

Moderators' Report/ Principal Moderator Feedback

June 2011

GCE Physical Education (6PE02)
Paper 1E/1V & 1B

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 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/>

Alternatively, you can contact our PE and Sport Subject Advisor directly by sending an email to PEandSportSubjectAdvisor@edexcel.com.

You can also telephone 0844 576 0036 to speak to a member of our subject advisor team.

June 2011

Publications Code US028528

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2011

GCE Physical Education 8536

Units 6PE02

Advanced Subsidiary Tasks: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4

This report will review moderation of coursework tasks for the examination series 2011. This will be for centres that either submitted coursework for the purposes of moderation of component 1V/E (through cluster moderations (1V)), or E-portfolios ((1E) and component 1B, external moderation). Centres are thanked for their support and punctilious administration this examination series.

General Comments:

This year has produced a successful series of cluster moderations, E-portfolio submissions as well as external moderation of some tasks. Centres, however, must be diligent in ensuring all CRAF, OPTEMs and electronic storage mediums, are sent to the moderation teams by the given deadlines. In most cases all administration requirements were completed successfully. The issues relating to confusion over the correct OPTEMs form for each component that were seen last year have now been resolved. Plagiarism of Tasks has once again been evident in some task submissions and centres are advised to not only give specific, exact and clear instructions to their candidates over such issues but also to thoroughly check all coursework prior to submission.

Centres are reminded that all candidates should make available the 'Performance Portfolio' for every candidate in each role even when involved in a cluster 'live' moderation. It is accepted that the depth of this will not be as detailed as those candidates electing for E-portfolio moderation. All off site activities should have both the compulsory and supplementary evidence to support the quality of a performance. This year's moderation highlighted this to be an issue for candidates undertaking leadership and officiating roles.

For some tasks, the specified word count limits are still being ignored and as a consequence adjustments in the marks awarded through moderation have occurred. In addition, two issues have emerged in greater numbers this year - firstly, there appears to be an increasing habit of including vast amounts of additional research material which does not form part of the moderation and is therefore both unnecessary and irrelevant and contained in the appendices. This section should only contain specific content relating to a set section; inclusion as defined by the assessment criteria and by way of reference in the text of the specific task. The second issue is including significant continuous narrative in text boxes as a way of circumventing a word count limit. For Tasks 2.2 and 2.3, text boxes may only be used for case studies which are by nature essentially only factual.

International centres submitting E-portfolio evidence should be aware that there has been some evidence from this year's moderation that they have the biggest issue with over-marking by centre staff. They are therefore advised to read carefully their own E9 report and to scrutinise the Ice document, the IAG and seek additional clarity of assessment through the 'Ask The Expert' Service.

Tasks 2.1 - Performance Roles

Host centres for live cluster moderations were generally well organised and had suitable resources and facilities for the processes to be completed. Candidates were well prepared for the practical work and the general standard was good to very high. This was invariably reflective where centre staff led activities and the drills and activities were sufficiently challenging enough to allow candidates of all abilities to demonstrate a range of key skills and techniques in structured practices and small sided games. The practical performances were generally well marked by centres with a few notable exceptions. The best performances often depended on the quality of the practical sessions put on by clusters. It is suggested that those staff responsible for the setting of the activities within a moderation session could inform the moderators what the practical sessions will include before the day so that they can be sure that they are suitable and stretch the better candidates.

The same level of structure and practices cannot be said for some centres moderated from overseas. These were not of the same calibre. The practices shown were very basic and did not allow those higher marked and more able candidates to display clear high level performances by comparison to others.

It was evident that more centres have chosen for their candidates to offer two practical roles for Unit 2 and a single practical performance for Unit 4. However, it is pleasing to report that candidates who are interested in sport but are not the best performers can still access the top marks by being good leaders/officials.

Those candidates undertaking the role of either a leader and/or an official in many cases were involved in the delivery of the practical work. Leaders were involved in leading warm up activities and introductory practices and in some cases a cool down session; officials refereed/umpired the final game activities. In most cases this quickly allowed the visiting moderator to see at first hand the confidence (or otherwise lack of) candidates in these two roles. At times though the abilities of these candidates did not allow for the practices to run at a sufficiently high standard and therefore a recommendation to centres is that they must prepare their candidates to work at A' level standard.

Contributions to the practical work were followed by a question and answer sessions and presentation of their Performance Portfolio, which is mandatory. The best examples included signed testimonials from coaches with recognised NGB qualifications, some video evidence which all helped detailing the *quality* of such performances. In addition, 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, e.g. a high, consistent level of performance was achieved in regional competition[s] which were detailed and analysed.

The log could also include the 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 student maybe able to explained their strengths/weaknesses and plans to develop their performance in their sport.

To accompany the above information the Teacher Examiner can explain the rational for explaining the mark awarded, e.g. the student was a regional swimmer, authenticated the times and training log and endorsed the student had applied appropriate knowledge to improve their performance. The best centres included a qualitative assessment which included statements on organisation, motivation, communication, knowledge of the sport; appropriately developing the session to the strengths and weaknesses of the group in the environment of that moment. Some outstanding candidates were observed and they made a difference to the performance of their subjects in the time allocated.

Where the 'leader' role was over-marked, candidates led poor quality sessions or presented poor quality session plans, with little self evaluation, no objective testimonials or relevant NGB coaching awards; there was tendency to rely on teacher's testimonials based on the character of the students rather than the quality of their leadership skills. There were fewer candidates offering the 'official' role with some outstanding students officiating at quite high levels of competition. The higher marked students grasped that pre-planning is vitally important to the quality of coaching sessions.

Centres are reminded that in a few cases they 'mixed up' the Leadership and Official roles, submitting marks for students for leadership but were actually acting as officials at competitions. It is imperative that students are given the correct guidance during the planning stages of heir roles as in some cases they subsequently failed to achieve the marks they were potentially able to.

The quality of the e-portfolio evidence is improving but some centres are repeating the errors that they made last year, but this is declining. However, there has been some evidence E-portfolio moderations have been more problematic. Much depends on the level of support given to candidates by centre staff. The best quality submissions come from centres where staff have been on training courses, read the E9 report forms and as a consequence understood correctly what is required and expected of their candidates.

Video evidence occasionally left much to be desired although this varied considerably as many centres provided excellent supporting evidence. Some centres have failed to provide additional supplementary evidence which is so helpful in arriving at marking levels. This is paramount when assessing the quality of a candidate's performance. Centres are reminded to read the additional guidance in the Edexcel ICE document in terms of the suggested length and quality of video evidence. Some centres have made good use of advanced software like Dartfish - although such softwares are not required to access the top grades.

Officiating

Officials were moderated in only a few sports. Where possible they had taken the NGB award, completed an eight week log and included critiques of their decision-making, umpiring or refereeing. Officials can include more senior coach observations, video clips and any NGB documentation. Invariably the more able candidates showed confidence, clear knowledge and understanding of the laws/rules of play and had a positive interaction with other performers. Weaker officials were unable to affect, control and administer all of the listed qualities.

Task 2.2 Local Study

This task was generally satisfactorily completed but in many cases there is little evidence shown or reported on the actual 'local provision'. Tasks are often too general demonstrating a lack of research of the 'nuts' and 'bolts' that make the sports work locally. Some centres still do not ensure that their students explain grass root development of their sport with appropriate provision (facilities and mini game{s}), resources [equipment], opportunity in local clubs (private and public) and the co-operation that had been developed through PESSCLs and the CSCs provision. The funding access for these facilities and opportunities should relate to the present economic situation. Most candidates included reference to all three performance roles while concentrating on one main role.

Only the top band students included information on LTAD and a critical conclusion on their findings. Some of the Information supplied was often vague and students are reminded of the need to include local examples to support the points they are making. References to gender and disabled issues were covered but the absence of an element of provision was often accepted by centres as sufficient to award a mark for: "there aren't any provisions for disabled people to play.... in my local area". If this is the case, then the next step for candidates is to critically analyse why this might be the case rather than accept that a brief 'search' had failed to yield any results. In some instances candidates submitted information that was incorrect and clearly the Teacher Examiner must be more diligent when assessing candidate's tasks.

As a result some candidates are awarded 15 marks for the volume of evidence produced rather than the accuracy and the quality of comment in the task and the critical analysis provided. The appendix section now seems to dominate the task and centres are reminded this is not included in the moderation process, and only a point of reference. There was some confusion apparent with the term 'first level elite' which sometimes led to the inclusion of irrelevant information best saved for Task 2.3. There is, however, an overlap between Task 2,2 and 2,3 at this level. Overall, the best candidates did this Task well and appeared well informed and knowledgeable about provisions in the locality.

Centres are reminded to ensure the word count total is included on the CRAF forms and that centre staff and candidates are reminded that the signing of the authentication sheet reflects an agreement to complete the task within the 1000 word count limit.

Task 2.3 National Study

Most students followed 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 and this is reflective of the availability of information. Many students 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. The use of the LTAD model can help in this task.

While nearly all 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.

Again, it needs to be reiterated that this is a study about how to progress from their details, the pathways and structures involved; therefore the pathways should be about their area, region and national route rather than a simple generic one. Where the task was not completed successfully, the information researched, was presented in general terms with little critical analysis offered. 'Mainstream' sports with clear pathways, academies and representative structures were common and the same information was accessed by large numbers of students. The majority of candidates chose 'performing' as the role in this task without really examining what is going on in the sport at the elite levels.

There was in some lower marked tasks a clear lack of structure from a number of centres with the work presented, appearing as a 'block of text' with few, if any headings and this made the process of moderation difficult in deciding where marks had been awarded. Only a few candidates really examined the provision for the 'disabled' or other 'gender' depending on the sport and critical analysis was limited.

6PE02: Component 1B

By way of general comment it can be highlighted that for many centres their level of assessment and subsequent marking was generous especially in the Tactical and Training analysis Tasks. It is suggested they read carefully the feedback given on each centre E9 report. A large majority of centres submitted multiples of documents for each assignment, for example four documents for each core skill, one for an introduction and another for the bibliography, totalling six for one task. It is recommended to all centres that they assimilate all the information into one document per Task.

Task 2.4.1 Technical Analysis

Overall, this remains the best produced of the five tasks. Candidates have produced detailed work which included annotated diagrams, links to perfect models and in the higher marked tasks elite model comparisons. Several candidates included video clips but these were not very well contextualised in the text and most centres marked this task accurately. The majority of the work was of a high standard and centres had clearly spent considerable time

on this Task and candidates had been well guided. Most candidates identified the appropriate four core skills.

Some candidates however, failed to break each skill down into phases. For a number of candidates there was a significant lack of mechanical and physiological analysis and where it did exist it was fairly basic with little flow between the phases. The majority of candidates provided visual evidence of themselves' and made comparisons of their experiences to elite performers, which enhanced their critical analysis. Candidates are reminded of the need to offer a tactical application of each skill and to work through the three phases of preparation, execution and recovery. A few centres were still generous in marking this Task.

Overall, this was probably the most accomplished areas of the performance analysis.

Task 2.4.2 Tactical Analysis

The tactical analysis tasks were less well completed with only a small majority who addressed this task to a very high standard and much of the work presented was descriptive and lacked serious analytical detail. The work varied with some of it of a high standard and some was clearly the result of a 'cut and paste' process. Visual evidence was often used but rarely referenced properly. At its best this work was well researched and written but where no reference was made to technical journals, nor elite level performances, candidates struggled in many cases to produce work of sufficient quality to justify the marks awarded by centres, which was sometimes over-marked.

Some candidates took work directly from www.talkfootball.com with no reference to that web site in their work. Centres need to be aware of this and use advanced scholar on Google to identify 'lifting' of work by students. Marking was generally accurate.

Many failed to address the full variety of different tactics available in their activity. Some approached the task inappropriately; for example, some candidates only included match analyses or only focused on one type of tactic or included a simple tactical match review. There was a significant lack of comparative analysis to elite tactics which prevented candidates gaining the higher marks. A number of centres included pages of rules that had no link to tactics and were not relevant to the completion of this task. Candidates should include a court/pitch diagram, individual position tactics, the differences in singles and doubles for rackets sports, set plays and formation variations.

Task 2.4.3 Notational Analysis

There were very few candidates who had not completed the required three notations. Most covered both personal and elite levels as an option. However many merely summarised and described the outcome - few neither got to grips with the analysis of the notations nor outlined an action plan. Although most candidates understood what the Task involved few scored in the top band as the work lacked depth and technical language. Centres may need to support candidates better here in terms of how to analyse the data collected

and in turn how that might support improving individual /unit / team performance. Marking was variable for this task. A final summative review with a proposed action plan based on the findings from their notations is always required.

2.4.4 Training Analysis

As previously, much of this work comprised descriptions of training sessions or simple logs. There was little consideration of fitness components, training methods/application of principles, appropriate testing and how to raise performance standards through training and frequently very little analysis. Where candidates provided a log of their training it was invariably at best was very basic and descriptive rather than analytical. Many did not comment on the testing they had completed and how this ranked to normative tables.

Few compared training to elite performers and from their own performance data of test results what they need to do to move onto the next level of performance. Few candidates scored really well on this task which was occasionally over marked. Candidates are free to apply their knowledge and understanding of energy systems, dietary modifications and other related issues such as periodisation to this task.

Most candidates therefore failed to provide extension into the detailed analyses of training regarding technical, tactical, physiological and psychological training. Centres over marked this Task.

Task 2.4.5 Analysis of Strengths and Weaknesses

Although a number of candidates did well in the completion of this Task many failed to include a wide range of test and performance data thereby supporting subjective analysis with objective conclusions. Some candidates, although few, provided a detailed analysis of strengths and weaknesses comparing their own performance to the perfect model and addressing in detail the areas in the specification: physiological, technical, psychological and tactical. However, there was a significant lack of quantifiable evidence and also visual evidence of candidates performing, compared to the perfect model and where candidates lacked detail in their technical analysis of strengths and weaknesses.

Using personal profiles and evidence from peer/coach assessments can cover a range of technical, mechanical, physiological and tactical components. Few linked this Task to the information from the other 4 Tasks and then to the A2 Development Plan where evidence to say how the candidate will develop a strategy to improve weaknesses must be included in the outline. Weaker candidates produced work that was vague and lacking in technical language. Marking was variable and candidates can use a variety of presentation mediums in order to give a depth to this task.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link: <http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code US028528June 2011

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

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

