

## GCSE PE 1PE0/04 – Athletics (100m) PEP Commentary

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

The candidate decides to begin their PEP with their overall aim, and although this is not advised, it is only a generic aim to optimise their performance in the 100m sprint. Centres should encourage candidates to research the physiological features of their chosen activity first and then interpret and analyse the data before stipulating an aim.

The candidate provides an excellent and thorough interpretation of fitness and performance data which was included and referenced to in the appendix. A battery of fitness tests was conducted, and the candidate was able to give a rationale as to why they used these tests. This is excellent practice rather than completing a random selection of tests with no explanation.

The analysis of the data was clear and concise with specific reference to particular muscles involved within sprinting that led to a well justified conclusion that power would be the most beneficial component of fitness to focus on.

*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.**

One component of fitness was selected to help form the aim of the PEP. Circuit training alone is not the most relevant method of training for power; however, the candidate did explain in very good detail that weight training and plyometric style stations would be utilised within the circuits. Although the candidate was correct that each station should be performed with high intensity and it would be anaerobically based with weight training exercises performed with a heavy load and low repetitions, there was no specific intensity levels mentioned. Also, it would have been beneficial if the candidate had provided further analysis with regards to specific exercises and why they are being included.

The analysis of the principles of training was not completed in enough depth for a Level 5 task, and just mentioning the points and referring to the appendix without much expansion does not fully meet the evaluative standards required for the task. This is an important part of strand 2 and did affect the marking of this section.

*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.**

The evaluation of fitness and performance data was completed to an excellent standard with appropriate use of data to help compare the differences in pre and post PEP results. Likewise, some of the fitness tests were not required to be conducted post-PEP. The candidate re-tests all components of fitness which is not necessary, however the data from the other components tested was used effectively when justifying improvements in performance.

Key factors as to why this section achieved top marks is the candidate's ability to include relevant and possible adaptations, as well as the continuous link on how improved fitness standards have also improved performance.

*Level 5: Fitness tests results are compared and interpreted, and the differences and/or similarities identified and analysed, and reasons for them justified, with ample supporting evidence.*

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

The evaluation was sophisticated and included excellent detail and depth regarding all aspects of the strand 4 criteria. All aspects regarding the application of SMART targets, principles and methods of training were analysed in depth. It was obviously the candidate completed the training thoroughly and explained in detail that how the training plan was modified in after weeks 3 & 7 in order allow for greater recovery. A key factor in this evaluation being given full marks is not just covering all aspects of the criteria, but the detail reasoning with specific examples from the training logs supplied in the appendix.

*Level 5: Sophisticated evaluation of the application of the method(s) of training, SMART goals and principles of training, in good detail and depth, with well justified recommendations to improve future training and performance.*

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

The PEP was completed with excellent coherence and structured with appropriate utilisation of scientific and technical terminology. The learner understood the requirements of the task and covered all aspects of the criteria.

Excellent detailed training logs were included in the appendix, and it was evident the candidate worked hard in both training and analysing the PEP.

There was a slight issue, albeit minimal, with the balance of content in each strand, although met the required 1500-word limit.

*Level 5: Excellent coherence and structure, with appropriate terminology used consistently, with few minor, if any errors.*