

## **GCSE PE 1PE0/04 – Rugby Rehab PEP Commentary**

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

The candidate offered an aim prior to any interpretation and analysis of data. There was also no introduction to add context. It can be deduced that the candidate has suffered a severe knee injury. They suggest they completed a series of fitness tests but there was no evidence in the write up. These were in the appendix. They presented a sit and reach result in a graph and compared to their score to normative data. On strength and one weakness was stated for their tests. The candidate also alluded to heart rate values; this seemed confused. No performance data was offered.

**The work provided in this strand is some attempts and is marked at Level 2**

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

The candidate has mentioned developing the range of movement in their knee, they also mention balance and then go on to suggest power is important, with good justification for their position in rugby. It was clear that the PEP was about overcoming injury and coming back stronger. The method of training was stated as rehab, however, plyometrics were mentioned in their training record forms.

Two SMART targets were presented one related to the range of movement in their knee and one related to strength/power. There was no suggestion as to how they would apply their SMART targets. Principles of training were stated rather than being applied, there was no evidence of initial training levels except HR data.

**The work provided in this strand is some attempts and is marked at Level 2**

### **Strand 3: Fitness test results are compared and interpreted.**

The required PARQ was included in the appendix. As this does not count against the word count it could have been placed in the PEP write up. The candidate included eight centre devised training record forms. This amounted to two sessions per week for four weeks. All contained the same data. All evaluations said the same.

A graph was presented to represent the pre, mid and post-PEP sit and reach data. They also presented some performance data in a table. It would have been good to have seen this at the start of the PEP. The data is good and shows improvement in their rehabilitation. Reasons offered were around specific exercises they had been directed towards by a therapist. The candidate compared their sit and reach results. It would have been good to have discussed anatomical reasons for the improvement. A table of HR data was presented without context.

**The work provided in this strand is good and is marked at Level 3**

**Strand 4: Evaluation of the application of the method(s) of training, SMART targets and principles of training with justified future recommendations.**

The candidate evaluated one of their SMART targets. The rehab training method of stretches and joint movement with strength exercises applied late had improved the range of movement at the knee and flexibility of muscles. This was an opportunity to add in data from their training sessions to support their statements. Principles of training were evaluated but this was very generic and again, data from sessions would have enhanced the work. Some adaptations made were stated.

Recommendations were appropriate to continue their rehabilitation back to full fitness.

**The work provided in this strand is good and is marked at Level 3**

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

The PEP was within the word count of 1500 words. The PEP included all components; however, the order of presentation could be better to allow it to be more coherent. Overall, it read well but to attain higher marks more detail is required across the strands.

There were some errors. All information including training record forms, should be presented in the main write up as the appendix is not marked. Training record forms do not count against the word count neither do tables of data such as fitness test results.

The candidate is to be commended on completing a Pep based around rehabilitation.

**The work provided in this strand is good and is marked at Level 3**