



Examiners' Report Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2025

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

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 2025

Publications Code 1PE0_04_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

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

Candidates continue to improve the start of their PEPs by including more relevant introductions covering the specific physiological or fitness requirements for their activity rather than generic information about playing history and teams they were involved with, which is irrelevant to the task. This information assisted candidates in selecting more relevant fitness tests as opposed to selecting all tests from the specification when it was not always necessary.

Appropriate collection and interpretation of data were evident for most PEPs, with many candidates opting to make comparisons within their analysis against normative data. The level of analysis has noticeably improved from the previous series, which did help candidates ensure an appropriate aim was established at the start of strand 2. However, when candidates did not achieve higher marks, it was mainly due to the lack of analysis of the data. Simply stating what the strengths and weaknesses are in terms of fitness does not meet the criteria for a thorough interpretation; higher ability candidates were able to use the data to elaborate further and linked the data effectively to the demands of their sporting activity.

Performance data was used more consistently this year and a clearer structure within the work helped most candidates meet the strand's requirements. A significant number of candidates were comparing their performance data to elite performers this series, which is acceptable and evident in some of the exemplar material; however, it must be stressed again that this is **not compulsory** nor part of the assessment criteria. Candidates need to ensure that whatever data is used, it must be relevant so a realistic analysis can be undertaken. Quite often, candidates used peer data, which gave a more realistic outlook on performance, although again, it is not required as part of the task.

Although most centres are encouraging their candidates to collect, interpret and analyse the fitness and performance data prior to establishing an aim, there are still candidates who include a pre-determined aim prior to any form of analysis. Centres are reminded once again, that an interpretation and an analysis of fitness and performance are required before establishing the overall aim, as this is used as a means of justifying how the plan will be organised.

Top Tips:

- 1. Physiological or fitness overview at the start to establish specific fitness tests related to relevant components of fitness for the chosen sporting activity (do not need to include all tests if they are not relevant).**
- 2. Use the data to interpret and analyse strengths and weaknesses, and how it impacts performance. This will then allow you to construct a specific and appropriate aim for the start of strand 2.**

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

Moderators once again mentioned that when candidates provided a sufficient analysis of the data collated in strand 1, they were able to select and justify a more appropriate aim. There was an improvement in the structure of PEP aims this series, as they were mainly performance-based and supported by a component of fitness, although there are still some lower performing candidates only providing targets or a target that is fitness-based. Some candidates are also still

choosing multiple components of fitness, which can be utilised, although this quite often leads to a lack of depth and structure throughout the PEP, considering the strict 1500-word limit.

Most centres now have got into the habit of ensuring candidates include specific and measurable targets that are both performance and fitness related, that feed into the overall aim, which was pleasing to see. A minority of candidates are providing a descriptive overview of SMART with very little justification, and at times get confused between specific and specificity, with the latter being a principle of training.

Most training methods were appropriately selected with circuit training, being the overwhelmingly most popular method. As stated in the last series, this makes sense due to logistical issues that centres may face; however, centres are reminded that to achieve higher marks, candidates need to elaborate on how circuit training can be adapted to meet the specific aims of the task. For example, with a power-based aim, it is expected that candidates justify how power exercises or plyometric training can be embedded within circuit training to ensure the principle of specificity is met.

The application of the principles of training was covered in reasonable detail once again in this series; however, candidates still need to ensure they include the correct intensity levels. Aerobic endurance-based PEPs 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. **PEPs based on strength, power or muscular endurance need to consider a % of repetitions rather than HR, as the latter does not align with the principle of specificity.**

Although this has improved, some candidates are still using a table format to present their work, which is acceptable and is counted towards the word count, however, candidates 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. 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.**
- 3. Include the correct intensities and evaluate how you intend to apply the principles of training, i.e. progressive overload.**
- 4. Ensure all aspects of the criteria are covered, as this will assist with completing the strand 4 evaluation.**

Strand 3: Fitness test results are compared and interpreted

This section was completed with a lot of success, and most candidates completed post-PEP data collection, with some collecting data midway through their PEP to show progression, and to adjust their programme if required, **although this is not a requirement to retest mid-PEP.** The data was presented in graph and table formats, with most candidates comparing to normative

data and the initial target percentages, which provided valuable data for comparison. Those achieving marks in the higher levels, linked their findings with their performance data, which assisted with a deeper analysis, as well as an exploration of potential physiological adaptations. Being able to make justified assumptions based on the supporting evidence on how the body has potentially adapted through training, and what impact it has had on performance is crucial in securing higher marks for this strand, something that has improved from the previous series.

Moderators commented, however, that there were still candidates retesting every component of fitness, whereas it is only advised to retest the relevant component of fitness that has been the focus of the PEP. Likewise, and as mentioned earlier, candidates are still using non-specific data in the form of HR and Borg scale data, even when their PEP is not based on aerobic endurance.

