation, DVD or a witness statement assessing improved

playing standards. There is evidence in some tasks of a lack of qualitative/quantitative evidence to support the success of Plan.

Research and Planning

The research and planning section is the starting point for the plan and without suitable detail and relevance for many students the overall effectiveness of the plan was severely affected. For some this is still the weakest section as a lack of research on their chosen area to support their aim meant the Plan had flawed content. The planning and research would therefore lack the depth of physiological and scientific research, while most of the principles of training are generic and not personalised. The intensities and 'work to rest ratios' (W:R) are often incorrect and not justified. In some cases students use general aims ie get fitter, improve everything which lacks the specificity needed for this task. A common key theme was the development of unclear rationales for the aims and objectives and the training methods selected did not always match the aims and objectives chosen.

The biggest area for concern therefore is students failing to establish appropriate aims and objectives at the start. This then makes it hard for students to construct a plan for the assignment. There should be a clear link with Task 2.4, looking at areas for development as a performer, leader or official. Quantifying objectives is also an issue. Students need to use fitness testing or information from 2.4 to justify the area for their development.

Some assignments are too subjective. In some cases there is too much 'padding' and irrelevant information that is added to the assignments. Some centres still encourage students to include all the information regarding energy systems, methods of training, all the fitness testing protocols etc. when it has nothing to do with their development plan, eg detailed descriptions of Energy Systems and SMART Targets but no links as to how they would consider these when choosing training methods. If students are marked in the top band they must make sure they include the relevant intensities in their training, and this needs to be recorded and monitored throughout the plan. Details on dietary modifications, % loadings for macro-nutrients and recovery strategies should be included for those accessing the top mark bands.

Performing and Recording

On the whole the recording of sessions can vary in quality and depth from very good to poor with little engagement or understanding of goal-setting and monitoring beyond mid-plan testing. Those students undertaking off-site plans should provide evidence/testimony as to the completion and quality of their training. A few centres are also awarding full marks for this section because they include a diary of the week even though the training is inappropriate. In some cases students are using club training sessions as a part of performing even though the amount of training is not quantified and can therefore not be accepted. Where students are only undertaking only one designated training session a week this will not be sufficient to enable adaptations to take place.

Students should present this section with detailed workloads, demonstrate progressions in training loads and be validated. This should reflect their planned periodisation using mesocycles and microcycles, the planned goal setting and the systematic detail set out in the first section. Validation is a major issue and the logging of sessions is often very superficial with key data missing without the intensity, duration, reps etc. and dates of training. This is essential in gauging if the training undertaken has been appropriate to the aim(s) of the Plan.

Review and Evaluation

Some students had reviewed and evaluated the Plans well; for example where their knowledge and understanding of energy system use and that of recovery were included. Many though were very basic and offered simplistic comments such as 'felt tired today' with no explanation as to why? Many evaluations are very weak, simply acknowledging their performance, with limited analysis. Centres should validate their students test results and attendance at training sessions and this is a recommendation for future plans

It is likely and desirable this section will involve some form of notational analysis or coach testimonial for validation purposes, currently very few do. In general, the section should include objective and quantitative information to justify conclusions. Where graphs and tables were used to illustrate progression and data on improved performance included (the fundamental aim of the plan is to improve performance) this provided evidence for discussion. While it is accepted that some of the information contained has to be subjective students should aim to be as objective as is possible drawing conclusions through independent expert validation, through the use of normative tables and sport related data. The use of notational analysis, 'personal bests' and/or coach testimonials are relevant and appropriate.

Where students provided excellent final evaluations they not only commented on their test results but also evaluated the success of all aspects of their Plan eg the types of training they had used, whether SMART targets had been achieved they were able to show insight and analyse the success of their Plan in depth this reflected those changes in performances that were identified in their planning section. Very few students submitted video evidence to support the outcomes of their plans which is a wasted opportunity.

For the Development Plans of those offering Leadership, Officiating or a technical development plan variable accurate marking was seen from centres. The use of updated exemplar material and the recently posted 'check lists' have guided centres more successfully. Students are required to detail how they intend to develop as a leader, an action plan and then a period of 'development' and finally include credited reviews of assessment by an appropriate other. Where this has been seen the marks have assessed the top range.

Task 4.3 Personal Performance

The marking of performance roles has been fairly accurate with students in the main well prepared and well-motivated in the live moderations with most centres having students portfolio of work to hand and where templates have been used for 3:8 the details tend to be better and more informative. Nearly all centres are now providing the compulsory evidence. Problems have occurred in the E-portfolio submissions where centres are not providing sufficient evidence for the process of moderation to be completed.

While not compulsory video evidence, details on the context of local leagues, centres standing and the level of the opposition, area standards all help to place in context the level at which a performer is playing. This is seen in some but not in all cases. This is vital for all E-portfolio centres and for overseas centres where local standards would not be known to the moderation team. The E-portfolios vary in standard with some video footage taken on mobile phones not providing sufficient detail while some video footage offered as supportive evidence was 'upside down' or 'on the side' so making the process of moderation difficult. Centres are asked to ensure all video is in the correct window. However, all centres should monitor the quality/appropriateness of video evidence before submitting. Too often videos included inappropriate background comments, students not wearing appropriate kit or students filmed in non-sport specific environments thus creating an impression inconsistent with the high marks awarded by the centre. In addition, when students are not clearly identified it is difficult for moderators to make judgements on performances. All videos could start with the student introducing themselves or a voice-over identifying the student being assessed.

The quality of 'leaders' are improving year on year. They are usually seen at their best when host centres are able to provide younger age groups eg U12 for moderation. However, centres are advised that at times there is a lack of the expected leadership qualities - communication or assertiveness; however this is usually reflected in the marking. The logging of coaching sessions is still variable with too few students providing the details in session plans that support the marks awarded, with coaching points and evaluations. While it is easy for students at times to demonstrate the rubric of assessment, 3 formal assessment sessions and a minimum of 8 weeks participation, centre staff must ensure there is validated evidence of the quality of the performance. In some cases all that is entered especially for leaders and performers is a written testimony and that is not enough as such to verify the mark given.

Students are usually marked quite highly in these components with some excellent examples of 'leadership' skills where students led sessions at the moderations. The better students have grasped that planning is vitally important to the quality of their coaching sessions. Good quality submissions come from centres where staff have been on training courses and understand correctly what is required of the students. Again, the 'leader' section was often over marked where students had been marked

highly but had provided poor quality session plans with little self-evaluation or no objective testimonials or relevant NGB coaching awards.

For officials, at the highest level, the standards are often very good, those marked at a lower level band 7-9 are often very weak and appear to have very limited experience and lack authority. The best performances often depend on the quality of the practical sessions put on by clusters. Overseas centres are in some cases still struggling to provide the depth of qualitative information needed. Officials, in some cases are not providing any supplementary information such as what level they are and how far they are into gaining the next level of NGB awarding. Referees have reports competed on them and these should be mandatory evidence.

Salient points for centres

- Ensure all paperwork is completed on time and the transfer of marks form FASAMs and FAMs is completed accurately
- Centres have a readily available back up copy of their work
- Centres ensure the inclusion of evidence for e-portfolio submissions reflects the quality and relative standard of a performances
- The development plan has validation, clear aims and measured outcomes while excluding non-specific plan related information
- International studies have appropriate word allocations for all sections and the 1000 word count limit is adhered to
- Personal Performances are fully supported by appropriate compulsory and any additional evidence to justify the marks awarded by centres
- Life Plans cover the full range of ageing time bands and include referenced supportive data

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>

