



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2023

Pearson Edexcel GCSE
In Physical Education (1PE0)
Paper 04: Personal Exercise Programme (PEP)

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2023

Publications Code 1PE0_04_2306_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

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

Irrelevant introductions that include player backgrounds and other active sports and leisure hobbies were not as prevalent in this series as many learner's work offered a more concise introduction. There was greater consideration given of the specific fitness requirements associated with their sporting activity, and it was evident from the higher performing learners that they used this information to determine the specific fitness tests that would be used to help analyse their fitness levels. Some centres still encouraged the use of all fitness tests from the specification, with interpretations provided for every single fitness test. The inclusion of all tests is fine; however, it was evident that the learners that provided a more specific test battery generally provided a thorough interpretation and analysis of fitness test results that used appropriate data.

The inclusion of performance data alongside fitness data also improved from the previous series, and together the collection of this data provided important information for interpreting and determining overall strengths and weaknesses which often led to realistic and measurable targets in strand 2. However, there are still too many learners pre-determining their overall aim before conducting a full interpretation and analysis of the data. Centres are reminded that this is an important initial aspect of the task and provides the necessary quantitative data that should be used to justify the overall analysis.

More tasks this series have included the raw data with comparisons to normative data, and graphs illustrating fitness and performance levels within the initial analysis. Some learners included this in the appendix which is acceptable, however, centres are reminded that this information does not count towards the overall word count and therefore are encouraged to include this within the main body of the task. In this way the flow of the PEP could be enhanced and it also allows candidates to refer directly to the data when completing their analysis.

Top Tip: this strand focusses on the learner's ability to collect, interpret and analyse relevant data concerned with their fitness and performance. Therefore, any mention of the PEP aim should only occur after this analysis has taken place and form the start of strand 2.

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

Learners who provided a sufficient analysis of the data collated in strand 1 were able to select and justify a more appropriate aim. Higher performing learners constructed an aim that was performance based and supported by a component of fitness. Learners who were assessed in the lower marking levels

tended to just focus on fitness with no or limited link to performance. Some learners still chose multiple components of fitness on some occasions, and although not as prevalent as last series, these centres may want to consider only focusing on one component of fitness in order to complete the task with greater depth.

Once an overall aim has been established, then the application of SMART targets can be included, and it was pleasing to see that more learners are now linking specific and measurable targets that are used as a means of achieving the overall aim. This is an important aspect of the task as these data driven targets help shape the planning of the PEP and provide important parameters for analysis on the effectiveness of the overall PEP in the evaluation strands. Although the level for this area of the strand has improved, there is still too many learners providing generic definitions or one-line descriptive content on each section of SMART that lacks direct application.

Most learners selected a relevant training method, with circuit training being favoured throughout the series. Circuit training is an adaptable method and logistically, a more appropriate way to manage a cohort of GCSE students during a training session. However, centres are reminded that learners must ensure they justify why this method is the most suitable to use to improve their future fitness and performance, as well as giving clear detail as to how it will be modified to meet the specific aims of the PEP. For example, using circuit training to develop power may be the easiest way in which to structure the training sessions, however it would be expected that the learner explain how plyometric style exercises would be embedded within circuit training, considering that plyometrics are a more specific method for this component of fitness.

The application of the principles of training was covered in reasonable detail, however learners could provide more information with regards to the specific and relevant intensities of training and examples of how progressive overload can be applied. This was probably the weakest aspect found from many learners in this strand, although higher-marked work did include this information. Centres are also encouraged to consider %1RM for strength and power-based PEP's. Alongside this, there also seemed to be many inaccuracies in terms of the number of sessions learners were suggesting they were planning to complete and the number of actual training sessions they provided.

Some learners also used a table format to present their work which is acceptable and is counted towards the word count, but centres are encouraged to use continuous written prose for this section as these tables often only saw basic descriptions or definitions rather than the direct application, which quite often limited the mark that could be awarded.

The vast majority of learners included a PAR-Q, which demonstrates good practice when starting any form of exercise, and in some cases highlighted issues that needed to be addressed within the planning of the programme.

Top Tips:

1. Ensure the Aim is performance based and supported by a component of fitness.
2. Consider specific and measurable targets (fitness and performance) that link to the overall aim.
3. Justify how the method(s) of training are going to help improve fitness and performance.
4. Include the correct intensities and evaluate how you intend to apply the principles of training i.e. progressive overload.

Strand 3: Fitness test results are compared and interpreted

Almost all centres ensured that their learners presented their pre and post-PEP fitness tests in table and graph format. Learners who scored higher in this section were able to compare and interpret differences in their test scores and use normative data as an extra layer for analysis. The inclusion of data with regards to percentage increase or decrease as a result of training by many learners has improved significantly, and the higher-marked PEP's were able to make comparisons to their original targets set within strand 2. There was also a greater focus by many learners to consider their post-PEP testing around the key component of fitness being targeted rather than displaying data from a range of irrelevant areas of fitness which had no link to their training or set targets.

A key area for development from last series was to link possible reasons for improvements to potential training adaptations that may have occurred, therefore using the PEP as a practical method of reflecting on some of the theoretical content in Components 1 and 2. An increased amount of learners attempted this, and although the depth of explanation needed improvements in some tasks, higher-marked learners were able to evaluate how potential adaptations occurred that resulted in fitness and ultimately, performance improvements. There are still instances where HR data is collated when it is not necessary e.g. power and strength-based PEP's, although it was pleasing to see the inclusion of RHR data to assist in the evaluations for endurance-based PEP's.

Learners marked in higher bands also successfully utilised performance data and compared this to pre-PEP standards. These learners made clear and measurable links that impacted their sporting performance when offering justifications and evaluations of the different aspects of the PEP. Although there was an increase in the use of performance data, some tasks only utilised this data in the evaluation, therefore it was hard to judge overall

improvements. Where this applies to centres, they are encouraged to ensure their learners include the initial performance data in strand 1 to be used in the initial analysis.

Like with strand 1, candidates are encouraged to include all tables of data and graphs in the main part of the PEP that will not only assist learners to refer to the data more when justifying the effectiveness of their training, but increase the flow and potentially improve the presentation of the task.

Top Tips:

1. Continue to compare data with initial targets and determine overall percentage increase or decrease for both fitness and performance.
2. Link improvements to potential adaptations - use this task as a practical way to learn/revise for the theory exams.

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

This strand of the PEP was the area that was completed with the most inconsistencies. There were two extremes where learners either provided very little evaluative comments and were too descriptive lacking depth and detail, or, they contained sophisticated evaluations of the application of SMART, methods and principles of training with well justified recommendations.

The amount of data collated throughout the task with regards to both fitness and performance levels as well as training session data generally determined the level of depth included within the evaluation. Some learners just added that they had improved or suggested a huge improvement without offering justifiable reasons. Learners scoring in higher marks were able to use the data and information collated in their training logs to demonstrate the effective application of certain principles of training (i.e. progressive overload) and give percentage increases with regards to improvements in certain exercises. Learners need to evaluate their training and consider whether the intensities, exercises and methods of training achieved the planned impact on their fitness and performance in accordance with their aim. Whether it was a positive or negative outcome, reasons and justifications for this must be developed.

Future recommendations varied once again this series, and often included a brief line on what they would do next time, sometimes with reference to focussing on another component of fitness; or were completed well where a full explanation was given with regards to how they could adapt the training plan by modifying the SMART targets, methods and principles of training to make further gains.

Top Tips:

1. All sections of this strand should be given equal weightings in the evaluation.
2. Ensure all training logs are completed and included within the sample in order for learners to utilise the data for their evaluative comments.
3. Link the learner's application of training to how it impacted both fitness and ultimately performance.
4. Ensure recommendations for future training are fully justified on how they would benefit the learner for further training and performance.

Strand 5: Coherence and structure, use of appropriate terminology

The tasks on the whole were completed succinctly with appropriate coherence and structure, and relevant terminology was used. There were still some cases where a lack of structure and sections missing from PEP's affected the overall standard, however this was not as profound as the previous series. There are still few cases where PEP's are being submitted in a template or with pre-loaded questions which is forbidden under the JCQ guidelines and learners must be given the opportunity to present their work independently.

The majority of the PEP's submitted covered the planning and the evaluation sections in good detail, although as mentioned above, strand 4 is an area for development for a lot of centres. Word counts on the whole were adhered to, and greater use of specific terminology, especially in strand 3 was utilised effectively.

Centres have improved the way in which they use the appendix, however there are still some learners that refer to the appendix too much rather than embedding the relevant information within the main part of the PEP. Centres are reminded that the appendix does not form part of the assessment criteria, and should only be used for reference only. Therefore, all analytical and evaluative content must be included within the main body of the PEP, and it is encouraged as mentioned previously, to include the relevant fitness and performance data within the main section of the task.

End

It is hoped that this report will prove to be informative, positive and constructive in improving standards for future series. The standards of the PEP submissions have improved, with the majority of tasks being marked in line with the assessment criterion. **Well done!** Centres should be congratulated for your efforts. Good luck for the next academic series.

Kind Regards,

Dane Smith

GCSE Physical Education
Principal Moderator for 1PE0_04

Resources they may help with future planning are listed below with the relevant links:

PEP Marking Grid:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/GCSE/Physical%20Education/2016/Teaching%20and%20learning%20materials/2023-PEP-marking-grid-v1.pdf>

PEP Checklist:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/GCSE/Physical%20Education/2016/Teaching%20and%20learning%20materials/2023-PEP-checklist-v1-fill-in.pdf>

PEP Performance data Examples:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/GCSE/Physical%20Education/2016/Teaching%20and%20learning%20materials/2023-PEP-performance-data-examples-v1.pdf>

PEP Exemplars and Commentaries:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/GCSE/Physical%20Education/2016/Teaching%20and%20learning%20materials/2023-pep-exemplars-v2.zip>

PEP SOW:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/GCSE/Physical%20Education/2016/Teaching%20and%20learning%20materials/personal-exercise-programme-pep-scheme-of-work-sow-final.pdf>

Past Training Content (Delivering Component 4):

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/GCSE/Physical%20Education/2016/Teaching%20and%20learning%20materials/1pe0-23o5-training-pack.zip>