

Strand	Level 1 <i>Limited</i>				Level 2 <i>Some Attempts</i>				Level 3 <i>Good</i>				Level 4 <i>Very Good</i>				Level 5 <i>Excellent</i>			
1. Interpretation and Analysis of pre-PEP fitness tests and sporting/activity performance	Collect initial fitness and performance data: pre-PEP fitness tests data covering a range of components of fitness, relevant and specific to the candidates’ selected sporting performance whilst also collecting performance related data that allows the possibility of realistic and measurable improvement. Interpret and analyse initial fitness and performance data: their strengths and weaknesses from the initial fitness testing data and from the initial performance generated data. Select and justify a component of fitness: (weakness to improve) with statement of aim(s) intrinsically linked to bring about the best improvement in the candidates selected element of their sporting performance .																			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
	Limited or little interpretation of fitness test results using some data.				Some attempt at interpretation and analysis of fitness test results using some data, but with errors that may impact analysis.				Good interpretation and analysis of fitness test results using appropriate data, with some errors that have insignificant impact on the analysis.				Very good interpretation and analysis of fitness test results using appropriate data, with one or two minor errors not significantly affecting the analysis				Excellent and thorough interpretation and analysis of fitness test results using appropriate data.			
2. Evaluation and justification for method(s) of training, SMART targets and principles of training	Select and justify a training method: an appropriate method of training to achieve the aim to improve the candidate’s component of fitness choice. Reasons for its selection and starting training intensities must be justified making it clear why this is the best and most suitable method to use to improve their future performance . Application of SMART targets: linked to fitness and performance, justifying why their targets are SMART and how they impact on the candidates selected element of their sporting performance. Application of principles of training: an explanation of how they initially intend to apply the relevant training principles to their selected training method to help them achieve their SMART targets. Adaptations to the training plan should be applied as the plan progresses and be influenced by the daily or weekly evaluations of the training sessions.																			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
	Limited evaluation (mainly descriptive) resulting in inappropriate selection of training method(s) and little application of SMART targets and principles of training to meet performance goal(s).				Some attempts at evaluation, with weak justification for training method(s) chosen, and attempts at applying SMART targets and principles of training to meet performance goal(s), with errors of judgement affecting the quality of the evaluation.				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.				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.				Evaluation with appropriate training method(s) selected and justified, and application of SMART targets and principles of training to meet performance goal(s).			
3. Fitness test results are compared and interpreted	Collecting and drawing up post-PEP fitness test data: relevant fitness tests, and performance data as at the start of the PEP. Compare pre- and post-PEP fitness and performance data: all data should demonstrate the differences in the fitness and performance data pre and post PEP. Justify differences in data: discuss reasons for any differences or similarities in the results and what the results mean in terms of the candidate’s SMART targets. Show evidence which informs the discussion on results.																			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
	Limited comparison, interpretation and/or analysis of differences and/or similarities between fitness test results and little/no supporting evidence used, with many significant errors of judgement / inaccuracies.				Attempts to compare and interpret the fitness test results, with some differences and/or similarities analysed in places and some supporting evidence used, but with many errors of judgement/inaccuracies.				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.				Fitness test results are compared and interpreted, and the differences and/or similarities are analysed with satisfactory supporting evidence, but with some minor errors of judgment/inaccuracies.				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.			
4. Evaluation of the application of the method(s) of training, SMART targets and principles of training with justified future recommendations	Evaluate application of: methods of training, SMART targets and principles of training Consideration as to whether the selected method of training; SMART targets and principles of training worked as intended should be discussed and whether they were well applied, and how they impacted overall on the candidate’s selected element of their sporting performance . Training plans or record sheets should be referred to within the discussion . Recommendations: Based on their evaluation of these factors they should then be able to identify what aspects of their programme should be changed and be able to justify the recommendations that they state that will improve future training plans and performance.																			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
	Limited evaluation of the application of the method(s) of training, SMART goals and principles of training, and no recommendation for improving future training and performance.				Some attempts at evaluation of the application of the method(s) of training, SMART goals and principles of training, with some attempt at recommendation for improving future training and performance, but with significant errors.				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.				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.				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.			
5. Coherence and structure, use of appropriate terminology	Candidates must produce a succinct and coherently structured PEP which should be written as continuous prose. This means the planning (analysis) and evaluation sections should be covered with appropriate content and detail ; that appropriate, subject specific terminology should be used; and that the PEP is succinct enough to be within the 1500-word count .																			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
	Lack of coherence and structure, with inappropriate and inaccurate terminology throughout.				Attempts at coherence and structure, with use of appropriate terminology in places but inconsistent and with some errors of judgement.				Good coherence and structure, with appropriate terminology used, but some errors of judgement/accuracy with no significant impact on the piece.				Very good coherence and structure, with appropriate terminology used throughout, but with a few minor errors.				Excellent coherence and structure, with appropriate terminology used consistently, with few minor, if any, errors.			

Strand	Mark
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
Total:	

Total mark:

Divided by 5:

Rounded:

Overall Level:

Using the GCSE PE PEP Marking Grid

All GCSE student work should be marked using the assessment grids in the accredited specifications.

The Marking Grid is a support tool to help you make accurate judgements about student work.

Step by step instructions

1. Mark the PEP, taking each Strand at a time.
2. Follow the Mark Grid across the chart (from left to right) until the work exhibits characteristics reflected in the descriptors in the levels from 1 to 5.
3. Choose those descriptors that apply to the work (not all of them will), identify the mark within that level that best demonstrates the evidence in the work and circle that mark.
4. Identifying the mark in the relevant boxes will give you a clear visual picture (like a graph) of the student’s performance for each Strand (see the worked example below).
5. Once completed transfer the marks into the ‘Strand/Mark’ grid at the bottom. Calculate the total.
6. Transfer this total mark into the ‘Total mark’ on the left-hand column, divide by 5 (and, if necessary, round this sum).
7. Identify and write down the overall Level.

A worked example

In Strand 1, a GCSE student’s PEP shows **good interpretation and analysis** of the fitness test data with evidence at the very top of the mark range in Level 3 (12 marks). In Strand 2 the evidence showed they were able to **evaluate and justify** their training methods, but there were a few areas where they made small errors and achieved a Level 4 (14 marks). The Strand 3 mark showed their weakest area, achieving 10 marks at Level 3, because they did not fully develop their **interpretations**. Strand 4, again evidenced to be at the top of Level 3, contained well-argued **evaluation** of the application of the method(s) of training, SMART goals and principles of training, scoring 12 marks. The final Strand, Strand 5, contained evidence that put them at the bottom of Level 4, contained very good **coherence and structure** but lacked the appropriate terminology and could only score 13 marks.

