

Examiners' Report/ Principal Examiner Feedback

January 2011

GCE

GCE Applied Business (6928)
Paper 01 Organising an Event

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated Business and Commerce telephone line: 0844 372 2187

January 2011

Publications Code UA026068

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2011

General Comments

There were only a small number of candidates entered for 6928 in the January window. Most centres organised suitable events. However, some centres undertook events that had too many pre-arranged or school arranged activities and did not leave sufficient work for the candidates to assess feasibility, plan and deliver the event. Examples of inappropriate activities seen, included annual discos and annual visits. The better events included entertainment evenings, gala events, charity events, etc.

Where suitable size events happened, then the approach was generally good although some candidates failed to actually describe their role in the event. This was often a reason why centres went out of tolerance with centre assessors awarding marks from their knowledge of the candidate's role/ participation in the event.

Witness statements &/or photographs to confirm that the event was held and the participation of the candidates are vital to this unit and these were often missing. Where included, these proved useful and supported the evidence of the group work, however, the use of photographs must be in line with the centre's policy on photographs and parental consent.

Most centres adopted a group work approach to the planning and delivery. There were a small number of centres that submitted group reports and these were not acceptable as each candidate must individually address the assessment criteria.

Many candidates performed less well on this unit compared to other units due to lack of participation. Where there was an active role undertaken candidates tended to score high marks.

Candidates that scored highly on this unit had major roles in the planning and delivery of the event.

Candidates tended to like the practical nature of the event and performed very well.

"Telling the story" rather than addressing the criteria is a problem with this unit.

Strand A: Feasibility research was often limited, especially where the event was an annual one or where the event was not the required "substantial event". Primary research was usually questionnaires about choices of event or interviews with staff who had run the event in the previous year.

Results were not usually analysed. Secondary research was usually research into travel costs or costs of physical resources. There was little prioritisation or reasoned conclusions.

Strand B: Constraints were usually present and risk assessments are improving. A number of candidates simply referred to the completion of their centre's risk assessment documentation by staff. These did not demonstrate knowledge or understanding of risk assessment. There is increasing amounts of prioritisation, ranking or rating of risks to probability of happening and severity of outcome.

Insurance needs again tended to be covered under the statement that the centre's insurance covered all risks. Some candidates did explain different types of insurance

and applied them to the event. Planning tools were often missing or included and not explained. Candidates displayed a lack of understanding of CPA, Gantt charts, etc. The link between planning tools, constraints and contingency planning was often missing and generally not understood. Candidates often produced risk avoidance plans rather than contingency plans.

Strand C: As stated above: Witness statements &/or photographs to confirm that the event was held and the participation of the candidates are vital to this unit and these were often missing. Candidates often failed to fully explain their input or simply referred to "we". The better answers gave detailed accounts of the candidate's contribution through all stages of planning and holding the event. Where clear and detailed witness statements showing significant sustained participation were present, centres could move candidates into mark band 3. Some candidates failed to describe the event itself.

Strand D: Evaluation was often poor. Few candidates referred back to original aims and objectives. A small number of centres collected feedback questionnaires from participants and used these effectively. Increasing evidence of use of exit questionnaires for evaluation

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code UA026068 January 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH