

CCEA GCE - Sports Science and the Active Leisure Industry  
Summer Series 2016

# 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](http://www.ccea.org.uk)



## Contents

<b>Assessment Unit AS 1:</b>	<b>Fitness and Training for Sport</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Assessment Unit AS 2:</b>	<b>The Active Leisure Industry: Health, Fitness and Lifetsyle</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Assessment Unit A2 1:</b>	<b>Event Management in the Active Leisure Industry</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Assessment Unit A2 2:</b>	<b>The Application of Science to Sports Performance</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Contact details</b>		<b>11</b>



# **GCE SPORTS SCIENCE AND THE ACTIVE LEISURE INDUSTRY**

## **Principal Moderator's Report**

### **Assessment Unit AS 1 Fitness and Training for Sport**

The GCE Sports Science and the Active Leisure Industry qualification continued to grow in 2016 with 27 centres involved in the AS level examination series. Once again centres must be congratulated for their expertise and diligence in preparing candidates for this qualification. Paperwork for the moderation process was generally correct and the detailed completion of the newly introduced E-Moderation candidate record sheets greatly assisted the moderation process.

The marking of the portfolios in a majority of the centres was sufficiently accurate to meet the agreed standard. However the marking was too generous to meet the agreed standard in a few centres. Task 1 and Task 3 were generally marked to the agreed standard by all the centres; however the marking of Task 2 did not meet the agreed standard in a number of centres.

The quality of the annotation on the portfolios showing where and why marks had been awarded varied greatly. Detailed annotation, supported by witness statements, greatly assists the moderation process and helps to justify to the moderator the mark awarded by the centre.

A number of areas were identified during the moderation process that centres may wish to consider for future work.

#### **Standard of work**

The sample of portfolios submitted continued the high standards demonstrated in previous years. This reflected the guidance given by centres and the hard work undertaken by many candidates. Centres produced work that allowed candidates to access the higher mark bands and reflected very good understanding of the assessment objectives.

#### **Presentation of work**

The form of presentation of work by a number of centres made the moderation process difficult. The use of lever arch files, poly pockets and loose leaf work in document wallets presents difficulties for the moderator and must be avoided. Portfolios must be bound and show the candidate and centre numbers clearly on the front cover.

The use of a contents page and accurate page numbering also assists the moderator to find and identify work in the portfolio.

#### **Annotation of the portfolios**

The internal standardisation and level of annotation by centres was generally very good, however in a minority of centres it was inadequate. Detailed annotation of the portfolios showing assessment objectives and levels indicates clearly where and why marks have been awarded. This is of great assistance to the moderator and provides evidence of the centre's understanding of the assessment criteria for this unit.

A very small number of portfolios showed no evidence of marking, whilst a simple tick was used by a number of centres to mark their portfolios.

## Witness statements and supporting documentation

The detailed completion of the eCandidate Record Sheet helped the moderation process. The inclusion of other supporting documentation by a majority of centres was evidence of good practice. All centres included 'teacher witness statements' for Task 3, but a minority of centres included similar documents for fitness testing in Task 1 or the Training Programme in Task 2. Such documentation is important to support the candidate's analysis and evaluation of their performance in all three tasks and substantiate the mark awarded.

A number of centres provided detailed information on the marks awarded through the inclusion of a marking 'matrix' sheet. These sheets are a valuable resource for both the teacher and the moderator; as such their use is strongly recommended.

## Structure and organisation of work

The majority of the centres presented well organised work which assisted the moderation process. However; although there is no set structure for the completion and organisation of the portfolios; a number of centres would benefit from a more 'holistic' approach to the organisation of their work.

For the Assessment Objective 1 (Knowledge and Understanding) section of Task 3, please note: preparation and planning is key to the successful delivery and evaluation of the training programme in Task 2. Many centres included the theory of teaching/instructing styles, anatomy and physiology at the start of Task 3, whereas, this information was required for the completion of Task 2. The Assessment Objective 1 section of Task 3 should be much more specific to the required detailed sessions.

The portfolio is a substantial piece of work and requires considerable time and effort for the completion of the required planning, performing and evaluation processes. A minority of centres presented excessive amounts of work, some of which was not required or was very repetitive.

## Application of knowledge and understanding

There were a number of areas where there was evidence of weaknesses in the application of knowledge and understanding by weaker candidates. Examples of this include:

- Candidates not applying reliability, validity, advantages and disadvantages to the individual fitness tests they conducted.
- Many candidates used a generalised repetitive (cut and paste) outline for each of the tests.
- There was limited application of appropriate training and monitoring methods in the training programme.
- A minority of sessions were either too hard or too easy for their client; or were not suitable to achieve the aims for the session/programme.
- A small minority of candidates did not include a complete training programme within their portfolio. The specification for the unit requires a 6–8 week training programme, involving the delivery of 2 or 3 sessions per week. Therefore, the minimum number of sessions included in the training programme will be 12.
- Finally; there was a lack of application of training and instruction theory to the methods and techniques used in the three detailed sessions required for Task 3.