Strand	Level 1 <i>Limited</i>	Level 2 <i>Some Attempts</i>	Level 3 <i>Good</i>	Level 4 <i>Very Good</i>	Level 5 <i>Excellent</i>															
1. Interpreting and Analysis of pre-PEP fitness tests and sporting/activity performance	Collect initial fitness and performance data: pre-PEP fitness tests data covering a range of components of fitness, relevant and specific to the candidates' selected sporting performance whilst also collecting performance related data that allows the possibility of realistic and measurable improvement. Interpret and analyse initial fitness and performance data: their strengths and weaknesses from the initial fitness testing data and from the initial performance generated data. Select and justify a component of fitness: (weakness to improve) with statement of aim(s) intrinsically linked to bring about the best improvement in the candidates selected element of their sporting performance.																			
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
	Limited or little interpretation of fitness test results using some data.				Some attempt at interpretation and analysis of fitness test results using some data, but with errors that may impact analysis.				Good interpretation and analysis of fitness test results using appropriate data, with some errors that have insignificant impact on the analysis.				Very good interpretation and analysis of fitness test results using appropriate data, with one or two minor errors not significantly affecting the analysis.				Excellent and thorough interpretation and analysis of fitness test results using appropriate data.			
2. Evaluation and justification for method(s) of training, SMART targets and principles of training	Select and justify a training method: an appropriate method of training to achieve the aim to improve the candidate's component of fitness choice. Reasons for its selection and starting training intensities must be justified making it clear why this is the best and most suitable method to use to improve their future performance. Application of SMART targets: linked to fitness and performance, justifying why their targets are SMART and how they impact on the candidate's selected element of their sporting performance. Application of principles of training: an explanation of how they initially intend to apply the relevant training principles to their selected training method to help them achieve their SMART targets. Adaptations to the training plan should be applied as the plan progresses and be influenced by the daily or weekly evaluations of the training sessions.																			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
	Limited evaluation (mainly descriptive) resulting in inappropriate selection of training method(s) and little application of SMART targets and principles of training to meet performance goal(s).				Some attempts at evaluation, with weak justification for training method(s) chosen, and attempts at applying SMART targets and principles of training to meet performance goal(s), with errors of judgement affecting the quality of the evaluation.				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.				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.				Evaluation with appropriate training method(s) selected and justified, and application of SMART targets and principles of training to meet performance goal(s).			
3. Fitness test results are compared and interpreted	Collecting and drawing up post-PEP fitness test data: relevant fitness tests, and performance data as at the start of the PEP. Compare pre- and post-PEP fitness and performance data: all data should demonstrate the differences in the fitness and performance data pre and post PEP. Justify differences in data: discuss reasons for any differences or similarities in the results and what the results mean in terms of the candidate's SMART targets. Show evidence which informs the discussion on results.																			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
	Limited comparison, interpretation and/or analysis of differences and/or similarities between fitness test results and little/no supporting evidence used, with many significant errors of judgement / inaccuracies.				Attempts to compare and interpret the fitness test results, with some differences and/or similarities analysed in places and some supporting evidence used, but with many errors of judgement/inaccuracies.				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.				Fitness test results are compared and interpreted, and the differences and/or similarities are analysed with satisfactory supporting evidence, but with some minor errors of judgment/inaccuracies.				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.			
4. Evaluation of the application of the method(s) of training, SMART targets and principles of training with justified future recommendations	Evaluate application of: methods of training, SMART targets and principles of training Consideration as to whether the selected method of training: SMART targets and principles of training worked as intended should be discussed and whether they were well applied, and how they impacted overall on the candidate's selected element of their sporting performance. Training plans or record sheets should be referred to within the discussion. Recommendations: Based on their evaluation of these factors they should then be able to identify what aspects of their programme should be changed and be able to justify the recommendations that they state that will improve future training plans and performance.																			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
	Limited evaluation of the application of the method(s) of training, SMART goals and principles of training, and no recommendation for improving future training and performance.				Some attempts at evaluation of the application of the method(s) of training, SMART goals and principles of training, with some attempt at recommendation for improving future training and performance, but with significant errors.				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.				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.				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.			
5. Coherence and structure, use of appropriate terminology	Candidates must produce a succinct and coherently structured PEP which should be written as continuous prose. This means the training (analysis) and evaluation sections should be covered with appropriate content and detail; that appropriate, subject specific terminology should be used; and that the PEP is succinct enough to be within the 100-word count.																			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
	Lack of coherence and structure, with inappropriate and inaccurate terminology throughout.				Attempts at coherence and structure, with use of appropriate terminology in places but inconsistent and with some errors of judgement.				Good coherence and structure, with appropriate terminology used, but some errors of judgement/accuracy with no significant impact on the piece.				Very good coherence and structure, with appropriate terminology used throughout, but with a few minor errors.				Excellent coherence and structure, with appropriate terminology used consistently, with few minor, if any, errors.			

Strand	Mark
1	12
2	14
3	10
4	12
5	13
Total:	61

Total mark:	61
Divided by 5:	12.2
Rounded:	12
Overall Level:	3

This student’s overall score, across the 5 Strands, was 61. This is then divided by 5 to give an average score across the Strands. This value is rounded to place them in the correct overall Level, which in this case is Level 3. They are a high Level 3, with elements of Level 4.