

WSU Practice Examination

Exam Deconstruction Guide for Michael

Teacher only. Use the completed practice paper to teach students how to identify a question's demands and build an answer that meets them. The session is 120 minutes and is separate from the 75-minute examination.

Answer key

Question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Answer	B	D	A	C	C	A	D	B

Question	Marks
1–8	8
9(a) and 9(b)	2 + 4
10(a) and 10(b)	2 + 2
11	4
12	6
13	6
14	6
Total	40

Session plan

Minutes	Focus	Teaching purpose
0–8	Set up and self-check	Students mark their confidence; model verb, scope, number and evidence.
8–26	Questions 1–8	Reason through distractors; spend longest on Q2 and Q4.
26–40	Question 9	Data description, determinant interaction and the sneaky s.
40–49	Question 10	Read the body-position diagram, then explain the mechanism.
49–59	Question 11	Answer two different requirements without drifting.
59–73	Question 12	Turn definitions into comparative analysis.
73–79	Pause and individual repair	Students revise one weak explanation; brief transition.

Minutes	Focus	Teaching purpose
79–97	Question 13	Connect park features and community barriers to a judgement.
97–112	Question 14	Justify two feasible choices for a specific context.
112–120	Exit task and transfer	Students plan an improved answer and identify one habit to use next time.

A consistent unpacking routine

First locate the directive. Then box the topic and limiting words, count the distinct requirements, and underline the evidence that must be used. Plan only the material that meets those requirements. After writing, check the response against the question, not against everything remembered about the topic. The sneaky s is a useful reminder to inspect plural requirements, not a universal one-mark-per-point rule. TWO sets an exact number; an unqualified plural normally requires more than one but the mark value and directive determine depth. “Examples” requires examples that support the answer, not decorative names.

Use the marking guidelines after students have attempted a repair. The suggested workshop minutes below total 98 minutes; introduction, pause and exit task add 22 minutes.

Multiple choice deconstruction

Question 1 1 mark 2 workshop minutes

Field	Teaching notes
Syllabus and directive	FA1; HM-12-01; S1, pp27. Identify by selecting one best answer.
Limits and task count	Distinguish new cases from existing cases and deaths. One selection; every condition in the stem must fit.
Plan and likely trap	Circle the event and the time period before reading the options. Trap: Choosing a familiar epidemiological term without checking “newly diagnosed”.
Michael should teach	Circle the event and the time period before reading the options. Ask students to defend B and reject the nearest distractor, then reveal the rationale.

- A. Prevalence counts existing cases at a point or over a period, rather than only new diagnoses. This distractor tests confusion between the two measures.
- B. Incidence concerns new cases in a defined population over a specified period.
- C. Mortality concerns deaths, not diagnoses. This distractor tests whether the student notices what event is counted.
- D. Life expectancy estimates expected years of life. It is not a count of disease cases.

Common error: Choosing a familiar epidemiological term without checking “newly diagnosed”.

Question 2 1 mark 3 workshop minutes

Field	Teaching notes
Syllabus and directive	FA1; HM-12-01, HM-12-06; S2, pp27. Interpret by selecting one best answer.
Limits and task count	Compare both indicators and avoid an unsupported causal or overall ranking. One selection; every condition in the stem must fit.
Plan and likely trap	Read units and desirable direction separately for each column. Separate comparison from causal explanation. Trap: Treating the smallest number as best across every indicator or inferring a single cause.
Michael should teach	Read units and desirable direction separately for each column. Separate comparison from causal explanation. Ask students to defend D and reject the nearest distractor, then reveal the rationale.

- A. One favourable indicator cannot establish the best overall health status; Country B also has the lowest life expectancy in this table.
- B. The table does not establish causation. Country A has higher smoking prevalence and higher life expectancy than Australia.
- C. Country A has higher life expectancy but higher smoking prevalence, so it is not worse on both measures.
- D. Country B has the lowest smoking prevalence but the lowest life expectancy. Relative position depends on the indicator selected.

Common error: Treating the smallest number as best across every indicator or inferring a single cause.

Multiple choice deconstruction

Question 3 1 mark 2 workshop minutes

Field	Teaching notes
Syllabus and directive	FA1; HM-12-01; S3, pp27–28. Apply by selecting one best answer.
Limits and task count	Select the option that supports function and prevention together. One selection; every condition in the stem must fit.
Plan and likely trap	Test each option against BOTH aims in the stem. Prevention and treatment are complementary but serve different immediate purposes. Trap: Choosing a useful treatment service without addressing prevention.
Michael should teach	Test each option against BOTH aims in the stem. Prevention and treatment are complementary but serve different immediate purposes. Ask students to defend A and reject the nearest distractor, then reveal the rationale.

Notes:

A. An accessible strength and balance program can maintain function and reduce falls risk, supporting independence and potentially reducing treatment demand.

B. Additional hospital beds

Hospital beds help treat established injuries. They may improve access to treatment, but they do not directly prevent falls or maintain physical function in the community.

C. Advertising private hospital options

This promotes awareness of treatment options, but it does not directly improve strength, balance or falls prevention. It also does not necessarily reduce future demand for treatment.

D. A larger ambulance fleet

Ambulances provide an important emergency response after falls occur. However, this primarily addresses the consequences of falls rather than preventing them.

Question 4 1 mark 3 workshop minutes

Field	Teaching notes
Syllabus and directive	FA1; HM-12-01; S4, pp26–28. Apply by selecting one best answer.
Limits and task count	Recognise coordinated care shaped by the person and Community. One selection; every condition in the stem must fit.
Plan and likely trap	Identify who has a voice in the decision. Avoid treating Aboriginal Peoples or Communities as homogeneous. Trap: Equating identical care or high service volume with appropriate care.
Michael should teach	Identify who has a voice in the decision. Avoid treating Aboriginal Peoples or Communities as homogeneous. Ask students to defend C and reject the nearest distractor, then reveal the rationale.

Notes:

A. The scenario describes shared planning, not a complete transfer of responsibility. Coordination remains necessary.

B. Identical plans overlook individual goals and preferences and are not necessarily person-centred.

C. The partnership incorporates patient goals and Community knowledge into coordinated care, supporting responsiveness to people's needs.

D. Appointment counts indicate activity, but do not alone establish whether care meets people's goals or improves outcomes.

Common error: Equating identical care or high service volume with appropriate care.

Multiple choice deconstruction

Question 5 1 mark 2 workshop minutes

Field	Teaching notes
Syllabus and directive	FA2; HM-12-04; S5, pp31. Apply by selecting one best answer.
Limits and task count	Distinguish screening from fitness measurement and program prescription. One selection; every condition in the stem must fit.
Plan and likely trap	Follow the sequence: information, relevant screening, informed prescription. Trap: Treating a questionnaire as a fitness test or automatic clearance.
Michael should teach	Follow the sequence: information, relevant screening, informed prescription. Ask students to defend C and reject the nearest distractor, then reveal the rationale.

Notes:

- A. A questionnaire flags health considerations; it does not measure aerobic performance.
- B. A program suited to another participant does not address this person's health information or exercise capacity.
- C. Relevant screening can clarify precautions and help individualise the program.
- D. Completion is not medical clearance. A flagged concern may require further assessment.

Common error: Treating a questionnaire as a fitness test or automatic clearance.

Question 6 1 mark 2 workshop minutes

Field	Teaching notes
Syllabus and directive	FA2; HM-12-04; S6, pp33. Apply by selecting one best answer.
Limits and task count	Match each of three recovery needs to an appropriate intake. One selection; every condition in the stem must fit.
Plan and likely trap	Use a three-column check: fuel, repair, fluid. Reject an option as soon as one required component is missing. Trap: Selecting an option that satisfies only one or two of the three requirements.
Michael should teach	Use a three-column check: fuel, repair, fluid. Reject an option as soon as one required component is missing. Ask students to defend A and reject the nearest distractor, then reveal the rationale. <i>Put x or tick above the answers to check each part within the answer</i>

- A. Carbohydrate supports glycogen restoration, protein supplies material for repair, and fluid intake addresses fluid losses.
- B. Protein supports repair and water supports hydration, but the option omits the carbohydrate needed to restore glycogen efficiently.
- C. Carbohydrate addresses glycogen, but caffeine is not a substitute for a protein source or a fluid-replacement plan.
- D. Water addresses hydration, but micronutrients do not supply the carbohydrate and protein required for the stated purposes.

Common error: Selecting an option that satisfies only one or two of the three requirements.

