



Pearson

Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2017

Pearson Edexcel GCE
In Physical Education (6PE02/6PE04)
Papers 1B/E/V

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 2017

Publications Code 6PE02_1B/E/V_1706_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

This report reviews the moderation of coursework tasks for the examination series 2017. Work for this series has been submitted for the purposes of external moderation through CD Rom, hard copy or live moderation.

Centres are once again, thanked for their continued support and for the efficient administration of this examination series.

General Comments:

This year saw reduced numbers of candidates for this year, as the specification is coming to the end of its operational lifespan. Over the years, centres have become increasingly efficient and accurate and this year proved successful with centres providing correctly formatted work and hosting well organised cluster days. There were very few reported problems around visits, administration or deadlines for the submission of work.

Candidates provided a good range of supplementary evidence to support their compulsory evidence; this added depth and detail to the ePortfolio submissions.

There were few administrative problems reported for this work.

Unit 2 (6PE02 1E and 1V): The Critical Sports Performer – Local Study and National Study

Task 2.1

Practical performances ranged from a good standard to outstanding (including a number of elite level performers) in a wide range of activities. Moderators reported marking was more consistent with the criteria and with compulsory evidence readily available.

Moderators at cluster moderation days commented on well organised events with motivated candidates who were enthusiastic and offered high quality practical sessions. Feedback from moderators indicated that sessions were well organised and included differentiated practical sessions commensurate with the range of abilities observed.

As in recent years, moderators reported an increase in the numbers being assessed as leaders and officials with a particularly high standard of leadership at many centres. At cluster moderations many candidates led appropriate warm-ups and practices as part of the practical sessions. Centres are reminded that in the new specifications candidates are not able to offer officiating.

The quality of ePortfolio submissions was often of a high standard, although in some cases moderators felt marks were not supported by the evidence provided. In particular, those marked in the top two mark bands and offering leadership and officiating roles need to supply more evidence to substantiate marks awarded by centres. In a few cases the compulsory evidence was not provided.

Again, as in recent years, more centres used video clips to contribute to the evidence and there were increasing numbers of high quality videos to support marks. Clips had been edited to include demonstrations of core skills, structured practices as well as competitive performances. However, some moderators felt that some video evidence material remains of limited benefit to the candidates and all centres are reminded of the importance of candidates introducing themselves at the start of the evidence and / or a voice-over commentary to aid visibility and clarity.

NB Centres are encouraged to develop an understanding of how the use of video is to be utilised in the new specifications

Task 2.2 Local Study

Candidates appear well supported by centres and many moderators reported on high quality submissions. Centres appear to be making effective use of the board's checklist which is available on the website and many local studies were accurately marked.

The best candidates offered a critique of local provision and did not merely describe existing opportunities. Although much of the work was detailed and accurate, moderators reported that work around public / private/ voluntary provision lacked insight and understanding.

The best candidates presented high quality and thoroughly researched material which left the reader fully appraised of the provision across all key areas, including critical analysis, appropriately contextualised case studies and a bibliography.

Candidates who achieved fewer marks often wrote using personal knowledge when undertaking research would have enabled them to record a more factually based account which in turn provides additional contextual information for the analysis element which is necessary to secure high marks.

Moderators reported few issues relating to word counts, as most centres conformed to the rubric, and mainly accurate marking.

Task 2.3 National Study

Most of the national studies ranged from being good to very high in quality and probably stronger than last year.

Moderators reported that those candidates who produced work of more modest quality had included information that was out of date or simply incorrect and many failed to identify opportunities at universities and did not provide enough detail around pathways to elite level. Recent initiatives and key new facilities were missed in some sports. One example is the number of studies on football which failed to refer to St George's Park.

The strongest national studies were well structured and thoroughly researched and demonstrated a clear understanding of the key aspects of the national provision and often included insightful evaluations.

Most of the marking was accurate, occasionally generous.

Unit 2 (6PE02 1B): The Critical Sports Performer – Performance Analysis

Task 2.4.1 Technical Analysis

With very few exceptions candidates identified four appropriate core skills and produced detailed work, frequently of a high standard.

The majority referred to the three phases of preparation, execution and recovery and used accurate technical language. A good range of presentation formats were used, which included annotated diagrams, links to perfect models and appropriate contextual information about the tactical application.

Where candidates scored less well it was because they did not cover the biomechanical aspect in sufficient depth and in a number of cases confused isometric and isotonic contractions. Weaker work tended to be overly descriptive and failed to analyse effectively.

This was the most accomplished area of the performance analysis and was generally marked accurately.

Task 2.4.2 Tactical Analysis

Candidates explored a wide range of tactics and strategies in their chosen activity, often in depth and with technical accuracy. Moderators reported that work was generally of a high standard but liable to over-marking by centres.

At its best this work was well researched and written with analysis linked to their own experiences and those of elite performers. It was also noted that candidates are still downloading information about team formations and standard tactics from web sites without using this as an opportunity to develop their own knowledge of tactics or apply it appropriately.

Task 2.4.3 Notational Analysis

Almost without exception candidates completed the required three notations, with most covering both personal and elite performances to aid analysis.

As in previous years moderators reported that although candidates seem to understand the nature of the task, they sometimes failed to achieve high marks because work lacked analytical detail. Candidates sometimes failed to link the three notations together to demonstrate how improvements were made and some did not analyse data but simply provided match reports or a series of scores from judges.

Centres need to support candidates better in terms of how to analyse the data collected and how in turn this might support improving individual /unit / team performance. The final analysis needs to be applied to the improvement of personal performance, or the performance of others.

2.4.4 Training Analysis

Moderators reported this often to be the weakest of the sections.

The best work considered and applied principles and methods of training, together with a review of fitness components, an analysis of test results and a comparison to elite levels training programmes. Those who did this, and analysed their own training regime, were able to indicate how training programmes needed to be modified in order to progress onto the next level of performance.

Candidates who presented a summary of their own training programme without any analysis, or an indication of how their preparation might be improved, struggled to achieve high marks. Moderators also reported that candidates had failed to apply the principle of progressive overload properly.

Overall this work was not of the same quality as other sections and a number of centres had over-marked this task.

Task 2.4.5 Analysis of Strengths and Weaknesses

This section was well completed by many candidates with many including helpful data, the views of their coaches and a review of the work undertaken in the other sections.

Those candidates who scored less well tended to rely on their own opinions and failed to include a range of test and performance data and/or the views of a respected coach; personal / subjective views need to be supported with more objective information. Moderators also reported that action plans had not been fully justified.

The best candidates provided a detailed analysis of strengths and weaknesses comparing their own performance to that of an elite performer and included detail in the four areas identified in the specification: physiological, technical, psychological and tactical.

Candidates who scored well linked the outcomes of their analysis to the A2 Development Plan which is good practice. Weaker candidates produced work that lacked analytical detail and an appropriate level of technical language.

Overall, candidates should be encouraged to enhance existing personal knowledge by accessing technical journals which are available on the best websites or via governing bodies and other appropriate agencies. This applies both to candidates who might be resitting this work next year and those offering analysis work as part of the new specifications

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>