

GCE



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

Summer Series 2017



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 Lifetsyle	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 (AA1L1/SAL1)

The 2017 Examination Series saw 31 centres undertaking GCE Sports Science and the Active Leisure Industry at the AS level. The centres involved are congratulated for their commitment and skill in preparing candidates for this qualification, whilst candidates must be complimented for the quality and effort evident in the work submitted.

Paperwork for the moderation process was mostly accurate and the quality of the annotation provided by most centres greatly assisted the moderation process. It was also clear 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 mostly of a high standard and consistent with the quality of work provided in previous years. Candidates continue to show a pleasing range of styles and formats for the portfolios which is an important trend with a task that is unchanged year on year.

The AO1 Knowledge and Understanding element of the unit was generally well referenced and provided evidence of a comprehensive range of sources. However some candidates struggled to apply this knowledge to the planning and instructing of the training programme.

Presentation of work

Overall the presentation of the portfolios continues to improve, however, some centres are still presenting work in lever arch files which is costly and is not as indicated in the 'instructions to teachers' booklet. Portfolios must show the candidate and centre numbers clearly on the front cover. A minority of centres failed to provide sufficient information on the cover sheet of each portfolio; this made identifying the candidate difficult and slowed the moderation process.

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 level and quality of annotation improved overall, but still ranged from superficial in a small number of centres to very detailed in a majority centres. Detailed annotation of the portfolios should refer to assessment objectives and levels and indicate clearly where and why marks have been awarded. The inclusion of witness statements and mark sheets helped to justify the awarding of marks.

Repetition of work

There was repetition of work in some areas of the portfolio. This has been highlighted at previous Agreement Trials but remains a problem in 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 inappropriate.

Size of portfolios

The portfolio requires careful planning for completion of the required processes. Some centres presented excessive amounts of work which was not required or was very repetitive. The volume of work presented by centres is concerning due to the workload it provides for candidates and staff. It may also have a negative influence on future uptake of the subject at this level.

Centres should strive to reduce the amount of material included in their portfolios. This should involve:

- Avoiding the inclusion of multiple copies of identical first aid and risk assessment information.
- 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.
- Repetition of normative data tables for fitness testing in the test protocols, test results and the evaluation of results sections.
- '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.

Application of knowledge and understanding

The AO2 section of Task 2 is the largest single section within the assessment criteria, accounting for 24% of the total marks for the portfolio. The variety of training programmes and use of training methods was encouraging. A majority of candidates applied their knowledge of the principles and methods of training with insight and precision. However a few candidates did not provide sufficient evidence of how sessions were monitored, their application of progressive overload, the use of a variety of training methods and the training intensity/workload targeted.

A small number of candidates failed to meet the specification for this unit in the planning of their training programmes. Centres are reminded the training plan must cover a 6 to 8 week period and that individual sessions must last between 40 and 60 minutes.

Evaluative work

The detail and quality of the evaluative work presented improved with candidates providing detailed analytical AO3 sections. These identified salient points and explained the reasons behind these points.

Some candidates continued to rely heavily on 'cut and paste' methods to present repetitive and descriptive evaluative work that lacked sufficient analytical content.

Key points to note for future work:

- Reduce the size of the portfolio, quality rather than quantity should be the focus.
- The quality of the training programme depends on detailed application of the principles of training and training methods.
- Avoid repetitive 'cut and paste' work.

Chief Examiner's Report

Assessment Unit AS 2 The Active Leisure Industry: Health, Fitness and Lifestyle (AA1L2/SAL2)

This was the fourth 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 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 answered well, with many candidates scoring full marks.
 - (b) Candidates generally did well in describing the main characteristics of continuous training and weight training and achieved full marks.
 - (c) The vast majority of candidates were able to explain the importance of risk assessment and correct lifting technique. However, some candidates did not seem to have an understanding of the importance of the avoidance of contraindicated exercises and provided generalised responses regarding safety issues to prevent injuries.
 - (d) This question was answered well by most candidates, however a significant number only achieved Level 2 marks. Candidates are reminded that the quality of their written communication is a key factor in extended responses.
- Q2**
- (a) A significant number of candidates did not achieve full marks in this question. Some candidates repeated the same information in Parts (i) and (ii) of the question. However, many candidates scored full marks in Part (iii) and were able to demonstrate their knowledge regarding what an athlete can do to promote recovery.
 - (b) Most candidates demonstrated an adequate knowledge and understanding regarding why an athlete might use illegal drugs and the consequences associated with this practice. Some candidates focused mainly on social reasons in their responses in both Part (i) and (ii).
- Q3**
- (a) The majority of candidates scored well in this question, clearly explaining why the management of stress is important for a coach to consider.
 - (b) This was generally well answered with a significant majority of candidates scoring full marks. However, some candidates did not read the question properly and included information about psychological or social benefits of exercise rather than short and long term physical benefits.
 - (c) In general this question was answered well with many gaining full marks. However, there was a number of candidates who provided vague responses to the benefits of the GP Referral Scheme for a client.
 - (d) This question was answered well, however, some candidates failed to read the question properly and provided information relating to what society could use to encourage participation in sport.
- Q4**
- (a) Most candidates were able to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding by outlining and examining three reasons for the rise in levels of inactivity, with many scoring full marks.
 - (b) A significant number of candidates gained Level 2 marks. However, a minority of candidates focused on religion or sectarianism only, this limited their ability to attain higher marks.