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 that can help to provide ample supporting evidence within the analysis.**
- 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 that there was an improvement in strand 4 once again, although it still tends to be the most challenging strand for most candidates overall.

It is imperative that candidates record all sessions on a centre-devised or the Pearson training record form. All the data from these training logs and the adjustments made to the training that are collated and recorded across the programme can then be used as evidence within strand 4. This enhances the evaluation with real examples of how principles and methods of training were applied to support the SMART targets and overall aim.

Moderators reported that when strand 2 was completed well, the corresponding training programme could be planned in line with the qualification requirements and hence had a direct correlation on whether the sufficient supporting evidence was available for evaluation. 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.

Although there were some very good future recommendations included in the higher-level PEPs, many candidates only offered surface-level recommendations without full justification. More detailed analytical conclusions are needed across most centres instead of just stating what the candidate would like to improve on the next time they complete the training, offering very little supporting evidence.

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. If strand 2 was not completed in full, it makes it difficult to fully complete strand 4.
2. Ensure all training logs are completed and included within the sample, for candidates to utilise the data for their evaluative comments.
3. Ensure all points made link back to impact on performance.
4. Ensure recommendations for future training are fully justified on how they would benefit the learner with their further training and performance.

Strand 5: Coherence and structure, use of appropriate terminology

Overall, the structure and coherence of the PEPs have seen an improvement in this series once again, with many commenting that the checklist available online and the new resources in the 'PEP Library' playing a major part in this. Although the exemplars online do provide centres with a useful resource, please ensure that these exemplars are only used as a guide, as on a few occasions, some PEPs submitted were looking very similar to the ones provided in the PEP library.

Terminology used by candidates was mostly appropriate throughout, with few minor errors. There were SPAG errors seen, but in some cases, it did not always affect the coherence, and where it did, it is mentioned in the centre E9 report. Most candidates were able to write their work with continuous prose, although there are still instances where centres are providing candidates with tables, a template or pre-loaded questions to answer. **Please be reminded that the JCQ rules state that templates or writing frames are not to be used for any NEA task.**

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 all in enough detail, as was the case last series. Centres have also improved the way how candidates use the appendix, although many candidates do not have an appendix anymore, whilst including all information in the main body of the task. Please be reminded that only words written by the candidate are used within the word count, which excludes tables of data, graphs and training logs. An appendix is still acceptable, although we are still seeing candidates refer to the appendix too much without providing the necessary level of analysis or evaluation within the main body of the PEP **(Remember- the appendix does not form part of the marking criteria, and any information within the appendix is there as a supportive measure, not for assessment).**

Other points to consider for the next series:

1. Some PEPs were still produced on sporting activities that were not listed in the set list provided by the DfE, e.g. weightlifting and karate. These activities cannot be accepted, and it is important that centre staff are aware of the approved activities.
2. If a candidate does not submit any work, then the mark entered into www.edexcelonline.com should be 'X', not '0'. When work has been submitted but there is no rewardable content, that is when '0' should be entered. This is important as a '0' marked candidate will form part of the sample as the lowest mark.

3. Please ensure the highest and lowest marked work is included within the sample on LWT, even if these candidates fall outside the initial pre-populated sample. This will speed up the moderation process and cut down on unnecessary communication.
4. Although not compulsory, Moderators have asked if centres could upload the PEP marking grid for each PEP. This practice can help make the moderation process more transparent, and centres that used and submitted them were able to demonstrate how the marks were awarded. This can assist with both confirmation of marks and provide more bespoke feedback if the marks do not align with the required standards.
5. Unfortunately, this series has seen an increase in the use of AI. The AI can be used; however, this must be referenced appropriately, and candidates must submit work for assessments which is their own, in accordance with JCQ regulations. AI misuse constitutes malpractice, and malpractice sanctions can also be applied for the offences of 'making a false declaration of authenticity' and 'plagiarism'. For further information, please refer to your centre's AI policy and the JCQ's guidance, 'AI in assessments' document, to avoid any unnecessary complications.

Overall comments

Overall, this was a successful year with most tasks assessed by the centre agreed by the Moderator. The average mark this year has also increased by almost two marks, which is a testament to the hard work applied by centre staff and their candidates in this series.

It is hoped that this report will provide centres with valuable points to consider for the next exam 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 Library:** <https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/qualifications/edexcel-gcses/physical-education-2016/exemplar-library/component-4-personal-exercise-programme.html>
5. **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>

6. **Past Training Content (Delivering Component 4):**

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/GCSE/Physical%20Education/2016/Teaching%20and%20learning%20materials/1peo-2402.zip>

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