Multiple choice deconstruction

Question 7 1 mark 2 workshop minutes

Field	Teaching notes
Syllabus and directive	FA2; HM-12-04; S7, pp34. Classify by selecting one best answer.
Limits and task count	Use both the onset and tissue type. One selection; every condition in the stem must fit.
Plan and likely trap	Underline onset and tissue separately. Every element of the selected option must fit. Trap: Classifying the cause while ignoring the tissue, or treating “indirect” as the best label for every injury without contact.
Michael should teach	Underline onset and tissue separately. Every element of the selected option must fit. Ask students to defend D and reject the nearest distractor, then reveal the rationale.

Notes:

A. No direct impact is described, and a tendon is not hard tissue.

B. Soft tissue is correct, but direct impact is absent. One correct element does not make the whole option correct.

C. Hard tissue is incorrect. The repeated gradual onset is best identified as overuse rather than an acute indirect mechanism.

D. Gradual repetitive loading indicates overuse, and a tendon is soft tissue. Both parts fit.

Common error: Classifying the cause while ignoring the tissue, or treating “indirect” as the best label for every injury without contact.

Question 8 1 mark 2 workshop minutes

Field	Teaching notes
Syllabus and directive	FA2; HM-12-05; S8, pp32–33. Interpret by selecting one best answer.
Limits and task count	Recognise the purpose of tapering without confusing it with complete rest. One selection; every condition in the stem must fit.
Plan and likely trap	Separate volume, intensity and purpose. A taper can retain intensity while reducing volume. Trap: Assuming less volume means loss of fitness or complete inactivity.
Michael should teach	Separate volume, intensity and purpose. A taper can retain intensity while reducing volume. Ask students to defend B and reject the nearest distractor, then reveal the rationale.

Notes:

A. The described reduction is not a large new overload; a last-minute overload could add fatigue.

B. Tapering reduces accumulated fatigue while maintaining adaptations and readiness for the target event.

C. The retained competition-intensity efforts preserve a sport-specific stimulus.

D. Reversibility means loss of training adaptations. It is not the intended purpose of tapering.

Common error: Assuming less volume means loss of fitness or complete inactivity.

Written response deconstruction

Question 9(a) 2 marks 5 workshop minutes

Field	Teaching notes
Syllabus and verb	FA1; HM-12-01, HM-12-06, HM-12-07; S9, syllabus pp26–27. Describe: Give the main features of the change, supported by the values. A cause is not requested.
Limiting words	EACH; from 2015 to 2025; data; mortality rate.
Distinct requirements	2 linked tasks: describe the change in each group and attach data to each.
Planning process	Label the two populations, then write direction + starting rate + ending rate for each.
Likely trap	Describing incidence rather than mortality; using counts of deaths rather than rates; mentioning only one population; copying four numbers without indicating change.
Michael should teach	A describe response gives the pattern. Do not spend time explaining determinants in part (a).

Directive: Describe. Give the main features of the change, supported by the values. A cause is not requested.

Marks	Criteria
2	Accurately describes the decline in each population, supporting each with correct rates or an equivalent correct numerical change.
1	Accurately describes and quantifies the decline in one population; OR identifies the decline in both populations without adequate numerical support.
0	No relevant correct information.

Indicative answer

In major cities the rate fell from 80 to 60 deaths per 100,000 people. In rural and remote communities it fell from 160 to 120 deaths per 100,000. Both rates decreased.

Response depth: Two concise sentences; about 30–50 words. Allow about 3 minutes.

Full versus partial credit: “Both rates fell” identifies the overall trend but does not support it with data: 1 mark. Correct endpoints for each group lift this to 2.

Common mistakes: Describing incidence rather than mortality; using counts of deaths rather than rates; mentioning only one population; copying four numbers without indicating change.

Marker guidance: Credit correct equivalent changes, including 20 and 40 per 100,000 or 25% for each. A percentage calculation is not required.

Worked repair activities

Q9(b): add an interaction and consequence to “distance and income affect health”.

