

GCE



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

Summer Series 2022

Foreword

This booklet outlines the performance of candidates in all aspects of this specification for the Summer 2022 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	6
Assessment Unit A2 1	Event Management in the Active Leisure Industry	7
Assessment Unit A2 2	The Application of Science to Sports Performance	10
Contact details		12

GCE Sports Science & the Active Leisure Industry

Principal Moderator's Report

Assessment Unit AS 1 Fitness and Training for Sport

Internal Assessment Overview

The 2022 Examination Series saw over 20 centres undertaking the AS Unit 1: Fitness and Training for Sport qualification and this has been the first time in three years that work has been internally assessed but externally moderated. Centres showed a very good understanding of the Specification, Assessment Objectives and Assessment Criteria for this unit. Teachers and candidates are congratulated for their hard work in preparing the portfolios for moderation.

Paperwork for the moderation process was mostly correct and the quality of the annotation provided by most centres did assist the moderation process. Portfolios submitted by most centres were marked to the agreed standard.

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

Standard of work

The standard of work presented was consistent with the quality of work provided in previous years.

Marking and annotation of work

Whilst the marking of the portfolios by many centres was of a high standard, it continues to be at the upper limit of the agreed standard.

The quality of annotation provided by most centres helped the moderation process and indicated clearly where and why marks have been awarded. This annotation supported the teacher comments on the e-Candidate Record Sheets and the marks awarded for each assessment objective. A few centres did not annotate their portfolios adequately and this made the moderation of these portfolios difficult.

Teacher witness statements/evaluative comments on candidates should be included to help verify the evidence collated by the candidate. The use of witness statements/evaluations was widespread for Task 3 AO2, but should also be included for Task 1 AO2.

Independent Learning

To clearly identify the degree of independent learning demonstrated by the candidate a 'level of guidance given' section was added to the e-moderation template for Summer 2022. This was completed by all centres and helped to explain how the level of guidance given affected the marks awarded to some candidates.

Application of knowledge and understanding

The on-line Agreement Trials in October 2021 highlighted the significant reductions to be implemented for this 2022 AS Unit and these were also published in the addendum 'Exceptional Assessment Adaptations for Summer 2022'. However, the moderation process found some centres did not follow guidelines described in the Agreement Trial of October 2021 and later published by CCEA in the addendum. Centres are strongly advised to ensure they are familiar with all the support and advice provided by the awarding organisation to ensure their students are not disadvantaged.

The diversity in the warm-ups and cool-downs of the top marked candidates gave them more opportunity to display evidence of their AO2 knowledge application and understanding.

The moderation team found that in Task 1 AO2, most centres did not include risk assessment for the fitness testing, therefore did not fulfil the Assessment Criteria (Level 4) that 'highly effective application of safety requirements during fitness testing' was applied. Also, a few candidates tested their clients in more than five components of fitness and the selection of the fitness tests seemed, at times, generic and was not always specifically related to the client's sport. Test protocols, validity and reliability of fitness testing were well evidenced in most portfolios. The analysis of results in fitness testing ranged from basic to good and higher marked candidates related back to the requirements and demands of the sport that their client participated in. As part of Task 2 AO1, the identification of the client's requirements was clearly evidenced through trainer-client interviews with higher marked candidates.

A weak area in several portfolios was in Task 2 AO2 where candidates are required to 'Identify and set realistic and achievable training goals and plan a fully developed training programme'. Higher Mark Band candidates provided evidence of a plan of the training that was going to be taken place over the six weeks, which included training methods to be utilised and the realistic progressive overloads that were targeted, in week three and week six. In lower marked candidates the SMARTER goals were simply described and not applied to developing the components of fitness in a training programme.

Monitoring the training sessions was generally well done in most portfolios using pulse rates and Borg Scale (or adapted version). Higher marked candidates also used electronic devices that indicated working and recovery pulse rates. Highlighting progressive overload in training sessions, helped make the moderation process more efficient. In several portfolios, the training sessions, although dated, did not have the starting time of the session recorded. The length of time planned and allocated for some of the main sessions, was unrealistic and could not have been completed. This should therefore be reflected in the evaluation of the session and adjustments made for following weeks.