The training log required for the Assessment Objective 2 section of Task 2 is the largest single section within the assessment criteria, accounting for 24% of the total marks for the portfolio. Candidates must produce detailed evidence of criteria identified in the assessment objectives, this includes areas such as planning, training methods, monitoring, progressive overload to access the higher mark bands.

## Repetition of work

As in previous years there was repetition of work in areas such as first aid, risk assessment, warm-up/cool-down and individual training sessions. The use of 'cut and paste' may be appropriate for some information within the portfolio but widespread use of this method is discouraged.

## The needs of the client

The needs of the client were quite well identified and taken into consideration. Many 'clients' were heavily involved in school and/or representative sport and their training programmes were designed accordingly with recovery sessions incorporated into their schedules. This showed good understanding of the principles of training and client safety.

## Evaluations

The quality of the Assessment Objective 3 Analysis and evaluation work has improved throughout all three tasks. Evaluations must identify salient points and explain the reasons behind these points. It is good practice to evaluate all training sessions as this will assist in accessing higher marks, however there was excessive amounts of repetitive (cut and paste) evaluative work in some portfolios.

## Key points to note:

- The use of witness statements to provide collaborative evidence for fitness testing, training sessions and quality of instruction.
- The correct application of the principles and methods of training to the training programme is where the majority of marks are lost.
- Annotation to indicate where and why marks have been awarded in the portfolio.
- Please ensure the portfolios are bound, but do not use lever arch files.

## Chief Examiner's Report

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

This is the third series of this specification and the majority of centres made use of the support days where guidance regarding the applied nature of the examination was given.

This paper was accessible to all candidates and there was a full range of performance from grade A to E across the centres. Most candidates demonstrated sound knowledge of the specification and were able to apply their understanding to the questions.

- Q1** (a) This question was generally answered well, with many scoring full marks.
- (b) The majority of candidates answered the question well, however a few repeated information for both positive and negative effects or included information regarding physical effects.
- (c) Whilst many candidates demonstrated their knowledge and understanding of the components of fitness, many could have gained full marks by providing an explanation instead of a general response.
- (d) This question was answered well by the majority of candidates. A significant number gained Level 2 marks and all are reminded of the importance of sentence structure and composition, punctuation and use of specialist vocabulary in banded responses, where the QWC is considered in awarding marks.
- Q2** (a) Candidates generally had a good understanding of the training methods, with many gaining full marks for providing detailed information.
- (b) (i) Many candidates demonstrated good knowledge and understanding regarding the types of stretching. However, some could have gained full marks by improving their explanation of each type of stretching used by an athlete.
- (ii) This was answered well by the majority of candidates and very few scored zero marks.
- Q3** (a) The majority of candidates scored well in this question, clearly identifying and explaining the dietary considerations for a power athlete.
- (b) This question was answered well, however a significant number of candidates failed to gain full marks as they repeated the same information from Question 3(a).
- (c) This question was answered well by the majority of candidates and very few scored zero marks.
- (d) This question invited a broad spectrum of answers which was evident from the responses seen. The candidates who focused on specific government initiatives accessed full marks. There were a significant number who focused on community or business based initiatives, which could not be awarded marks.
- Q4** (a) A significant number of candidates failed to gain full marks in this question. Some candidates repeated information regarding resources in all three parts of answer, this limited the marks that could be awarded for this question.
- (b) In general, this question was answered well. However, for some, poor QWC prevented access to Level 3 marks. Candidates are reminded that the quality of their written communication is a key factor in accessing the higher level in extended responses.
- Q5** (a) A significant number of candidates failed to gain full marks in this question because they did not refer to a European Country or they focused, incorrectly, on the UK. Some of the answers provided were vague and candidates did not outline a specific initiative.
- (b) Some candidates provided basic responses to this question. Candidates focused on the increase of obesity and other hypokinetic diseases and continued to repeat the impact this would have on the NHS throughout the answer. This resulted in limited marks being awarded. A few candidates achieved top band marks as they provided detailed responses, demonstrating excellent QWC and extending writing skills.

Centres should note the following general points for the next series:

Candidates should be encouraged to read each question carefully before formulating a response and to write as legibly as possible to ensure that examiners can clearly understand the answer given and award the best possible mark. 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 candidate's script and to make sure that the question number is included on the page.

