



Internal Assessment Report: Business Management

Sector Panel or SSC:

Business Education

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback to centres on verification in National Qualifications in this subject.

National Units

Titles/levels of National Units verified

DV4G 11	Business Enterprise (Intermediate 2)
DV4G 12	Business Enterprise (Higher)
DV4K 11	Business Decision Areas: Marketing and Operations (Intermediate 2)
DV4K 12	Business Decision Areas: Marketing and Operations (Higher)
DV4L 11	Business Decision Areas: Finance & HRM (Intermediate 2)
DV4L 12	Business Decision Areas: Finance & HRM (Higher)
DV4M 13	Managing Organisations: The External Environment (Advanced Higher)
DV4N 13	Managing Organisations: The Internal Environment (Advanced Higher)
DV4P 13	Researching a Business (Advanced Higher)

All Units were verified centrally.

General comments

Fifty centres were verified this year, covering Intermediate 2, Higher and Advanced Higher levels. All had used materials from the National Assessment Bank. The samples inspected gave much evidence of good practice and rigorous marking. Most centres have established systems of internal verification, in several cases cross marking their entire submission. Several centres included documentation of their internal verification systems, some of which had space for comments by the marker and the internal verifier, and details of how agreement was arrived at; this was very helpful in the verification process. No centre this year had awarded half marks: this was an improvement on last year, and in accordance with SQA policy in both internal and external assessment that only full marks should be awarded.

Last year's internal assessment report made it clear that partial reassessment is inadmissible, and submissions using it would not be accepted this year. Despite this warning, several centres' submissions were rejected owing to their having reassessed candidates, either orally or in writing, on parts of a failed instrument of assessment. This is unacceptable. If a candidate fails an assessment, he or she must re-sit the Unit in its entirety using a completely different instrument of assessment.

It would be helpful if centres could include an explanation of the reasons for anything that might appear out of the ordinary to the verifier **prior to** the verification event, in order to avoid any potential confusion.

Advice on good practice and areas for further development

Good practice observed

More centres this year used brackets rather than ticks to indicate where marks have been awarded. This is good practice as it makes it clear to both candidate and verifier exactly what part is receiving marks. It is also good practice to put marks in the margin opposite the bracketed sections; in a few instances this year, failure to do this resulted in marks being wrongly totalled.

There was strong evidence of internal verification from many centres. In some cases helpful summary grids were provided, showing the marks awarded by the original marker and the verifier along with a brief comment on how final agreement was reached. This was very useful in the verification process.

Many centres added helpful comments to their candidates' scripts, eg indicating where marks had been lost because of vagueness, undue brevity or failure to 'describe' or 'explain'. This helped the verifier as well as the candidate to see why marks had or had not been awarded, and showed candidates how to improve their performance.

Several centres showed good practice in the use of comments alerting candidates to the meanings of the different command words. For example, one centre indicated by letters such as 'I' and 'E' in the margin where candidates had scored marks for 'identifying', 'explaining', etc. This is helpful to candidates in the final exam as it reinforces the importance of the command words.

Many of the centres verified had in place all or most of the practices described above, and the verification process demonstrated that, in the vast majority of cases, the internal assessment process this year had been conducted with both confidence and competence.

Areas for further development

In a very few cases there was no evidence of internal verification: it is good practice to verify 10-15% of submissions. (Cross marking the entire submission is not normally necessary, though it might be useful in certain circumstances, eg where a teacher is delivering a particular Unit for the first time.) In some cases it was difficult to ascertain whether verification had taken place, as the process was not made entirely clear. Using differently coloured pens, or a grid as described above, and adding the initials of both markers would help to provide greater clarity in future submissions.

As in the external exam, marks should not be given for answers which do not match the command words used in questions. For example, on some occasions, candidates were awarded marks for description where analysis or explanation was called for. It is vital that all candidates are fully familiar with the meanings of all the command words for the level they are sitting. These are available on SQA's website.

In a few instances internal assessment at Intermediate 2 and Higher level was too lenient owing to the award of development marks. As in the external assessment, where scope for scoring such marks is severely restricted, they should not be routinely awarded in internal assessment. Development marks are, however, awarded at Advanced Higher level in both external and internal assessments.

Centres should ensure that they note on form VS00 which NABs have been used for which candidates. Submissions should be included for all specified candidates, including those who have moved down a level since failing an assessment, with a clear indication given of any change of level.

All evidence submitted for verification should be original: photocopied evidence is unacceptable.

Relatively few centres submitted amended versions of the marking schemes. It is accepted that marking schemes cannot cover every eventuality and that, on occasion, it may be necessary for a centre to add to or amend them. In such cases, annotations may be useful to provide justification for particular decisions.