

Summary of marking assessment matrix

Technical (5%)

Theoretical knowledge relevantly applied to the un-seen issues on exam day e.g. SWOT, Mendelow's Matrix, PEST, SFA etc.

Briefly explain the relevance of any theoretical knowledge you do apply and make sure it is well applied to the un-seen information.

1% is typically awarded for each theory relevantly applied to the un-seen information.

Application (15%)

How well the candidate applies theoretical knowledge or numerical calculations to the un-seen information provided on exam day.

A range of marks given for applying theoretical knowledge to the un-seen information e.g. Typically 2%-3% awarded for a SWOT updated with the un-seen issues and used in a constructive way within your report.

A range of marks also given for applying numerical techniques to the financial information provided within the un-seen information on exam day e.g. profitability calculations, NPV, business valuations, financial or non-financial ratios. Typically up to 10% of the marks awarded for calculations.

Diversity (5%)

Real life examples provided that are relevant to the business or ethical issues identified within the un-seen information.

Typically 1% for each relevant business example provided.

Focus (5%)

Business (and ethical) issues sufficiently discussed at an appropriate level of depth. Clear relevance displayed and your discussion dealing with the most important matters for each issue.

Prioritisation (5%)

4-5 business issues prioritised (ranked) and a rationale (justification) for the ranking provided e.g. why each issue is more important than the other.

Typically 4%-5% could be awarded if the top 2 issues according to the examiner are placed by the candidate as their top three issues, and the rationale for the ranking is good.

Typically 2%-3% awarded, if the top 2 issues are placed by the candidate as their top three issues but rationale for the ranking is weak.

Typically 1% maximum, if the top 2 issues are not placed by the candidate as their top three issues (as considered by the examiner), irrespective of the quality of the rationale for their ranking.

Judgement (20%)

Marks based upon the depth of your evaluation and the commercially realistic advice or recommendations you give when discussing business or ethical issues.

Good marks can be awarded for evaluation and alternative advice given for each business or ethical issue discussed. Higher marks are given for providing advice which is clearly evaluated.

Ethics (10%)

This section of your report ~~ethics~~ is concerned with morally the concept of what is right and wrong in terms of the organisations conduct. Ethics is one dimension of corporate social responsibility.

Up to 5% for identification and discussion of 2-3 ethical issues e.g. the ~~moral~~ dilemma facing the organisation and why the issue is considered ethical.

Up to 5% for ~~ethical~~ advice (not business advice) e.g. moral recommendations (with reasons why) to address each ethical

issue identified.

5% max to explain why the issues are ~~morally controversial~~
and 5% max to say what to morally do (with reasons).

Un-seen issues could have both a business and ethical dimension coexisting, the ethical section of the report should deal with the ethical dimension only.

Logic (30%)

Up to 20% available to make ~~well justified~~ recommendations for your prioritised business issues. Recommendations must have strong reasoning, allot of marks are given for the strength and rationale of the advice you have recommend (the ~~WHY~~). Brief reasons must be stated for why the board should follow your advice given. Often financial calculations can be the back bone to support your reasons.

Unjustified recommendations will score at the most 1% each.

Question 1 part (b) of your exam will give up to 10% available for the candidate to demonstrate some form of communication. e.g. draft slides, email, letter, graph, chart. Do this within an appendix to your report.

The 10% awarded based upon the format, clarity and brevity of information provided by the candidate, and its relevance to the recipient.

Integration (5%)

Your script judged ~~holistically~~ its depth and completion e.g. does it speak to the user in a professional language?

Up to 2% awarded for report format

Up to 3% awarded based on the quality and functionality of the report.

Essentially reports deemed to be highly professional, sound, satisfactory, inadequate or poor (1%-5% awarded).