

## GCSE PE 1PE0\_04: Rugby Union PEP Commentary

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

It was good practice to see that the candidate performed the battery of fitness tests prior to deciding on the aims of the PEP. This allowed the candidate to conduct an analysis of his S & W's based on comparisons to normative data (although it is recommended that the normative data is included within the table of data). It would have been beneficial as well to include a graph to illustrate the levels of each test in comparison to normative data.

Although there was some good analysis and justification as to why speed and agility was selected based on fitness test results, there was no interpretation of results with regards to performance and how these aims will help with overall improvement in rugby union.

*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.**

From the analysis, the candidate selected to improve speed and agility as his aims for the PEP as they were in the lower levels when compared to normative data.

There is some attempt to apply his knowledge of the principles of training in constructing a PEP, but with errors of judgement affecting the quality of the evaluation. For example, the candidate has stated that he will only train once a week to allow for full recovery for club training on a Thursday and Sunday. This does not meet the needs of a fully progressive PEP and will make adaptations and potential improvements difficult to justify in the evaluation. Also, the candidate states, 'I will try and be in my aerobic target zone' ..... 'I would like to achieve at least 70% of my maximum heart rate'. Since speed and agility are anaerobic based, there is a clear lack of specificity with regards to the intensities of training.

The candidate eventually mentions the benefits of improving speed and agility, however this should have been analysed in further detail when establishing the aims and included within the specific part of SMART, not within specificity, as the latter refers more to the application of training. The SMART principle is mentioned, however it is not fully analysed, although the candidate does include two measurable targets, albeit fitness based with no correlation to improving performance. The candidate states that interval training will be used to improve speed & agility, which would be beneficial for the former but did not mention any alternate methods for the latter (SAQ?). There is some attempt to describe how interval training will be utilised throughout the PEP, but this lacks depth with regards to intensity and potential W:R ratios.

A PARQ has been completed and is included within the appendix.

*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.**

The candidate completed the two tests (30m sprint and Illinois agility test) with a table of data and a graph illustrating pre-, post and target levels. Improvements were made and the candidate did make some attempt to justify the reasons for not meeting the agility target... 'used most of time to improve on my speed.'

There was some error of judgement when the candidate evaluated possible reasons for the success of the speed improvement where he stated, 'I believe this is mainly from the weight training of parachute sprints'.. a slight contradiction of terms being used! It is difficult to make a full evaluation of the success of the training and testing when the following are missing from the PEP:

1. No analysis of performance and how training has had an impact on rugby performance.

2. The training logs, although present in the appendix as an overview with weekly evaluations, do not provide sufficient supporting evidence.

*Level 3: Fitness test results are compared and interpreted, and the differences and/or similarities are analysed, and sufficient supporting evidence used, but with some 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 evaluation of the SMART targets, principles and methods of training is very descriptive and limited which offer no concrete reasoning for the improvements in fitness and no application to performance. The candidate did mention that his RHR decreased by 5bpm, however considering that this is not a measure of improvement for both speed and agility, it had no relevance to the PEP.

One recommendation was mentioned with regards to improving the progress of the PEP, but this was limited and completed without any detailed reasoning.

*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 PEP has potential as it was clear the candidate understood the structure required. There is an attempt to write concisely, although the required detail was missing to justify marks in level 3.

Attempts to include appropriate terminology were made, however the terminology was applied inconsistently with some errors of judgement, especially when evaluating relevant intensity levels and principles of training.

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