

GCSE PE 1PE0/04 – Volleyball PEP Commentary

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

The candidate gave a very brief introduction. They placed two power fitness tests results compared to normative data in a table and offered a limited rationale as to their inclusion.

The candidate did not offer performance data. There was very limited interpretation of the two fitness test results.

The work provided in this strand is limited and is marked at Level 1: 2 marks

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

The candidate had preselected power as their chosen component of fitness. They stated their aim which was to improve both fitness tests results. This was linked to volleyball and some data was mentioned, however, there was no context provided.

An appropriate method of training was selected, and the candidate attempted to justify its selection linking it to their chosen component of fitness and their sport. A second method of training was stated with no justification.

The candidate made some attempts at applying SMART targets and the principles of training linking to performance goals.

The work provided in this strand is some attempts and is marked at Level 2: 6 marks

Strand 3: Fitness test results are compared and interpreted.

The candidate produced six tables, one per week, of their programme stating what they did. It would be better if all training sessions were recorded on either the Pearson training record form or a centre devised form. There was evidence of one training record form which contained limited data and adaptations.

Mid and post-PEP fitness test data was tabulated and presented in graphs and again compared to normative data. Comparison and interpretation of the data was limited as they stated only that the distances had increased. There was no attempt to discuss why there was a difference in data.

The work provided in this strand is limited and is marked at Level 1: 3 marks

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

The candidate wrote about the principles of training, however, they never really evaluated how they were applied and failed to use any data from their sessions to support their comments. There were no evaluative comments about the selected method of training and SMART evaluation was limited.

Recommendations for improving future training and performance were not included. The candidate did not discuss if they were a better performer at the end of their six-week programme as there was no post-PEP data collated.

The work provided in this strand is limited and is marked at Level 1: 2 marks

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

There were some attempts at appropriate coherence and structure and the reader had a general idea as to what the candidate was aiming to achieve. However, the work lacked detail. The PEP should ideally be written in full prose as opposed to being presented in tables.

The work provided in this strand is some attempts and is marked at Level 2: 5 marks

Centre mark: Level 4 – Moderated mark: Level 1

S1: 2

S2: 6

S3: 3

S4: 2

S5: 5

Total: $18/5 = 3.6$

Level 1 – 4 marks