

## GCSE PE 1PE0/04 – Football Rehab PEP Commentary

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

The candidate gave an introduction which offered context to his situation in terms of a serious injury. Reasons for recovery were given in terms of their position in football. Performance data was offered in the form of three one max rep tests, these were compared to offer a level.

Eight fitness tests were presented in a table and then in graph form and compared to normative data. A resting heart rate was also offered. The candidate interpreted and analysed their results linking their findings to football and how their physical development would enhance their sporting performance.

*Level 4: Very good interpretation and analysis of fitness test results using appropriate data, with one or two minor errors not significantly affecting the analysis.*

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

The candidate stated the aim of their PEP having selected muscular strength as the component of fitness to improve. This was well justified. This then led to the selection of two SMART targets, one fitness related underpinning their ability to increase their jump height as a central defender. They explained the application of SMART with the inclusion of a numerical target for the vertical jump.

Two methods of training were selected to fulfill their rehab programme. The plyometric method was well justified, but the weight training seemed confused around CV health. The six-week training programme outline was useful. The candidate commented on how they would apply the principles of training. Adding initial starting intensities to this would be beneficial, particularly around progressive overload/intensity.

A PARQ was included which is good practice.

*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.**

Post-PEP vertical jump test results were presented in graph format as were the three one rep max tests. This is useful for visual comparison. Results were compared and related to football. To improve, the candidate could go on to discuss the underlying reason(s) as to why there was physical improvements, discussing potential anatomical changes.

*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 candidate made some attempts to evaluate the application of the method of training, SMART targets and the principles of training. The inclusion of data collated throughout their training sessions and recorded on their training record forms could have been used to enhance their work and attain higher marks.

Recommendations for improving future training and performance were not offered.

*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 within the 1500-word count. It was pleasing to see the candidate including a bibliography. This was a good PEP, and the candidate had cleverly replaced the required performance data with max rep tests. The PEP contained all the required elements barring recommendations. It was well presented and flowed well in a coherent manner. Some errors were acknowledged.

*Level 4: Very good coherence and structure, with appropriate terminology used throughout, but with a few minor errors.*

**Centre mark: Level 4 – Moderated mark: Level 3**

S1: 14

S2: 12

S3: 12

S4: 8

S5: 14

**Total: 60/5= 12**

**Level 3 – 12 marks**