



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2024

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 2024

Publications Code 1PE0_04_2406_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

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

Candidates are now, on the whole including a more relevant introduction that covers the specific fitness and physiological characteristics of their chosen activity. This has assisted them in selecting a fitness test battery that is more relevant, and is a big improvement compared to previous series where candidates were including personal information about the sports they play that has no relevance to the assessment criteria.

Moderators commented on the excellent work shown by some centres in collecting both fitness and performance data, which was thoroughly analysed to evaluate strengths and weaknesses and linked to the candidate's sporting performance. Lower level candidates often relied on just stating the obvious with regards to test results and therefore limited their ability to analyse. Higher level candidates picked out strengths and weakness, linked them to their own performance within their sport and made informed decisions as to which components needed to be improved, and why. A significant number of candidates are comparing their performance data to elite performers, which is acceptable and evident in some of the exemplar material, however it must be stressed that this is **not compulsory** or part of the assessment criteria. Candidates need ensure whatever data is used, it must be relevant so a realistic analysis can be undertaken.

Although strand 1 has seen a big improvement with the inclusion of fitness and performance data, as well as the depth of analysis of this data, there are still centres encouraging their candidates to pre-determine their aim prior to any form of analysis. Centres are reminded once again; interpretation and an analysis of fitness and performance is required before establishing the overall aim as this is used as means of justifying how the plan will organised.

Top tips:

1. Collect specific fitness data relevant to the candidate's activity.
2. Ensure there is performance data for further analysis.
3. Include a thorough interpretation and analysis of all data that will assist the candidate to select and justify an appropriate aim at the start of strand 2.
4. It is encouraged that all tables of raw data and graphs are included within the main section.

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

Similar to last series, candidates who provided a sufficient analysis of the data collated in strand 1 were able to select and justify a more appropriate aim. Higher performing candidates constructed an aim that was performance based and supported by a component of fitness, whereas lower performing candidates only provided targets or a target that was just fitness based. Moderators commented that some candidates are still choosing multiple components of fitness which quite often leads to a lack of depth and structure throughout the PEP.

Once an overall aim has been established, then the application of SMART targets can be included, which were evidenced most of the time. Whilst the targets themselves followed the SMART process, there was often no justification as to why they were SMART for some candidates, and this was mainly due to a lack of a performance link.

Most training methods were appropriately selected but the justification for some candidates did not provide the detail required to justify some marks awarded. For example, reasons for selection of certain methods of training included *'weight training is good for strength'* or *'circuit training allows multiple components to be worked on and it's not boring'*. The higher-level PEP's were able to consider the characteristics as well analysing the advantages that make the method of training beneficial for developing by fitness and performance.

The most popular method of training selected by centres was circuit training, which makes sense with regards to logistical issues during lesson time. Last series it was mentioned in the report that candidates need to be more specific with their analysis of circuit training and how this could be modified to meet the specific needs of the PEP. This has improved and centres are thanked for their progress in ensuring candidates adapt their circuits to meet the specificity principle of the selected component of fitness. Some candidates selected two methods of training, and like the comment mentioned above regarding the selection of multiple components of fitness, this tends to lead to a lack of depth and centres may want to re-consider this approach.

The application of the principles of training was covered in reasonable detail once again this series, however candidates still need to ensure they include the correct intensity levels. Aerobic endurance-based PEP's tended to be excused from this comment as they generally included the correct HR ranges, although RHR data should be considered for monitoring to add another level of analysis. PEP's based on strength, power or muscular endurance need to consider a % of repetitions rather than HR as this does not align with the principle of specificity.

Some candidates are still using 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, again, 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 candidates 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. Continue to ensure the aim is performance-based and supported by a component of fitness, and is derived directly from the analysis in strand 1 (not before).

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 by linking the characteristics and advantages to the aim of the plan.
4. Include the correct intensities and evaluate how you intend to apply the principles of training i.e. progressive overload.
5. Not all principles of training need to be mentioned, so be specific to help with the quality and depth of the planning.

Strand 3: Fitness test results are compared and interpreted

Most candidates presented their fitness results pre- and post-PEP in a graph and table format, with most comparing to normative data which provided a valuable layer of data for comparison. Those achieving marks in the higher levels, linked their findings with their performance data that assisted with the analysis.

Moderators mentioned that it was pleasing to see candidates only re-testing the component(s) specific to the PEP instead of the full battery of tests (which was still seen in some PEP's). Higher-level candidates had their pre- and post- test results side by side and were able to explain why they had improved by linking fitness improvements to specific physical adaptations. Higher marks were also generally achieved when candidates used the data from their SMART targets to compare this progress and how they had impacted their performance, especially if performance data was also present to fully justify their analysis.

