

Examiner's Report

June 2010

GCE

GCE Physical Education 6PE02/1A

Unit 2 - The Critical Sports Performer

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

June 2010

Publications Code US024528

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2010

Unit 2 - The Critical Sports Performer

Centres were given freedom to select their own preferred assessment pathway. Centres could opt either to take part in a cluster moderation or to submit candidates work via e-portfolio for Tasks 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3. Task 2.4 was moderated externally, centres could submit either an electronic or a hard-copy of their work.

Task 2.1 - Personal Performance

Player/Participant

Generally practical performance grades were marked well, with strong video evidence to back up performances. The standard of practical performances varied from good to excellent, with most candidates being marked within the correct band. The standard and amount of compulsory evidence, however, varied significantly.

The best candidates included an introduction to their diary/log of 8+ weeks explaining the standard of play they had achieved utilising, where appropriate, the AS standard tables which give specific time[s]/distances and/or adjectives explaining their performance eg a high, consistent level of performance was achieved in regional competition[s] which were detailed and analysed. Some logs included short term preparation for an event e.g. warm up for a game and with the three analyses of performances, long term planning to maintain and improve their standard of performance. This planning referred to physiological, technical, tactical and psychological application of knowledge as it related to their performance. Concluding the log the students explained their strengths / weaknesses and plans to develop their performance in their sport.

To accompany the above information the Teacher Assessor included the rationale for explaining the mark awarded eg the student was a regional swimmer. The Teacher Assessor authenticated the times and training log and confirmed that the student had applied appropriate knowledge to improve their performance. This was very helpful. A handful of portfolios included only a statement from the centre, no video and no compulsory evidence. There were no marks awarded as a result of submitting no evidence.

Centres must ensure that whichever form of assessment is submitted, it must meet the requirements as stated in the specification and in the Internal Assessment Guide available online. If submitting e-portfolios staff should be mindful that the moderator does not know their candidates or their ability. If centre staff feel that the evidence due to be submitted does not do the candidate justice, then they should advise their candidates how this could be supplemented. Whilst video is not compulsory, being able to see the candidate perform, even through photo stills, gives the moderator a clearer indication of their ability. This however, needs to be the candidate's responsibility especially in larger centres.

Leadership

It is clear that students have undertaken leadership courses and show at least an 8 week involvement in this. However, as with the performance role, the aim of the task is to show improvement throughout this period. Very few candidates, if any, have grasped this and this is an area for development. They need to consider leadership as a journey. How well do they communicate instructions at the start of the course and how has this been improved over the period of time? What involvement have they had with teams/sport or activities during the 8 weeks and how have the participants benefited from their input?

Candidates have tended to record only what they have done with varying levels of efficiency. Session plans need to be submitted in sufficient detail. They need to do at least three analyses of their performance to complete the requirements of the specification. This is an area for improvement for the coming year. Where candidates have attended a level one coaching course, in many cases (not all), this is attendance based. Therefore this should not replace other evidence to show what level they can lead/coach a specific activity.

Officiating

Centres must ensure that candidates produce sufficient evidence of their officiating activity. Some candidates have undertaken NGB courses but they also need to show that they have used these. This should include scorecards plus photo or visual evidence. They also need to analyse their progression as an official, as they would a leader or a player/participant. They must also ensure that they include the compulsory risk assessments which should be age and ability appropriate.

Overall this is generally marked well and candidates are prepared for the assessment. It is a concern where all candidates in a centre are entered for the same sport/activity as their second role as this is not beneficial to them individually.

Task 2.2 - Local Study

This was generally well marked. Some centres, however, still do not ensure that students explain grass root development of their sport for all 3 roles i.e. player/participant, leader and official. This should include FUNDamentals with appropriate provision (facilities and mini game/s), resources (equipment), opportunity in local clubs; private and public, and the cooperation being developed through PESSCLs (Physical Education, School, Sport and Club Links). Information supplied was often vague and students should include local examples. Reference was made to gender and disabled issues. It is also worrying that candidates do not include schools in their grassroots section.

Task 2.3 - National Study

Candidates are required to demonstrate a high level of knowledge of ONE aspect from: performer, leader or official. Many students attempted to include information on all three.

Most candidates did follow the development from the initial elite stage through academies to professional performer / international athlete. Differences between genders were well referenced for football but not other sports. The majority of candidates did not include sufficient detail on the opportunities for elite disabled sports people. Rarely were opportunities to develop their selected sport within Higher Education included.

All the candidates included a conclusion. Few were critical of the pathway of their sport e.g. explaining possible development for a footballer who is injured at 18 years of age or not selected for the next stage or reaching the end of their career.

For both tasks 2.2 and 2.3 some centres are still advising their students to include additional information in the appendixes and are therefore exceeding the 1,000 word limit. The skill of both of these tasks is to research a vast amount of information and then be able to recount it succinctly. The use of tables and diagrams helps vastly with explaining things in fewer words. Centre staff should ensure that they are signing for the 'actual' word count on the CRAF as this in many cases is not adhered to.

Where candidates have chosen to submit a power point presentation it would be useful to have a feedback sheet or a video of the presentation. The word count still applies but this form of presentation is, or should be, far more verbal and therefore less information on the slides. There is further guidance on PowerPoint presentations available in the Instructions for the Conduct of Examinations (ICE) document available online. Some centres did send videos of the presentations being done but this tended to be candidates reading out the slides to the class. This is not a presentation and so centre staff need to be mindful of the format chosen for submission.

Administrative Matters:

Some centres are still not sending the highest and lowest candidate's work to be moderated. There is also still a problem with not being able to open certain file types and thereby preventing the work from being moderated. It is recommended that files are saved in generic file types, please refer to the new Instructions for the Conduct of the Examination and Coursework (ICE) document for further guidance on this.

Grade Boundaries:

Unit 2:

Grade	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	N	U
Raw Mark	90	79	70	62	54	46	38	0
UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	30	0

Unit 4:

Grade	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	N	U
Raw Mark	90	84	78	68	59	50	41	32	0
UMS	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	0

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code US024528 Summer 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH