OCR

Oxford Cambridge and RSA

Cambridge Technicals Level 3

Business

05834-05837, 05878

Unit 15 Change Management

OCR Report to Centres June 2018

About this Examiner Report to Centres

This report on the 2018 Summer assessments aims to highlight:

- areas where students were more successful

- main areas where students may need additional support and some reflection

- points of advice for future examinations

It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

The report also includes links and brief information on:

- A reminder of our **post-results services** including **reviews of results**

- Link to **grade boundaries**

- **Further support that you can expect from OCR**, such as our CPD programme

Reviews of results

If any of your students' results are not as expected you may wish to consider one of our Reviews of results services. For full information about the options available visit the OCR website. If University places are at stake you may wish to consider priority service 2 reviews of marking which have an earlier deadline to ensure your reviews are processed in time for university applications: http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/stage-5-post-results-services/enquiries-about-results/service-2-priority-service-2-2a-2b/

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other assessments, can be found on the OCR website.

Further support from OCR

Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear exam feedback directly from a senior assessors or drop in to an online Q&A session.

https://www.cpdhub.ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Cambridge Technicals
Level 3 Business
(05834-05837, 05878)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content   **Page**

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

Unit 15 Change Management

1.   General Comments:

This was the second session which this examination paper was available and it was pleasing to see that candidates again engaged well with the paper and its contents. It was particularly pleasing to see many candidates engage with the case study content in terms of using the context that it presented well in the responses given to the various questions on the paper. There was also generally good evidence that candidates had been prepared well for the paper in terms of the style of writing used and the structures used to answer the questions that were set. This allowed candidates to achieve good Level 3 responses to extended writing questions which allowed them to build marks well across the paper.

The case study material was familiar to candidates in terms of the way that it was presented and allowed candidates to make full use of the material across the responses that they gave. There was no evidence that there were any time pressures to be considered in the responses that were given and as such allowed those candidates that were fully prepared to answer all questions well. In this paper it is important that candidates can use case study material in their responses as it allows them to build answers well and naturally allows answers to move into higher level responses therefore.

In all areas of the specification there was generally good evidence that candidates were well prepared theoretically in terms of the knowledge required to address the questions that were set within the paper. There are a couple of exceptions to this which are outlined within the individual question feedbacks that are presented below. This understanding is important as candidates would not be able to grasp significant points within the case material in terms of its application to the questions set without this in place.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Q1a Overall the question was not well answered as many candidates could not distinguish specific drivers for change that related to the case study. This was particularly the case for lower ability candidates who were not able to access this question as required. There also seemed to be confusion about driver for change which was the focus of the question and benefits of the change taking place which is not the same thing. Centres should ensure that candidates know the difference between these things in relation to questions of this nature. Where candidates were able to identify drivers then they invariably were able to go on to develop their selected drivers within the context of the case study. This is an important skill for candidates to have as the applied nature of the paper dictates the need to be able to develop answers in a contextual manner to achieve the higher level of marks on the paper.

Q1b Most candidates were able to access this question as the setting for the question has been similar across the sample assessment material and the initial sitting of the paper in the January 2018 session. Most candidates in their responses were able to demonstrate an understanding of what barriers to change are and were able to successfully select these from the case material. Where there was some misunderstanding was in the confusion between barriers to the change which was the focus of the question, and limiters to the success of the change. The former relates to things which may affect the change occurring whilst the latter focuses on how

4

successful the change is likely to be. Whilst there is a subtle difference between the two, one would allow the question to be successfully answered whilst the other would not.

Candidates invariably managed to achieve answers in the range of the top of Level 2 and the bottom of Level 3 through being able to identify relevant barriers, explain them in context and comment on the impact that these barriers would have to the change. The main reason why candidates were not able to progress answers into Level 4 was because they did not consider the required number of relevant barriers within the responses. As the question asked to consideration of four barriers then this is what was required into order to access Level 4. Another reason was because of the lack of a valid conclusion. In several responses candidates had considered appropriately the required number of responses but disappointingly did not progress answers further to conclude which was the most significant barrier with appropriate reasoning. Care should be taken to ensure that reasoning is not a restatement of points previously made but centres should ensure that conclusions can be drawn from the evidence presented in the previous part of a candidate's response.

Q1c This question focused on the use of McKinsey's 7S change management model, and the soft S elements of it, to suggest a strategy that can be followed to implement the required change. Responses to this question were very varied including some very good Level 4 answers through to responses where candidates did not even attempt the question. There were a larger than expected number of the latter type of response which indicates that centres need to focus more on the delivery and application of the various change management theories in context to allow candidates to produce a response to a question of this nature.

When candidates were able to offer responses, most were able to identify the four soft elements of McKinsey's theory which garnered a Level 1 mark for theoretical understanding. As the question required candidates to develop a change management plan using this theory then candidates were required to identify actions relating to these theories to access marks at Level 2. The most popular area for development were skills and the identification of the need for training. Staffing issues were less well addressed as candidates seemed to mix this up with skills causing confusion with responses given. Better candidates were able to develop their answers to achieve Level 3 through consideration of the impact of the actions suggested. Very few answers were seen moving into Level 4 and centres should look to develop the skill of evaluating the suitability of using stated change management theories in the context of case material.

Q2a Most candidates were able to identify two new services that would be offered because of the change taking place. This showed that candidates were able to access the case study material well and identify the relevant information that was provided across the supporting information. As such this question was probably the most accessible on the paper and the work that centres have done in terms of using case material has been well rewarded in this instance.

Q2b There were many candidates who were able to achieve all of the marks on offer through the identification of appropriate external stakeholders and then developing their answers to explain how the identified stakeholders would benefit from the changes made. Where candidates lost marks tended to be because their answers did not provide an explanation of the benefits for the selected stakeholders. This was largely because the responses given were statements of benefits as opposed to an explanation. Explanations require a linked expansion to be made of a point stated in an answer which is where candidates tended to lose marks consequently. Some candidates confused external stakeholders with internal stakeholders although these sorts of responses were not as common.

Q2c The focus of this question was to analyse the data provided in the case material and then advise which were the most significant issues that needed to be addressed. This fact caused problems as parts of the answer focused on data which was not actually an issue that needed to be addressed. Most candidates were able to identify issues that required addressing and were then able to explain why these were issues which gave a mark within Level 2. Fewer candidates were able to develop answers into Level 3 with some indication of what impact these issues would have on the football club which should be a natural step following on from the explanation of the issue in the first instance. Few candidates achieved Level 4 where they were expected to select and justify the most significant issue for the football club to address. By offering some indication of this with reasoning candidates would push their responses into the higher level as a consequence.