

GCSE PE 1PE0/04 – Volleyball PEP Commentary

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

The introduction was too generic and descriptive that did not provide any valuable information in relation to fitness standards, components of fitness required for their sport and any justification to fitness tests used in the test battery. A positive for this task is that the candidate conducted the battery of tests prior to selecting the aim(s) for the programme. However, there was limited interpretation of the fitness test results and no link to improving performance.

The candidate selects three components of fitness as aims, with little justification initially other than limited links with the fitness test data. The candidate then provides general definitions of the various components of fitness that have no relevance to the PEP, and again further fitness test data. Questions are also asked as to why the candidate has selected three components of fitness rather than one? **(you can select more than one, although this may reduce the depth of analysis throughout the task).**

Level 2: Some attempt at interpretation and analysis of fitness test results using some data, but with errors that may impact analysis.

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

The candidate does attempt to provide further analysis within the SMART targets; however, this is mainly based around developing the relevant components of fitness rather than performance.

There is limited analysis of the methods of training that is being planned to use for the basis of the PEP. Only statements of intent were included with very little depth or research provided.

The task continues with again, generic definitions of the various joint movements followed by some attempts to link muscles to the importance to specific movements required in volleyball. Unfortunately, there was no information provided with regards to the application of the principles of training and how the PEP will be structured to ultimately achieve the candidates aims.

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.

Fitness tests are re-taken, and progress is illustrated in graph format. There is limited analysis of the results that lacks supporting evidence as to why the results have improved and how it has improved performance. Training logs are present (only 6).

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 information provided in this section is very limited and only really offers a week-by-week evaluation and nothing substantial with regards to a full analysis of the application of SMART, methods and principles of training. There are also no recommendations for future training.

The work provided in this strand is not worthy of a mark and is awarded 0.

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

There is a lack of coherence and structure throughout the PEP with clear gaps in information missing (e.g. performance data and analysis, principles of training within the planning and depth required for the evaluation). The task was completed within the 1500-word limit, but this was due to the lack of breadth and depth required to achieve marks in higher mark bands.

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