



Pearson  
Edexcel

Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2019

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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

## **Grade Boundaries**

Grade boundaries for all papers can be found on the website at:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

Summer 2019

Publications Code 1PE0\_04\_1906\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

## **Aim and planning analysis**

The majority of candidates identified their activity and defined an aim they wanted to see improved, with most including a fitness related target. Candidates who scored more highly included a performance related target. However, some candidates also stated their aims quite clearly at the beginning of their PEP but offered little to no evidence of interpretation or analysis of their fitness testing data. This ultimately limited the justifications of their choice of their aims or their choice of components of fitness that they wanted to improve and therefore their choice of training methods. Aims should not be stated without any initial analysis or evaluation of their current levels of fitness.

Candidates struggled to gain marks within the higher levels because of the lack of pre-testing or normative data not being used, or a real lack of an evaluative approach to the choices they had made. Best practice is using normative data to identify their strengths along with their weaknesses and then using this information to put in place their training programme. Normative data are not being used and a general assumption of what candidates presumed they would be weak in has already being decided prior to testing taking place, or there is a lack of an evaluative approach to the choices they have made. Centres need to encourage their candidates to choose specific fitness tests, which will allow them to generate data which they can analyse and state their strengths and weaknesses, not only in their physical capacity, but more specifically in relation to their chosen sport. Strengths and weakness must be linked to their chosen sport, comparing both will help the candidate to justify their selection of the component of fitness which they want to improve on.

Many candidates listed too many of principles and methods of training and SMART principles. Candidates who took a descriptive approach could only access the lower levels of the assessment criteria. Best practice was shown by candidates who selected principles that could then be commented upon in-depth in an evaluation covering the impact that these alterations to training are likely to have on performance, by focussing primarily on one method of training and providing appropriate justification for their choices related to their chosen sport. In future series, centres must emphasise these points to their candidates to enable access to the higher levels of 4 and 5. Judgements, arguments for and against selections of methods of training and appropriate prioritised fitness tests and principles of training to meet the candidate's performance goals/targets are vital if candidates are to show their evaluation skills.

Candidates who offered a benchmark for their sporting performance did so by collecting meaningful notational data that could then be compared post training to note the level of improvement in an objective fashion. This would enable candidates an opportunity to access the higher levels. A lot of candidates appeared to choose a relevant method of training to

support the component of fitness but appeared to overlook referring to this training method selection coming from a selection of other methods which have been considered and discounted. The majority of candidates know what smart targets are and the principles of training however all but top level candidates find them hard to apply effectively and as a consequence the work in this strand remains mostly descriptive.

### **Carrying out and monitoring the PEP**

Most candidates completed a training programme of sufficient length as outlined in the specification and the majority of centres have candidates record the data on the official training record form. Where session plans were written up, the extent to which measurements were taken other than HR scores was limited i.e. lack of detail of work to rest ratios, number of repetitions etc. Candidates were very inconsistent in making their full array of training sessions available in the appendix section of the PEP with copious centres not including them at all.

Centres 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. Centres must emphasise to their candidates that omissions in this area will limit the top end students accessing those upper levels of 4 and 5 in the third and fourth bullet points of the assessment criteria. 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.

### **Evaluation of the PEP**

Some candidates' evaluations did attempt to focus on the effectiveness of the PEP in bringing about their stated aim in relation to the desired changes in fitness. However, fewer candidates then linked this to the impact on performance. Some pre and post PEP data was collected and included in the work. The higher ability candidates produced graphs of the fitness test results clearly showing the difference in achievement. To access the higher-level marks, comparison of collected data in relation to a measurable area of sporting performance should have also been evidenced. The majority of candidates made only limited attempts at an evaluation of the training methods and principles with some recommendations given but

many lacked enough detail to access marks in the higher levels. Some candidates included a limited evaluation of their smart targets within their evaluation but little discussion was had about the positives of smart targets and the impact these targets had upon their training. Candidates lacked any real evaluation/justification for the principles and methods of training chosen and more importantly the successes and limitations gained from these choices and the resultant impact it had on the performance within their chosen sport. Comments such as 'I want to last 90 minutes after completing my PEP' and then at the end comments like 'I feel fitter' were also quite common; centres must look to encourage their candidates to evaluate their post PEP sporting performance with data driven evidence. Many candidates still do not include recommendations for future performance. A common practice is for candidates to only make references to recommendations for training.

### **The use of data**

Data generated from the fitness tests was prevalent in all the PEP's. Candidates did select appropriate fitness tests (Battery of Tests) that matched the specific Components of Fitness relating to their sport. These were prioritised by the top band candidates in this area. Candidates did display their data and both strengths and weaknesses were highlighted. However, candidates in the future series must be encouraged to select one (minimum) of the weaknesses, justified by the data, and structure their PEP around improving this weakness. Candidates should not only evaluate their Fitness Testing scores, but also use the data collected in their activity/sporting performance to feed back into the evaluation of the PEP.

### **General comment**

Centres should promote the work as being a personalised document. In future series, centres need to address the process of candidates analysing and evaluating their actual activity/performance. Candidates should be guided by the centre at the beginning of the PEP and after selecting the component of fitness, they need to improve on how supporting evidence and data justifies their analysis and evaluation outcomes. Candidates must be encouraged by their centre to link their selected component of fitness, which should be one of their weaknesses from their Pre-PEP fitness test analysis, to improve a specific and appropriate element of their activity/sporting performance. Candidates who select an individual sport find it easier to set targets, but game players need guidance in this area. Centres should aim to move away from having all candidates identifying the same component of training and the same method of training. Centres are also reminded that the word count is 1500 words. Graphs and data in boxes do not count towards the final word count, but the candidate's own words in boxes are part of the total word count.

It is hoped that this report will prove to be positive and constructive in helping to raise achievement in future series.

Centres are to be congratulated on their continued efforts to adjust to the current specification and for the professional approach by most centres and students which have made this a successful moderation series.

Thank you to all for your positive contribution and hard work in making a success of this second moderation series.