As highlighted in the Agreement Trials, the purpose of the training programmes was to improve a client's fitness in 2 components of fitness over a 6 week period. Several candidates had their client trying to develop a different component of fitness in each week of the programme, this simply does not fulfil the FITT principle to develop any component of fitness.

Task 3 was generally well presented with the AO1 knowledge of anatomy and physiology documented at a good theoretical level. Higher marked candidates were able to apply this knowledge to their client and discuss the adaptations they were hoping to attain. Centres should encourage their candidates not to include copious and irrelevant pages of First Aid but condense information into tabular format. Regarding teaching methods, most candidates discussed and implemented a range of these and evidence of this was recorded in teacher witness statements/evaluations, outlining the ability of their candidates to lead sessions and follow health and safety procedures.

Most candidates had two extended training sessions evaluated and higher marks were awarded where candidates selected a session at the start and end of the programme and then thoroughly analysed and evaluated teaching styles, motivational skills adopted,

progressive overloads and strengths and weakness of the sessions. Some centres had candidates presenting extended evaluations of every training session, up to 12 sessions in 6 weeks, and this seemed excessive workload for students.

Overall evaluations of the process of developing a training programme and implementing it as a trainer were well documented and reviews suggested ways in which the candidate would improve a future fitness programme.

Presentation of work

Portfolios were generally well presented, although some lacked a contents page and page numbers. This made it hard to find and identify work in the portfolio and slowed down the moderation process.

Size of portfolios

The size of the portfolios presented by centres continues to be a concern for candidates, teachers and the moderation team. It has been noted that the workload involved has had implications for both centres and students in their choices of subject at this level.

Most centres acted on advice given at the 2021 Agreement Trials and produced smaller portfolios. These centres are to be commended and other centres are encouraged to follow suit for 2023.

To repeat the advice given last year; the amount of material included in portfolios can be reduced by avoiding:

- the duplication of work, for example the inclusion of multiple copies of identical first aid and risk assessment information in Task 1 and 2. Only include relevant first aid material that is relevant to the testing and training that will be taking place.
- long descriptive and repetitive evaluations of each training session, a tabular format to evaluate sessions would be adequate for candidates when critically commenting on how effective each session was.
- 'Cut and paste' of the Task 2 training sessions into Task 3, it is sufficient to identify the session by the week/session number and date.
- One set of exercise diagrams for warm-ups, cool-downs and main activity exercises rather than including them in weekly sessions. These can be referred to in the session plan.
- Reducing excessive use of 'cut and paste' material in the AO1 sections of the portfolio. Many candidates simply copy massive amounts of information on 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.

Resubmission of Work

A few centres had candidates who resubmitted portfolios for moderation. This was discussed at the 2018 Agreement Trials and the following guidelines apply:

- Candidates who resubmit work must send a copy of their original portfolio along with their new work if their work is requested for moderation.
- A resubmitted portfolio must include a new training programme designed for a client, along with evidence of the execution and analysis of this programme. It is not sufficient to 'adapt' the original training programme.

In conclusion, Centres must be complimented for their commitment and skill in preparing candidates for this qualification. Equally, candidates are also commended for their submissions in especially challenging circumstances.

Chief Examiner's Report

Assessment Unit AS 2

The Active Leisure Industry: Health, Fitness and Lifestyle

Unit Overview

The paper was accessible for most candidates who demonstrated good knowledge of the specification content. The level of language used in the paper proved appropriate as most candidates showed good application of their understanding to the questions. Candidates appeared familiar with the paper style and format and there were no reported timing issues. The mark scheme reflected most of the candidates' responses.

