

GCE



**Chief Examiner's and
Principal Moderator's Report
Sports Science and
the Active Leisure
Industry**

Summer Series 2018



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	5
Assessment Unit A2 1	Event Management in the Active Leisure Industry	6
Assessment Unit A2 2	The Application of Science to Sports Performance	8
Contact details		10

GCE SPORTS SCIENCE AND THE ACTIVE LEISURE INDUSTRY

Principal Moderator's Report

Assessment Unit AS 1 Fitness and Training for Sport

The 2018 Examination Series saw 28 centres undertaking GCE Sports Science and the Active Leisure Industry at AS level. The candidates are congratulated for the effort shown and quality of work presented. Equally staff involved are complimented for their continued thoroughness in preparing their candidates.

Paperwork for the moderation process was generally well prepared and the quality of the annotation greatly assisted the moderation process. Portfolios submitted by most centres were accurately marked.

It was clear throughout the moderation process that most centres have a very good understanding of the specification and assessment objectives for this unit.

Centres should note the following points, identified during the moderation process, for future work.

Standard of Work

The portfolios submitted for moderation were generally of a high standard and consistent with the quality of work provided in previous years.

Marking of Work

The marking by the vast majority of centres was of a very high standard. A few centres were overly lenient however, most had adjusted their marking following advice given at the 2017 Agreement Trials.

Within the AO2 section of Task 2, the training programme, the accuracy of marking was inconsistent with a number of centres being generous in their allocation of marks.

Witness statements and other teacher testimonies, particularly for Task 3, should verify the evidence collated by the candidate and not refer to evidence that is not included in the portfolio.

When appropriate, teachers should use the candidate record sheet to explain that marks reflect the level of support provided.

Application of Knowledge and Understanding

The training programmes did not reflect the quality of work presented in the AO1: Knowledge and Understanding sections of the portfolios. The application of the principles of training and choice of training methods was often repetitive and very limited. Similar, or in some cases identical sessions were carried out each week which does not provide sufficient evidence of the candidate's ability to 'plan a fully developed training programme'. Introducing more diversity into the warm-ups and cool-downs with a greater variety of training methods in the programme, will give candidates more opportunity to display better evidence of their AO2 understanding.

Centres should be careful not to make their students' focus too narrow for their portfolios in terms of components of fitness identified for the training programme. Several centres developed two components of fitness throughout their training programme; it is recommended students work on three to five components of fitness.

Presentation of Work

The presentation of the portfolios has greatly improved. The use of treasury tags by most centres was very helpful and centres are thanked for acting on the advice given at the 2017 Agreement Trials. The inclusion of a contents page and accurate page numbering by most candidates assisted the moderator to find and identify work in the portfolio.

Annotation of the Portfolios

The quality of annotation, use of marking grids and the inclusion of detailed witness statements helped the moderation process and indicated clearly where and why marks have been awarded.

Repetition of Work

As stated at the 2017 Agreement Trials; 'There was repetition of work in some areas of the portfolio. This has continued in the following sections: first aid, risk assessment, warm-up/cool-down and individual training sessions. The use of 'cut and paste' may be appropriate for some information in the portfolio but widespread use of this method is inappropriate'. This issue is referred to elsewhere in the report.

Size of Portfolios

A number of centres included excessive amounts of work which was not required or was very repetitive.

Centres need to find methods to manage this workload to reduce pressure on candidates and staff. It has been noted that the workload involved has had implications for centres and students in their choices at this level.

Centres can reduce the amount of material included in their portfolios in the following ways:

- Avoiding the duplication of work e.g. the inclusion of multiple copies of identical first aid and risk assessment information in Task 1 and 2.
- Long descriptive evaluations of each training session, the tabular form of each session provided by all candidates should provide sufficient information on the content of the session.
- 'Cut and paste' of the Task 2 sessions into Task 3, it is sufficient to identify the session by the week/session numbers and date.
- Reducing excessive use of 'cut and paste' material in the AO1 sections of the portfolio. Many candidates copy huge amounts of information for components of fitness, training theory, anatomy and physiology and first aid. Candidates and centres must be more selective about what to include and remove any unnecessary material.

Independent Learning

The grade descriptors listed in the specification for this unit require candidates to ‘apply knowledge, understanding and skills accurately and independently to a range of work-related situations based on the sports science and the active leisure industry.

A number of centres appeared to display a very ‘teacher led’ approach to the completion of this coursework; this can affect the moderation process as it is difficult to distinguish independent learning by the candidate. To clearly identify the degree of independent learning demonstrated by the candidate a ‘level of guidance given’ section will be added to the on the e-moderation template for Summer 2019.