Question 9(b) 4 marks 9 workshop minutes

Field	Teaching notes
Syllabus and verb	FA1; HM-12-01, HM-12-06, HM-12-07; S9, syllabus pp26–27. Explain: Make a causal relationship clear: show how two determinants can work together to influence the specified health outcome.
Limiting words	TWO; interact; could; higher; cardiovascular disease mortality; rural and remote.
Distinct requirements	4 tasks: identify two determinants, connect them, and connect the interaction to the outcome.
Planning process	Use a chain: determinant A + determinant B → reinforced barrier or exposure → mortality consequence.
Likely trap	Giving two labels only; describing two unrelated determinants; blaming all rural residents for choices; assuming the data prove the explanation; discussing disease incidence without a mortality link.
Michael should teach	Flag the sneaky s in determinants, then show why “interact” requires more than two <i>separate</i> mini-paragraphs.

Geographical isolation can mean long journeys to specialist cardiovascular care. Low income can make those journeys harder to afford, particularly when travel also requires time away from work. Together, distance and financial barriers can delay diagnosis and ongoing treatment. Poorer access to timely treatment can increase the likelihood that cardiovascular disease results in death. These are plausible contributors; the table alone does not establish the causes.

Response depth: One connected paragraph; about 80–110 words. Allow about 6 minutes.

Full versus partial credit: “Distance delays treatment; low income makes care less affordable” explains two separate effects but does not show their interaction. It may earn 3 if both effects and the mortality link are developed; 4 requires the reinforcing relationship.

Common mistakes: Giving two labels only; describing two unrelated determinants; blaming all rural residents for choices; assuming the data prove the explanation; discussing disease incidence without a mortality link.

Marker guidance: Do not require these specific determinants. Accept other defensible interacting determinants. Do not assume every rural or remote person has a low income

Note: if you read your response and the interaction isn’t as clear as a 4 marker should be then add a smaller paragraph, demonstrating the interaction. Sometimes 4 mark questions require 2 paragraphs; they are flexible based on the question.

Written response deconstruction

Question 10(a) 2 marks 5 workshop minutes

Field	Teaching notes
Syllabus and verb	FA2; HM-12-04, HM-12-06, HM-12-07; S10, syllabus pp33–34. Explain: Connect a specific change in body position to drag and movement efficiency.
Limiting words	Figure 1; position B compared with A; same speed; less effort.
Distinct requirements	Link the visible change in body alignment to water resistance and the effort needed at the same speed.
Planning process	Compare the hips and legs in A and B. Write: visible change → water resistance → effort at the same speed.
Likely trap	Saying that less drag directly increases muscular strength; discussing only stroke rate; naming a principle without explaining its effect.
Michael should teach	Ask students to point to the difference before explaining it. The image supplies body position; students supply the mechanism. Do not infer measured speed or energy values from a diagram.

directive: Explain. Connect a specific change in body position to drag and movement efficiency.

Marks	Criteria
2	Links the more horizontal body position in B to reduced frontal area or water resistance, and explains why less force or energy is needed to maintain the same speed as in A.
1	Identifies reduced drag, improved streamlining or a relevant efficiency benefit without a clear link.
0	No relevant correct information.

Notes

In B, the hips and legs are nearer the surface and the body is more horizontal than in A. This reduces the frontal area pushing through the water and therefore drag, so less propulsive force and energy are needed to maintain the same speed.

Response depth: Two or three linked sentences; about 35–50 words. Allow about 3 minutes.

Full versus partial credit: “It makes the swimmer more streamlined” is relevant but stops before the mechanism and efficiency consequence: 1 mark.

Common mistakes: Saying that less drag directly increases muscular strength; discussing only stroke rate; naming a principle without explaining its effect.

Marker guidance: Accept clear comparative references without the letters A and B. No equation or measured angle is required. The drawing does not measure drag or energy expenditure.

Question 10(b) 2 marks 4 workshop minutes

Field	Teaching notes
Syllabus and verb	FA2; HM-12-04, HM-12-06, HM-12-07; S10, syllabus pp33–34. Explain: Connect one feature of video analysis to checking a change in technique.
Limiting words	ONE; video analysis; check the change from A towards B.
Distinct requirements	2 tasks: identify a useful feature and explain how it checks the change.
Planning process	Choose one video feature, then state exactly what is compared or observed.
Likely trap	Listing several devices; claiming video alone proves lower energy expenditure; answering about lap time rather than visible technique.
Michael should teach	Ask what the video can show: hip and leg alignment. It cannot by itself measure energy expenditure. One explained benefit is enough.

Marks	Criteria
2	Explains how a relevant video feature or comparison allows the swimmer or coach to check hip position or body alignment after the change.
1	Identifies a relevant benefit of video analysis without explaining how it checks the technique change.
0	No relevant correct information.

Notes:

Side-on video can be paused at the same stage of the glide before and after coaching. The coach can compare the hips and legs with the water surface to check whether the swimmer now maintains the more horizontal alignment shown in B.

Response depth: One developed point; about 30–45 words. Allow about 3 minutes.

Full versus partial credit: “Video provides feedback” identifies a general benefit but does not show how it checks this change: 1 mark.

Common mistakes: Listing several devices; claiming video alone proves lower energy expenditure; answering about lap time rather than visible technique.

Marker guidance: Mark independently of part (a). Accept slow motion, replay or another valid comparison that checks the specified position.

Written response deconstruction

Question 11 4 marks 10 workshop minutes

Field	Teaching notes
Syllabus and verb	FA1; HM-12-02, HM-12-06, HM-12-07; S11, syllabus pp29. Explain: Explain a benefit and a privacy measure, each through its effect on the supplied digital-health system.
Limiting words	Using the proposal; ONE benefit; patient care; ONE measure; privacy.
Distinct requirements	4 tasks: select benefit, explain care effect, select measure, explain protection.
Planning process	Split into two paragraphs: record feature → care consequence; safeguard → prevented access or disclosure.
Likely trap	Treating a shared record as unrestricted public data; claiming it guarantees error-free care; naming “privacy” as the measure; discussing unrelated apps or online consultations.
Michael should teach	A noun is not an explanation. Keep the care benefit separate from the privacy mechanism.

Directive: Explain. Explain a benefit and a privacy measure, each through its effect on the supplied digital-health system.

Marks	Criteria
4	Explains one relevant patient-care benefit and how one suitable privacy measure protects the information. Both are applied to the shared-record proposal.
3	Explains one requirement clearly and outlines the other relevant requirement.
2	Explains one requirement only; OR outlines a relevant benefit and a relevant privacy measure.
1	Identifies one relevant benefit or privacy measure, or provides other relevant correct information.
0	No relevant correct information.

Notes:

A clinician can check the patient’s current medicines alongside recent test results before deciding on treatment. This can reduce the risk of an unsuitable prescription or unnecessary repeat test. Role-based access should restrict each staff member to information needed for their care role, limiting access by people without a legitimate reason to view the record.

Response depth: Two short linked explanations; about 65–90 words. Allow about 7 minutes.

Full versus partial credit: “It improves care and needs passwords” identifies relevant ideas but does not explain how either works: normally 2 marks. Explaining the care mechanism and how access is restricted earns 4.

Common mistakes: Treating a shared record as unrestricted public data; claiming it guarantees error-free care; naming “privacy” as the measure; discussing unrelated apps or online consultations.

Marker guidance: Accept informed consent with meaningful access choices, secure authentication, encryption, audit and access controls, or another appropriate measure when its protective role is explained. Do not require technical implementation detail or legal provisions.

Question 12 6 marks 14 workshop minutes

Field	Teaching notes
Syllabus and verb	FA2; HM-12-04, HM-12-05, HM-12-06, HM-12-07; S12, syllabus pp31–32. Analyse: Examine the two plans and make their different relationships to adaptation and performance clear.
Limiting words	Why; Plan B more likely than Plan A; BOTH; ONE; 5-kilometre.
Distinct requirements	4 tasks: compare specificity, compare overload, identify one adaptation, explain performance implication.
Planning process	Use two columns for the plans. Link each required principle to a detail. Finish with training → adaptation → sustained pace.
Likely trap	Calling Plan A useless; assuming any hard training is specific; equating overload with doing maximum exercise daily; naming an adaptation without explaining its performance effect; treating one session as enough for adaptation.
Michael should teach	Analysis joins the parts. A definition of progressive overload cannot substitute for applying it to the changing duration.

Directive: Analyse. Examine the two plans and make their different relationships to adaptation and performance clear.

