Examiners' Report/
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2012

Principal Learning
Sports and Active Leisure -Level 3
SL301, SL302, SL304, SL306-SL308

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, please visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

Our website subject pages hold useful resources, support material and live feeds from our subject advisors giving you access to a portal of information. If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

www.edexcel.com/contactus

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

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

Contents

Unit 1: The Impact of an Active and Healthy Lifestyle

General comments

In this unit candidates are asked to demonstrate their understanding of the implications of lifestyle choices on individuals and the implications that these lifestyle choices have on society.

The key focus of the assessment in this unit is the requirement for the candidates to apply their knowledge to a practical situation and evaluate the impact of lifestyle choices on individuals planning lifestyle changes for them to improve their health and wellbeing.

Candidates were required to produce a report that included background information that reviewed a range of lifestyle choices and their impact on the individual and on society. The candidates also provided evidence of a lifestyle evaluation activity and a suggested intervention with a client.

This was the third exam series for this module and the majority of centres produced relevant work that was appropriate to the level. It was evident that some centres have made significant improvements in both the quality of work that the candidates have produced and in the accuracy and consistency of assessment.

However a significant number of candidates work still lacked the detailed application required by this vocationally relevant unit. Similar to the conclusions drawn from the first two series, the general guidance for future exam series would be to include more application of the key points raised to the lifestyle information that was collected or researched. There were often only a few examples offered by the candidates, with the lack of depth of description/explanation being the reason why marks were limited in some cases.

As with the first two exam series, the level of detail provided in the applied Learning Outcomes limited the marks awarded to the majority of candidates. Learning Outcome 3 was the ideal opportunity for the candidates to demonstrate their ability to apply the theory surrounding lifestyle choices to a real life situation, by developing and undertaking a programme of lifestyle tests with a client(s).

Some candidates still utilised predominantly performance related tests which made the subsequent learning outcomes more challenging than if the tests were more lifestyle focused. LO 3.3 and 3.4 often suffered from a lack of detail which restricted the marks awarded. There was also little reference made to the overall concept of measuring lifestyle statistics, highlighting the lack of application previously mentioned.

The other major issue was in Learning Outcome 4 where, although feedback to the client was included, it did not link to the specific requirements of the feedback, as detailed in the learning outcomes. Most candidates provided some evidence of the provision of feedback with the client, but some centres did still rely on the submission of a Learner Observation Record (LOR), which was not appropriate due to the outcomes being in Mark Grid A. The focus of this feedback often deviated from the specific requirements of the learning outcome, again, limiting the marks awarded.

Individual Learning Outcomes

Centres in the main followed the Edexcel reference assessments or an adapted version, with all centres moderated providing the candidates the opportunity to achieve all the learning outcomes.

LO1.1 – Most candidates provided a relatively basic description of a range of lifestyle choices that included smoking, diet, alcohol, exercise and sleep. The better candidates provided an in depth of description of smoking, diet, alcohol, exercise and sleep. This was supplemented by coverage of a wider range of examples, including the psychological implications of the lifestyle choices. Centres that chose to provide evidence for this outcome using a brochure had to ensure that the candidates were encouraged to submit sufficient depth of information to access the higher mark bands. There were some very high standard brochures submitted that achieved the high marks, but also there were some examples that were very brief.

LO1.2 –The candidates at the lower end of the mark band provided a limited description of the reasons why individuals make different lifestyle choices, simply identifying what these influences might be without fully describing them. The more successful candidates completed this in a thorough fashion, with a depth of detailed description. There was a clear rationale behind the reasons for the lifestyle choices that was often supported by referenced secondary research.

LO2.1 – Candidates were asked to explain the positive or negative implications of the different lifestyle choices on the individual. At the lower mark band, this explanation was limited, simply defining the different physical adaptations that would result from a healthy lifestyle or the problems that might result from following negative lifestyle choices. At the higher mark band, these points were extended resulting in a through explanation, incorporating a range of examples that were often justified by referenced secondary research.

LO2.2 – For this Learning Outcome, candidates needed to give an explanation of how the potential lifestyle choices impact on society. Again, at the lower range, this was a basic explanation, relying on a description of the statistics found and lacking significant detail. The better candidates

provided a more detailed explanation covering a range of examples supported by some research evidence.

LO3.2 – Candidates needed to demonstrate/evidence their level of accuracy in the collection of lifestyle data from their client. The candidates in the lower mark band did not present their results in a systematic, logical format, with data that was lacking in the consistent use of units. There was often limited use of valid protocols for the testing being carried out, which suggested a lack of awareness of how the testing should be controlled. The better performing candidates offered a clear presentation of their data, including the consistent usage of appropriate units and appropriate testing protocols.

As in previous exam series, some centres provided a Learner Observation Record (LOR) to evidence the level of accuracy of the results recording process. This was less prevalent across this series, but centres should be aware that as LO3.2 is Mark Grid A, then evidence needs to be submitted to support this outcome that can be moderated. There were also more examples of the selection of lifestyle tests rather than performance related tests, which enabled candidates to provide more meaningful evaluation and feedback on the results of lifestyle choices.

LO3.3 – Most candidates compared their primary data to relevant normative scores with the level of analytical detail separating the higher and lower mark band performance. The majority of candidates did not analyse the data obtained in the testing beyond a comparison to these norm values. However, a small number of candidates did attempt to look at some of the variables that could have affected the results, taking their analysis into the higher mark bands.

LO3.4 – Following of from the analysis, the candidates were required to provide an evaluation of the data collected from the client. The level of detail when making the links between the data collected and the lifestyle choices determined the level of marks awarded. The work in the higher mark band discussed the impact the existing lifestyle choices had on the individual based on the data collected. This was then extended to suggest what might happen to their client if the lifestyle choices remained the same.

LO3.5 – Candidates were required in this Learning Outcome to explain the concept of lifestyle statistics and show an understanding of their relevance. Candidates often provided limited information about how they undertook each of their tests, which would infer a very limited awareness of issues related to reliability and validity when collecting data. There was also limited usage of examples of lifestyle data, suggesting a lack of awareness of how they are used.

There was more evidence seen for this outcome in this series, but this outcome was still one of the least well answered across all the learning outcomes. Centres should clearly articulate to candidates the need to document the ways they have controlled their testing situation to generate

valid and reliable results, as most candidates will have done this practically, but there was limited evidence to support this fact.

LO4.1 – Candidates were to provide feedback to their client on the implications of their current lifestyle choices. The feedback offered to the clients in this series was generally of a higher standard than previous series, mainly due to more appropriate selection of lifestyle related testing and more detailed analysis of the data (LO3.3) and evaluation of the impact of the current lifestyle choices on the candidate (LO3.4). However, the feedback offered was generally not fully extended to achieve the higher mark bands, with candidates reporting results as opposed to discussing with the client what might happen in the future if their lifestyle choices remain the same. This reporting and subsequent discussion would be vital in this process to ensure the client has a good understanding of their current health status.

As in previous series, a LOR was submitted to evidence the provision of the feedback for some centres, which is not appropriate for this Mark Grid A learning outcome. It is vital that written or visual evidence is provided for this outcome that can be moderated.

LO4.2 – The candidates were required to set meaningful lifestyle goals that were relevant to the client. At the lower mark band, the targets offered lacked detail and were often linked to performance or fitness targets such as training plans. This lack of detail limited the usefulness of the targets to the client, as they would not know how they would go about achieving them. Ideally, the candidates would communicate targets that were clear, achievable, within a realistic timeframe, meaning that the client should feel they would be achievable and know what they had to do to achieve them. If the testing completed by the candidate was directly related to obtaining lifestyle test data, the links between the targets set and improvements in overall health would be far clearer.

LO4.3 – The final Learning Outcome required the candidates to sell the benefits of the proposed lifestyle changes to their client, which were often limited and not clearly stated. This would leave the client unaware of what they would gain from the changes in lifestyle that were being suggested. Very few candidates were able to effectively communicate these benefits, with some use of secondary research to support the statements made. This level of detail made it very clear to the candidate exactly why they should embark on the lifestyle changes being suggested to them.

Summary:

Based on their performance in this unit, candidates should:

- ensure that all tests covered within the client consultation and testing session have clear links to lifestyle, to make the assessment of the client's current lifestyle more effective

- clearly define the tests being used, include protocols and a rationale as to why the tests have been selected for the particular client

- uf any of the evidence submitted for the unit is gained practically, ensure that written evidence is also submitted and not rely solely on a Learner Observation Record to support the work

- when providing feedback on the results of the tests, make clear reference to how the current lifestyle choices have affected them

- make sure that the targets set for the client are; related to the results collected, achievable, clearly explained with a clear timeframe for achievement. The client should know exactly how to go about trying to achieve the targets that have been set

- ensure that the client fully understands the reasons why they have been given targets to achieve and that the benefits of the new lifestyle regime have been effectively "sold" to them, as this will motivate the client to achieve them.

Unit 2: Being an Effective Manager and Leader in Sport and Active Leisure

PRINCIPAL MODERATOR'S REPORT – Level 3 Unit 2

General Comments

In this unit the candidates identify business opportunities to increase participation in SAL. Candidates will gain knowledge and the skills needed to become an effective manager to take advantage of potential business opportunities.

The purpose of this unit is for candidates to be able to understand how business models and functions within an organisation can contribute to success in the SAL industry, both strategically and operationally.

This will be carried out by looking at the demand for opportunities in the form of research. This research may consist of looking at competitors in the local area via the internet, the use of interviews and questionnaires. The applied aspect of this unit requires candidates to present the opportunities available to sustain or increase participation at their chosen organisation.

Candidates are able to work in groups to gather information but the candidate's final presentation / work must be delivered individually. Candidates can only be awarded marks for producing their own individual piece of work / presentation.

If the candidates are asked to produce a presentation, please could teachers ensure that the candidates are identifiable in the DVD/ Video. Without this information candidates cannot be awarded marks. We can only moderate work which has been evidenced.

A teacher observation can be used to support candidates work but it cannot be used as the only evidence that a candidate has completed the LO.

Individual Learning Outcomes

LO.1.1 For this learning outcome candidate's needed to give a description of business models and their functions in sport and active leisure (SAL) which demonstrated their knowledge of the topic. Better candidates described the strategic and operational functions of business models linking these to the sector the business is in and also to their mission statement. Candidates could include a full description of strategical and organisational models and describe their strengths and weaknesses. For example they could look at the staffing structure of a business, the different types of employees used, why and when the business might employ part time, full time and seasonal workers.

LO.2.1 Candidates were required to give an explanation, which demonstrated an understanding of how business functions can be used to promote and sustain participation. Candidates generally produced a basic description of how business functions can be used to promote and sustain participation. For example, a centre visit may have provided information on classes and facilities and candidates looked at how these had been developed into increasing participation eg loyalty schemes, popular classes. Weaker candidates identified business functions and how promotion could be used but failed to link the two together. To demonstrate the understanding of how to link the business functions to the application of promotion candidates could include reference to point of sale displays or membership fee promotions at different times throughout the year.

LO3.1 Candidates described the role and responsibilities of managers and leadership within a facility. Most candidates stated and listed roles and responsibilities but did not apply this to any of the management tiers within the centre. Better candidates had applied their responses and had included reference to strategic and operational managers.

LO3.2 Candidates gave a description of the characteristics of effective managers and leaders. Most candidates could identify the characteristics of a manager/leader in general terms, but did not develop their answer to how these make the manager effective. Better candidates described how different characteristic of a manager/ leader were required at the different levels of management and leadership.

LO4.2 Candidates carried out research into the opportunities to increase participation within a facility. Most of the candidates did this by using a questionnaire, but often the questions used limited the candidates in their relationship to business opportunities because they only asked about existing classes or facilities. Some candidates looked at what leisure centres/organisations already had in place and not at new opportunities. Some of the candidate's research was linked to their chosen centres website and the provision of their activities. This information needs to be used to enable the candidate to suggest the timing activities or the facility requirements for their business opportunity. Better candidates researched competition in the local area by looking at various websites, discussing the possible opportunities in an interview with staff at the centre and then

carrying out questionnaires with the customers/ members, looking at the potential / demand for new classes, facilities.

LO4.3 Candidates carried out an analysis of the opportunities for increased participation. Often candidates had restricted themselves by selecting unrealistic or inappropriate opportunities eg an existing activity is not an opportunity if the centre already includes it in their timetable, it is not realistic for the centre to build a new pool to run a mother and baby swim session. This LO may be achieved through the analysis of the candidate's questionnaire by looking at the demand, target groups, time available, staffing costs and facility requirements. Weaker candidates had carried out an analysis of their questionnaires but had not related this to business opportunities and increasing participation.

LO4.4 This LO is an extension from LO4.3, candidates look at the demand for the opportunities in their facility. Stronger candidates used their research evidence (from LO4.2) to draw on different conclusions relating to customer demand for their business opportunities. This could have been presented in the form of a percentage costing or arguments generated from the questionnaires. Weaker candidates who had not focussed their research on new opportunities to increase participation gave themselves nothing to develop and so limited their marks. Candidates need to ensure that they have researched the demand for their new opportunities.

LO4.5 Candidates evaluated, with conclusions, how motivation and leadership skills could be used to sustain and increase participation. Most candidates struggled with the application of motivation to increase and sustain participation. Some of the candidates were able to state how motivation can be used to promote participation but the majority linked this to having an effective manager. Better candidates provided an evaluation which was backed by with comprehensive conclusions on how motivational and leadership skills can be used to sustain and increase participation. These candidates described the type of schemes in place for both staff and customers. For example, setting targets for customers to reach, 3 sessions for the price of 2 or employee of the month. Weaker candidates simply identified why a leader needs to be motivated and failed to include any reference to increasing participation.

LO4.6 Candidates needed to describe how to take advantage of business opportunities with persuasive arguments to back up their chosen opportunities. Most candidates used the information taken from their own questionnaires or centre visits. Their suggestions were often very basic, eg adding more classes or offering more classes for the popular sessions eg Zumba because it is new and people are interested in it. Better candidates would have looked at the target group, dead or quiet times in the facility and what they can offer which is different to their competitors.

Unit 4: Applying Science and Technology to Enhance Performance in Sport and Active Leisure

PRINCIPAL MODERATOR'S REPORT – Level 3 Unit 4

General Comments

In this unit candidates examine how performance in SAL can be enhanced and how the principles of psychology can be used to enhance performance. Candidates then go on to measure and analyse performance, making suggestions for future performance improvements.

The purpose of this unit is to enable candidates to analyse and measure methods of performance enhancement on performance, and make suggestions for performance improvement.

Candidates will include testing procedures, test results and analysis of results which must be evidenced.

This unit may be broken down into a written plan, a table of results and written evidence. Observation will be done of the candidates selecting and using performance enhancement aids and performance measurement techniques.

This is the first submission for this unit and there were a small number of submissions. With the small number of entries comments made will look at the future direction of the unit and the compliance of the awarding of the marking grid.

Individual Learning Outcomes

LO1.1

Candidates described how performance can be enhanced. Often candidates provided basic descriptions which lacked any real depth. Weaker candidates focussed on the performance characteristics rather than how they could be enhanced. Better candidates gave a detailed description of how the performance can be enhanced with reasons and examples as to how this can be done. Candidates who looked at a specific sport or sports person seemed to focus their work more on this LO and were able to produce detailed and relevant descriptions.

LO2.1

Candidates gave an explanation of the ways in which performance is enhanced. When the explanation lacked content lower marks were awarded. To achieve the higher markbands candidates needed to give examples and explanations of how their chosen methods of performance enhancement would be carried out. Where candidates had selected a sport to focus on they channelled their explanations onto how to benefit specific sports people, in their sport and candidates were able to provide a good range of examples.

LO3.1

Candidates generally gave a detailed description of the principles of psychology. Most candidates provided a sound description of some of the principles, social identity, attribution theory, mental resilience, motivation theory and aggression. Candidates scoring lower marks had addressed these principles but had not described them with real depth, sometimes on a superficial basis. Candidates scoring higher marks had addressed these principles and had described them with real depth. By describing the reasoning behind the principles higher marks were achieved. Better candidates gave examples from the world of sport to demonstrate their understanding of the subject.

LO3.2

Candidates gave a description of how psychology is used within SAL. Lower candidates linked some principles to sports examples but did not thoroughly describe specifically how they would use the principles to enhance performance. Candidates who linked principles to sports examples, thoroughly describing them, stating specifically how they would use psychological principles to enhance performance achieved higher marks. This LO was carried out very well by candidates who gave sports examples and linked how psychology can be used to how it is used by different sports people.

LO4.2

Candidates showed that they can organise time in an appropriate way making reference to resources. Generally this LO was completed very well or very poorly. Candidates who produced timescales for the testing, provided evidence of organising time. If the candidates included testing procedures they showed how their time and resources would be organised.

Better candidates described what they would do before and after testing and described the arrangements made for setting up testing areas. Weaker candidates copied and pasted the testing protocols but did not refer to these. There needs to be some reference to work which is included as part of the candidates portfolios.

LO4.4
Candidates recorded results of performance analysis and measurement with accuracy. All candidates attempted to compare results to norm data, however not all had referenced it and some did not check that they were using the correct data eg for a male/female and age. Better candidates looked at their test results and linked these to the specific sports/activities that their sports person takes part in. Weaker candidates simply stated that results were good or bad with no real reference to the sports person or the test.

LO5.1
Candidates conducted an analysis of results of performance analysis and measurement. Most candidates attempted to relate test performance results to norm data, the better candidates gave rationales behind their analysis. Stronger candidates were able to demonstrate an understanding of independent testing by explaining the need for reliability when testing and the need for validity and following test protocols.

LO5.2
Candidates conducted an evaluation about the value of the information provided. Most candidates found this LO challenging and some failed to attempt it. Candidates needed to build a profile of their sports person's characteristics and relate this to the tests carried out and to the activities done by the performer. How valid is the test for the activity the sports person carries out? Weaker candidates attempted a basic evaluation. Stronger candidates built a profile of their sports person's characteristics and related these to the tests carried out and to the activities done by the performer, enabling them to access higher marks.

LO5.3
Candidates made suggestions for future performance improvement; often these were un-substantiated or irrelevant. Stronger candidates suggested improvements linked to the evidence gained from their testing and related these to their specific performer. For example candidates who suggested training programmes and stated which exercises to use and why these would be appropriate for their sports person were able to access markband 3. Weaker candidates described what to do for example that their sports person should stretch more. There needs to be more development to achieve higher marks.

Unit 6: Sport and Active Leisure Policy

PRINCIPAL MODERATOR'S REPORT – Level 3 Unit 6

General Comments

In this unit candidates examine the range of drivers that affect the SAL industry and why and how policies are created at local and national level.

The purpose of this unit is to enable candidates to analyse the extent to which the SAL industry has influenced national policy on a sport or active leisure issue and evaluate the legacies of major SAL events.

Candidates will include an element of research which must be evidenced as well as present their analysis and evaluation of SAL policy. This unit may be broken down into a research task and a presentation (PowerPoint with fully annotated slides) to present findings.

This is the second submission for this unit and there were a very small number of submissions. With the small number of entries comments made will look at the future direction of the unit and the compliance of the awarding of the marking grid.

Candidates are able to work in groups to gather information but the final presentation / work must be delivered individually. Candidates can only be awarded marks for producing their individual piece of work / presentation.

If the candidates are asked to produce a presentation, please could teachers ensure that the candidates are identifiable in the DVD/ Video, if one is presented as evidence? Without the information candidates cannot be awarded marks.

Individual Learning Outcomes

LO1.1
The candidates researched key government policies to show the impact on the SAL industry. Most candidates had carried out limited research, listed websites. Research sources must be used, referred to in, the candidates work. If the websites, sources are simply listed then markband 1 is best fit. Candidates who had evidence of carrying out extensive research, had listed websites, books, included a bibliography and made reference to them in their work. This enabled candidates to score higher marks. Research should be relevant and applied, put into context and linked to the impact on the SAL industry.

LO2.1
Candidates examined the key drivers that impact on policies related to local and national SAL. When candidates had listed the drivers or briefly described what they are, with no real development of the impact these drivers have on SAL, markband 1 was the best fit. If candidates had listed the drivers or briefly described what they are with no real development of the impact these drivers have on SAL, markband 1 was also awarded. For candidates to achieve higher marks they would need to develop their examination on the different drivers and apply this information to the impact these drivers have on SAL, demonstrating their knowledge of drivers and policies. Candidates might focus on Sport England, The FA and how these bodies impact on policy.

LO2.2
For this LO candidates gave an explanation of why central government and national organisations devise policies that affect SAL. Candidates who had not developed their descriptions and lacked any real explanation scored lower marks. To achieve higher marks candidates would have developed their descriptions and explanations. There would be links to relevant SAL policies. For example the candidates might refer to child obesity, social inclusion, the FA's 'Respect' campaign. There would be evidence of research which was referenced throughout their work.

LO2.3
Candidates gave an explanation of the effects of key local government policies on SAL. Candidates who have copied and pasted text from websites and had made no reference to it limit themselves to marks in lower markbands. Candidates should ensure that realistic explanations are given and linked to studies of local government policies. A talk from a local sports development officer would be beneficial to candidates. A visit to different local leisure centres, private and public sector. Candidates scoring higher marks had used evidence, research from centre visits to support their explanations, enabling them to use examples of current local policies and projects.

LO3.1
Candidates gave an explanation of how the industry influences national SAL policy. Candidates who scored lower marks had not explained any industry influences. They may have reference to the Hillsborough disaster

but not explained how this affected SAL policy, eg the Taylor report, safety at sports grounds act and how that had made sports grounds safer. Candidates often struggled to explain this LO in more than basic detail, limiting marks to mark band 1. Candidates should analyse policies and develop their discussions with examples related to specific policies / situations. Candidates scoring higher marks would have given examples such as the FA's 'Respect', Sport England's 'No Limits' or the Taylor report. They would then use these to explain how the industry may have influenced national policy.

LO3.2
Candidates carried out an analysis of the influence of SAL on national policy. Most candidates had attempted to analyse some policies but some did not develop their discussion / analysis which meant that marks were awarded in mark band 1. Candidates should analyse policies, developing these by discussing them with links to realistic and specific policies and situations. For example, better candidates may have analysed the Taylor report and looked at it from the perspective of the fans and the club, and the overall effect the report has had on the football.

LO4.1
Candidates carried out an evaluation of the legacies of major SAL event. Candidates provided a good range of examples including the Beijing Olympics, Manchester Commonwealth Games and Athens Olympics. When the candidates made only limited reference and attempted some evaluation markband 1 was the best fit. For higher marks candidates would need to ensure that they have developed their work to support their evaluation linking this realistically to their findings. Better candidates may have highlighted the positive and negative legacies of a major games and specifically at who has benefited and lost out. Candidates who included research for this LO generally achieved higher marks, they had more evidence to enable them to draw substantial evaluations.

LO4.2
The candidates identified the implications of the legacies for future planning. Basic identification of implications limited marks to mark band 1. Candidates should develop their ideas with examples of implications linked to previous games to achieve higher marks. Implications need to be relevant and well throughout. Better candidates had identified strengths and weaknesses from previous games and then applied these to a new games / event. They would have used this to identify most of the implications of future planning in a realistic situation. For example, how the lessons learnt from the Delhi Commonwealth games can be used to benefit the planning of the London 2012 Games.

Unit 7: Promoting Opportunities For All in Sport and Active Leisure

In this unit candidates were asked to evaluate the effectiveness of sport and active leisure provision in relation to including and engaging all sections of the community.

Candidates were required to develop an awareness of the different groups that make up the community, an understanding of the concept of inclusion, and the ability to review current SAL provision in their area.

Once the candidates had built an understanding of the underpinning theory surrounding inclusion, they were tasked to apply this to a practical situation with the requirement for the candidates to plan, implement and evaluate a sport and active leisure activity to promote inclusion.

There were issues in some centres, with the groups used for some of the practical activities as they were targeted at groups within the school/college that were convenient to access. This did not really meet the brief of promoting inclusion, as the participant groups used were often those already engaging in sport and active leisure. Some centres used schools or groups with children with additional needs, which provided extra challenge to the candidates. This experience enabled the candidates to reflect more widely on their performance and the performance of the event overall and produce a more appropriate evaluation.

The candidates raised a lot of good points across the Learning Outcomes, but consideration should be given to the lack of application of the points being raised to the promotion of inclusion using sport and active leisure activities. The links between analysing, evaluating and developing sport and active leisure provision and the concept of inclusion were quite difficult to make out in a number of candidates work. Some candidates offered work that was more appropriate for a sports development/coaching unit as the links to inclusion were extremely limited for the outcomes related to the practical event.

Some centres utilised group work within the unit, especially in the practical event related outcomes. This group work is a valid method of working as it is appropriate to the sector, but it is important that individual work is completed and submitted for assessment and moderation.

Individual Learning Outcomes

Centres in the main followed the Edexcel reference assessments, with all centres moderated providing the candidates the opportunity to achieve all the learning outcomes.

LO1.1 – Most candidates provided a detailed overview of the general importance of promoting sport and active leisure for all participants, using some headline statistics to support the key points. The better performing candidates covered a wide range of the social, physical and psychological benefits of sport and active leisure. These were supported by statistical evidence to reinforce the points raised.

LO1.2 – The candidates generally completed this outcome in a detailed fashion, with the majority of candidates producing work that identifies a number of the barriers to participation for a limited range of groups within society. The higher performing candidates covered a wider range of groups and extended their examination of the potential barriers to accessing sport and active leisure by explaining why they were significant issues to the groups in question.

LO2.1 – This outcome asked the candidates to describe legislation related to Equal Opportunities and show how sport and active leisure providers have complied with it to meet the needs for different participant groups. The candidates generally provided a brief overview of the legislation pertaining to gender, ethnicity and disability and offered examples of how local leisure providers have complied with it. Providing there was a reasonable overview of the legislation, the level of application to the sport and active leisure providers determined which mark band the candidate was credited with, with clearly explained examples being the key indicator of the level of understanding of this outcome.

LO2.2 – Most candidates provided a basic overview of the skills and knowledge needed to meet the needs of a range of participant groups. The description was generally not extended to look at how and why these skills were important in providing a high level of customer service. Most candidates focused on one particular job role within sport and active leisure (eg sports coach, PE teacher), but candidates who applied a wider consideration to a range of sport and active leisure job roles generally provided a more complete answer and accessed the higher mark bands.

LO3.1 – Most candidates provided a detailed overview of the activities on offer at the local provider, with some candidates focusing on the provision for specific groups (disabled, women etc). The level of assessment of effectiveness was not as well defined, with a significant number of candidates not drawing any conclusions about how useful and appropriate this provision was. The better performing candidates utilised participation statistics to support the candidate's own perception of the strength and appropriateness of the provision, which accessed the higher mark bands.

LO3.2 – The requirements for this outcome are to explain the views of providers of SAL that might contrast with their own views. Candidates generally offered some basic argument that focused on the tensions between centres making a profit whilst offering provision that might be of greater health benefit (but less profitable) and also the tensions between provision for participation against provision needed to improve performance levels. At the lower mark band, these arguments were introduced rather than developed, with the better performing candidates offering more specific detail and examples.

LO4.1 – Most candidates offered a range of activities that could be appropriate to enhance inclusion in the local area. The measure of appropriateness (which is central to the outcome) relied on the definition of a specific group that does not typically engage with sport and active leisure and a rationale behind why the potential activities suggested would be appropriate for that group. The candidates that provided all this information accessed the higher mark band, while those missing parts of this information achieved the lower bands.

LO4.2 – Candidates were required to outline a range of roles and responsibilities to be considered in the planning and implementation stages of the event, as well as demonstrating how and why the roles had been assigned in the practical application. The candidates who achieved lower mark band scores tended to assign names of their peers to the roles identified, whereas the better performing candidates provided an overview of the different roles, their significance in context to the overall event and a rationale behind why particular peers had been assigned to their role.

LO4.3 – Most candidates produced a basic action plan that was often lacking in detail relating to timings, prioritisation of tasks, resources etc. Some centres submitted work that was as a result of some group activities, which would need to be directly attributable to individual candidates for awarding of individual marks that could be reviewed during the moderation purposes. However, some centres produced very detailed overviews of the steps taken to plan and implement the event along with detailed accounts of how resources and time would be managed to ensure a successful event, which clearly accessed the higher mark bands.

LO4.4 – Most candidates submitted risk assessments that were quite general, although most were contextualised to their own event. There was little information about what precautions were taken in an attempt to avoid risks, although a significant number of candidates did produce very detailed risk assessments that took the precautions into consideration.

LO6.1 – The evaluations offered by most candidates were largely descriptive accounts of what took place during the day, which in the main were based on the candidates' own reflection and contained limited evaluation of the event from the perspective of promoting inclusion. The focus of the practical event did play a substantial part on the level of evaluation that candidates were able to offer. The candidates who essentially ran a sports development event within their school/college generally found it more challenging to evaluate the event within the

context of inclusion as the participant groups involved were already engaged within sport and active leisure. The centres that aimed their event at groups who may have some barriers to accessing sport and active leisure had more of an inclusive context and therefore, the potential for an effective evaluation of the event was far greater.

Some candidates did produce a reasonable level of evaluation and used the potential barriers for the community group involved in the event and explained how their event had overcome these barriers. This then demonstrated a level of awareness of how their event was inclusive and what aspects would need to be improved for future events within the context of inclusion.

LO6.2 – As with LO6.1, most candidates found it challenging to submit an effective evaluation of their performance within the context of promoting inclusion. Most candidates submitted a basic reflection of their own performance during the event, providing a limited view on what skills they felt had helped them and which ones they felt they need to develop further when working to promote inclusion in this SAL situation.

Summary:

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates should:

- ensure that all information provided across the learning outcomes is linked back to how it could help in the promotion of inclusion amongst participant groups that may have some barriers in accessing sport and active leisure

- if any of the work produced during the unit is completed in a group, make sure that an individually produced piece of evidence is submitted

- clearly identify a particular target group for the practical event that does not typically access sport and active leisure.

- make the rationale behind the choice of suggested activities as detailed as possible, to show how and why the proposed events are appropriate to the target group and could help to promote inclusion

- when evaluating the event and personal contribution toward the planning and running of the event, make sure that the focus is on how and why the event might have helped to promote inclusion within the target group and what implications there may be for the future.

Unit 8: Bringing the Community Together Through Sport and Active Leisure

General Comments

In this unit candidates were asked to explain how sport and active leisure can be used to influence or challenge behaviour patterns in society through providing positive role models and building new social networks that bring together different parts of the community.

The key focus of the assessment of this unit was the requirement for the candidates to apply creative thinking, self-management and reflective learning skills in the development of a strategy of how to use sport or active leisure to promote local community cohesion. Candidates were expected to present their proposals to industry experts in order to receive feedback, and then amend them to be more appropriate in promoting cohesion within the local community.

Overall, the standard of work submitted for Unit 308 was at a higher level than in previous series. However the links between the content researched and the focus on promoting cohesion was still lacking in the majority of cases, so consideration still needs to be given to the lack of application of the points being raised to the impact on the community, as this has limited the marks awarded.

It is suggested that the candidates undertake more locally focused research to gather participation data from the local area that could be used across a range of learning outcomes. This would demonstrate the candidates' knowledge of the local area and their ability to use data in the development of strategies that would be effective locally.

Some centres, although fewer than were seen in the last exam series, provided evidence using Learner Observation Records (LOR), which are predominantly for Mark Grid B outcomes. As all the outcomes in this unit are Mark Grid A, there should be written or visual evidence submitted for each learning outcome, with the LOR providing supplemental evidence to corroborate or support the candidates evidence.

Some interesting group work activities were again used in some centres during the assessment of the module, but again consideration should be given to the production of clear individual evidence to support the candidate's contribution (LO3.1). Also, with the feedback task to shape the strategy (LO4.1), clear evidence needs to be presented by the candidate of the feedback they received. This could be in the form of a video of the presentation/feedback, or a transcript of the feedback received.

Individual Learning Outcomes

The work entered for this unit often followed the Edexcel exemplar material. There were some issues with the interpretation of some of the learning outcomes and the lack of individual evidence for candidates when engaged within group activities for part of the assessment process.

LO1.1 – Most candidates provided a basic description of the characteristics that individuals and groups display, covering areas including gangs, ethnic minority groups, socio economic groups and young/peer groups. The candidates achieving the lower mark bands tended to identify a range of groups within the community without really describing what they are like and how they engage with other sections of the community. Some candidates at this level provided an overview of the demographic make up of the local area, which was very detailed regarding the percentage make up of the local community, but did not really meet the requirements of the outcome.

There were some examples of some very good work in this outcome though, with candidates providing insightful descriptions of the characteristics of a range of groups within the local community.

LO1.2 – This learning outcome asked candidates to describe how improved access to sport & active leisure could promote cohesion within a community. There were two main areas that were focused on by candidates in this outcome; looking at access to facilities and access to sport and active leisure opportunities (through different initiatives etc). Both of these are valid interpretations of this outcome, with the higher performing candidates managing to cover descriptions of how both these aspects could promote cohesion in the community.

Overall, the responses would have benefitted from more depth in the detailed description and more links as to how this improved access might promote community cohesion.

LO2.1 – Candidates were asked to explain the positive or negative responses of the community to sporting cultures. Overall, the level of responses to this outcome were quite limited. The explanations offered covered a range of responses, with the lower mark bands being limited in depth of detail. The better performing candidates linked case study examples to the points raised demonstrating understanding of the potential responses of the community to different initiatives.

LO2.2 – For this Learning Outcome, the candidates needed to give an assessment of the impact of role models upon community cohesion. The overview on the qualities of the role model was detailed for most candidates, but there was still limited application of how these qualities could benefit the community, which is the main focus of the learning outcome. The overall level of responses for this outcome was generally higher than in previous series, with some candidates providing very detailed views of how role models could be utilised effectively within the local community.

LO2.3 – Candidates were asked to explain how role models and leadership skills can be utilised in the promotion of community cohesion. As with LO2.2, the level of detail with regard to defining and explaining the concept of leadership skills was far deeper than the application of how these skills could be applied in the development of community cohesion.

LO2.4 – Most candidates offered reasonably detailed descriptions of different behaviour patterns within the local community including crime, employment and anti-social behaviour. The depth of the links between the concept of how sports and active leisure provision might challenge, influence or support these behaviours determined the level of mark awarded.

LO3.1 – Candidates were asked to generate ideas of how sport & active leisure could be used to promote cohesion. Within some centres, the evidence for the individual aspects of this group task was limited, with significant amounts of work often not being directly attributable to the candidates.

The majority of activities that were identified by candidates could have been appropriate, but it was the supporting rationale that explained why they were appropriate to the particular community situation they were referring to that determined the level of appropriateness – and ultimately the mark awarded.

LO3.2 – Candidates needed to provide an argument as to why their proposed strategy would promote community cohesion. Candidates at the lower mark band provided a reasonable description of their proposal but had a limited rationale for their reasons behind its development, thus making the argument ineffective. The more successful candidates provided a more detailed description of their proposal with a clearer rationale, therefore making the argument more effective. The links between the strategy and the promotion of community cohesion needed to be very clear as this was the theme that the effectiveness of the proposed strategy was judged.

LO3.3 – Most candidates produced a basic action plan that was often lacking in detail relating to timings, prioritisation of tasks, resources etc. Some centres submitted work that was as a result of some group activities, which would need to be directly attributable to individual candidates for awarding of individual marks that could be reviewed during the moderation purposes. However, some centres had taken on board the feedback from previous series and produced very detailed overviews of the steps taken to plan and implement the strategy, along with detailed accounts of how resources and time would be managed to ensure a successful event; this clearly accessed the higher mark bands.

LO3.4 – The candidates that offered between 1-3 appropriate indicators that would measure the success of the strategy achieved the lower mark band with those that offered more than 6 appropriate indicators achieved the higher band. Some candidates focused on the different methods of

collecting information about the success of their strategy (eg questionnaires, focus groups etc) rather than the actual indicators that each of these methods could assess. This limited the marks awarded for this outcome as marks were awarded directly for the number of appropriate indicators identified.

LO4.1 – Most candidates lacked detailed evidence of the feedback that was received following the presentation of their strategy. The candidates were limited in this outcome by the strength of the argument proposed in LO3.2, so the marks awarded for this outcome reflected this.

The majority of the feedback received often dealt with more operational issues related to the running of the event as opposed to suggestions linked to how the strategy could be developed to promote community cohesion. Centres need to ensure that candidates seek responses from their consultations that will promote community cohesion rather than simply make the event run more efficiently.

LO4.2 – The candidates were required to amend their strategy based on the feedback received. The majority of candidates suggested amendments that were generally superficial only adding limited value to the strategy and would not have contributed a great deal to an improved level of success. This was again linked to the strength of their argument (LO3.2) and due to the operational nature of the feedback received for LO4.1. Centres must ensure that the candidates are directed to seek feedback on the strategic nature of their proposed strategy rather than the more practical operational issues, as this will enable the candidates to add value to their strategy linked to improving community cohesion.

Summary:

Based on their performance in this unit, candidates should:

- ensure that all information provided is linked back to how it could help in the promotion of community cohesion

- if any of the work produced during the unit is completed in a group, make sure that an individually produced piece of evidence is submitted

- if any of the evidence submitted for the unit is gained practically, ensure that written evidence is also submitted and not rely solely on a Learner Observation Record to support the work

- make the rationale behind the choice of activities as detailed as possible, to show how and why the strategy is appropriate and could help to promote community cohesion

- when gaining feedback on the proposed strategy from industry experts, make sure that questions are asked that will develop the strategy so it could have a positive impact on the community

- ensure that the feedback received from the industry experts is acted upon and the strategy amended in an attempt to benefit the community.

Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

Rewarding Learning