

# Examiners' Report/ Principal Examiner Feedback

January 2010

GCE

GCE Applied Business (6928) Paper 01

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com).

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternately, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated **[Economics and Business]** telephone line: **[0207 190 5329]**

January 2010

Publications Code UA023107

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Edexcel Ltd 2010

## PM Report on coursework paper 6928/01 - Organising an Event - January 2010

### Administration

Administration was generally good.

The majority of centres used the Edexcel Mark Record Sheets. Centres should ensure authentication statements are fully completed when submitting evidence for external moderation.

The work submitted again demonstrated similar approaches in content and style from earlier series. Assessment seen was generally consistent with some evidence of leniency and assessment of much of the work around or just outside the limits of tolerance.

### General Comments

As in the previous windows, the unit was leniently assessed in some cases and so adjustments had to be made. Similar issues to those found in the previous series were again found in this window.

A small number of centres submitted work for this moderation window. There were a number of candidates re-submitting work to improve their marks in this window.

Many centres have developed approaches to this unit learnt from previous submissions, reports and training. Many centres sent questions into the Ask the Expert Service and by so doing avoided some common pitfalls such as size of event, appropriateness of choice of event, group size, etc.

Where suitable size events happened then the approach was generally good although some candidates failed to actually describe their role in the event.

In some centres the planned events did not happen. This caused problems as candidates could not access marks in mark band C and many of the marks in mark band D.

Witness statements and/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. This proved useful and supported the 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. A very small number submitted only a group report, or individual reports containing identical sections and these were not acceptable as each candidate must individually address the assessment criteria.

## **Areas of the Specification**

### **Strand A**

Feasibility research was often limited, especially where the event was an annual one or where the event was not the required "substantial event". Primary research was usually questionnaires about choices of event or interviews with staff that had run the event in the previous year. Results were not usually analysed or used. Secondary research was usually research into travel costs or costs of physical resources. There was little prioritisation or reasoned conclusions.

Where centres divided groups up into smaller groups working on research and feasibility on various events but then did "other" events, problems were caused as candidates had not covered feasibility for the chosen event.

### **Strand B**

Constraints were usually present and in detail. Some candidates simply referred to the completion of their centre's risk assessment documentation by staff. These did not demonstrate knowledge or understanding of risk assessment. There was no prioritisation, ranking or rating of risks to probability of happening and severity of outcome. Other candidates produced their own risk assessments which demonstrated their knowledge and understanding. 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 applied them to the event.

### **Strand C**

As stated above: 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. 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.

Where clear and detailed witness statements showing significant sustained participation were present, centres could move candidates into mark band 3. Some candidates failed to describe the event itself.

### **Strand D**

Evaluation was often poor. Few candidates referred back to original aims and objectives. A small number of centres collected feedback questionnaires from participants and used these effectively.

## Grade Boundaries - January 2010

6928	Total	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Raw Mark	60	55	50	44	38	32	27
UMS	100	90	80	70	60	50	40

Further copies of this publication are available from  
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467  
Fax 01623 450481

Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code UA023107 January 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit [www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no. 4496750  
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH