**Marking and Standardisation Workshop – Business: Graded Unit 2**

**Evidence Requirements -** **Stage 3: Evaluating (24 marks)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Alison Barker** | **Charles Ford** | **Frances Fairfax** |
| **Evaluating Stage****Minimum evidence requirements** | **Minimum****Mark****Required \*** | **Criteria met for additional mark(s)\*\* & Total Marks** **Awarded**  | **Criteria met for additional mark(s)\*\* & Total Marks** **Awarded** | **Criteria met for additional mark(s)\*\* & Total Marks** **Awarded** |
| **1** A brief outline of the investigation | **1** |  |  |  |
| **2** Assessment of the extent to which each of the original objectives of the investigation have been met. This should include reference to any modifications made during the course of the investigation and their importance and to any alternative courses of action considered but rejected. Throughout, the assessment should be supported with credible reasons | **2** |  |  |  |
| **3** Commentary on aspects of the Planning and developing stages which worked effectively and why and/or aspects of the Planning and Developing stages which did not work as effectively as expected. Three separate aspects should be covered — one for the planning brief, one for the plan and one for the development report  | **2** |  |  |  |
| **4** Assessment of the reliability and validity of the primary and secondary sources of information  | **1** |  |  |  |
| **5** Assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the report of the investigation. This should be supported by credible reasons and cover at least one strength and at least one weakness | **2** |  |  |  |
| **6** Recommendations for future investigations. These should be based on items above and must relate to the personal development of the learner (eg in terms of the further development of skills used in this investigation) and aspects of the process or product of the investigation (eg with respect to setting timescales, gathering information or possible future investigations). It should be clear from the recommendations that the learner has reflected on what happened and has drawn conclusions from this reflection  | **2** |  |  |  |
| **7** Assessment of new skills and knowledge gained during the process of the investigation  | **2** |  |  |  |
| **Total marks awarded/Grade****Comments** |  |  |  |  |

**Marking criteria**

**Grade A: 17 or more, Grade B: 15 to 16, Grade C: 12 to 14, Not achieved less than 12.**

\*Learners must secure at least the minimum mark for each of the minimum evidence requirements.

\*\*Up to the maximum of 12 additional marks may be awarded on the basis of the following criteria:

1. The extent to which the evaluation demonstrates clear and explicit links between the three stages of the investigation.
2. The extent to which it is highly focused on the objectives of the investigation.
3. The extent to which it makes accurate and apposite reference to relevant concepts studied in the HND Business
4. The strength and validity of the points made to justify statements
5. The extent to which the justification of points is logical, credible and well thought out
6. The extent to which reflection is considered and careful and relates explicitly to the learner’s experience during the investigation
7. How well the recommendations follow from the learner’s reflection and how well the report explicitly draws a connection between reflection and recommendation
8. The extent to which recommendations are realistic
9. The extent to which the evaluation as a whole is logical and directly related to the investigation carried out by the learner
10. The extent to which the assessment of new skills and knowledge gained during the process of the investigation is reflective and evaluative