We have seen a year on year improvement in all aspects of the delivery of this qualification and teachers are to be commended for their efforts in ensuring that candidates are well prepared for the exam and submit high quality coursework.

## Principal Moderator's Report

### Assessment Unit A2 1 Event Management in the Active Leisure Industry

The GCE Sports Science and the Active Leisure Industry qualification continued to grow in 2016 with 16 centres involved in the A2 level examination series. Once again centres must be congratulated for their diligence in preparing candidates for this qualification.

Paperwork for the moderation process was generally correct and the detailed completion of the newly introduced E-Moderation candidate record sheets greatly assisted the moderation process. There was excellent evidence of research, planning, organisational and evaluative skills in a majority of centres.

The marking of the portfolios in a majority of the centres was sufficiently accurate to meet the agreed standard; however the marking was too generous to meet the agreed standard in a few centres and too harsh in a minority of centres.

The quality of the annotation on the portfolios to show where and why marks have been awarded varied greatly. Detailed annotation, supported by witness statements, greatly assists the moderation process by showing appropriate application of the agreed assessment criteria for the required assessment objectives.

A number of areas were identified during the moderation process that centres may wish to consider for future work.

#### The event

The candidates and centres must be congratulated for the highly imaginative and successful events undertaken in completing the requirements for this unit. Once again a number of centres used the events to raise money for different charities, whilst not essential this is commended.

The quality of the event is more important than the size or complexity of the event; it is the process of event management that is being assessed. The quality of the event is vital if candidates are to access the higher mark bands. A number of the events did not allow candidates to provide enough individual evidence of their contribution before, during and after the event to access these higher mark bands.

Group size is vital for candidates to be able to provide enough individual evidence of their contribution. Attention is drawn to page 15, paragraph 2 the specifications for this unit:

‘Although the activity is a group event, each student must produce their own internal assessment portfolio. We advise a group size of 4–8 students.’

In larger centres where two or more events were organised, standardisation of the different events must take place to ensure all candidates have an equal chance of accessing the higher mark bands. This was apparent in most of the centres where multiple events were organised, but in a minority of centres there appeared to be inequalities.

## **Presentation of work**

The form of presentation of work by a number of centres made the moderation of this work difficult. The use of lever arch files, poly pockets and loose leaf work in document wallets presents difficulties for the moderator and must be avoided. Portfolios must be bound and show clearly the candidate and centre numbers on the front cover.

The use of a contents page and accurate page numbering also assists the moderator to find and identify work in the portfolio. This will also help candidates to organise their work and help teachers in the time consuming marking process.

The annotation by teachers on the portfolios varied from a simple ‘tick’ to detailed identification of assessment objectives and levels. Annotation showing where and why marks have been awarded greatly assists the moderation process and provides evidence of the centres understanding of the assessment criteria for the unit.

A number of centres provided detailed information on the marks awarded through the inclusion of a marking ‘matrix’ sheet. These sheets are a valuable resource for both the teacher and the moderator; as such their use is strongly recommended.

## **Task One      Researching and planning an active leisure event**

Candidates must show ‘Excellent knowledge of the key components of the Leisure Industry’ to access Level 4. Excellent marks for this section. Level 4 marks were awarded by a number of centres for work that was not of this standard. Insufficient background detail along with limited local examples and up-to-date statistics was provided.

A small minority of candidates did not present an individual feasibility study as required by the specification for this unit. A larger number of candidates provided insufficient evidence of their knowledge and understanding of event planning before presenting their feasibility study. The ‘AO1: Knowledge of the event’ section of Task 1 provides the knowledge and understanding for Task 1 and Task 2. Marks are not awarded for Assessment Objective 1 in Task 2 but may be awarded on a ‘holistic’ basis in Task 1.

The selection process for the chosen group event was well done in a majority of centres. Appropriate selection methods were outlined and applied, justifying the selection of the event.

## **Task Two      Working as part of a group to organise an active leisure event**

Some information; such as marketing, risk assessment, legal considerations and staffing was copied from Task 1 into Task 2 rather than being applied to group event. Some information included in this section is generic, but candidates must avoid ‘cut and paste’ methods of presenting information.

The use of appendices by some candidates continues to slow the moderation process and makes it difficult to identify evidence of individual contributions to the planning and staging of the event.

The log books included by a majority of candidates were detailed and provided good evidence of their contribution before, during and after the event. The quality of the log book is vital if the candidate is to access the higher mark bands.