Key Points to Note for Future Work:

Reduce the size of the portfolio, quality rather than quantity. This will be the main area for discussion at the Agreement Trials in October 2018.

Chief Examiner’s Report

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

This was the fifth examination series for this specification. This paper was accessible to all candidates and there was a full range of responses from grade A to E 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 answered well, with many candidates scoring full marks.
 - (b) Generally well answered with clear explanations of the objectives in the public and private sectors achieving full marks.
 - (c) This question was answered well by most candidates, however, a significant number did not provide solutions and focused instead on problems encountered.
 - (d) This question was answered well by most candidates, however, a significant number included detailed information about government initiatives or information was repetitive. Candidates are reminded that the quality of their written communication is a key factor in extended responses.
- Q2**
- (a) Candidates generally had a good understanding of three lifestyle improvements and many scored full marks in this question.
 - (b) (i) The majority of candidates scored well in this question, clearly explaining the physical benefits of exercise for an older adult.
 - (ii) This question was answered well, however, a significant number of candidates failed to relate the answer to an older adult and provided a generalised response.
- Q3**
- (a) The majority of candidates scored well in this question, clearly explaining how the two government initiatives could have an impact on the health of the nation.
 - (b) In general this question was answered well although some candidates provided vague responses for hypertension and a few did not provide a response.
 - (c) This question was answered well by the majority of candidates.

(d) This was generally well answered, with most candidates scoring full marks.

Most candidates were able to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the components of fitness.

Q4 (a) The majority of candidates scored full marks in this question.

(b) A significant number of candidates did not achieve full marks in this question. Some focused on the health benefits of PE in school and did not provide information about the effect on lifelong involvement in sport.

Q5 (a) The majority of candidates scored well in this question, clearly demonstrating their knowledge and understanding of training methods.

(b) The majority of candidates demonstrated excellent knowledge and understanding and achieved Level 2 and 3 marks. However, a few did not achieve marks in the top mark band as the responses provided were repetitive.

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

- Candidates should read each question carefully before formulating a response and write as legibly as possible to ensure that examiners can 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 additional 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.

Principal Moderator's Report

Assessment Unit A2 1 Event Management in the Active Leisure Industry (A2LA/AAL1)

The 2018 Examination Series saw 29 centres undertaking GCE Sports Science and the Active Leisure Industry at A2 level. The work presented by these centres continued the high standards established in previous series'.

Centres are to be congratulated for their commitment and skill in preparing candidates for this qualification and candidates must be complimented for the quality of the work submitted.

Paperwork for the moderation process was generally correct and the quality of annotation greatly assisted the moderation process. The use of marking grids and witness statements showed clearly where and why marks had been awarded.

Throughout the moderation process it was clear that most centres have a very good understanding of the specification and assessment objectives for this unit. Portfolios submitted by most centres were marked to the agreed standard.

Centres should note the following points for future work.

The Event

The range and quality of the events selected by the centres was commendable. This allowed the majority of candidates to provide sufficient evidence of their contribution to the planning, organisation, running and evaluation of the event.

However, centres must remember it is the quality of the event and the process of event management that is being assessed not the size or complexity of the event. The quality of the event is vital if candidates are to access the higher mark bands. The size of the group must allow each candidate an equal opportunity to meet the assessment criteria for this unit. The specification advises a group size of 4–8 students, the exact number will be dependent on the nature of the event.

It was evident in larger centres where two or more events were organised that standardisation of the different events had taken place to ensure all candidates have an equal chance of accessing the higher mark bands.

Presentation and Marking

The presentation of the portfolios has improved significantly with the majority of centres using treasury tags to bind their work. There were a number of discrepancies between the marks awarded on the portfolios and the marks recorded on the e-moderation system. Centres must be diligent in ensuring all administrative tasks are completed accurately.

The marking was generally to the agreed standard. However, as has been stated in previous reports, it was at the upper limit of the allowed standard in a significant number of centres. Again centres are reminded this has implications for the setting of grade boundaries and the potential adjustment of marks.

Annotation on the work continues to improve and this is vital to substantiate the marks awarded. The inclusion of a contents page and accurate page numbering by most candidates assisted the moderator to find and identify work in the portfolio. Page numbering can be done in pen/pencil when the work has been completed.

Size of Portfolios

A major concern to the Moderation Team was the size of the portfolios and the volume of work involved in their completion. Centres need to find ways to manage this workload and reduce pressure on candidates and staff. It has been noted that the workload involved has had implications for both centres and students in their choices at this level.

The following advice is given to help reduce the replication and volume of work:

- Centres are responsible for managing the amount of material submitted within a portfolio. Improved structure and ‘stripping out’ of unnecessary work will reduce the size of the portfolios.
- The Components of the Active Leisure Industry should be an overview of the nature of this area supported by up-to-date examples and statistics. Case studies should not be included; the information included in these studies should be included in the individual sections.
- Only include the candidate’s own feasibility study. Too many candidates include all the individual feasibility studies for their group.
- Candidates still include multiple copies of customer evaluation sheets/questionnaires; it is sufficient to include one example rather than multiple copies.

- Removing repeated 'cut and paste' copies of the same information.
- Some centres presented excessive amounts of work which was not required or was very repetitive.

Team Approach to Completion of Work

The nature of this unit allows for some 'commonality' of work. Sections of the business plan for the event, agendas and minutes of meetings and evidence of the running of the event may be the same for all members of a group. However, candidates must individualise these sections to satisfy the assessment criteria.

A number of centres allocated individual sections of the business plan; e.g. resources or finance, to individual members of the group and then shared this information in the final presentations. This is good practice as it is what would happen in the 'real world'. Centres adopting this approach must remember:

- Candidates must acknowledge the author of each section and ensure 'shared work' is clearly identifiable as not of their own doing.
- To satisfy the specification for this unit; candidates must include their own summary and/or analysis of each section to 'individualise' their work.
- The log book that forms part of the portfolio allows each candidate to provide individual evidence relating to the business plan; as well as their contribution to the event.

If this information is not provided the marking/moderation process becomes difficult and the marks awarded to each candidate may be affected.

Independent Learning

The grade descriptors listed in the specification for this unit require candidates to 'be encouraged to work independently and present their research in a variety of ways', 'accurately and independently apply knowledge, understanding and skills to a wide range of work-related situations' and 'demonstrate an informed viewpoint and evidence of own thinking'.

A number of centres appeared to display a very 'teacher led' approach to the completion of this coursework; this can affect the moderation process as it is difficult to distinguish independent learning by the candidate. To clearly identify the degree of independent learning demonstrated by the candidate a 'level of guidance given' section will be added to the on the e-moderation template for Summer2019.

Key points to note for future work:

Reduce the size of the portfolio, quality rather than quantity should be the focus. This will be the main area for discussion at the Agreement Trials in October 2018.

Chief Examiner's Report

Assessment Unit A2 2: The Application of Science to Sports Performance (A2LB/AAL2)

This was the fourth 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.

- Q1** (a) This question was generally answered well and very few scored zero marks.
- (b) The majority of candidates demonstrated excellent knowledge and understanding of the long-term effects of aerobic exercise on the respiratory system. However, a few included cardiovascular adaptations in their responses.
- (c) The majority of candidates answered this question well and achieved full marks.
- Q2** (a) This question proved fairly accessible and a significant number of candidates gained full marks.
- (b) This question was well answered by the majority of candidates although a few repeated information from Part (a) in their response.
- Q3** (a) Many candidates achieved full marks in this question.
- (b) In this question a significant number of candidates were unable to explain wave summation and spatial summation.
- (c) Some candidates displayed excellent knowledge when discussing the positive impact on the skeletal and muscular systems for an adult who participates regularly in sport. Consequently, they achieved marks in the Level 3 Mark Band. However, candidates must be reminded of the need for quality in their written communication in extended responses.
- Q4** (a) The majority of candidates answered this question well and achieved full marks. A few focused on the cardiovascular system in all three parts.
- (b) (i) This question was answered well and very few scored zero marks.
- (ii) Many candidates achieved full marks in this question. However, some failed to gain full marks in Level 2 or 3 as they did not provide enough reasons and focused on describing altitude training.
- Q5** (a) (i) Some candidates demonstrated excellent knowledge and understanding of ethical considerations surrounding the use of technology in sport. However, a significant number of candidates provided vague responses.
- (ii) In general, this question was answered well and very few scored zero marks.
- (b) This question was answered well by the majority of candidates, where candidates discussed the advantages and disadvantages of the use of technology. Candidates presented contemporary examples to illustrate their answers, demonstrating excellent knowledge and understanding. However, there was variation in the quality of answers provided. Candidates are reminded that the quality of their written communication is a key factor in accessing the higher level marks in extended responses.
- Many candidates displayed very detailed knowledge and understanding of the strategies organisations have introduced, however, their QWC was the main reason preventing some candidates from accessing Level 3 marks. Candidates did use contemporary sporting examples to support their answers.

Overall, candidates should be encouraged to read the questions carefully to avoid misinterpretation.

Candidates need to endeavour to write as legibly as possible and should be reminded of the importance of QWC 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)
- **Officer with Subject Responsibility: Peter Davidson**
(telephone: (028) 9026 1200, extension: 2993, email: pdavidson@ccea.org.uk)



INVESTORS
IN PEOPLE

