

Moderators' Report/
Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2015

Pearson Edexcel GCE
in Leisure Studies (6969)
Paper 01 Leisure in Action

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 2015

Publications Code UA040832

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

The number of entries for this year's moderation was similar to recent years. From the dates identified on much of the coursework, this unit continues to be left until the end of the course. Again, all the activities selected were suitable for the course and had been chosen carefully given the small class sizes for most of the centres moderated.

Most events planned were sports related. The most popular consisting of a sports related knock out tournament involving local junior schools, or year 7 to 9 groups. It is pleasing to see some centres showing innovation by holding functions including a continental market, "bake offs" and "(name of school) has talent" shows. The main consideration, as always, is that the activity allows ample scope for the entire cohort to be involved, and that it is the process rather than the final product (activity) that is most important.

The standard of work again showed a marked improvement on previous years' entries, particularly with the work deemed by the assessors to have met mark band 3.

Centre assessment and annotation was generally accurate, but centres are again to be reminded of the importance of internal standardisation and in making reference back to past advice in the form of moderators' reports.

AO1: The Plan of the Event

Centres should ensure that students do not produce generic notes on SMART targets and Gant charts. Obviously these topics are part of the teaching process, but submitted work does not need to include this theory unless it relates to their specific planning activities. For a plan to be "workable", it needs to include all aspects as shown in the specifications. A good judge would be that it should be to a level where it could reasonably be picked up and followed by a third party.

Generally, all aspects of the planning process identified in the specifications had been included, and there were few students achieving marks within mark band 1, or even mark band 2. Students had produced good risk assessments which showed understanding of potential hazards and how to deal with them. The weakest aspects of planning were related to lack of content in contingency planning or financial documentation. Again it is advised that centres monitor what students are including in the plan as they go along. Yet again, too many of the plans were similar in presentation to ones submitted by peers and gave a view that the plans were undertaken as a group with minor alterations for individual submission.

AO2: Individual contributions

This was a vast improvement on previous years. Centres are encouraging students to keep a diary or log sheets completed on a regular basis. This goes a long way towards earning higher marks simply by having the right evidence to prove their role. Centres that had accurately awarded marks within mark band 3 had clear witness testimonies from the assessor describing student participation. (An accurate assessor's statement should leave the moderator in no doubt as to the amount of work inputted by the student during planning, and carrying the

activity out), together with comprehensive logs supported by minutes of meetings which should identify individual contribution rather than a sweeping statement or mass produced feedback sheet.

There was often implicit evidence of a lot of hard work on the student's part. It was not always detailed in a manner that made it obvious to the moderator as to what the student's role had been.

AO3: Research and Feasibility of the Event

Feasibility studies were vastly improved on previous years. Although it is necessary for there to be a documentation of discussion about various other activities that might have been considered, there is no need for students to include page upon page about each of the original ideas. AO3 needs to focus on the reasons why the chosen activity came about, how workable it is and how the listed components of a business plan (from the specifications) relate to the activity. It is becoming popular for many of the centres entered to encourage their students to present findings as a PowerPoint presentation, either collectively as a group, or individually. These talks came as a result of initial discussions which were clearly documented, and from describing ideas that had been flagged up, together with reasons for their rejection. The research and studying of previous ideas from former cohorts was still not being considered. There again appeared to be a lot of research carried out amongst target groups and in deciding the nature of the activity. This is to be encouraged as this assessment objective focuses on research. However, as stated, this initial research should not be to the extent that it takes over the entire feasibility study. It appears that many centres encourage this particular assessment objective as the first task of the assignment; but this still continues to be a problem as students tend to merge the plan and the feasibility study into one. A bibliography, although not essential, is very helpful.

AO4: Evaluation of the Event

As in the case of AO2 there is much scope for students to "score high" by allowing good time in preparing methods to evaluate in the most detailed way. Many centres were correctly awarding marks within mark band 3 as students demonstrated a clear format, a comprehensive evaluation of their role, their peer groups' roles, and solid recommendations for improvements with justification.

The reason for most students not gaining mark band 3 for this is that they fail to consider how the team worked together, or the process leading up to the activity (often just focusing on the day itself). As previously, students should be discouraged from merely describing the activity, and must evaluate the activity including the individual role played, and the teamwork shown. Students fortunately appear to have got out of the habit of presenting copious pages, questionnaires and surveys about how successful the day has, or has not, been. Recommendations for improvements need to be documented properly. As in AO1, a good guideline is that anyone wishing to repeat the activity at a later date should be able to consider the evaluation and gain from the experiences documented.

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>