### Task Three Reviewing and evaluating an active leisure event

The quality of evaluations of the event and of the individual/group contributions to the event improved in this series. Weaker candidates presented insufficient individual evidence to satisfy the assessment criteria.

Witness statements were used by many centres as part of the evaluation process; this was good practice and provided valuable feedback about the event. Centres/candidates must provide witness statements from a range of sources not just the teacher in charge. The candidate, teacher, other staff involved, 'outside' individuals/groups, internal/external clients and photographs can all be used to provide evidence for the portfolio.

#### Key points to note

- Improved structure and organisation of the portfolios will allow candidates to recognise and correct weaknesses in their work, allowing them to access higher marks.
- The event must be of sufficient quality to allow the entire group an opportunity to access the higher mark bands.
- Witness statements from teachers, clients and outside agencies are vital sources of evidence for the candidate's contribution to the event and for the success of the event.
- Annotation to indicate where and why marks have been awarded in the portfolio.

## Chief Examiner's Report

### Assessment Unit A2 2 The Application of Science to Sports Performance

This was the second series for Unit 2: The Application of Science to Sports Performance. The paper was accessible to the majority of candidates who demonstrated a good knowledge of the specification content and applied their understanding to the questions. It was evident from the high number of completed scripts with few omissions, that the paper was well received by most candidates who responded positively to the demands and challenges of the paper. Candidates appeared familiar with the paper style and format and there were no reported timing issues with this paper.

- Q1**
- (a) This question was generally answered well, however, a few candidates only included the equation.
- (b) (i) This question saw a range of responses, with most stating the correct answer – stroke volume. A few stated bradycardia which was incorrect.
- (ii) A significant number of candidates failed to gain full marks in this question because the description provided was too basic.
- (c) (i)& (ii) Candidates generally had a good understanding of the two phases of the cardiac cycle, however some did not access full marks because their answers were too vague.

- Q2** (a) This question proved fairly accessible and a significant number of candidates gained full marks.
- (b) Candidates generally demonstrated good knowledge and understanding of the physiological adaptations that occur, some could have gained full marks by improving their description.
- (c) (i) Many candidates achieved full marks in this question.
- (ii) This question was well answered by the majority of candidates, though a few did not read the question properly, incorrectly giving cardiovascular or muscular adaptations in their responses.
- Q3** (a) This question was answered well by the majority of candidates and very few scored zero marks.
- (b) (i) Whilst most candidates demonstrated their knowledge and understanding of flexion and extension, many could have gained full marks by using a sporting movement in their explanation.
- (ii) The majority of candidates answered this question well, however a few mixed up plantar flexion and dorsiflexion.
- (c) The majority of candidates answered parts of this question well. The positive effects of training on the skeletal system were detailed. However, some did not include information about the negative effects. A significant number only achieved Level 2 marks. Candidates are reminded that the quality of their written communication is a key factor in accessing the higher level in extended responses.
- Q4** (a) The majority of candidates answered this question well. However, a few confused the stages of learning with types of transfer.
- (b) The majority of candidates demonstrated their ability to discuss motivational strategies used by coaches. However, a significant number failed to gain marks in the top mark band due to weaknesses in their QWC. Candidates should be reminded of the importance of sentence structure, composition, punctuation and use of specialist vocabulary in banded responses where the QWC is considered when awarding marks.
- Q5** (a) (i) This question was well answered by most candidates, however some appeared to have not read the question properly. Consequently, they included information on legal methods or illegal methods used by endurance athletes which was incorrect.
- (ii) The majority of candidates answered this question well, however a few only stated two disadvantages, limiting the marks that could be awarded for that question.
- (b) In general, this question was well answered by the candidates. However for some, poor QWC prevented them from accessing Level 3 marks. Candidates must develop competence in the use of appropriate terminology to achieve marks in the higher levels in extended responses.
- (c) This question was answered well by the majority of candidates, where candidates discussed the role of technology in the preparation of elite athletes. Candidates presented lots of topical and contemporary examples to illustrate their answers. However, there was variation in the quality of answers provided and a significant number of candidates only achieved Level 2 marks. Candidates are reminded that the quality of their written communication is a key factor in accessing the higher level in extended responses.

Overall, candidates should be encouraged to read the questions carefully to avoid misinterpretation. Candidates should be encouraged to write as legibly as possible to ensure the examiners can award the best possible marks for the work. Candidates should also be reminded of the importance of QWC to access higher mark bands in questions requiring extended writing.

## 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](mailto:aashfield@ccea.org.uk))
- Officer with Subject Responsibility: Peter Davidson  
(telephone: (028) 9026 1200, extension: 2993, email: [pdavidson@ccea.org.uk](mailto:pdavidson@ccea.org.uk))