



## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2015  
Publications Code UA040768

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

## **GCE Applied Business (6922) June 2015**

### **General Comments**

This series most samples of the work were again received on time together with the appropriate forms and were signed to indicate authenticity. In general, marks on the work conformed to those on the 'OPTEMS' with occasional discrepancies. The Principal Moderator saw most of the work this year and was able to compare different approaches adopted by Centres. Marks awarded by Centres, tended to be within tolerance.

Work was submitted on time and generally well annotated. Witness statements account for a substantial part of the marks. However, these do need to be more detailed and have the supporting evidence to warrant the marks awarded. This was not always the case.

### **Annotation of Portfolio Work**

It is again worth noting that the minimum requirement for annotation of portfolios is laid down in the Code of Practice to be identification of where a candidate's evidence of criteria coverage may be found in the work. There were some samples where little or no annotation was evident and moderators were left trying to identify where and how marks had been awarded.

The recommendation to annotate by reference to 'Mark Band' achieved and 'Strand', 'Theme' or 'Area' covered eg MB1a, MB2b etc is still not being followed by some Centres but, however this is done, it is worth emphasising again the importance of clear annotation and internal standardisation for the benefit of candidates as well as for external moderation purposes.

### **Presentation of Portfolio Work**

The preferred format remains loose-leaf or treasury-tagged sheets that can be easily opened and read. Although less evident this year, there still remains the issue of inaccessibility and unsuitable presentation of some of the portfolios with work either tightly packed into plastic wallets (that split on opening), left in ring binders or clipped into plastic folders (this simply makes the process of extracting the work more laborious than should be the case).

### **General Issues with the Specification:**

Although most Centres included witness statements for strand C regarding candidates' performance, there was insufficient evidence from some candidates to support the marks awarded by the assessor.

## **Quality of Written Communication 'QWC'**

Few assessors appear to specifically record the marks available for the level achieved. Up to 3 marks for 'QWC' can be given in Strand (b) and these are part of the total mark available for that strand which has a total of 18 marks. In general, where such marks had been given, these appear to have been beneficial to candidate

### **Areas of the Specification:**

This unit has one of the smallest entries. This is probably due to the need to run an enterprise over time that requires a substantial work commitment outside lesson time.

**Strand A:** Many centres adopted the approach of setting up the enterprise to run an event. This did not always work very well as the time frame tended to be very short and some of the assessment criteria was not fully addressed. The best approach seen was the centre that used Young Enterprise as a vehicle. This centre ran the enterprise over a number of weeks, making the whole enterprise much more realistic. It enabled candidates to be able to access higher marks.

Where detailed records in diaries/journals were kept then Centres that did this tended to gain the best results. Much of the evidence for candidate involvement comes from such diaries that also show timelines and make activities clear. They support the other three strands. Some candidates found it difficult to discuss what they did and tended to use the collective "we". Evidence needed witness statements to support diaries/commentaries and these were not always present. It is again recommended that candidates are encouraged to demonstrate their own contribution through their diaries entries.

The Centre has to ensure that the product/service of the company involves sufficient activity to enable all candidates to have an active input to enable them to move out of mark band 1.

A substantive business activity is required. Centres must also ensure that the group size is appropriate.

Candidates are required to undertake a self-evaluation in this strand. These were often unsubstantiated or, in many cases, were simply a description of what they did rather than self-evaluation.

**Strand B:** Some Centres produced excellent work for this strand with clear descriptions of roles and responsibilities as well as supported evaluations of team members in these roles.

**Strand C:** The witness statements for the presentation are often brief and require greater detail. Where there are clear and detailed witness statements showing substantive contribution were present then Centres could move candidates into mark band 3. This does need supporting

evidence from candidates showing originality of thought and outstanding contribution to the group report and presentation.

In most portfolios, where there is a strong witness statement identifying strong and sustained contribution to the running of the company, the group activity and the group presentation by the candidate there was usually sufficient candidate evidence to support the allocation of higher marks.

Where roles or contribution was minor it was extremely difficult for candidates to move outside mark band 1.

Candidates should include their own PowerPoint printouts, cue cards, etc. and identify their own input. The Centre must also ensure that a full copy of the group presentation is sent for moderation so that individual input can be gauged. The Centres should not restrict themselves to the one side of the exemplar witness statement pro forma found in the qualification guidance and on the Edexcel website. This is only a guide and Centres must ensure that they make full and clear statements about candidate input into the company and the presentation. Where the activity/event was too small candidates often could not generate sufficient evidence.

Where a company report is produced as well as the individual portfolios, this must be sent with the sample.

**Strand D:** This strand needs the financial outcomes of the company to be used to enable effective evaluations. This did not always happen. Evaluation was often limited to making a profit, therefore, marks were often restricted to mark band 1.

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