Marks	Criteria
6	Analyses both plans through specificity and progressive overload, using the stimulus to explain why Plan B better matches the event. Clearly links a relevant physiological adaptation to improved 5-kilometre performance.
5	Explains both principles in relation to the plans and gives a sound adaptation-to-performance link, with less developed comparison or analysis.
4	Explains both principles with some use of the plans, but the adaptation-to-performance link is incomplete; OR gives a strong explanation of one principle and adaptation with limited treatment of the other.
3	Describes both principles and relates them to the plans, with only a limited explanation of performance or adaptation.
2	Outlines a relevant principle, training difference or adaptation with some connection to the runner.
1	Provides some relevant correct information.
0	No relevant correct information.

Indicative answer

Plan B is more specific to the predominantly aerobic demands of a 5-kilometre run: continuous running develops the ability to sustain running for the event. Plan A's short maximal sprints with full recovery mainly target brief high-intensity efforts, so transfer to sustained 5-kilometre running is more limited. Plan B also gradually increases running duration as the runner adapts, applying progressive overload. Plan A repeats an unchanged load and is therefore more likely to produce a plateau once the runner has adapted. With adequate recovery, sustained aerobic training can increase stroke volume. More blood and oxygen can be delivered per heartbeat, helping the runner sustain a faster pace before fatigue. Plan A could still help sprint speed; it is less suitable as the sole program for this goal.

Response depth: Two or three connected paragraphs; about 130–170 words. Allow about 10 minutes.

Full versus partial credit: A response that defines both principles but barely uses the plans is descriptive. To reach 6, show how the different training demands produce different likely performance benefits and explain the adaptation mechanism.

Common mistakes: Calling Plan A useless; assuming any hard training is specific; equating overload with doing maximum exercise daily; naming an adaptation without explaining its performance effect; treating one session as enough for adaptation.

Marker guidance: Accept increased maximal oxygen uptake or another syllabus-supported aerobic adaptation with an accurate mechanism. Do not require exact threshold percentages, energy-system timings or two adaptations.

Worked repair activities

Q12: underline training details and adaptation links

Written response deconstruction

Question 13 6 marks 18 workshop minutes

Field	Teaching notes
Syllabus and verb	FA1; HM-12-03, HM-12-06, HM-12-07, HM-12-09; S13, syllabus pp29–30. Evaluate: Make and support a judgement of likely effectiveness against the stated SDGs, using strengths and limitations of the proposal.
Limiting words	Likely effectiveness; residents' health; SDG 10 AND SDG 11; Figure 2 AND community information.
Distinct requirements	Judge the proposal through both SDGs, linking a visible park feature and the community information to health benefits and remaining access barriers.
Planning process	Select a visible feature in Figure 2 and match it to a community need. Weigh that benefit against the transport, time or unsafe-route barrier. Support a qualified overall judgement.
Likely trap	Defining all four SDGs; ignoring SDG 10; assuming free access means equitable access; copying percentages without interpreting them; making recommendations without evaluating the actual proposal.
Michael should teach	Have students point to a numbered feature, explain who it could help, then test whether that person can reach the park or attend. A welcoming picture is not evidence that every access barrier is solved.

Directive: Evaluate. Make and support a judgement of likely effectiveness against the stated SDGs, using strengths and limitations of the proposal.

Marks	Criteria
6	Makes a supported overall judgement of likely effectiveness. Applies both SDGs accurately, uses specific details from Figure 2 and the community information to analyse health benefits and limitations, and presents a cohesive response.
5	Makes a clear judgement, applies both SDGs and uses relevant details from the figure and community information to explain benefits and a limitation, with less developed analysis.
4	Explains relevant benefits and limitations using some stimulus evidence, but judgement or one SDG is underdeveloped.
3	Describes how the proposal could improve health with some relevant stimulus or SDG links; evaluation is limited.
2	Outlines relevant features of the proposal or an SDG with a simple health link.
1	Provides some relevant correct information.
0	No relevant correct information.

Notes:

The proposal is likely to improve health for some residents, but its effect on inequalities will be limited unless access barriers are addressed. Free sessions reduce the cost barrier reported by 40% of respondents, supporting SDG 10. Figure 2 shows a step-free entrance (1), a walking loop (2) and shaded seating (3). These improve access to usable public space, supporting SDG 11 and allowing more residents to be active and meet others. Greater physical activity and social connection can improve physical and mental wellbeing. However, the park has no bus service and the only sessions

are at midday on weekdays. Residents without transport or with work commitments may still be excluded, even though cost is reduced. The 35% who report unsafe walking routes may also remain unable to reach the park safely. Overall, the proposal is a useful start, but safer routes, transport access and varied session times would be needed for wider and more equitable benefits. Participation from underserved groups and changes in activity would help judge its success.

