

GCSE PE 1PE0_04- Football PEP Commentary

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

The candidate starts the PEP with an introduction that includes a subjective overview of his performance attributes, and although this is fine, a more generic physiological overview of football would help provide a more thorough analysis of the fitness requirements.

What makes this strand a Level 5 is the excellent use of data that has been used that provides the candidate with a useful platform for the analysis of both fitness and performance. Although the analysis could have been completed with more depth, the candidate is able to recognise his S & W's with enough information to be awarded marks in Level 5.

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.

There are specific and measurable SMART targets included at the start of strand 2, and although these are very clear, it is advised that tasks have an overall aim that is performance based and supported by a component of fitness, with targets that are derived from this.

Multiple components of fitness are included as the foci of the PEP which goes against the advice given for this task. However, the candidate can balance the analysis of the relevant methods of training to an excellent standard, providing targeted adaptations and relevant links back to the benefits to football performance.

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. This was completed in table format, and although this is fine, centres are reminded anything written in their own words in a table is counted towards the word count.

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

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.

There was a substantial amount of training evidence, both written and the use of apps. The candidate also included weekly evaluations of the training, and although this does not count towards the word count, nor is it assessed, there is no mandatory requirement to complete this, as this was a personal choice.

Excellent use of performance and fitness data with clear data driven analysis embedded within the evaluation, although not all fitness tests need to be included post-PEP. Potential physiological adaptations were explored, and the candidate was able to link these improvements to justify performance standards.

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 was written in a sophisticated manner, interspersed with the data and information from strand 3. The inclusion of data from the training logs to justify the application of SMART, the methods and principles of training added further justification to the effectiveness of the training.

Well justified recommendations with the addition of specific exercises and variations to the methods of training were well explained and relevant to improving overall performance.

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 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 and data.

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