

Moderators' Report/
Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2014

GCE Leisure Studies (6969)
Paper 01 Leisure in Action

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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 2014

Publications Code UA038037

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

General Comments

Introduction:

The standard of work moderated this series was much higher than previous years. Some centres had greatly encouraged and supported students to undertake ambitious activities. Casino nights, murder mysteries and wine tasting all featured alongside the more typical activities of Sports' tournaments or activity days. Consequently, many centres were accurate in their awarding of marks in the higher bands. However, there continues to be a small number of assessors who either fail to interpret the guidance within the specifications, or push marks into higher mark bands deliberately. Quality of presentation was also vastly improved; students and centres should be praised for their efforts in that respect. Assessor's comments and annotation is still lacking in many centres. These could help to determine how borderline decisions had been reached. Likewise, accurate witness statements for AO2 go a long way to supporting mark decisions. Finally, some centres are still making errors in completion of the OPTEMS. It is essential that centres clearly reconcile these so that the mark sheets show final marks awarded.

AO1: The Plan of the Event.

This continues to be a problem area for a lot of centres. This year, there were a very high number of marks awarded in mark band 3, where in fact only mark band 1 should have been awarded. The specifications are clear in asking for "a comprehensive plan". Students are tending to include notes on a lot of theory taught with generic notes on SMART targets and Gant charts. This is obviously needed from a teaching point of view, but the submitted work from students should only show this if it relates to their specific planning activities. For a plan to be "workable", it needs to include all aspects as shown in the specifications. Centres should ask if the work could easily be followed by a third party, thus demonstrating the workability of the plan. As in past series, contingency plans, finance and timings tend to be weak or absent, risk assessments and job roles tended to be well documented. Again, centres are encouraged to 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: Contribution to the Event.

The quality of work for this criterion showed a vast improvement compared to previous moderations. Many centres had encouraged their students to provide accurate and detailed evidence of their roles. It is not too

important how the log or diary is presented, provided they are kept regularly. Many centres have turned to producing a template of a weekly log sheet; this was then completed in detail, recording individual and team actions, problems encountered/solved, and ongoing work. Many of these were highly professional in their appearance and content, generally related to students achieving mark band 3. Pride in the work was evident. Centres are encouraged to constantly monitor the record keeping of students, 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.

A basic log/diary will be awarded mark band 1. For higher mark bands, there must be evidence of consistent involvement throughout the event. To achieve the higher mark bands, learners must demonstrate that they have solved problems. In many cases minutes of meetings demonstrated that attendance by learners was erratic. Therefore the higher mark bands cannot be accessed. Minutes are also a useful tool to provide evidence of contribution but if included, assessors must ensure that the minutes meet a business standard. Minutes of meetings were, more often than not, a complete set of photocopied documents for every student which failed to indicate the individual student's role at the meeting or ongoing tasks allocated. Photocopied sets can be used but should be backed up by individual notes expanding on the student's contribution to decision making or discussions.

Witness testimonies and tutor observations are particularly useful in the assessment of this assessment objective. These could reflect learner contributions to meetings, attendance and consistency throughout the project as well as contribution to the running of the event itself. Indeed, the majority of work achieving mark band 3 usually consisted of detailed log sheets, minutes of meetings and an assessor's witness testimony.

AO3: Feasibility of the Event.

The majority of centres had correctly assessed students' work to be at the top end of mark band 2. Most research was relevant and students had considered a variety of ideas for their event. The normal practise was to come up with 3 or 4 ideas which were then discussed in some detail by the group undertaking the unit. Following these team meetings, which need to be logged, the eventual idea was researched further.

It is important that students undertake both secondary and primary research to inform their choice of project. This was not always the case. Consequently, some centres had wrongly awarded marks within mark band 3. Most students showed that secondary research had been undertaken but few provided the evidence of the source of the research or provided a bibliography. Care should be taken when the event has been "tried and tested" before, as it does prevent originality by the current group as they repeat the plan already prepared for them.

Students achieving higher marks had generally sent out questionnaires to their chosen target group, investigated ideas carried out by previous cohorts, or been in discussion with teachers or external agencies in order to assess the feasibility. The majority of centres encouraged students to follow all the elements of planning shown in the specifications.

AO4: Evaluation of the Event.

It is important for centres to appreciate that this criterion carries 18 marks, nearly one third of marks for the whole unit. However, centres are still encouraging their students to write long notes which tend to describe the activity, rather than evaluate the process involved! These descriptions are often accompanied by reams of questionnaires which have been completed by participants. Customer feedback is of course essential, but results could be collated, and questions included which focus on planning or team performance as seen by the target group.

Students awarded marks within mark band 3 had considered evaluation of their own role, that of their peer group, and how the team had worked together. Better students also included evaluation of both the roles on the day, as well as the build-up to the activity.

It is essential that there are clear recommendations for improvement. These were rarely in depth. In some cases recommendations were lacking. The recommendations are an essential part even of mark band 1. Weaker learners require guidance on this aspect. It is not sufficient just to identify shortcomings or room for improvement. At mark band 3 these need to be detailed and show careful consideration.

Again, it is suggested that centres need to give learners more guidance with regard to the type of evaluation required. It is evident that some students at the lower end of the mark scale have not been given any ideas on how to evaluate, or different methods of evaluation.

Grade Boundaries

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

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