

## GCSE PE 1PE0/04 – PEP: Athletics (800m) Commentary

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

The candidate collated performance data in the form of split 100m times for the 800m athletics event and analysed the effects of slower times in the later stages that effected performance caused by certain physiological responses e.g. lactate build up and a lack of oxygen availability to break it down. This was an excellent attempt to analyse performance and provided a great platform for the development of an aim. An area that could have been included that would have added an extra layer of analysis would have been the comparison to an elite or a more elite performer. This could have provided the candidate with interesting data relating to the levels required to perform at a higher level.

An extensive fitness test battery was conducted and the results were interpreted and analysed to an excellent level with the use of normative data and specific links to performance, although the candidate would have benefited from a more specific category of tests. The inclusion of a mini literature review at the start that summarised the important components of fitness would have helped justify a more specific selection of fitness tests. Nevertheless, the analysis was excellent and marked accordingly.

**The work provided in this strand is excellent and is marked at Level 5: 20 marks**

### **Strand 2: Evaluation and justification for method(s) of training, SMART targets and principles of training.**

The excellent and thorough analysis of both performance and fitness data allowed the candidate to construct an overall aim of the PEP that was **performance based** (optimise performance in the 800m race) supported by **developing a component of fitness** (muscular endurance). The candidate also offers two relevant SMART targets that are measurable, with one being fitness based and one performance based. The evaluation and application of SMART is clear and concise, however greater detail covering all aspects could have enhanced this section of the criteria further. There is more detail in the appendix, however the appendix is not assessed and does not form part of the marking criteria, therefore any essential information should be included within the main section of the PEP.

The candidate was able to provide extensive information regarding the application of the principles of training in conjunction with circuit training including a periodised plan, specific rep ranges, muscles targeted and the benefits to type IIa muscle fibres which had been deemed specific to the 800m event. Although some detail regarding intensity was included, the candidate would have benefitted from including specific intensity levels with regards to percentage of 1RM considering the development of muscular endurance was the main focus in terms of fitness.

A PARQ was included within the appendix demonstrating good practice before starting an exercise programme.

**The work provided in this strand is excellent and is marked at Level 5: 19 marks**

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

The candidate included pre-, **mid- (although not compulsory)** and post-PEP fitness and performance data that was used for evaluative purposes. Another layer of analysis was provided with the inclusion of normative data, and it was good to see that the raw data and graphs were embedded within the main part of the PEP. The presence of the data also allowed the candidate to refer to this more frequently and make clear links in terms of percentage increases and the impact the training had on fitness and performance improvements.

This section was completed clear and concisely utilising data appropriately to demonstrate the candidate's excellent ability to interpret and analyse the positive impact training has had on performance.

**The work provided in this strand is excellent and is marked at Level 5: 20 marks**

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

The candidate provided well-argued evaluations of the application of training methods and principles of training with some link to their SMART targets. Physiological reasons behind improvements in performance were outlined, with the candidate clearly linking knowledge gained from Component 1 and the application of circuit training to improving tolerance to lactate build up, resulting in greater resistance to fatigue.

The candidate was also able to evaluate the difference in progress made in performance from the first 3 weeks compared to the second 3 weeks of training, suggesting that progress slowed down due to a lack of variation in intensities and monotonous activities. Further recommendations in the way of recovery methods between sessions were also explored offering justifiable solutions.

**The work provided in this strand is excellent and is marked at Level 4: 19 marks**

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

The PEP displayed excellent coherence and structure utilising appropriate terminology and including an abundance of data with both fitness and performance links demonstrating an excellent level of theoretical knowledge. The task however would benefit from evidence of research through referencing, although it was clear the candidate understood all elements of the marking criteria.

There was evidence of training, although it is recommended for good practice that all individual training logs are submitted. Overall the PEP was clear and concise and well within the 1500 word-limit.

**The work provided in this strand is excellent and is marked at Level 5: 20 marks**

**Principal Moderator mark:**

**S1: 20**

**S2: 19**

**S3: 20**

**S4: 19**

**S5: 20**

**Total:  $98/5 = 19.6$**

**Level 5- 20**