

GCSE PE 1PE0/04 – PEP: Swimming Commentary

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

The candidate provided a detailed and well-researched introduction explaining the physiological requirements for the 200m backstroke event. This information was very useful as it was concluded that the three main components of fitness required for the event were aerobic endurance, power and speed, which determined the number of specific tests used in the initial test battery.

Please note: *this is good practice and should be encouraged. Not all tests for every component of fitness needs to be used in the pre-test battery. If justified appropriately, only specific components and tests associated with the chosen sport/activity need to be included.*

The candidate collated performance data in the form of split 50m times for the 200m backstroke as well as the distance covered underwater from the start and the turns. This data was compared to an elite performer which was researched and referenced.

After gathering both performance and fitness data, the candidate provided an excellent and thorough interpretation of the results and was able to assume that power was a weakness that was affecting her performance.

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 for the PEP that was **performance based** (improve efficiency of starts and turns) supported by **developing a component of fitness** (lower body power). The candidate also offers three relevant SMART targets that are measurable, with one being fitness based and two being performance based. The information provided for SMART was clear, appropriate and concise. 'A' in SMART represents **achievable** in the specification, however **agreed** is also a recognised alternative. The information provided is relevant as it states that targets were agreed between the coach and the candidate.

The evaluation of methods and principles of training has been completed in depth and was well researched. The candidate has justified the use of plyometric training and how it will benefit them in developing power and ultimately their performance. The information included with regards to principles of training has allowed the candidate to structure their PEP effectively and has included specific intensity levels and exercises.

A PARQ has been included in line with the task requirements which is good practice before starting an exercise programme.

The work provided in this strand is excellent and is marked at Level 5: 20 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. Elite data was used, like in the planning section, for comparison against times and distance travelled under water during the 200m backstroke swim.

The candidate was able to meet and slightly exceed their target with the VJ test and justified reasons for the positive change demonstrating her knowledge & understanding of possible adaptations that may have occurred.

There was also an in-depth analysis of performance with the candidate explaining how improvements had been made with regards to the distance covered underwater at the start, however it did not meet the overall target set. The other target was to improve distance off the turns, and this was improved in part (1st turn only). Justification in terms of lacking aerobic endurance later in the race were given and developed further later in the evaluation.

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 a sophisticated and well-argued evaluation of the application of the principles of training with some link to their SMART targets. Physiological reasons associated with not fully meeting the targets were provided with appropriate justification that included issues relating to overtraining and reference to her training logs that specifically looked at the time for recovery that led to the effects of DOMs.

The benefits of plyometric training were provided, however further detail and depth could have been included as most of the information provided related to the negative effects of overtraining using this method (excessive microtears caused due to eccentric loading).

Recommendations were explained and researched to an appropriate standard that focussed on developing/maintain aerobic endurance levels in order to tolerate higher intensity levels and recovery from bouts of high intensity work.

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 tables of data and graphs included within the main section of the PEP were presented well and helped with the flow of the task.

There was evidence of training with individual and dated training logs submitted. Overall the PEP was clear and concise, however the candidate was slightly over the 1500-word limit for the task.

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

Principal Moderator mark:

S1: 20

S2: 20

S3: 20

S4: 19

S5: 19

Total: $98/5 = 19.6$

Level 5- 20