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

- Candidates should read each question carefully before formulating a response.
 - Candidates should be reminded of the importance of QWC to access higher mark bands in questions requiring extended writing.
- Q1**
- (a) In general, this question was answered poorly. It was clear that a significant number of candidates had a poor understanding of the key components of the active leisure industry.
 - (b) This question was answered well by most candidates.
 - (c) This question was generally well answered with clear explanations of two psychological effects of an active lifestyle.
 - (d) Most candidates achieved up to Level 2 marks in this question. Many discussed poor lifestyle choices in some detail. Better candidates assessed the impact of these choices on the health and life expectancy of an individual.
- Q2**
- (a) This question was answered well by the majority of candidates, with many scoring full marks.
 - (b) (i) This question was answered well by most candidates.
 - (b) (ii) This question was answered well by most candidates.
- Q3**
- (a) Most candidates provided a satisfactory response to this question and achieved at least 2 marks for each research method. Weaker candidates provided no response at all.
 - (b) (i)(ii) This question was answered well by most candidates.
 - (b) (iii) This question was answered well, with many scoring full marks.
 - (c) (i) In general, this question was answered poorly. A significant number of candidates stated the acronym 'SMART' but did not explain each aspect further, to access higher marks.
 - (c) (ii) This question was answered well by most candidates.
 - (d) Most of the responses were good for this question with most candidates accessing up to 2 marks for the description of nutritional strategies before, during and after an event. Some candidates did not give sufficient detail relating to each strategy to access full marks.
- Q4**
- (a) Most candidates scored well in this question, clearly identifying and analysing three government initiatives aimed at improving the health of the UK population. Some candidates described non-government initiatives such as a 'Couch to 5K' and therefore, did not access any marks.
 - (b) This question was answered well by most candidates.

- Q5** (a) This question was generally well answered. Some candidates explained the benefits of a healthy and active workforce to the employee, rather than the employer, which was reflected in lower marks awarded.
- (b) Most candidates accessed level 2 marks for this question with a limited number providing sufficient detail to achieve level 3 marks. Top band marks were missed where candidates only described some hypokinetic diseases, but then did not discuss how an active and healthy lifestyle could help prevent these diseases.

Finally, teachers should be commended for their efforts in ensuring all candidates were sufficiently prepared for this exam given the unprecedented circumstances presented by the COVID-19 public health crisis.

Principal Moderator's Report

Assessment Unit A2 1 Event Management in the Active Leisure Industry

Internal Assessment Overview

In the summer 2022 examination series, CCEA moderated over 20 Centres for GCE A2 Sports Science and the Active Leisure Industry. This is the first time since 2019 that work has been internally assessed but externally moderated.

The work presented continued the high standards established in previous series.

Paperwork for the moderation process was mainly correct and the quality of the annotation provided by most centres greatly assisted the moderation process. The widespread use of marking grids and teacher witness statements/evaluations showed clearly, where and why marks had been awarded. The completion of the candidate 'level of guidance given' section also helped to explain how marks were awarded for some candidates due to the level of guidance given.

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

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

The Event

The range and quality of the events selected by the centres were very good for the 2022 Series. This allowed most candidates to provide sufficient evidence of their contribution to the planning, organisation, running and evaluation of the event. Some candidates' evaluative statements remarked on how some school events were too basic and this was highlighted from customer feedback surveys.

There were a variety of events presented. The structure from top portfolios outlined clearly, evidence of individual contributions from candidates responsible for a specific role and who worked to assist others in a team to plan, carry out and evaluate an 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 had an equal chance of accessing the higher mark bands.

Once again, several centres raised substantial amounts of money for different charities through their events. This is hugely motivational for the organising team(s) and all schools should be commended for the significant funds raised.

Presentation and Marking

In previous reports by the Principal Moderator, it has been stated that:

‘The marking was generally to the agreed standard. However, ..., it was at the upper limit of the allowed standard in a significant number of centres ... this has implications for the potential adjustment of marks’.

The same scenario was evident in the marking of the 2022 portfolios. Centres should now be familiar with the requirements for this unit and it was therefore hoped that the marks awarded would be more accurate, reducing the need for adjustment.

The annotation of the portfolios was generally very good and substantiated the marks awarded to each area of the portfolio. The inclusion of a contents page and accurate page numbering by most candidates assisted the moderator to find and identify work in the portfolio.

The annotation should be in the ‘body of the work’ (at the end of sections or throughout) and examples of this were shared in the 2021 Agreement Trial portfolio (see 5mins 8 secs into the Power Point pre-recorded presentation). Please note, that copious ticks on portfolios are not appropriate. Unfortunately, portfolios continue to show evidence of this misunderstanding – even the best examples. As a guide, please annotate when you want to highlight to the moderator, where and why you awarded what marks. You should include the AO, the level and a mark which should clearly address each of the AO descriptors found at the back of the SAMs (also sent out in the Addendum, ‘Exceptional Assessment Adaptations for the Summer 2022’). If there are omissions, please state these and then justify the subsequent mark(s).

Some centres produced meaningful teacher witness statements/evaluations that personalised the abilities of the candidates e.g. teacher witness statement/evaluation of an individual feasibility study; of the candidate’s contribution to the group’s business plan; of the candidate’s contribution during the day of the event; of the candidate’s contribution post event.

Some other centres reproduced generic teacher witness statements/evaluations that lacked differentiation in relation to the marks awarded, and the moderator sometimes found it difficult to find the evidence in the portfolio that was being alluded to in the teacher’s statements.

Managing and resolving conflict, particularly in a working group setting, should be evidenced by all candidates rather than just explained. Higher marked candidates usually recorded this in their individual contributions to group meetings, usually after a set of minutes. Some portfolios lacked sufficiently detailed evidence of the evaluation and analysis of their event to warrant the higher marks awarded.

Some centres had correctly, marked candidates down, due to a lack of evidence, limited individual contributions or complete/partial sections of work missing.

Individual contribution and group work

Several centres allocated individual sections of the group's business plan to different members within the group. This work was then shared among the group for inclusion in the portfolios. This approach was outlined in previous Agreement Trials and is good practice as it is what would happen in the 'real world'. However, centres adopting this approach must remember:

- Candidates must acknowledge the group member that authored each section and not 'claim' it as their own work. This should also be echoed when minutes of meetings are recorded, clearly including the author of each set of minutes.
- To satisfy the specification for this unit; candidates must include their own summary and/or analysis of each section to 'personalise' this section of their work. This individualisation must be present if candidates are to access the higher mark bands, for all the planning sections of the group's business plan and not just the section they were allocated.
- A personalised logbook provides the opportunity for candidates to evidence their individual contributions when working in a team and should help greatly with differentiating the marking of portfolios. A logbook chronologically evidence from the start of the planning process: such as the initial 'shower thinking' to generate event ideas; to outlining the work on their individual role particularly outside the taught class; to what they did on the day of the event, to their final post-event responsibilities.
- If this information is not provided, the marking/moderation process becomes difficult and the marks awarded to each candidate will be affected.

Structure and size of portfolios

It was evident from the structuring and size of the portfolios presented by several centres that they had followed the suggestions made at the 2021 Agreement Trials.

However, for some Centres, the size of the portfolios and the volume of work involved in their completion continues to raise concerns. The following (repeated) suggestions can reduce the workload for candidates and teachers:

- All portfolios must be printed in duplex that is double sided.
- Centres must manage the amount of material submitted within a portfolio by:
 - Improved structure and 'stripping out' of unnecessary work
 - Scanning to remove copies of the same information, e.g. risk assessment policies.
 - Encouraging candidates to reduce 'white space' on pages.
- Case studies should not be included in entirety; the information researched from such studies should be included where necessary and referenced.
- Only include the candidate's own individual feasibility study. Too many candidates include all the individual feasibility studies for their group. Slides from PowerPoint presentations should be printed out as 3-4 slides per A4 page.
- The AO1 sections of Task 1 and Task 3 only account for 16 marks, compared with 50 marks for the AO2 sections and 34 for the AO3 sections. Many centres include huge amounts of very detailed AO1 material (marketing, group structure or legal requirements) when a more 'streamlined' version of this material would be adequate. Higher marked candidates showed understanding of AO1 by including appropriate applied examples of what was happening in their own group during the planning process. Likewise, the evaluative aspects of AO3, were present in all 3 Tasks with ongoing analytical comments throughout planning and then in their overall post-evaluations.