The standard of analysis for this strand has improved from previous series and centres are thanked for their assistance in ensuring data is used thoroughly to underpin the analysis provided by the candidates. However, the use of HR data should be only used when it is specifically required, and as mentioned above in stand 2, power, strength and muscular endurance-based PEP's do not really require this.

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.
3. Continue to include the tables of raw data and graphs within the main section of the PEP to help illustrate progress alongside the analysis.

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

Moderators commented on an improvement in strand 4 from last series, although there were still too many evaluations that were brief that contained descriptive content. Where higher marks were awarded and agreed with, it was generally characterised by the following:

- Strand 2 planning was completed well, therefore a direct evaluation between planning and outcomes could be conducted.

- Where training logs were submitted in full, candidates were able to use recorded data from these logs to specifically evaluate the impact the principles and methods of training had on their fitness and performance, and how this has helped to achieve their SMART targets/aim.
- Have followed the 'PEP Strand 4 Evaluation Guidance' from the website and provided relevant depth to their evaluations with specific examples used to support sophisticated evaluations.

Although improvements have been made, this section of the PEP was still the weakest strand, with some candidates still missing this from their PEP's altogether. Candidates need to be more specific with real examples from their training logs, reducing the amount of descriptive and generic content, and evaluate the impact their training had on all areas mentioned in strand 2.

Future recommendations were generally attempted but some candidates failed to make the link as to why these would benefit future performances. Lower-marked PEP's still just stated to that they wanted to improve a separate component of fitness that had no justification attached to it and how it would further future performance.

Top tips:

1. All sections of this strand should be given equal weightings in the evaluation and should reflect what was covered in strand 2.
2. Ensure all training logs are completed and included within the sample in order for candidates to utilise the data for their evaluative comments.
3. Ensure all points made link back to the impact on performance.
4. Ensure recommendations for future training are fully justified on how they would benefit the learner for further training and performance.
5. Utilise the 'PEP Strand 4 Evaluation Guidance' document from the Pearson website.

Strand 5: Coherence and structure, use of appropriate terminology

The consensus amongst Moderators that the structure and coherence of the PEP's has seen an improvement this series, with many commenting that the checklist located of the Person website has assisted centres with this. Please note that the checklist is not a compulsory document to use, rather a resource that offers advice on a possible structure.

Individual plans with a different layout that cover the required content of the assessment criteria is also encouraged. However, having mentioned this, even the lower-marked PEP's have improved as it was clear centre staff had encouraged candidates to adopt a clear structure, although the level of analysis in these cases need improvement to gain higher marks.

Although the structure of the PEP's had improved, there were still some cases where PEP's are being submitted in a template or with pre-loaded questions which is forbidden under the JCQ guidelines. Candidates must

be given the opportunity to present their work independently and templates should not be used.

The 1500 word-limit was generally adhered to, although it was quite often breached when candidates had chosen multiple components of fitness and methods of training which was directly linked to the amount of content that was required to analyse them in enough detail. Usually, with the lower level PEP's, candidates were well below the word count due to a lack of detail and mistakes with regards to appropriate terminology.

Centres have improved the way in which they use the appendix, and quite often it was not used by higher-marked PEP's as all tables of data and graphs were embedded within the main section of the PEP. However, there are still some candidates that still refer to the appendix too much rather than including the relevant information within the main part of the PEP, although there was an improvement from the previous series. Centres are reminded once again 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.

Overall comments

Overall there was an improvement in the standard of the PEP's as well as agreement between centre and Moderator marks. Well done once again for your continued hard work and support. It is hoped that this report will prove to be informative, positive and constructive in improving standards for future series. Have a good Summer and good luck for the next academic series.

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

1. **PEP Marking Grid:**
<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/GCSE/Physical%20Education/2016/Teaching%20and%20learning%20materials/2023-PEP-marking-grid-v1.pdf>
2. **PEP Checklist:**
<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/GCSE/Physical%20Education/2016/Teaching%20and%20learning%20materials/2023-PEP-checklist-v1-fill-in.pdf>
3. **PEP Strand 4 Evaluation Guidance:**
<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/GCSE/Physical%20Education/2016/Teaching%20and%20learning%20materials/gcse-pe-pep-strand-4-evaluation-guidance-document.pdf>
4. **PEP Exemplars and Commentaries:**
<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/GCSE/Physical%20Education/2016/Teaching%20and%20learning%20materials/2023-pep-exemplars-v2.zip>

5. **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>

6. **PEP Scheme of Work:**
<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>

7. **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>

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom