

CCEA GCE - Sports Science and the Active Leisure Industry
(Summer Series) 2014

Chief Examiner's and Principal Moderator's Report

sports
science
and the active leisure industry

Foreword

This booklet outlines the performance of candidates in all aspects of CCEA's General Certificate of Education (GCE) in Sports Science and the Active Leisure Industry for this series.

CCEA hopes that the Chief Examiner's and/or Principal Moderator's report(s) will be viewed as a helpful and constructive medium to further support teachers and the learning process.

This booklet forms part of the suite of support materials for the specification. Further materials are available from the specification's microsite on our website at www.ccea.org.uk

Contents

Assessment Unit AS 1: Fitness and Training for Sport	3
Assessment Unit AS 2: The Active Leisure Industry: Health, Fitness and Lifestyle	4
Contact details	6

GCE SPORTS SCIENCE AND THE ACTIVE LEISURE INDUSTRY

Principal Moderator's Report

Assessment Unit AS 1 Fitness and Training for Sport

This was the first series for this new qualification and most centres made extensive use of support and portfolio clinic services available.

The standard of work produced for this unit was generally sound. The Candidate Record Sheets (CRS) were completed as required.

Teachers should record the level of help given on the CRS. Independent work is indicative of Mark Band 4. Where the teacher has indicated help has been given Mark Band 4 should not be awarded.

The work produced by candidates was generally of a very high standard and there was clear evidence of centres effectively guiding candidates re: appropriate structure and presentation of portfolios. The majority of centres met the standard set out by CCEA.

It is good practice in centres where more than one teacher is teaching AS Unit 1 to regularly monitor and standardise the candidates' work. Internal standardisation should also highlight that the correct information is clearly stated on the CRS, notably the correct totaling of candidates' marks.

Internal standardisation was evident for most centres and was very useful in assisting the external moderation process.

The standard of marking in this unit was largely accurate and was, in best cases, very well supported by informative annotation. Many centres provided a detailed commentary on the CRS. Unfortunately there were some centres who did not annotate the work to show where assessment objectives had been met. If this could be carried out consistently then it should result in accurate application of the assessment evidence grids.

It is apparent from the high standard of work submitted by many centres that candidates did benefit from the advice given at the portfolio clinics. The sourcing of research was more consistent, following the advice given. However, there were still a significant number of candidates who used the cut and paste method without using quotation marks or crediting the source and who then failed to add their own comments and interpretation. Such work cannot be credited as evidence. It is also important that candidates and centres maintain the depth of evidence required by the specification to show the applied knowledge and understanding needed in this subject.

Assessment Objective 1 (AO1) appears to have been well understood by most candidates and was generally covered very well. Candidates must ensure that all objectives listed in the specification are addressed. This includes risk assessment, first aid, and teaching styles.

Assessment Objective 2 (AO2) was covered quite well. A number of candidates, however, did not provide sufficiently detailed information about their client's specific goals and session plans. It is also important that candidates gather specific information about risk assessment and apply it to their coaching sessions for their client. This is good practice as it prepares them for the issues in the world of work.

Assessment Objective 3 (AO3) highlighted a tendency for a number of candidates to provide a description of the sessions carried out by their client rather than analysing and evaluating the coaching sessions. The evaluation of the training programme ranged from a fully developed clear and coherent explanation of their own and their client's outcomes to some which were rather superficial, lacking clarity and the use of specialist vocabulary. The base line for fitness was not always established and consequently some candidates found it difficult to identify realistic goals. Some candidates did not carry out detailed evaluations and did not make recommendations linked to areas for improvement.

Witness statements are a valuable tool for confirming assessment and standards achieved, providing they are specific to the candidate and not generic. These statements can assist in validating the actual completion of training sessions and the carrying out of risk assessments. Furthermore, the candidate's communication skills, and ability to meet the needs of the client effectively can also be verified in this way.

However, in some cases, there was limited or no evidence to justify marks awarded for the candidate's ability to take an effective session and also how effective they were at communicating with their client.

It is good practice to include a contents list at the beginning and a bibliography at the end of the portfolio.

It is essential that all documentation is correctly completed and teachers should ensure that both they and the candidates sign the Candidate Record Sheet.

I would like to commend all the centres who worked very hard this year to prepare their candidates for the first awarding of this qualification. I also look forward to continued collaboration with existing centres as well as helping new centres in delivering a comprehensive support programme for the coming year.

Chief Examiner's Report

Assessment Unit AS 2 The Active Leisure Industry: Health, Fitness and Lifestyle

This is the first paper for this new specification and most centres made use of support days and portfolio clinics where guidance given to aid coursework submissions were also relevant to the examination.

In general, the candidates performed well in this paper. The paper was accessible to all candidates and there was a full spectrum of performance from 'A-E' across the centres. It was apparent that most centres had prepared their candidates very well and candidates clearly understood the assessment criteria enabling them to access the full range of marks.

- Q1**
- (a)&(b)** These questions were answered well and the majority of candidates scored full marks.
 - (c)** This question was very well answered by most candidates although some candidates included 'stress' as a hypokinetic disease and a few candidates repeated, CHD, heart disease and stroke in their answer.
 - (d)** This question was misinterpreted by some candidates who included exercise initiatives in their answers. This reinforces the need for candidates to be fully conversant with the command words and to look for specific information in

the question. Candidates should be encouraged to read the question carefully before formulating their answer

- Q2**
- (a) Performance in this question was good, however, some candidates identified three factors from the same area: 'Drugs' and lost marks for repetition.
 - (b) Many candidates attained high marks, demonstrating good knowledge and understanding of goal setting. However, some candidates lost marks as a result of repetition. In a few cases, some candidates included information about frequency, intensity, type, progression and tedium which was not correct. Some candidates referred to SMARTER goals which was rewarded.
- Q3**
- (a) This question was well answered with the majority of candidates achieving full marks, demonstrating excellent knowledge of the social and psychological benefits of sport and physical activity.
 - (b) Generally, this question was answered well. However, in some cases it was evident that the candidates who had revised rest and recovery in detail were able to achieve more marks than those who had relied on their general knowledge.
 - (c) A mixed range of responses were observed in relation to this question on circuit training. Some candidates repeated their answers or lacked sufficient explanations to access marks.
 - (d) The majority of candidates scored well in this question, clearly explaining the components of fitness and using sport specific examples.
- Q4**
- (a) Most candidates answered this question well, using realistic examples to support their answers, however, some candidates lost marks as a result of repeating the same safety examples.
 - (b) Whilst some candidates showed good knowledge and understanding of risk assessment, some candidates failed to score beyond Level 1 as they repeated the same information from Question 4(a).
- Q5**
- (a) This question was well answered by the majority of candidates.
 - (b) Most candidates managed to access Level 2 marks. Only a small number of candidates demonstrated the level of analysis and Quality of Written Communication required to achieve a mark at Level 4.

Overall, candidates should be encouraged to read each question carefully before formulating a response and to take great care over writing as legibly as possible to ensure that examiners can award the best possible marks for the work. Candidates should be reminded of the importance of QWC to access higher mark bands in questions requiring extended writing.

Centres must ensure that additional sheets are securely attached to scripts, rather than simply placed inside the candidates' scripts.

Contact details

The following information provides contact details for key staff members:

- Specification Support Officer: Arlene Ashfield
(telephone: (028) 9026 1200, extension 2291, email: aashfield@ccea.org.uk)
- Officer with Subject Responsibility: Peter Davidson
(telephone: (028) 9026 1200, extension 2293, email: pdavidson@ccea.org.uk)