- Candidates still include multiple copies of customer evaluation sheets/questionnaires; it is sufficient to include one or two examples rather than multiple copies.
- Some centres organised the contents of the portfolios sequentially following Tasks 1-3, while some other centres mixed the order of Tasks. Portfolios that were not in a chronological order made the moderation process much less efficient.

Following the guidelines presented in the online Agreement Trials of October 2021 would have assisted centres in structuring portfolios better. It was also evident from the moderation team that some centres either ignored or did not read the guidelines in the Agreement Trials which were reiterated in the addendum published by CCEA; An example, for this year's series, was that a maximum of seven sets of minutes would have been adequate, selected from different stages of the planning process, but some centres had up to 25 sets of minutes. A second example occurred where evaluation of each member of the organising team post-event was included, when only one self-evaluation was necessary post-event. The additional workload candidates were asked to fulfil was more arduous for them, unnecessary, and possibly had a negative impact on the student and teacher's workload.

In conclusion, Centres must be complimented for their commitment and skill in preparing candidates for this qualification. Equally the candidates must be commended for the imagination and quality of the events they organised and the effort evident in the work submitted.

Chief Examiner's Report

Assessment Unit A2 2

The Application of Science to Sports Performance

Unit Overview

The paper was accessible to all candidates, most of whom demonstrated good knowledge of the specification content. The level of language used in the paper proved appropriate with most candidates showing good application of their understanding in their responses. Candidates appeared familiar with the paper style and format and there were no reported timing issues. The mark scheme broadly reflected most responses given by the candidates.

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

- Candidates should read questions carefully before formulating a response.
- Candidates should be reminded of the importance of QWC to access higher mark bands in questions requiring extended writing.
- Candidates generally performed poorly in Question 1 Part (a) and Question 1 Part (b). Candidates may need to be more prepared in relation to the topic of respiratory system for future exam series.

- Q1** (a) (i) In general, this question was answered poorly. A significant number of candidates did not give an accurate definition, or the definition lacked sufficient detail to access full marks.
- (ii) The majority of candidates accurately identified the effect but did not provide a sufficient description to access full marks.
- (b) This question was answered poorly by most candidates. Many provided a basic explanation that lacked crucial elements of the gaseous process in the lungs. A significant number of candidates explained gaseous exchange in the muscle. Use of appropriate terminology was poor and it was clear that a significant number of candidates had a poor understanding of gaseous exchange in the lungs.

- (c) Most candidates provided a satisfactory response, accessing at least 1 mark for each role.
- Q2** (a) This question was answered well by most candidates, with many scoring full marks. Some candidates showed limited knowledge of transfer methods.
(b) This question was answered well by most candidates.
- Q3** (a) This question was answered poorly. Most candidates identified only one characteristic accurately and a significant number of candidates tended to outline the characteristics of skill rather than ability.
(b) This question was answered well by most candidates.
(c) Most candidates answered this question well. Some candidates tended to list strategies rather than discuss motivational strategies in good detail.
- Q4** (a) The majority of candidates scored well in this question.
(b) (i) Most candidates answered this question well.
(b) (ii) This question was generally well answered. Top candidates examined a range of structural and functional adaptations experienced by an endurance athlete. Some candidates provided less detail and had difficulty distinguishing between a structural and functional adaptation.
- Q5** (a) This question was generally well answered. Some candidates did not refer to the positive impact technological developments had on sports performance which was reflected in the lower marks awarded.
(b) This question was generally well answered. Top candidates discussed performance enhancing drugs used by power athletes and assessed both the health and career risks involved. Some candidates discussed illegal drugs which were not relevant to a power athlete.
(c) This question was generally well answered. Level 3 responses identified a range of strategies in addition to making several valid discussion points. Some candidates went into too much detail on test protocols to the detriment of other strategies. Other responses lacked knowledge in relation to sporting organisations and demonstrated limited understanding of the strategies implemented to counteract the use of illegal performance enhancing drugs in sport.

Teachers should be commended for their efforts in ensuring all candidates were sufficiently prepared for this exam given the unprecedented circumstances presented by the COVID-19 public health crisis.

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)