Response depth: About three concise paragraphs, roughly 150–200 words; plan, write and check within 12 minutes. Word count is guidance, never a marking rule.

Full versus partial credit: “The park will make people healthier because they can exercise for free” is a relevant benefit, but cannot earn full marks without both SDGs, stimulus-based limitations and a reasoned judgement. *Evaluation mechanism may also be required (how will the proposals be validly measured?)*

Common mistakes: Defining all four SDGs; ignoring SDG 10; assuming free access means equitable access; copying percentages without interpreting them; making recommendations without evaluating the actual proposal.

Marker guidance: Accept a more positive or negative conclusion if well supported. Do not require an extra strategy or success indicator for full marks; these can strengthen the judgement but are not additional hidden tasks. Accept clear descriptions of visible features without their numbers. Do not infer distances, lighting or route safety from unshown surroundings.

Worked repair activities

Q13: link a park feature to a need and a remaining barrier.

Question 14 6 marks 15 workshop minutes

Field	Teaching notes
Syllabus and verb	FA2; HM-12-04, HM-12-06, HM-12-07, HM-12-09; S14, syllabus pp33–34. Justify: Choose two changes and provide reasons showing why each suits this athlete and the short recovery period.
Limiting words	TWO changes; overnight; next match; use the information.
Distinct requirements	4 tasks: select two changes and justify each with context, mechanism and performance consequence.
Planning process	For each change write: existing problem → feasible change → recovery mechanism → next-match benefit.
Likely trap	Listing many strategies without explaining two; changing the adequate fluid plan without evidence; prescribing a universal quantity or supplement; discussing long-term training adaptations instead of overnight recovery.
Michael should teach	Flag the sneaky s in changes. Justify means show why the choice fits, not just describe what the athlete would do.

Notes:

Directive: Justify. Choose two changes and provide reasons showing why each suits this athlete and the short recovery period.

Marks	Criteria
6	Justifies two appropriate changes using specific stimulus details, accurate recovery mechanisms and clear links to next-match performance. Reasons show why the changes suit the available recovery period.
5	Gives sound reasons for two changes and links both to the scenario and performance, with one link or contextual justification less developed.
4	Explains two appropriate changes with some contextual or performance links, but justification is uneven; OR thoroughly justifies one change and outlines a second.
3	Describes two appropriate changes with limited reasons; OR justifies one change without a relevant second change.
2	Outlines two appropriate changes; OR explains one relevant recovery benefit.
1	Identifies one appropriate change or provides some relevant correct information.
0	No relevant correct information.

Notes:

First, the player should replace the midnight video review with a brief review earlier in the evening, then follow a wind-down routine and an earlier bedtime. The proposed schedule allows only six hours in bed and the player already feels mentally tired. More opportunity for sleep and relaxation can reduce fatigue and support attention, decision-making and coordination in the morning match. Second, the player should add a carbohydrate-rich meal or snack to the fluid plan instead of eating only the protein bar. The long match will have used glycogen, and the short overnight turnaround makes refuelling important. Carbohydrate supports restoration of glycogen so repeated running efforts can be sustained; protein can still support repair. Together these changes address mental readiness and the energy needed for performance rather than relying on fluid and protein alone.

Response depth: Two developed paragraphs, about 140–190 words; allow 12 minutes including planning. No fixed word count is required.

Full versus partial credit: “Go to bed earlier and eat carbohydrates” identifies two useful changes but does not justify them: 2 marks. Full credit requires reasons linked to this player and tomorrow’s performance.

Common mistakes: Listing many strategies without explaining two; changing the adequate fluid plan without evidence; prescribing a universal quantity or supplement; discussing long-term training adaptations instead of overnight recovery.

Marker guidance: Accept other defensible changes, including an explained relaxation strategy. Two related sleep changes can receive credit if they have distinct, well-supported mechanisms; do not impose an unstated requirement to choose one nutrition and one sleep change

Worked repair activities

Q14: check each change has a mechanism and next-match consequence.