

GCE



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

Summer Series 2019





## Foreword

This booklet outlines the performance of candidates in all aspects of this specification for the Summer 2019 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 section on our website at [www.ccea.org.uk](http://www.ccea.org.uk).



## Contents

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



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

## **Principal Moderator's Report**

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

This was the sixth year of the AS Unit 1: Fitness and Training for Sport qualification and the experience of the centres involved was reflected in the standard of work presented. It was clear centres had a very good understanding of the Specification, Assessment Objectives and Assessment Criteria for this unit. Staff and candidates must be congratulated for their hard work in preparing the portfolios for moderation.

Paperwork for the moderation process was generally correct and the quality of the annotation provided by most centres greatly assisted the moderation process. Portfolios submitted by a majority of the 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 the vast majority of centres was of a very 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.

Witness statements and other teacher testimonies should be included to help verify the evidence collated by the candidate. The use of witness statements was widespread for Task 3: AO2 but they should also be included for the AO2 section of Task 1.

A number of candidates provided evidence of sessions that took place outside 'school hours' or at 'off-site' locations. Centres are reminded that all sessions should be witnessed by a member of staff and 'signed off' when completed.

#### **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 Summer2019. 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 training programmes were generally well presented, but the choice of training methods was often repetitive and very limited. This does not indicate an excellent level of knowledge, understanding of different training methods and did not provide sufficient evidence of the candidate's ability to 'plan a fully developed training programme'. Diversity in the warm-ups and cool-downs will also give the candidates more opportunity to display evidence of their AO2 knowledge and understanding.

The focus of the training programmes improved with most candidates planning programmes involving 3 or 4 components of fitness, as identified in the specification for this unit.

## **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 continued 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 candidates in their choices of subject at this level.

A number of centres acted on advice given at the 2018 Agreement Trials and produced smaller portfolios. These centres are to be commended and other centres are encouraged to follow suit for 2020.

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.
- 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.
- One set of exercise diagrams for warm-ups, cool-downs and main activity exercises rather than including them in each session. 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 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 un-necessary material.

## **Resubmission of Work**

A number of 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.

## Chief Examiner's Report

### Assessment Unit AS 2

### The Active Leisure Industry: Health, Fitness and Lifestyle

This was the sixth examination series for this specification. This paper was accessible to all candidates and there was a full range of responses from across the centres. Most candidates demonstrated sound knowledge of the specification and were able to apply their understanding to the questions.

- Q1**
- (a) The majority of candidates scored well in this question, clearly describing the term 'goal-setting'.
  - (b) This question was answered well by the majority of candidates.
  - (c) Generally well answered with clear explanations of how sport and exercise can have an impact on the health and well-being of a young person.
  - (d) A significant number of candidates did not achieve Level 3 marks in this question. Many discussed a limited number of factors. Better candidates discussed a range of factors which can act as barriers to participation in sport for a young person.
- Q2**
- (a) This question was answered well by most candidates however, poorer responses did not explain how exercise can help combat each hypokinetic disease.
  - (b)
    - (i) This question was answered well by the majority of candidates.
    - (ii) Candidates generally had a good understanding of procedures for food handling and food preparation to prevent illness and many scored full marks.
- Q3**
- (a) This question was answered well by the majority of candidates, with many scoring full marks.
  - (b) In general, this question was answered poorly. A significant number gave vague explanations of stretching methods and several provided no response at all.
  - (c) The majority of candidates scored well in this question, clearly explaining the advantages and disadvantages of using circuit training as a method to improve fitness.
  - (d) This question was answered well, with many scoring full marks.
- Q4**
- (a) This question prompted a broad spectrum of responses. The responses which focused on specific government initiatives aimed at improving the health of young people in society were usually awarded full marks. A significant number focused on initiatives that were not government driven and these could not be awarded marks.
  - (b) A significant number of responses only achieved Level 2 marks. Many did not access the top mark band as they neglected to discuss how an individual's poor choice of lifestyle can impact on the health of the nation.
- Q5**
- (a) This question was answered well, with many candidates scoring full marks.
  - (b) Most candidates achieved up to Level 2 marks in this question. Many candidates provided a limited discussion of how a lifestyle coach could improve lifestyle factors. Top candidates discussed the positive changes a lifestyle coach could make to the health and well-being of middle aged clients and also the limitations of a lifestyle coach

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.

The level of language was appropriate for the candidates sitting the examination.

The mark scheme was appropriate and relatively easy to apply. The mark scheme reflected the large majority of responses given by the candidates.

