

Script: Pre-recorded Event

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Event Code: | 1PE0-21P6 |
| Event Title: | Event: Pearson Edexcel GCSE in Physical Education: Coursework marking training Component 4- Module 3: Understanding the marks awarded for each of the exemplars in Module 2 |

| | |
|---------|--|
| Slide 1 | <p><u>Module title slide</u> - Hello. My name is Dane Smith. Welcome to the online inset training programme for GCSE Physical Education. This NEA marking training event is designed for teachers delivering our Pearson Edexcel GCSE PE qualification and in particular Component 4.</p> <p>As you are aware the training is broken down into 4 modules. Modules 1, 2 & 3 can be completed in your own time and can be visited as many times as you need. Before moving to the next module, it is important to have completed the previous module.</p> <p>The structure of the modules is based around the principles we use when training our moderators.</p> <p>As a reminder here are the 4 modules:</p> <p>Module 1 – Understanding the assessment mark grid for Component 4</p> <p>Module 2 – Applying the assessment mark grid for Component 4</p> <p>Module 3 – Understanding the marks awarded for each of the exemplars in Module 2</p> <p>Module 4 – A live Q&A session</p> <p>The aim is to give you guidance into the use of assessment marking grids. This will enable you to mark your students' work fairly and accurately.</p> <p>Examples of candidates' work are not intended to represent course structures or delivery. We are using them purely as real examples of work to which we can apply the mark grid.</p> |
|---------|--|



Pearson

| | |
|---------|--|
| Slide 2 | Aim – To examine how marks are given in each strand of the marking grid applying the assessment criteria to each of the exemplar PEP's in Module 2. |
| Slide 3 | <p>Title slide – Applying the Assessment Mark Grid</p> <p>In this session we will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Understand how to apply the Assessment criteria to each of the three examples in Module 2• Examine how marks are given in each of the five strands of the marking grid for all three examples in Module 2 |
| Slide 4 | <p>When assessing each PEP, Teacher Assessors should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Read the PEP thoroughly- Read the generic statement for each strand, noting the key indicators in bold. It is clear that it is the intention for the PEP to contain this specific content- Apply the key word within the levels for each strand- Decide whether the evidence 'just' meets, 'mostly' meets or 'fully' meets the descriptors in the level to determine the appropriate mark within the level of performance for each strand- Use a best-fit approach to award the mark that corresponds most closely to the descriptors that have been met. For example, if the content fully meets the descriptors in level 3 then a mark of 12 would be awarded for the strand- Apply a mark within the level |
| Slide 5 | <p>Title Slide – Applying the Assessment Mark Grid to PEP Example 1.</p> <p>At this point it is important for you to read the exemplar PEP before moving forward with the rest of the presentation.</p> |
| Slide 6 | <p>Now that you have thoroughly read PEP Example 1 you will be able to make some judgements.</p> <p>The PEP makes some attempts with the analysis and evaluation of their training, but discussion is mainly of a descriptive nature. Fitness</p> |



Pearson

| | |
|---------|---|
| | <p>testing data is evident however, there is little interpretation and limited comparisons made with pre and post-PEP data.</p> <p>Some attempts are made at applying SMART targets, principles and methods of training, but overall greater depth of analysis is needed in these sections for higher marks.</p> <p>The PEP is mainly focussing on fitness gains with some link to performance in football.</p> <p>The candidate mentions that a PARQ has been completed, but there is no evidence of this. The training logs are present, including specific exercises and intensity levels, however there are some issues in terms of specificity in relation to developing power.</p> |
| Slide 7 | <p>The candidate states his aims prior to any analysis of fitness or performance data. A deeper analysis of the components of fitness or the physiological requirements for football and/or the candidate's position would have been more appropriate for the introduction.</p> <p>The battery of tests completed were for the most part, specific to football. All results were compared to normative data ranking them from poor to above excellent, with some attempts to analyse the fitness testing results.</p> <p>This strand is marked at Level 2 with 5 marks being awarded as the candidate just met the requirements of Level 2 for strand 1.</p> |
| Slide 8 | <p>Strength and power were identified as weaknesses from the fitness testing scores and from this, targets were formed. Although candidates are free to select more than one aim, in this example the candidate would have been better off only selecting one.</p> <p>The candidate selects an appropriate training methods, weight and plyometric training, to improve his strength and power but with weak justification or evidence to support these methods improving his component of fitness choice or future performances.</p> <p>The SMART targets are fitness based with limited application to improving performance in football.</p> <p>Specific Principles of Training are identified, but on the whole only definitions with limited application and supportive evidence are provided.</p> |



