

## GCSE PE 1PE0\_04- Basketball PEP Commentary

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

The candidate starts the PEP with a physiological overview of the requirements for basketball that has been clearly research and linked specifically to the candidates position of shooting guard.

Performance data was obtained in the form of a notational analysis, with a clear and specific criterion that was analysed in relation to an elite NBA performer (**please note: elite data is not a requirement for the PEP**). As is required, there is a fitness test battery of results that have been gathered and compared to normative data.

Physiological strengths and weaknesses are identified across the main components of fitness and the candidate can make a clear evaluation that power is a major weakness, linking both performance and fitness data together effectively.

*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.**

The candidate has a clear aim that is performance based supported by developing a component of fitness. The candidate also offers two relevant SMART targets that are measurable, with one being fitness based, and one performance based.

Plyometric training has been stated, research and applied to the PEP specifically on how it will develop the candidate's power to improve his jump shot. Principles of training were interlinked with the FITT principle, providing detailed analysis of the intensity levels and how other principles such as progressive overload will be applied. There was also clear evidence that the principles of training were being applied in the training sessions documented within the PEP.

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

Overall, this is an excellent evaluation for the requirements for strand 2.

*Level 5: Evaluation with appropriate training method(s) selected and justified, and application of SMART targets and principles of training to meet performance goal(s).*

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

Training sessions were detailed that did demonstrate progressive overload in terms of intensity, however frequency of training remained the same. The candidate should also be encouraged to include dates and times when recording the session plans.

The candidate has repeated the specific fitness test (vertical jump test) and compared this to both pre-and mid-PEP tests as well as to an elite performer (**both mid-PEP tests and elite data are not required**). These results were illustrated in graph format and the candidate was able to analyse the data to make a judgement about how successful the training was in developing power. Very good links were made regarding the possible adaptations that may have occurred because of the 6-week PEP; however, this could have been expanded to include more examples on how they have improved performance.

Excellent use of performance data was evident when evaluating the impact of the training on the candidate's success rate for the jump shot, increasing from 30% pre-PEP to 67% post-PEP. This supporting evidence provided the candidate with a great platform to evaluate overall performance.

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

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

The evaluation of the SMART targets and principles of training is good, albeit a little descriptive that lacks specific examples. The evaluation of plyometric training highlighted realistic issues with regards to recovery due to an increase in microtears, and the candidate made well justified recommendations in relation to future training structure and recovery days.

The inclusion of data from the training logs to justify the application of the methods and principles of training would have added further justification to the effectiveness of the training within the 6-week PEP.

*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 is excellent in both structure and coherence. The depth, detail and flow of the candidate's work is excellent. There is clear research that has been embedded that has helped to justify all aspects of the criterion, that includes appropriate terminology. The training logs were clear and concise, although further evidence of progressive overload is required.

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