

Examiners' Report/ Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE
in Applied Business (6928)
Unit 13: Organising an Event

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 or 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.

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

Summer 2016

Publications Code 6928_01_1606_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

The candidate is required to take part in organising an event. The work is carried out in groups but the report is written up individually.

There were a variety of examples of events including fashion shows, trips, Battle of the Bands, entertainment evenings and charity coffee mornings, were seen. This year saw an increasing number of centres undertaking small events such as day trips and sports tournaments which limited the job roles and activities carried out by the learners.

Many centres organise appropriate events for this unit. A small number of centres did not set/ organise suitable events. A number were too small, 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 where there were often insufficient activities/ roles for candidates include annual discos, annual tournaments, annual visits, small demonstrations to other candidates, visits lacking any real aim.

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 were found to be assessing leniently with centre assessors awarding marks from their knowledge of the candidate's role/ participation in the event.

Observation records/ 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 the required useful and supportive 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 but ensured that individual reports were produced. Group reports are not acceptable as each candidate must individually address the assessment criteria.

A small number of 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.

Many 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. As was assuming that the reader knew about the event and so roles and activities were not described.

Little reference was made to QWC by centre assessors with the majority of centres not separately identifying QWC marks within the allotted strand.

Strand A: Candidates are required to show evidence of research into the feasibility of the event and to give aims and objectives. They will provide evidence of primary and secondary research which will include qualitative and quantitative data from a range of sources.

This strand is often leniently assessed. Feasibility research is often limited, especially where the event was an annual one or where the event was not the required “substantial event”. Primary research is usually questionnaires about choices of event or interviews with staff who had run the event in the previous year. An increasing number of centres are including focus groups as part of the research.

Results are not always analysed. Secondary research is usually research into travel costs or costs of physical resources. There is often little prioritisation or reasoned conclusions.

The majority of candidates now look at a range of events as an introduction to the portfolio and decide upon one event to carry forward.

Lower marks were achieved where there were omissions/imbalance in coverage of factors, e.g. only aims, objectives and outcomes with no mention of financial constraints.

Higher marks were achieved where there was detailed research into all aspects of viability of the event, all sources were referenced and clear application of research to the event and justified conclusions to appropriate resources were made.

Strand B: This strand has the assessment of QWC in it. Candidates plan the event and cover a range of constraints. A risk assessment and contingency plan will be produced. Candidates will also cover insurance needs.

Constraints are usually present; risk assessment is improved with candidates completing an appropriate risk assessment. There are increasing amounts of prioritisation, ranking or rating of risks to probability of happening and severity of outcome. Contingency plans tend to be based on risk avoidance rather than being a real contingency plan of alternatives.

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 apply 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.

In this band at the lower range of marks, there was an imbalance of treatment, but at least two constraints were considered, e.g. physical constraints were described superficially and without much thought as to how they might be dealt with. Time constraints were often put in a simple time line, but with no attempt to introduce critical path analysis of the project. The legal constraints looked selectively at relevant contract, negligence and health and safety law, with accurate but not derivative information and application to the event.

At the top of this band, all constraints were covered in equal detail. Explanation and application were related specifically to the event. There was clear application of the physical requirements to the funding required. Evidence of a projection of likely costs that can be compared with actual costs in the evaluative part of the work was seen. The physical constraints were described in detail. Often there was a simple time line and critical path analysis of the project. There were accurate descriptive summaries of the legal principles relating to contract, negligence and health and safety law in the context of the project. The description of the law was selective and with clear application. Risk assessments were produced that were of a standard form with some justification for the assessed levels of risk of different aspects of the project. There was identification of essential and some non-essential insurance requirements with some explanation of the reasons for inclusion and likely costs.

Strand C: This strand covers the contribution of the candidate to the staging of the event. This requires an observation record/ witness statement to support evidence produced by the candidate. A number of centres did not include observation records/ witness testimonies. Witness statements and/or photographs to confirm that the event was held and the participation of the candidates are vital to this unit.

Where clear and detailed witness statements showing significant sustained participation were present, centres could move candidates into mark band 3. Centres that fail to provide observation records/ witness statement disadvantage their candidates.

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.

Candidates must explain their own role and provide a self-evaluation

Some candidates failed to describe the event itself.

At the lower end the evidence produced was often superficial, with major aspects of the event omitted. Some candidates did not explain their role in the event or the activities they carried out. The evaluation of own performance was often very subjective and superficial.

At the top end of the mark range there was detailed information on significant participation in the staging of the event, with in-depth objective explanation of own role and a justified conclusion.

Strand D: For this strand, candidates evaluate the success of the event. Viability will be covered.

Evaluation is improving. Candidates usually refer back to original aims and objectives. A number of centres collected feedback questionnaires from participants and used these effectively.

At the lower end of the mark band, a basic evaluation of the successes and failures in the project as well as simple recommendations for improvements were produced. Sometimes this was brief, simplistic and superficial, with limited connection between the evidence of success or failure and the recommendations. Also, at the lower end of the band there was list-like coverage of how well some aspects of the event went in the report, without any critical comments, reference to contingency plans or adjustments made or the reasons given as to why they were needed.

At the lower end of the mark scale there was little attempt to evaluate either success or failure.

At the top end there were sound and detailed connections between the evidence of success or failure and the recommendations. Candidates also used quantitative and qualitative data / information, often collected through post event questionnaires/ evaluations, to support their own evaluations and conclusions.

Grade Boundaries

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>

