

GCSE PE 1PE0/04 – Athletics High Jump PEP Commentary

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

Although the aim has been mentioned prior to any analysis, the evaluation of both fitness data has been completed and compared to normative data. The candidate then goes on to selecting the components of fitness which are important to high jump, linking this to performance which is a fast explosive movement. They also mention muscle fibres. This is a good analysis and interpretation of fitness test results. The candidate did not mention their High Jump performance.

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.

No overall aim has been determined. However, both a performance target and fitness target have been mentioned. The candidate did not go on to apply SMART. The candidate gave a good justification for their choice of training methods, which linked well to performance. There were direct links to improving power and type IIa muscle fibres. Principles of training were applied that offered an idea into how the learner was going to apply them to allow for physiological adjustments.

The candidate completed and included a PARQ as is required.

Level 3: Good evaluation with appropriate training method(s) selected and explained, and application of SMART targets and principles of training to meet performance goal(s), with some errors of judgement that have insignificant impact on the evaluation.

Strand 3: Fitness test results are compared and interpreted.

Fitness tests, pre, mid and post-PEP were compared in a table and the high jump data placed on a graph. The candidate attempted to give some physiological reasons for the improvement in data, linking this to the methods of training selected as they specifically targeted the muscles important to the event, enabling them to develop strength and power resulting in an improved performance. However, overall, the information provided was too brief to be awarded marks in higher assessment levels.

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.

Performance had improved and the candidate was able to offer a good evaluation about the methods of training used throughout their PEP. They offer some insight to the adaptations they made through their programme regarding principles of training. Changing exercises to improve their programme was well thought out and justified. The candidate did not specifically mention their SMART targets but mentioned their overall performance, high jump had improved over the six weeks. Recommendations were attempted with some justification, adding that speed would enable better momentum through the jump.

Level 3: Good evaluation of the application of the method(s) of training, SMART goals and principles of training, with sufficient detail/depth, and appropriate recommendation(s) to improve future training and performance.

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

The PEP was completed with good coherence and structured with appropriate terminology. It was within the 1500-word limit. The PEP read well, and the candidate gave the impression that they knew what was required of them and covered the requirements to a good level overall.

A training plan was included in the appendix. It would enhance the PEP if all sessions were thoroughly recorded on the training record form and included. This would offer more data and adaptations to be used in the evaluation.

Level 3: Good coherence and structure, with appropriate terminology used, but some errors of judgement/accuracy with no significant impact on the piece.