

GCSE PE 1PE0/04 – Basketball PEP Commentary

Strand 1: Interpretation and Analysis of pre-PEP fitness tests and sporting/activity performance.

The candidate offered a brief introduction. Performance data from a match was tabulated. There was also a table labelled 'Fitness Test Battery', however this was additional performance data compared to an elite basketballer. One strength is mentioned.

It is unclear why they have included the elite basketballer.

Level 1: Limited or little interpretation of fitness test results using some data.

Strand 2: Evaluation and justification for method(s) of training, SMART targets and principles of training.

An aim is stated, and power has been selected as the component of fitness without justification. Three SMART targets are stated and there is a limited attempt to apply some aspects of SMART. Circuit training was selected as the method of training. There were some attempts at justifying its selection. Principles of training, FITT were discussed and limited attempts were made to the application of the principles to meet performance goals.

Level 1: Limited evaluation (mainly descriptive) resulting in inappropriate selection of training method(s) and little application of SMART targets and principles of training to meet performance goal(s).

Strand 3: Fitness test results are compared and interpreted.

The candidate included a table of their 16 sessions completed with limited information about each session. This was also presented in graph form. Results of a vertical jump test were briefly discussed using some data with no application to their performance. Performance data was again presented post-PEP for the candidate and the elite player. In the analysis the candidate suggested a new training method, plyometrics. There was some attempt at applying their improvement in fitness to their sporting performance.

Level 1: Limited comparison, interpretation and/or analysis of differences and/or similarities between fitness test results and little/no supporting evidence used, with many significant errors of judgement/inaccuracies.

Strand 4: Evaluation of the application of the method(s) of training, SMART targets and principles of training with justified future recommendations.

The final evaluation was limited in terms of how they applied SMART, and the principles of training. The training method was briefly evaluated but this was a different method to circuit training mentioned in the plan. The candidate did not offer any recommendations to improve future training and performance.

Level 1: Limited evaluation of the application of the method(s) of training, SMART goals and principles of training, and no recommendation for improving future training and performance.

Strand 5: Coherence and structure, use of appropriate terminology.

The work flowed, but there was some confusion about the training method used. The candidate offered data from an elite source but did not contextualise this. It is only late in the PEP that the fitness tests results are presented, these should be included in the early part of the PEP. Session plans were also included later but were not alluded to at all in the evaluation.

The PEP was within the required 1500-word count.

Level 1: Lack of coherence and structure, with inappropriate and inaccurate terminology throughout.