



EXAMINERS' REPORTS

**LEVEL 1 / LEVEL 2 AWARD IN
EVENT OPERATIONS**

SUMMER 2019

Grade boundary information for this subject is available on the WJEC public website at:
<https://www.wjecservices.co.uk/MarkToUMS/default.aspx?l=en>

Online Results Analysis

WJEC provides information to examination centres via the WJEC secure website. This is restricted to centre staff only. Access is granted to centre staff by the Examinations Officer at the centre.

Annual Statistical Report

The annual Statistical Report (issued in the second half of the Autumn Term) gives overall outcomes of all examinations administered by WJEC.

Unit	Page
Unit 1 – The Events Industry	1
Unit 2 – Event Operations	6
Unit 3 – Event Planning	9

EVENT OPERATIONS
Level 1 / Level 2 Award
Summer 2019
THE EVENT INDUSTRY

General Comments

The exam paper offered two formats, an online question or paper based answer paper. There were 9 questions and 90 marks were available. The questions all related to the events industry and link to the specification.

It was pleasing to see that the paper catered for the full range of abilities. The majority of candidates attempted all questions and consequently they picked up marks across the exam paper.

There were some questions that were answered very well. For example, question 6b and the calculation questions. However, the questions that related to specific terminology such as insurance and question 6a 'communication strategy' didn't perform as well. It is important that candidates are familiar with all the terminology detailed within the specification. A number of candidates struggled with the legal related questions in particular question 1b. There were a few candidates that didn't consider the question command or didn't read the question properly. For example, question 3a. Some candidates explained why promotion is important rather than simply 'describe one way the school can market the event'. The responses to question 2 ai and ii tended to be applied but a number did not focus on what the question was asking and simply described the accommodation and catering provided.

Some candidates who completed the online exam omitted to open the information about the venues which was required in order to complete question 4 e, f and g. Candidates should be reminded to read the information provided and follow all instructions. Please note that there is a sample WJEC online assessment available.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Q.1 Candidates found this question one of the most challenging.

- (a)** The majority of candidates attempted this question, however the description of 'planning activities' varied in detail. Many focused on health and safety or marketing related activities. Those who were awarded full marks were able to provide some detail in their description.
- (b)** This question was poorly answered. Few candidates related their answer to the regulatory requirements in relation to having a raffle. There were a number of responses that were not related to regulation.

Example of a response applied to a raffle.

'Prizes need to be provided by yourself or different companies with permission. If alcohol happens to be a prize ID needs to be shown or the prize given to parents or guardian. Age restrictions for example, a kids raffle or an adults raffle'.

- Q.2 (a) (i)** Responses to this question varied. A number of candidates didn't read the question properly, giving a description of the facilities available rather than an explanation about how Appleside Brewery how could meet accommodation requirements.
- For example,
'The village where the festival is taking place has a small hotel which due to being small and local will be affordable for people travelling there.'
- Candidates who did address the question requirements tended to link their responses to 'the surrounding fields' linking answers to using the fields to pitch tents and relating the explanation to cost or location. Explanations on the whole were limited in detail.
- (ii)** This question was answered slightly better than Q2ai) although a number of candidates simply described what could be offered rather than explain how Appleside Brewery how could meet catering requirements.
- Some candidate's responses considered convenience i.e. not having to leave the event to find food, and dietary needs in relation to offering a variety of meal options.
- (b)** Many candidates answered this question well. There was a range of recommendations, many with some detail. There were a few candidates that provided recommendations but not in relation to security i.e. generic activities at a music event.
- Example of a good response.
'The event could have bag searches before people go inside to see if there is anything that can harm such as knives'.
- (c)** Most candidates gave an example of an outdoor event and gained at least 1 mark. Many candidates achieved full marks as they provided some detail in the description. Popular answers were sport related.
- Q.3** All candidates attempted the question although the level of response varied. Some candidate responses did not fully reflect the requirements of the question. For example, more than one method was described and analysed and responses in this instance lacked focus.
- (a)** Responses linked to posters or social media were the most popular. A few candidates explained why marketing was important rather than describe one way the school can market the event and therefore didn't achieve any marks. Some candidates described more that one method.
- Sample answer which has some detail
'They make posters and give them to the kids to take home and put up around the area. The posters could tell people about the celebrities.'
- (b)** The majority of candidates answered the question although those who incorrectly answered Q3a) were unable to analyse an idea. The level of analysis varied. Many candidates gave some detail and reasoning.

Sample applied answer which provides some detail in the description
'Everyone uses social media and it doesn't cost anything and the celebrities can share it as they know loads of people. If lots of people know then it will be good as it will make lots of money for the school. If people know celebrities are coming then they will want to come.'

- (c) A number of candidates provided a good response although some answers were not related to 'organising on the day'. Instead they related to planning an event i.e. what was asked in Q1a).
- (d) This question was answered very well. Most candidates calculated the correct total income.

Q.4 All candidates attempted the question although the level of response varied.

- (a) Many candidates were able to calculate the venue and meal cost correctly.
- (b) Responses were mixed and a variety of different potential event costs were suggested. A number of candidates simply repeated the stated potential costs rather than 'other potential costs'.
- (c) Some candidates were able to identify a permission applied to the question scenario. However, there were a few answers that didn't relate to permissions.
- (d) In general, this question challenged candidates. Responses tended to be basic and many confused cancellation insurance with other insurance types.
- (e) Many identified Ashton Court Mansion but a number stated Homewood Park which was incorrect as it was in Bath rather than Bristol.
- (f) Most candidates were able to identify two correct features.
- (g) The justifications varied. Some responses were simply a repeat of the features rather than a justification of why the venue selected is suitable.

Example of a justified response (the grammar isn't assessed):

'The venue is best as it is in Bristol which is what they wanted and will be easy for guest to come. If more people come it is fine as the hotel can have 680 people so they can make more money for the charity. There is entertainment what they want so they save money so more profit. It has food needed for dinner as they get this in the ticket.'

- Q.5**
- (a) Most candidates calculated the total expenses although some got the decimal point in the wrong place and some calculated profit rather than expenses.
 - (b) Most candidates calculated the total profit although a few added rather than deducted the expenses and therefore didn't get a mark.
 - (c) This question was generally well answered. Candidates engaged with the question and were able to give some explanation. Those who answered well considered the organisers in their explanation.

- Q.6**
- (a) Some candidates struggled with this question and responses suggest that some candidates were unfamiliar with the term 'communication strategy'. Where candidates clearly understood the term suitable points to be included within a communication strategy were identified.
 - (b) This question was answered very well. The majority of candidates included the key information and many used persuasive language to promote the event, gaining themselves full marks.
 - (c) The level of analysis varied between candidates. The better responses picked up on a number of points within the email. There were clear links and detail. Those only picking up a couple of marks simply focused on the event being a success with limited reasoning.
Some candidate responses were a reply to the letter rather than analysis of the information provided. Some candidates simply re stated the information provided in the email.
- Q.7**
- (a) Most candidates attempted the question and a number of candidates described the role of transport organisations well. There were some candidates who simply gave examples of transport which isn't a description of the role.
 - (b) On the whole most candidates showed some understanding of how event organisers work together with emergency services. There were some good responses that made links between how the organisers and emergency services work together. However, some candidates only described the responsibility of emergency services.

Sample example where the links were clear:
'Emergency services are told in advance of the event. Some runners can be ill or injured during the race so the organisers can get the ambulance to come straight away and help as they are there. The police need to block the roads but they need to know what to close so the organisers tell them.'
 - (c) A number of candidates were able to identify a correct permission. Many picked up on *'the council'* or *'to close roads'*.
- Q.8** Candidates found this question the most challenging.
- (a) Responses were mixed. Some candidates simply repeated 'written agreement' i.e. *'it is an agreement that is written'*. A number managed to provide a good description. For example, *'a contract that is signed by someone in the organisation to promise or ensure that rules and regulations will be followed'*. There were a few candidates that didn't attempt the question.
 - (b) Some candidates were able to fully describe public liability insurance detailing what and who were covered. There were some that gave basic details so only were awarded one mark, but a number of candidates confused the insurance with other insurance. There were a few candidates that didn't attempt the question.

- (c) Many candidates were able to identify an example of a corporate event although few were able to describe the event. For example, a suitable corporate event was given but then details about the event were not described. Instead some explained where it would take place or who would attend rather than describe the event itself.
- Q.9** (a) Many candidates were able to assess at least one health and safety risk. Many answers linked to falling on the ice.
- (b) This question was generally answered well. Overall candidates were able to give some explanation. Many candidate answers related to being able to watch and identify problems.
- (c) (i) Many candidates were able to state one other contingency plan. However, a few gave examples that were not realistic for an ice rink disco.
- (ii) Where a realistic contingency was given most candidates gave some justification.

Summary of key points

- Ensure that candidates are familiar with all the terminology used within the specification.
- Make sure candidates are aware that they must read through the instructions prior to starting the exam.
- Consider activities that can support candidates' understanding of the command words.
- Consider techniques to support candidate's exam skills so that they clearly focus on the requirements of the paper. For example, highlighting key words, underlining command words, etc.

EVENT OPERATIONS

Level 1 / Level 2 Award

Summer 2019

UNIT 2 - EVENT OPERATIONS

General Comments

It was pleasing to see a significant increase in the number of centres (14) offering this qualification following the introduction of Specification A which replaced Specification B which was last awarded Summer 2018. The majority of centres submitted work that arrived on time and were well presented for moderation. There was a tendency for centres to devise their own brief, which were deemed suitable for purpose.

In general, good administration was demonstrated by centres who completed a breakdown of assessment criteria grades and mark record sheets. However, some centres need to ensure that all mark record sheets are completed correctly. For example, some forms had ticks missing from the AC or the candidate number was missing. The majority of candidate evidence has annotation. However, this varied from highlighting ACs, particularly when some of the candidates had used the incorrect sub-headings to detailed justification why performance bands had been awarded. In general, the observation forms were detailed. However, there were instances where the grades awarded on the observation form were different to those on the mark record sheet. It is important that the form includes as much detail as possible for all candidates and is signed by the tutor. Timesheets were included by the majority of centres showing when the work was completed and the number of hours allocated per task.

In terms of marking, the marking by the majority of centres reflected the performance bands but others were slightly generous. Moreover, some centres adopted a 'best fit' approach which resulted in overall grading errors. When awarding a unit overall grade all assessment criteria must be met for the grade to be awarded. If any assessment criteria marking decisions select a lower performance band then the overall grade must reflect this. For example, if only one AC is marked as L1P and the rest are the highest band possible then it is possible that a candidate could drop from D to L1P.

Comments on individual sections

AC1.1 – Describe the principles of customer service.

Evidence was mixed in terms of detail. Future cohorts may consider discussing industry visits and their own experience of events, as this could allow students to demonstrate a broader knowledge and provide additional context.

AC1.2 – Explain how events meet customer needs.

Some candidates required demonstration of further application to events in order to achieve higher bands. In addition, upper level candidates are required to explain how events meet a range of customer needs. A 'range' is deemed to be three or more criteria e.g. those with specific needs, different cultural and ethnic groups, age groups, etc.

AC1.3 – Analyse factors affecting customer service provided at events.

Similarly to the above AC, some candidates required demonstration of further application to events in order to achieve higher bands. It is important to highlight that candidates being awarded Merit need to analyse factors affecting customer service provided with reasoning appropriate to the event and that evidence is required for pre, during and post event. In particular, evidence of post event could have been more detailed.

AC1.4 – Communicate with customers.

In general, the observation forms were completed to a good standard in terms of detail. This AC is based on the observation form completed by the assessor rather than commentary from the candidates. Having said this, if candidates have, for example, drafted email correspondence or promotional material targeted at customers or photographs of candidates participating at the event then these could be included as an Appendices in order to support this AC.

AC2.1 – Describe roles of individuals in different types of team.

Varied evidence as candidates should be able to describe the role of each team member in relation to the event held. This can be completed as a table describing the team/roles within the context of events illustrating the candidates' understanding relating theory into practice. A range would equate to three or more individual roles being described in different types of event teams. Some candidates adopted an alternative approach in which they described the generic roles e.g. chef, organiser, marketing, without linking to individuals. However, the different types of teams must also be discussed e.g. formal, informal, temporary, and permanent.

AC2.2 – Explain the benefits of teamwork

Varied evidence as some work lacked explanation and became descriptive. Greater depth and detail of the benefits of teamwork is required to reach the higher bands. Reasoned evidence is also a requirement.

AC2.3 – Explain how the principles of team working are applied in event operations.

Greater depth and detail is required to reach the higher bands. Candidates should explain the stages of working as a team in relation to their event, as well as the roles within the team. The principles include strengths and weaknesses of team members, allocation of individuals to different roles, encouraging participation, constructive comments, enabling team cohesion and recognition of individual contributions which may be effective as sub-headings to provide structure and focus to this section.

AC2.4 – Contribute to team performance.

In general the observation forms were completed to a good standard in terms of detail. This AC is based on the observation form completed by the assessor. However, candidates may demonstrate self-reflection within AC3.2.

AC3.1 – Set criteria to assess event success.

The detail of the criteria set varied as some of the objectives within some of the work by candidates were rather vague. Candidates should set out criteria clearly to assess event success. In addition to the objectives candidates could also consider how they are going to assess whether they meet the needs and expectations of customers, meeting supplier requirements and following policies and procedures.

AC3.2 – Evaluate own performance in event situations.

Evidence was mixed as, although candidates evaluated their own performance, there was limited evidence of feedback from others within some of the work.

AC3.3 – Evaluate performance of others in event situations.

In general, candidates evaluated the performance of others effectively. The L2P should be awarded if a range of criteria has been considered and judgements have been reasoned with exemplification.

AC3.4 – Evaluate event success.

As this AC linked back to AC3.1 the evidence was varied for this AC due to some of the criteria that was set being vague or lacked variety e.g. only focusing on meeting customer needs. However, good practice was demonstrated by a number of centres. For example, the inclusion of and analysis of customer feedback forms. Some of the work used specific quotes but could have been analysed further. The examples of completed surveys/feedback forms could be included within an Appendices. Within the higher bands it was pleasing to see that areas for improvement were considered and related to the evaluation. Areas for improvement could be an area to include as part of a customer feedback form/survey and the candidates would benefit from analysing the feasibility of any suggestions.

Some centres adopted a table proforma format to the work which may restrict the detail provided by some candidates but, equally, could be effective to provide structure for weaker candidates.

Summary

- Overall, considering this was the first submission for Specification A, centres should be pleased with the standard of work submitted by candidates. However, the marking did vary from centre to centre and some of the marking was slightly generous when awarding the higher performance bands.
- Some of the work tended to merge different ACs together. Although, some assessors had annotated the ACs to some extent it would be easier for candidates and moderators if ACs were identified more distinctly within the work.
- Further guidance is available on the WJEC website and exemplar material will be available at future CPD events and on the secure website.

EVENT OPERATIONS

Level 1 / Level 2 Award

Summer 2019

UNIT 3 - EVENT PLANNING

General Comments

It was pleasing to see a significant increase in the number of centres (12) offering this qualification following the introduction of Specification A which replaced Specification B which was last awarded Summer 2018. The majority of centres submitted work that arrived on time and were well presented for moderation. There was a tendency for centres to devise their own brief, which were deemed suitable for purpose.

In general, good administration was demonstrated by centres when completing a breakdown of assessment criteria grades and mark record sheets. However, some centres need to ensure that all mark record sheets are completed correctly. For example, some forms had ticks missing from the AC or the candidate number was missing. The majority of candidate evidence has annotation. However, this varied from highlighting ACs, particularly when some of the candidates had used the incorrect sub-headings to detailed justification why performance bands had been awarded. Timesheets were included by the majority of centres showing when the work was completed and the number of hours allocated per task.

In terms of marking, the marking of the majority of centres reflected the performance bands but others were slightly generous. Moreover, some centres adopted a 'best fit' approach which resulted in overall grading errors. When awarding a unit overall grade all assessment criteria must be met for the grade to be awarded. If any assessment criteria marking decisions select a lower performance band then the overall grade must reflect this. For example, if only one AC is marked as L1P and the rest are the highest band possible then it is possible that a candidate could drop from D to L1P. There were Distinction level candidates who should be commended for demonstrating an excellent level of research.

Comments on individual sections

AC1.1 – Explain event finances.

In general the marking was consistent and in-line with the performance bands. However, some candidates needed to relate the event finances more to the proposed event. Moreover, some candidates only defined finance terms rather than applying them to the proposed event.

AC1.2 – Explain event administration requirements.

Generally, this was a weak AC. More depth and detail are required to achieve the higher bands. The minimal detail within the work of some candidates restricted the grade awarded.

AC1.3 – Explain how promotional activities contribute to achieving event objectives.

In general, the marking was consistent and in-line with the performance bands. However, there were instances where students could have linked to event objectives rather than just describing promotional activities in general terms.

AC1.4 – Propose resource requirements for events.

This AC was marked slightly generously, particularly in relation to the higher bands as further justification, depth and detail should be evident. Moreover, it should be noted that a generic list of resources does not reflect the event requirements.

AC2.1 – Design research tools.

In general, the marking was consistent and in-line with the performance bands. It is important to emphasise that evidence of the tools used must be provided by all candidates and must demonstrate individuality. Future cohorts may wish to discuss how their research influenced the type of event they propose or indeed reflect on the effectiveness of other examples of research tools/questions.

AC2.2 – Analyse event research.

Generally, this AC was marked slightly generously and the evidence varied for this AC due to the different levels of depth, detail and analysis. In particular, in relation to secondary sources, it is important to note that in order to achieve a Merit grade, candidates must use secondary sources e.g. charity event websites, in addition to primary sources. The secondary source needs to be explicit and not implied e.g. reference to specific websites. These could be discussed in terms of how they relate to the assignment brief and their proposed event e.g. What types of charity events have the school organised previously? and How would their own idea(s) be different/successful? In addition, candidates could draw comparisons and discuss factors such as ticket prices.

AC2.3 – Report research findings.

In general, this AC was marked slightly generously as the higher grade bands should be clear and either mainly clear and well-structured (merit) or clear and logical structure (distinction) as well as using a range of appropriate presentation features to highlight key findings. Most centres used graphs / charts to present findings which were effective but some of the reporting tended to be brief.

AC3.1 – Set event objectives.

The evidence varied for this AC as the SMART objectives were not always clearly described or explained and, in some cases, were very brief. Candidates may consider adopting a breakdown for each objective in order to ensure this AC clearly reaches L2P.

AC3.2 – Plan event activities.

This AC was marked slightly generously and the evidence varied for this AC. Greater detail, clarity and range of strategies are required to achieve the higher bands. Candidates may consider including strategies for changes, should they be required.

AC3.3 – Use planning tools.

Candidates used a wide range of planning tools and marking was generally consistent with the marking criteria. Although some planning tools such as gantt charts were included in work submitted by candidates, in some instances there was little evidence of the effective use of these.

AC3.4 – Explain how experience of running events informs event proposals.

In general, this AC was marked slightly generously as there were some instances where the work lacked depth and evidence of direct involvement in the planning and running of three events.

In terms of structure, sub-headings for each event were effective as it enabled students to relate to the content and previous learning e.g. "Promotional activities used for our previous events which were effective included..., therefore we are going to use x method for our proposed event". This AC could essentially be viewed as a way for students to reflect on how their experiences of being involved with organising three events has helped them produce the Unit 3 coursework.

Summary

- Overall, considering that this was the first submission for Specification A, centres should be pleased with the standard of work submitted by candidates. However, the marking did vary from centre to centre and some of the marking was slightly generous when awarding the higher performance bands.
- Some of the work tended to merge different ACs together. Although, some assessors had annotated the ACs to some extent it would be easier for candidates and moderators if ACs were identified more distinctly within the work.
- It is important that centres ensure that candidates have sufficient direct involvement in the planning and running of three events to complete this unit. This may be challenging for centres with large cohorts of students undertaking this qualification. Centres may wish to explore work experience placement opportunities for students with Events Management companies or organise guest speaker sessions.
- Further guidance is available on the WJEC website and exemplar material will be available at future CPD events and on the secure website.



WJEC
245 Western Avenue
Cardiff CF5 2YX
Tel No 029 2026 5000
Fax 029 2057 5994
E-mail: exams@wjec.co.uk
website: www.wjec.co.uk