There was no evidence that candidates had insufficient time to complete the papers

## Principal Moderator's Report

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

The 2019 Examination Series saw 28 centres undertaking GCE Sports Science and the Active Leisure Industry at the A2 level. The work presented by these centres continued the high standards established in previous series.

Again, 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.

Paperwork for the moderation process was generally correct and the quality of the annotation provided by most centres greatly assisted the moderation process. The wide spread use of marking grids and witness statements 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 a majority 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 was outstanding for the 2019 Series. This allowed the majority of candidates to provide sufficient evidence of their contribution to the planning, organisation, running and evaluation of the event.

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.

Once again a number of centres raised substantial amounts of money for different charities through the running of their events. This has been an unforeseen feature of the qualification, but it is of great value and should be recognised as such by all concerned.

#### **Presentation and Marking**

The 2018 Principal Moderators report stated:

*'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 potential adjustment of marks'.*

The same trend was evident in the marking of the 2019 portfolios. Centres are now familiar with the requirements for this unit and it is therefore hoped that the marks awarded will be more accurate, reducing the likelihood of 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.

## Individual contribution and group work

A number of centres allocated individual sections of the 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 at the 2018 Agreement Trials and 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 not 'claim' it as their own work.
- 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 sections of the business plan and not just the section they were allocated.
- The log book that forms part of the portfolio also 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 will be affected.

## Size of portfolios

It was evident from the structuring and size of the portfolios presented by a number of centres that they had followed the suggestions made at the 2018 Agreement Trials.

The size of the portfolios and the volume of work involved in their completion continues to be a concern. The following suggestions have been made previously to attempt to reduce the workload for candidates and teachers:

- It is up to centres to manage the amount of material submitted within a portfolio. Improved structure and 'stripping out' of un-necessary work will reduce the size of the portfolios.
- 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 individual 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.
- The AO1 sections of Task 1 and Task 3 only account for 16 marks, compared with 50 marks for the AO2 sections or 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.

## Chief Examiner's Report

### Assessment Unit A2 2

### The Application of Science to Sports Performance

This was the fifth 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 in general showed good application of their understanding to the questions. It was evident from the high number of completed scripts with few omissions, that the paper was well received. 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 received zero marks.
  - (b) The majority of responses were good for this question, however some mixed up the agonist and antagonist muscles involved.
  - (c) The majority of candidates answered this question well and achieved at least two marks.
- Q2**
- (a)
    - (i) This question proved fairly accessible and a significant number of candidate's gained full marks however some mixed up adaptations with responses.
    - (ii) This question was well answered by the majority of candidates although a few gave aerobic adaptations and not anaerobic adaptations in their response.
  - (b) The majority of candidates responded well on this question with most scoring full marks.
  - (c) Most candidates scored well on this question, however some gave only long term impacts and could only access half the marks available. Other candidates examined respiratory or muscular skeletal impacts and not impacts on the heart.
- Q3**
- (a) Many candidates achieved full marks in this question.
  - (b) In this question a significant number of candidates failed to identify sprinter in the question and did not apply answers to this area. Some focused their answers on aerobic elements of performance enhancing drugs.
  - (c) Some candidates displayed excellent knowledge when discussing why elite athletes feel under pressure to use illegal methods to succeed in sport. Consequently, they achieved marks in the Level 3 Mark Band although the quality of written communication was basic in many cases.
- Q4**
- (a) Some candidates did not use the 'lead in' statement to the question. Consequently many responses used a single skill classification rather than skill continuum to be used their answer. Some candidates had limited or no knowledge of this area and were unable to answer the question.
  - (b) This question was answered well and several candidates achieved full marks however, some failed to gain full marks in Level 1 or 2 because they did not provide enough discussion on the influence of transfer on learning and performance. Many made the focus of their answer the description of transfer types. This prevented them from accessing Mark Band 3.

- Q5 (a) (i)** Some candidate's demonstrated excellent knowledge and understanding of the stages of learning. However, a significant number of candidates provided responses that explained the advanced learner and not the associative learner for Part (ii).
- (b)** This question was attempted by the majority of candidates and most accessed Mark Band 2 but very few developed enough points to access Mark Band 3. Many candidates were very descriptive of motivational strategies a coach could use and only a few offered real discussion in their answers. Candidates are reminded that the quality of their written communication is a key factor in accessing the highest marks in extended responses. Many candidates displayed very detailed knowledge and understanding of the strategies however their QWC was a significant limiting factor which prevented some candidates from accessing high Level 3 marks. Candidates did use contemporary sporting examples to support their answers.

In summary, candidates should be encouraged to read the questions carefully to avoid misinterpretation and endeavour to write as legibly as possible. They also need to remember 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