Pearson

| | |
|----------|---|
| | <p>Overall, the candidate identifies the key areas in this strand and attempts but with limited application and supportive evidence.</p> <p>This strand is marked at Level 2 with 5 marks. This was arrived at by part of the work for this strand being at Level 2 and some work at Level 1.</p> |
| Slide 9 | <p>The candidate has repeated a number of the fitness tests and displayed the results in a table format and illustrated these with graphs. This evidence has enabled the candidate to compare pre and post-data but with limited analysis and interpretation of the data discussed. The fitness outcomes are discussed but with limited link to improving performance in football. This is limited work and as such, this strand is marked at Level 1 with 4 marks being awarded as it meets the requirements of Level 1 for strand 3.</p> |
| Slide 10 | <p>The candidate has briefly attempted to evaluate the application of the SMART targets and how they had been achieved.</p> <p>Evaluation of the principles and methods of training is very limited and there is a clear lack of application of how the PEP has affected performance in football.</p> <p>The candidate finishes this section with what components of fitness they would focus on next time, rather than offering a structured analysis of how well the PEP was completed and how effective it was in developing performance.</p> <p>This is limited work and is marked at Level 1 with 3 marks being awarded.</p> |
| Slide 11 | <p>The PEP is within the 1500-word count. The candidate has attempted to structure the PEP and use continuous prose. However, detail and appropriate terminology is inconsistent, and this affects the coherence of the work.</p> <p>This strand is marked at Level 2 with 6 marks being awarded as it partially meets the requirements of Level 2 for strand 5.</p> |
| Slide 12 | <p>The marks for each strand have now been added up to gain a total of 23. This total mark is divided by 5 and equals 4.6. This is then rounded up to 5 marks, placing it at the bottom end of Level 2.</p> |



Pearson

| | |
|----------|---|
| Slide 13 | <p>Title Slide – Applying the Assessment Mark Grid to PEP Example 2.</p> <p>At this point it is important for you to read the exemplar PEP before moving forward with the rest of the presentation.</p> |
| Slide 14 | <p>Now that you have thoroughly read Example PEP 2 you will be able to make some judgements.</p> <p>It is clear that this is an excellent PEP. It has all the required components and is performance related.</p> |
| Slide 15 | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>As is required, there is a full fitness test battery of results that have been gathered and compared to normative data.</p> <p>The required PARQ is included, and this is good practice prior to starting any programme.</p> <p>This strand is marked at Level 5 with 20 marks being awarded as it fully meets the requirements of Level 5 for strand 1.</p> |
| Slide 16 | <p>Physiological strengths and weaknesses are identified across the main components of fitness and the candidate is able to make a clear evaluation that power is a major weakness, linking both performance and fitness data together effectively.</p> <p>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.</p> |



Pearson

| | |
|----------|--|
| | <p>Plyometric training has been stated, research and applied to the PEP specifically on how it will develop the candidate's power in order to improve his jump shot.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Overall, this is an excellent evaluation for the requirements for strand 2. The work in this strand hits the requirements for Level 5, and 20 marks has been awarded for strand 2.</p> |
| Slide 17 | <p>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.</p> <p>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. 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 as a result of the 6-week PEP, however this could have been expanded to include more examples on how they have improved performance.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>This is excellent work and as such, this strand is marked at Level 5 with 17 marks being awarded as it just meets the requirements of Level 5 for strand 3.</p> |
| Slide 18 | <p>The evaluation of the SMART targets and principles of training is good, albeit a little descriptive that lacks specific examples. The evaluation of</p> |



Pearson

| | |
|----------|--|
| | <p>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.</p> <p>This strand is marked at Level 4 with 14 marks being awarded as it meets the lower end of the requirements of Level 4 for strand 4.</p> |
| Slide 19 | <p>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.</p> <p>This strand is marked at Level 5 with 19 marks being awarded as it meets most of the requirements for Level 5 for strand 5.</p> |
| Slide 20 | <p>The marks for each strand have now been added up to gain a total of 90. This total mark is divided by 5 to get an overall mark of 18 as it meets most of Level 5.</p> |
| Slide 21 | <p>Title Slide – Applying the Assessment Mark Grid to PEP Example 3.</p> <p>At this point it is important for you to read the exemplar PEP before moving forward with the rest of the presentation.</p> |
| Slide 22 | <p>The PEP makes a good attempt with the analysis and evaluation of their training, but discussion is descriptive at times.</p> <p>The aim is a performance-based aim with a clear measurable target to achieve. Fitness testing data is evident in the appendices and there is a good level of analysis of the components of fitness required for shot putt.</p> <p>Smart targets, principles and methods of training have been included that ranges from weak to good justification, but the PEP does follow a clear and logical structure throughout.</p> |



