

Moderators' Report/
Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2016

GCE Leisure Studies (6969)
Paper 01 Leisure In Action

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. 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 for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson. Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at www.edexcel.com/ask. You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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 6969_01_1606_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

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>

Unit 4 Leisure in action 6969/01

General Comments

The number of entrants for this unit was slightly less than last year's entry. However, the standard of work appeared to be much higher than in previous years, with more candidates achieving marks correctly adjudged to meet the higher mark bands. The activities chosen were generally very well suited to the Leisure industry. This series indicated a move from arranging sports related activities to more entertainment based events. This included many T.V. themed topics such as a school "Bake off", "Blind Date" and "My school's got Talent". All of these were acceptable events, and there were still a number of lower school football tournaments, and other sporting events. There were two centres that each only had one candidate entered for this moderation series. Combination with the Travel and Tourism students planning their activity was permitted in one centre; whilst at the other centre the candidate had enlisted support from two friends and a member of staff to ambitiously arrange a demonstration and audience participation of a variety of sports. It is acceptable to arrange a trip out for other students if there is a leisure theme to it. However, even with a leisure link, a trip does rather restrict the amount of participation or contribution to the day. It is therefore important that future cohorts do adhere to the guidelines and specifications of this unit.

The advantage of arranging activities with a sporting theme, particularly for lower year groups, is that they give ample opportunity for risk assessments, providing resources, and more importantly, job roles for larger sized cohorts. Often all the facilities are available within school or college and there is plenty to consider in the planning process and on the day.

There are still centres who are not annotating work or indicating why they awarded the mark bands they did. Work for unit 4 is notorious in that there are often notes/documents common to all students, and for the volume of work. It helps the moderator immensely if there is clear indication of the reasoning behind the awarding of a mark.

AO1: The Plan of the Event.

Many centres were being generous in awarding mark band 3 for the plans. This should only be given if there is clear and detailed evidence of all the required elements as shown in the unit specifications. It is important for centres to understand that the more comprehensive the plan, the more likely the candidate is to achieve top of mark band 3. It is crucial that all aspects are in depth. Good examples at top level showed resources to be more than just a list of items required during the activity. Greater detail showing who was to obtain them, where and from whom, when they may be collected and who was responsible for them, is obviously more considered and detailed.

The best plans are those which could feasibly be picked up by a third party and followed with reasonable ease.

It was pleasing to note that most candidates had produced excellent risk assessments. However, timescales and contingency plans were noticeably absent.

AO2: Individual contributions.

Centres are tending to assess this on the generous side, especially some of those awarding marks within mb3. It would appear that centres are almost “rewarding” the candidate for a successful activity rather than probing for correct and clear written evidence to support it. Generic comments such as “X played a major role and worked hard” etc., should be avoided. Mark band 3 should not be too difficult to achieve. However, it is crucial that there is sufficient evidence available to confirm the candidate’s role in planning and taking part. Quite often, assessor’s comments or witness testimonies, confirming roles played, were weak; and were often just included as a postscript to the mark sheet at the front of the unit. However, it was equally as pleasing to see that many centres had heeded the warning from previous Moderators reports by producing clear and comprehensive descriptions of individuals’ contributions.

There should be a detailed individual log or diary kept on a regular basis, highlighting every activity or task the candidate was involved in. The main concerns from moderators are that these dairy sheets are often retrospective or recount class input or discussion. It is very important that the INDIVIDUAL’S role be documented on a regular basis, and not in the form of an ongoing description of “what we did”! The more comprehensive these pages are, the more it will reflect the effort put in by an individual. Also, if photocopied minutes are submitted by each group member, then highlighting the input of each individual is necessary to confirm their role.

Centres are encouraged to constantly monitor the record keeping of candidates, as a small contribution every day or week can build into a comprehensive log, which is then much easier for assessment purposes in being able to determine how big a role was played.

AO3: Research and Feasibility of the Event.

This continues to be the weakest part of the coursework for this unit. It is also the one where assessors are being too generous with the marks they award. It is generally recommended that better centres start AO3 before any of the other assessment objectives. There is obviously a lot of sense in this as ideas are considered or rejected in the initial discussions. It was therefore disappointing to note that a large amount of candidates appeared not to have considered alternative events. AO3 is a research and Information gathering criterion. It therefore makes sense for candidates to show how the original activity came about, and the options that were considered and then rejected. Where centres have done this well, they have documented clear and lengthy records of discussions between the group, and of Primary research for each considered activity. At mark band 3, candidates are required to have carried out relevant and comprehensive research from a variety of sources. This is often not the case, or more likely, information sources are not referenced. It is important that primary and secondary research is evident and informs the project. Suggestions of sources are shown in the specifications. A long list of websites is not usually realistic or the best way of research. The more evidence available the better. Candidates should not be allowed to go straight into documenting the chosen activity without stating how it came about in the first place.

AO4: Evaluation of the Event.

There is so much potential to earn high marks for what should be the simplest of the four assessment objectives to complete, coupled with the fact that the candidates are on the "last lap" of the process. Evidence again demonstrates that candidates have either got this right or are prone to struggle. A recurring problem seems to be that centres do not allow sufficient time after the activity, or brief the candidates well enough on how to evaluate. There seems to be a common trend by candidates to evaluate the activity as opposed to the individual role played, or the teamwork shown. This is often followed by reams of completed questionnaires from competitors/participants. The important thing to remember is that we do not require a description of the activity or comments on how it went. This only has relevance if it links to evaluating individual roles and the team's performance. There was a clear divide between centres who had "got it right" and those whose candidates produced weak work. It is recommended that centres ensure that all aspects are covered, particularly looking at how the team worked before and on the day of the activity, suggested recommendations for improvement, and others shown in the specifications.

With 18 marks being available for this Assessment Objective, it is suggested that centres need to give learners more guidance with regard to the type of evaluation required. It is evident that some candidates at the lower end of the mark scale have not been given any ideas on how to evaluate, or on different methods of evaluation.