- Q5 (a)** Some candidates answered this question well, achieving full marks. However, a few were unable to identify factors that can affect people on low income and provided generalised answers about health and well-being.
- (b)** Some 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 lacked detail and focused on the changes to packaging, which was repeated throughout the answer.

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.

Principal Moderator's Report

Assessment Unit A2 1 Event Management in the Active Leisure Industry

The 2017 Examination Series saw 22 centres undertaking GCE Sports Science and the Active Leisure Industry at the A2 level. The Centres are congratulated for their commitment and skill in preparing candidates for this qualification, and candidates must be complimented for the quality and effort evident in the work submitted.

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

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.

The event

The centres involved in this unit must be congratulated once again for the wide range of events selected and the professionalism evident in the execution of these events. The money raised for various charities continues to grow and this is a highly commendable bonus emerging through this qualification.

As previously stated; 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. Equally it is recognised that centres may have restrictions placed on them by school policies or their Senior Management Team. Such restrictions should be highlighted in the evidence provided by the candidates.

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

The majority of centres selected groups of an appropriate size to select, plan, organise and evaluate the event. Centres should refer to page 15, paragraph 2 of 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.'

Presentation of work

Overall the presentation of the portfolios continues to improve, however, some centres are still presenting work in lever arch files which is costly and is not as indicated in the 'instructions to teachers' booklet. Portfolios must show the candidate and centre numbers clearly on the front cover. Some centres failed to provide sufficient information on the cover sheet of each portfolio; this made identifying the candidate difficult and slowed the moderation process.

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 work

The high level and quality of the annotation on the work presented was greatly improved, this was vital to substantiate the marks awarded to each area of the portfolio. A majority of centres made extensive use of witness statements; as had been highlighted at the Agreement Trials in October 2016.

Quality of work

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.

A log book should be part of the portfolio; it gives an opportunity for the candidate to provide evidence of their contribution to the event. The quality of the log books presented varied from centre to centre; and in a number cases candidates did not identify sufficient evidence of their individual contribution.

Agendas and minutes for group meetings will be identical for all members of the group, however the candidate must 'individualise' these by identifying their contribution to the meeting, their evaluation of the meeting, their 'to do list' after the meeting and other salient information.

The analysis/evaluation of 'self and of peers' by a majority of candidates concentrated on the positive aspects of 'performance', there was insufficient analysis/evaluation of the negative aspects.

Size of portfolios

The portfolio requires careful planning for completion of the required processes. Some centres presented excessive amounts of work which was not required or was very repetitive. The volume of work presented by centres was of concern due to the workload it provided for candidates and staff. It also has the potential to influence future students considering this subject.

Centres should strive to reduce the amount of material included in their portfolios. This should involve:

- Avoidance of excessive amounts of work on the Components of the Active Leisure Industry.
- Only including the candidate's individual feasibility study.
- Selecting 1 or 2 witness statements rather than multiple copies of the same questionnaire.
- Removing repeated 'cut and paste' copies of the same information.

Key points to note for future work:

- Reduce the size of the portfolio, quality rather than quantity should be the focus.
- Maintain the quality of annotation and witness statements evident in this series.

Chief Examiner's Report

Assessment Unit A2 2 The Application of Science to Sports Performance

This was the third 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, however, a few candidates did not address the second part of the question relating to the coach and only defined the term learning plateau.
 - (b) In this question, many candidates achieved full marks.
 - (c) Many candidates achieved full marks in this question. However, some failed to gain full marks in Part (ii) of the question regarding limiting the effects of negative transfer on the learning and performance of skilled sporting actions.
- Q2**
- (a) In this question a significant number of candidates were unable to identify three classifications of motor skill. However, some scored full marks, demonstrating excellent knowledge.
 - (b) Some candidates found Question 2(b) challenging. Many did not have a clear understanding of gross motor ability or psychomotor ability and therefore did not achieve marks.
- Q3**
- (a) This question was answered well and very few scored zero marks.
 - (b) A significant number of candidates achieved the full marks available for this question, demonstrating excellent knowledge and understanding of the autonomous stage of learning. A few appeared to confuse the term 'autonomous stage' and provided vague responses.
 - (c) Some candidates displayed excellent knowledge when discussing the advantages and disadvantages of a coach using the command style of teaching. 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) This question was challenging for many candidates and the resulting poor performance reflected the lack of underpinning knowledge and understanding of the skeletal system.
 - (b)
 - (i) The majority of candidates answered this question well and achieved full marks.
 - (ii) There was a mixed array of responses to this question with those candidates who discussed the positive and negative effects of regular physical activity on the musculoskeletal system scoring the top marks. Some only focused on the positive effects which resulted in limited marks being awarded. However, a significant number failed to gain top marks in the mark bands due to

weaknesses in their QWC. Candidates should be reminded of the importance of sentence structure and composition, punctuation and use of specialist vocabulary in banded responses where QWC is considered in awarding marks.

- Q5**
- (a)** In general, this question was answered well and very few scored zero marks.
 - (b)** The majority of candidates demonstrated good knowledge and understanding of the structural and physiological adaptations to the cardiovascular system experienced by an endurance athlete. For some candidates, poor QWC prevented them from highest marks in Level 3. Candidates must develop competence in the use of appropriate terminology to achieve higher marks in extended responses.
 - (c)** Some candidates failed to gain full marks in this question. A few repeated information regarding the cardiovascular system, a few focused on adaptations rather than responses of the muscular and respiratory system. However, there was variation in the quality of answers provided and a significant number of candidates achieved Level 3 marks. Candidates are reminded that the quality of their written communication is a key factor in extended responses.

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)

