



## **Alternative Certification Model 2020–21: National QA Exercise Key Messages**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Business Management</b>
<b>Level</b>	<b>Higher</b>

This report provides information on themes emerging from the national quality assurance exercise, which is part of the Alternative Certification Model for National 5, Higher and Advanced Higher courses.

A sample of candidates' assessed work from selected centres was reviewed to determine whether assessment was in line with the national standard. The evidence submitted may have been partial or incomplete and is unlikely to have represented all of the evidence that will be gathered to allow the centre to determine a provisional result.

The centres selected for review in this subject and at this level have been provided with specific feedback on the evidence that they submitted. The comments below highlight key points about the assessment approaches and instruments used and the sampled centres' assessment judgements, for all centres delivering the subject at this level to reflect upon and make any appropriate adjustments.

## **Section 1: Comments on approach to assessment**

The volume of evidence for each candidate varied across centres, ranging from two or three full question papers to one section of a paper or unit assessments only. Key evidence can be gathered from a mixture of assessments.

Centres made effective use of commercial papers that were in line with national standards, the full or part SQA 2021 NQ assessment resource, assessments devised by the centre, and SQA's unit assessment support packs. Assessments made from a range of SQA past papers had appropriate course coverage and level of demand.

Some centre evidence included unit assessment support packs and these have a level of demand notional of 'C' grade. Centres should take account of the level of demand of assessments when determining provisional results.

Some full question papers were adapted to remove a complete topic(s); however it was not always clear what other assessments would take place later. The focus of key evidence should be on demonstrating a candidate's knowledge and understanding of the five areas of the course, as outlined in the subject-specific guidance document.

Most centres clearly indicated that further assessment would take place after the moderation evidence had been submitted, which is an acceptable approach.

## **Section 2: Comments on assessment judgements**

Marker judgements were generally acceptable and in line with national standards, with candidates being assessed accurately, fairly and consistently. Occasionally marking was lenient, with development marks being given generously, in other instances marking instructions were applied too severely.

In most cases, candidates successfully met the required standards of attainment for the course. There was clear evidence of effective learning by candidates.

There was strong evidence of clearly annotated work showing where judgements were made.

Some centres provided excellent supporting documentation that clearly showed how the centre would determine provisional results based on demonstrated evidence.

There was strong evidence of moderation taking place within centres and with other schools. Discussion of any variations in marking, and how these were resolved, were often documented, which is excellent practice.

There was clear evidence that teachers and lecturers are working hard to develop and to encourage the skills, knowledge and understanding necessary for the course.