

## Moderation Feedback — Central

**Assessment Panel:**

Management and Enterprise

**Qualification area:**

**Subject(s) and Level(s)  
Included in this report**

SG Business Management  
(Foundation, General and Credit Levels)

---

## Central Moderation

### General comments on central moderation activity

- 1 Candidates performed very well in all three levels of reports. There was a noticeable decrease in the number of candidates presented for Credit level who could have been more aptly suited to carrying out the General level report for Business@Work. As in previous years there was still a predominance of Credit level presentations.
- 2 Whilst there has been a steady improvement in the matching of pupil ability to the level of report, centres are encouraged to continue to be aware of this as, at times during moderation, it was noted that some candidates were still finding it difficult to tackle the Credit level report.
- 3 From a management perspective the process of running the [Business@Work](#) CD and then assessing the appropriate Foundation, General and Credit reports seemed to be carried out smoothly. Almost all schools submitted their own copies of solutions with any annotations included. Also TO DO lists and Class lists were on the whole included.
- 4 Once again, reassuringly, there seemed to be very few technical difficulties in the running of the CD at all.
- 5 The "Important Information" supplied prior to and with the copies of the papers clearly allowed teachers to manage the process more easily. Some schools within the sample had not absorbed the necessary information to assist in classroom planning of the activities but acknowledged this and made SQA aware of the situation.
- 6 The clarification notice, which was sent out to schools, did cause confusion in some centres when calculating final percentages and grades. SQA acknowledged this and tried to ensure that, within the sample materials, no candidates were disadvantaged as a result.
- 7 Standardisation was carried out at the start of the session and the work of each Moderator was sampled to ensure consistency.
- 8 The moderation team were updated by SQA personnel about changes in reporting forms to be adhered to.

## Specific issues identified

- 1 The moderation team felt that although in general terms there had been an improvement in the depth of Credit level answers, that there were still instances where marking was lenient. Again focus on accurate presentation would be appreciated as well as ensuring that marks are awarded for full answers and not for one or two words only.
  
- 2 Feedback was provided to centres that were accepted but where it was felt that constructive comment would assist in assessment for future years.  
  
Only two centres were not accepted for arithmetical errors.  
  
One centre was not accepted and referred to SQA for further investigation.  
  
One centre was not accepted based on incorrect assessment.
  
- 3 The moderation team would like to encourage centres to spend some time planning each report with pupils to ensure that print outs are initiated at the correct point within the report. Otherwise, information required may not be easy to access if the software has been used further.
  
- 4 There is a wide range in the styles of presentation by Credit level pupils. Centres are encouraged to recommend styles of reporting for Credit level candidates such as 14 pitch and double line spacing.  
  
Some centres have allowed pupils at Foundation and General level not to use the report format provided. It is strongly recommended that pupils do use the SQA report formats provided as these are structured to support Foundation and General in their responses.
  
- 5 There was, this year, evidence of internal moderation at a school departmental level. This was greatly appreciated as part of the quality assurance process. However, if schools are reducing the provisional grade for assistance provided they should try to give brief details or an example of the nature of such assistance. This would allow the moderation team to analyse areas of difficulties within the reports themselves.  
  
Also it is essential if more than one member of staff is involved in assessing the reports that they agree on marking approaches to ensure consistency within the sample. For example, in some schools one member of staff may use ticks to indicate what a mark is awarded for whilst another gives no indication and simply states a total number of marks allocated to a question. The latter approach should be avoided and centres indicate clearly how marks have been awarded.

## Feedback to centres

The moderation team felt that now there seemed to be little or no technical difficulties that they would wish in future to build up the level of feedback for centres generally.