

GCSE PE 1PE0_04: Tennis PEP Commentary

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

The candidate gave some useful information regarding the skill and coordination factors required for tennis; however, the task requires further analysis and interpretation of other fitness components and performance data initially to justify a relevant aim in strand 2.

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 included the overall aim on the title page, which was relevant, however it would have been beneficial to include this in the main task at the start of strand 2 after the initial analysis. SMART targets were considered, but this was too generic and there was no indication of measurable targets that were specific to the overall aim.

Both methods and principles of training were considered, however overall, the information provided was too descriptive with only some attempts at evaluating the information with weak justification.

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 training, however the exercises included did not meet the full requirements of developing power (except plyometric lunges). Also, the candidate used a coordination test when the aim was based around improving power.

There was some link too performance with the data provided for serving, although overall this section lacked detail and specific information to support the planning of the PEP.

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 evaluation was very generic and subjective with very limited quantitative data to justify comments made. Recommendations were expressed, although nutritional guidance that was included does not directly link to the assessment criteria and further analysis of SMART, methods and principles of training is encouraged.

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 all strands.

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.