

## **GCSE PE 1PE0/04 – Athletics PEP Commentary**

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

The candidate offered an introduction which offered some context. However, they suggested short distance running but did not state an athletics event. A PEP aim was offered. This should come about post analysis of all data and not be predetermined. The candidate completed one fitness test, the 30-metre sprint and compared it to normative data. No performance data was submitted.

*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.**

Speed was selected as the component of fitness to improve. A SMART target was stated which was fitness test related. There was no performance target. The candidate made some attempts at applying SMART. The candidate suggested they would use plyometric training and attempted to justify this selection. They went on to explain some of the exercises they would incorporate into their training programme. There was some irrelevant information included. Principles of training were not discussed.

The candidate included the required PARQ.

*Level 2: Some attempts at evaluation, with weak justification for training method(s) chosen, and attempts at applying SMART targets and principles of training to meet performance goal(s), with errors of judgement affecting the quality of the evaluation.*

### **Strand 3: Fitness test results are compared and interpreted.**

They explained how they planned to use circuit training, which was different to what was suggested initially. There was a plan of exercises. It is difficult to establish exactly what the candidate did across the six weeks as they included only one training record form and this differed from the plan. It is recommended that candidates include a training record form for each training session. They should be completed with as much detail and depth as possible.

Mid-PEP and post-PEP 30 metre test were completed and again compared to normative data. There was also a graph representing the test results. A brief attempt was made to compare and interpret the results.

*Level 2: Attempts to compare and interpret the fitness test results, with some differences and/or similarities analysed in places and some supporting evidence used, but with many 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 candidate made some attempts to evaluate their programme in terms of the application of SMART. At this point an evaluation of the method of training should have been incorporated. They briefly alluded to progressive overload. Adding in examples with data would have enhanced their work.

Recommendations for improving future training were offered. The candidate stated that they had improved as their normative data category had improved. This was correct but this should have been event performance related.

*Level 2: Some attempts at evaluation of the application of the method(s) of training, SMART goals and principles of training, with some attempt at recommendation for improving future training and performance, but with significant errors.*

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

The work was within the 1500-word count. The PEP contained errors, and it was unsure as to exactly what the candidate did and what athletics event they performed. There was some confusion and as such the PEP was

difficult to follow, lacking coherence and structure. Important elements such as the principles of training were missing from the planning phase of the PEP.

*Level 2: Attempts at coherence and structure, with use of appropriate terminology in places but inconsistent and with some errors of judgement.*