



**Standard Grade 2013
Internal Assessment Report
Business Management**

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback to centres on verification in Standard Grade qualifications in this subject.

Standard Grade

Titles/levels of Standard Grade qualifications verified:

Standard Grade Business Management, Practical Abilities at Foundation, General and Credit level

General comments

The vast majority of centres are working well within the requirements of the national standard.

At General and Foundation levels, the accuracy of marking was particularly noteworthy.

At Credit level, whilst still within the requirements of the national standard, some centres were a little lenient with marking. Minor issues also related to the use of the command words.

Administration of assessments

The vast majority of centres provided documentation that was well organised and contained: annotated solutions, completed to-do lists and password sheets.

Centres presented candidates at appropriate levels.

The majority of centres had completed internal verification which was clearly evidenced by the use of different coloured pens for each marker and the provision of marking grids, which included columns for internal verification comments.

Areas of good practice

A small number of centres produced a word-processed template for candidates to complete the Credit report.

The provision of marking grids, which included columns for internal verification comments, is clearly good practice and is to be commended.

Specific areas for improvement

At Credit level, there were some minor issues with the use of command words:

Some candidates appeared ill equipped to answer **compare** questions, such as question 6 in the Credit question paper. Centres should be advised to instruct candidates that when answering such questions, connecting words such as 'whereas' should be used. In addition, it should be noted that similarities can be indicated when answering comparison questions.

Justification responses were not always sufficiently detailed to warrant marks. Candidates should be aware that generic responses such as 'quicker', 'cheaper' etc. are not enough.

Describe questions were not always well answered. Some candidates merely provided an example or a list. For example in Credit question 9 (b), candidates who listed 'political, economic, technology' received no marks.