

GCSE PE 1PE0_04- Netball PEP Commentary

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

The candidate starts the PEP with an introduction that includes personal involvement in netball, and although this is interesting to read, the candidate would be best advised to include more of a physiological overview to help with the initial analysis of fitness and performance.

The candidate then goes on to stipulate her aim, and although the aim is relevant and makes sense, this should be avoided as no account for any fitness and/or performance data has occurred at this point. The inclusion of performance data is below this and relevant with an appropriate level of analysis.

Fitness test data is in the appendix, but the level of analysis of this data is minimal and requires further depth to achieve higher marks in this strand.

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.

At the start of strand 2 should be the place where the aim is confirmed. This has already been completed, but the candidate does provide further detail as to why muscular endurance is the focus with further comparisons to normative data, although this should have formed part of the strand 1 analysis.

Relevant targets, methods and principles of training are included, but the level of analysis required to achieve higher level marks is missing. Also, the intensity levels are based around a percentage of HRmax., whereas muscular endurance-based aims should be monitored through a percentage of repetitions. Due to the lack of depth in the analysis, there is a reduction in specificity of information.

The required PARQ is included, and this is good practice prior to starting any programme.

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.

Good use of fitness and performance data was embedded into the PEP to illustrate improvements after the 6-weeks of training. The candidate was able to include percentage differences and offer reasons as to why improvements have been made. Links to how improvements in performance have also been made because of the training were also outlined with some subjective comments based on the data provided. HR data was included; however, this had no real direct influence on the analysis due to the lack of specificity with the aim.

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 for this strand tended to be too generic and descriptive with little data to justify attempted evaluative points. Training logs were included in the appendix, and this would have been a good opportunity to utilise the data gathered in these logs to justify the application of SMART, methods and principles of training.

There was an attempt to include recommendations for future training, and although this was performance driven, there was an overall lack of detail.

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

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

The PEP was within the 1500-word count, was coherent and maintained a good structure. All areas of the criteria were covered, although it was lack of depth of information and application through all strands that inhibited this task from progressing any further from Level 3.

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