

GCSE PE 1PE0/04 – PEP 2 Volleyball Commentary

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

The candidate introduced themselves and stated their choice of sport/activity which is no issue, however it would have been more beneficial to include a brief analysis of the physiological requirements for their activity. The candidate should also be discouraged from stating their aims at the very beginning without an initial analysis of their performance and fitness standards.

A battery of fitness tests was conducted, and the candidate was able to give a rationale as to why they used these tests. This is good practice rather than completing a random selection of tests.

There is some analysis of the data generated from the tests with good interpretation, highlighting their physiological strengths & weaknesses, although greater reference to performance would improve attainment in this section.

The work provided in this strand is good and is marked at Level 3: 9 marks

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

Two components of fitness have been selected to form the aims of this PEP. Selecting multiple components of fitness is allowed, however centres should be aware that this can cause issues in terms in workload and structure.

There was a fitness test battery used to help derive the aims and SMART targets, however greater link and emphasis on developing performance should be included using more quantitative methods.

Methods of training through circuit training was evident, however there was limited evidence of muscular endurance training in the appendix.

Principles of training are outlined with the candidate linking principles on how they will be applied. The information meets the requirements of the specification, although the explanations from the candidate lacked the detail, depth of knowledge and use of terminology to access the higher levels.

Prior to carrying out the PEP, the candidate included two paragraphs on the benefits of warm-ups and cool-downs. Although interesting to read, this is not required and takes up valuable word limit space.

The work provided in this strand is good and is marked at Level 3: 11 marks

Strand 3: Fitness test results are compared and interpreted.

Training logs have been evidenced through their specific circuit training in Appendix 2. However, the candidates six training logs on display have no real significance as they lack detail and hold unrelated data e.g. resting and working heart rate figures. These health indicators have no relevance to the overall aims and are not required to be included.

Likewise, some of the fitness tests were not required to be conducted post-PEP. Considering that flexibility and muscular endurance development was the major focus, there was no reason to re-test an aerobic endurance and power test.

Nevertheless, the candidate has shown evidence of physiological improvement in their results by comparing their pre-PEP and post-PEP fitness test results, however, the candidate is lacking full evidence or justification of their training having such an impact on their sporting performance.

The work provided in this strand is good and is marked at Level 3: 9 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 has put together a good evaluation of the application of their chosen methods of training, setting SMART goals and principles of training, through their discussion and supportive evidence displayed in the appendix.

Recommendations to improve future training has been included and fulfilled the requirements of the specification, however they are not very strategic and have no real reference to the effectiveness of the candidates PEP.

The work provided in this strand is good and is marked at Level 3: 12 marks

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

Coherence, conciseness and structure of the candidates PEP was very good, although there are definitely areas for improvement.

The work submitted for this section would put this PEP at the bottom of Level 4, with 13 marks awarded.

For this candidate to progress to Level 5, the candidate would need to reference their supportive evidence more to support their statements and organise their work in such a way that they do not exceed the 1500-word limit. Also, the discussion on heart rates had no rationale and would need re-consideration of inclusion.

The work provided in this strand is very good and is marked at Level 4: 13 marks

Principal Moderator mark:

S1: 9

S2: 11

S3: 9

S4: 12

S5: 13

Total: $54/5 = 10.8$

Level 3- 11