Pearson

| | |
|----------|---|
| | <p>Performance data is analysed some discussion of fitness improvements; however, the candidate has not included all the training sessions through the 6-week PEP.</p> |
| Slide 23 | <p>Fitness tests were conducted; however, they were all weight training exercises. This is fine, although the candidate did analysis other components of fitness, power and coordination, therefore it is advised that candidates conduct a battery of specialised tests that relate to the components of fitness required for their sporting activity or event. This will then allow the candidate to compare their results to normative or elite data, as well as peer data, with the latter form of data being encouraged in the absence established norms.</p> <p>This strand is marked at Level 3 with 12 marks being awarded as it fully meets the requirements of Level 3 for strand 1.</p> |
| Slide 24 | <p>This aim would have been strengthened with the inclusion of a fitness aspect, which was described later in some detail in the analysis section. The aim was performance based and did include a clear target to achieve.</p> <p>The candidate understands his strength & weaknesses and is clear about the type of training required to make improvements in his performance.</p> <p>The candidate has identified the appropriate methods of training to develop both strength and power through weight and plyometric training, but with weak justification. Greater analysis of the benefits with examples of these methods of training is required. The candidate may also benefit from selecting one fitness component to help improve performance, allowing him to provide greater depth of analysis to support his PEP.</p> <p>SMART targets were linked to performance with examples of their application to the PEP. The inclusion of measurable data would have</p> |



Pearson

| | |
|----------|--|
| | <p>allowed the candidate to better analysis improvements later on in the evaluation.</p> <p>Relevant principles of training were discussed, but the justification was weak and more direct examples of the application of the principles is required.</p> <p>This strand is marked at Level 2 with 8 marks being awarded as it fully meets the requirements of Level 2 for strand 2.</p> |
| Slide 25 | <p>The candidate has completed the fitness tests/exercises and presented them in graph format, illustrating the progress over the 6 weeks.</p> <p>The improvement in the performance of the shot putt has also been discussed, with the candidate improving his performance by more than the original aim. Reasons for this improvement could have been investigated more with further justifications coming from the candidate's knowledge regarding adaptations and the effects on exercise.</p> <p>Although there was some mention, further linking adaptations with his knowledge and understanding from the content in component 1 would add valuable depth. Use of data to in terms of percentage increases could also be used to assist in justifying the success of the PEP.</p> <p>However, the candidate has mentioned that he was surprised with the results due to the impact covid had had on his training, although modifications were made at his home. The specific modifications that could have also been explored in more detail.</p> <p>This is good work and as such, this strand is marked at Level 3 with 11 marks being awarded as it almost meets the requirements of Level 3 for strand 3.</p> |
| Slide 26 | <p>The candidate has provided a good evaluation, although descriptive in parts. It is mainly linked to performance improvements with some attempt at evaluating the methods evaluation and exercises used. SMART targets were completed in weak detail and lacked depth and specific examples of how they were applied appropriately throughout the 6-weeks.</p> |



Pearson

| | |
|----------|--|
| | <p>Evaluation of the principles of training was good, although further depth and examples would enhance the level of the PEP.</p> <p>The candidate finishes this section with a brief outline of what went well and the issues surrounding the covid pandemic, however there is no justified recommendations of how the PEP could be structured and undertaken for improving future training.</p> <p>This is limited work and is marked at Level 3 with 10 marks being awarded.</p> |
| Slide 27 | <p>The PEP is inside the 1500-word limit. It has a clear structure and is easy to read and follow. The candidate has used some appropriate terminology throughout, however greater detail is required with regards to the application of all principles and methods of training and the effects they have on the body and performance.</p> <p>The coherence and structure are good; however, the candidate is advised to include all training sessions as required into the task for submission.</p> <p>This strand is marked at Level 3 with 12 marks being awarded as it fully meets the requirements of Level 3 for strand 5.</p> |
| Slide 28 | <p>The marks for each strand have now been added up to gain a total of 53. This total mark is divided by 5 and equals 10.6. This is then rounded up to 11 marks, placing it towards the top of Level 3; a good PEP.</p> |
| Slide 29 | <p>Now that you have completed Module 3, hopefully you will have a better understanding of how marks are awarded in each Strand of the marking grid whilst applying the assessment criteria.</p> <p>In Module 4 there will be a live Question & Answer session where any submitted questions and live questions can be discussed and answered by our expert trainer. If you would like to submit questions to be answered, you can use the survey that each delegate will receive once they have registered for the Module 4 live event. You can find these events by visiting the training section of the Pearson website.</p> |
| Slide 30 | <p>Title Slide – Support</p> |



Pearson

| | |
|----------|---|
| | If you have any queries about any section of the Pearson GCSE Physical Education course, please contact our Subject Advisor Penny Lewis. All relevant contact details can be found on the next slide. |
| Slide 31 | Contact Detail Slide. |