

GCSE PE 1PE0/04– Football PEP Commentary

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

The candidate offers a useful, brief introduction. Five fitness test results, compared to normative data, were tabulated. They also explained how each component of fitness related to their chosen sport. Good performance data was offered in a table, collated over five matches, identifying tackles, ball carries and 1 v 1s. Both sets of data were interpreted and analysed, with weaknesses identified. All comments were performance related.

Level 3: Good interpretation and analysis of fitness test results using appropriate data, with some errors that have insignificant impact on the analysis.

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

CVE was identified as the selected component of fitness to improve with some justification. The candidate did not state an overall aim of their PEP. Two SMART targets were established one fitness based and two performance targets. The candidate made some attempts at applying SMART.

Fartlek training was selected with limited justification. Principles of training were offered in a table. The explanation of the application of the principles was quite generic and did not include reference to training zones, HR data and initial starting intensities.

The required PARQ is included.

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.

Within the appendix the candidate placed centre devised training record forms. The candidate's forms suggest they completed three sessions per week for two weeks. However, there were evaluations/adaptations offered from six weeks. As such it is difficult to determine precisely what the candidate did. The sheets lacked specific data.

Pre, mid, and post-PEP 12-minute cooper run test results were tabulated and graphed then compared to normative data so that progress could be seen. The candidate also presented post-PEP performance data over five matches. The candidate did not collate, or present HR data linked to fartlek training within their sessions. There were attempts to compare and interpret post-PEP results. The candidate linked this to football but no reasons for improvement were discussed.

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 at evaluating the application of fartlek training, SMART goals and principles of training. However, the comments made were generic with no specific data included. Had the candidate fully completed a training record forms for each training session across the six weeks then they would have had ample data and adaptations to refer to, to fully evaluate their PEP.

There was no initial aim to evaluate. One recommendation to improve future training was mentioned but this lacked justification.

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 PEP was well structured, it flowed and as such was easy to read. It was within the 1500-word count. All the required components were included. However, the work lacked detail and as such it sat within level 2, some attempts.

It is worth noting that any work placed in the Appendix is not marked. The principles of training were presented in a table, the PEP is better presented when written in full prose.

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