

GCSE PE 1PE0/04 – Football PEP Commentary

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

The candidate includes an informative introduction that includes some of the physiological requirements and movements patterns in football, which potentially assists with constructing a more relevant analysis of data.

Excellent collection of relevant fitness and performance data which was presented well and analysed in line with the requirements of the task.

Level 5: Excellent and thorough interpretation and analysis of fitness test results using appropriate data.

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

An overall aim has been established in an appropriate format with well planned SMART targets, although spending more time on the pitch is not generally considered a direct performance target. A more relevant focus to the aim could have investigated specific areas around work rate linked to the performance criteria that was used in strand 1.

Methods and principles of training were analysed in good to very good depth with relevant training thresholds included, although slightly inconsistent in parts. Circuit training was used for developing CV endurance, and although the candidate did mention that continuous training was also being used, greater analysis of the circuit could have helped justify the stations that were being used and their relevance to football performance. Furthermore, a more specific method in fartlek training could have been adopted.

A PARQ was included before training began, which is good practice.

Level 4: Evaluation with appropriate training method(s) selected and explained, and application of SMART targets and principles of training to meet performance goal(s), with few errors of judgement not significantly affecting the evaluation.

Strand 3: Fitness test results are compared and interpreted.

A strength of the task is the amount of data included for both fitness and performance and the ability to measure the percentage improvements based on the initial SMART targets. However, the analysis was mixed, and although the candidate could explain some improvements based on certain physiological adaptations, greater depth is required. To justify adaptations like cardiac hypertrophy, RHR data could have been included throughout the PEP which then could be used and interpreted further to justify these claims.

The training logs were included, however there is a slight issue with regards to specificity of the stations and the overall 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.

Overall strand 4 was completed with the relevant information required from the criteria, but at times lacked the in-depth analysis to achieve Level 5 marks. Some good analysis that the candidate did include was the embedding of training log data to justify the application of the methods and principles of training with specific examples.

Recommendations were included with some scientific detail used to help justify the points made, although greater link to improvements in performance and further relevant recommendations would help improve the standard of this section.

Level 4: Well-argued evaluation of the application of the method(s) of training, SMART goals and principles of training, in satisfactory detail and depth, with justified recommendations to improve future training and performance.

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

The PEP was completed within the 1500-word limit which was coherent and followed a very good structure. The candidate was comfortable in using appropriate terminology, although further depth of analysis in all strands is required to fully justify a Level 5 piece of work.

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