



Examiner's Report Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2018

Pearson Edexcel GCSE
In Physical Education (1PE0)
Component 4 (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 2018

Publications Code 1PE0_04_1806_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

The purpose of the PEP is to improve/optimize the performance of the candidate in their chosen activity. Feedback for the examination series is presented in the different elements that should be present in the coursework.

Aim and planning analysis:

The majority of candidates stated their choice of sport and activity which they aimed to improve their performance in. However, many showed little or no evidence of interpretation or analysis of fitness testing data which ultimately limited their justifications of their aims or their choice of components of fitness that they wanted to improve and therefore their choice of training methods. Centres should be aware that this is a key assessment area. The specification states:

"...the student's initial analysis and evaluation of their current fitness, and justification of their decision to pursue a particular method of training in their PEP"

Candidates also demonstrated good practice in their planning of their PEP by completing a PARQ, identifying their component of fitness which they wanted to improve, whilst the higher-level students attempted to explain suitable justifications of their choice in relation to the impact this physical improvement may have on their performance.

Centres need to encourage their candidates to choose specific fitness tests which will allow them to generate data which they can then analyse and state their strengths and weaknesses, not only in their physical capacity, but more specifically in relation to their chosen sport. Comparing both will help the candidate to justify their selection of their component of fitness which they want to improve on. Their analyses of their pre-PEP fitness tests results will, as stated in the specification:

"..determine and justify their choice of training methods and training intensities."

Whilst most candidate did select appropriate training methods and showed use of appropriate principles of training, they did however neglect the justification behind their selections and this ultimately influenced the quality of their evaluations.

Data needs to be generated pre-PEP, during the PEP and Post-Pep. This will give the candidates ample material and opportunity to interpret, analyse and then evaluate. This must be the major focus of the centres for next year. The emphasis for each centre needs to be brought back to the opening lines stated in the specification:

Centre's are advised to give their candidates more autonomy in their selection. Individual guidance for candidates from centres should be encouraged. The best evidence of good practice from the candidates was displayed when they choose one specific component of fitness to improve. A large number of candidates tried to improve in two, three and even four components. A number of candidates looked to improve two components at either end of the training spectrum. Speed and Endurance.

Some candidates appeared to misunderstand the application of SMART targets in the planning of the PEP and merely wrote that their SMART target would be achieved if they saw a numerical improvement in for example the number of sit ups they were able to achieve. However, top performing candidates applied the Principles of Training and SMART targets well and constantly referred to the initial goal and explained whether or not they had achieved it.

Carrying out and monitoring the PEP:

The length of programs varied between 6 – 8 weeks. Most candidates carried out two sessions per week but in some instances some candidates completed only 1 training session per week. All achieved their aim of improving in the fitness test irrespective of the number of sessions completed. Much of the work moderated was fitness test target driven and not performance driven.

Weekly Programmes were evident in most of the PEP's. Frequency of training was displayed also but overload was applied, in most occasions, virtually every week without candidates giving reasons for changes of intensity.

Centre's must encourage their candidates, as stated in specification, "...to adapt their PEP as appropriate, as it progresses...adaptations should be noted and explained ...". Whilst most candidates did state their changes there was no real evidence of analysis or evaluation of their weekly sessions which would then prompt the changes and give reason for making them. Detailed training logs, put in an appendix format and referred to in the body of the assignment to support arguments discussed, are essential evidence to

support the candidates post-PEP analysis, evaluation and recommendations for future training. Adaptations to the logs need to be evaluated with a discussion on how this has impacted on their performance in fitness tests and most importantly their game/physical activity performance. How and why did improvements take place or maybe why and how no improvements took place.

Centres should use the official record sheet for future cohorts. This will ensure they capture all the correct and required data. One of the least understood theories was that of training zones. The number of candidates who trained using a component of fitness which lent itself to collating HR data was significant in numbers, however, evidence of candidates who fully understood the process of how to train within the training zones was minimal.

Evaluation of the PEP:

Most candidates all generated data through their fitness testing results. Data was displayed excellently in graph format and comparisons from initial testing to final testing was attempted in all the samples but no real interpretation from data was generated to allow a discussion to take place on their application of the results on their chosen activity/sport. Though improvements were displayed in the test results the candidates have not evaluated the overall effectiveness of their PEP in relation to their initial aims. Candidates need to evaluate the effectiveness of their PEP, showing supporting evidence, to demonstrate improvements made in their actual performance.

Candidates should be advised in the planning stage to elect an appropriate component of fitness to improve, whilst being a weakness, were they can explain and quantify their improvements in their sport.

Candidates need notational analysis or analytical data generated to support their findings, if the candidate is going to state that their performance has improved or not.

"My leg power has definitely improved and has help me play to a higher ability during my next football match.", "I am very happy with the results. Since I have a lower heart rate compared to first week it means that I'm fitter...", is not specific enough or sufficient evidence to justify the statements. This data generated needs to be analysed and evaluated also with a discussion on how it has affected their sporting performance.

Use of Data:

Data generated from the fitness tests was very prevalent in all the PEP's. However, many candidates just randomly selected tests rather than making them specific towards their chosen activity/sport. Candidates should be encouraged to select appropriate fitness tests (Battery of Tests) that match the specific Components of Fitness relating to their sport. The process of interpretation of results, which was widely neglected by candidates.

General Comments:

Candidates, within a centre, mostly adopted a similar structure which contributed to making their PEP's coherent, but the lower marked candidates used terminology inconsistently with some major errors of judgements displayed. To access higher than level two candidates must look to interpret, analyse and evaluate their PEP, creating a discussion on the effectiveness of their PEP in bringing about their stated aims and the desired changes in fitness and the impact of this on their performance in their chosen sport or activity. A key feature of the lower levels of PEP's was their descriptive nature, with the candidates explaining what they did during their six weeks and then including a lot of information relating to warm-ups, stretches, cool downs and methods/principles of training; rather than the candidate demonstrating their skills of analysing and interpreting data generated Pre-PEP, during PEP and Post-PEP. Higher scoring candidates attempted to link their physical adaptations to the theory they had learnt.

Centres samples were very well organised and only a small minority needed reminders about authentication forms and online printout of marks form signed and dated. All centres sent the ticked candidates work as their sample,

