

**AUCKLAND UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY
YOUNG ENTERPRISE TRUST**

**Young Enterprise Examination 2010
New Zealand
Chief Examiner's Report**

Auckland University of Technology (AUT) has offered this examination since its inception in New Zealand in 1996.

Marks ranged from 0 to 96.

ASSESSMENT PROCESSES

The preparation of the case study, examination questions, suggested solutions and the marking of scripts are carried out by the Auckland University of Technology under the direction of Russell Harray, New Zealand Chief Examiner. The process is moderated by Kay Rogers, Auckland University of Technology.

The assessment process was based on the revised marking model first introduced in 2003 which incorporated a Band 8 (21-25) and modified further by adding R as part of the criteria for Band 7 (17-20) in 2004. The marking model is based on a system of annotation and candidates are placed in one of the eight bands.

This year there was a marketing question for the first time.
The Achieve mark (pass) is set at 50 and grades are allocated on the following basis:

Achieve	50 - 67
Merit	68 – 79
Excellence	80+

The grade boundaries are the same as the previous 5 years.

The level of performance for 2010 is detailed below with comparative figures provided for 2009, 2008, 2007 and 2006. The decline in students sitting the exam has continued the trend of the last 4 years.

At the time of writing this report, marks have been entered for 1268 candidates. There were 18 applications for Compassionate Consideration.

The number of students who sat the examination

Year	Student numbers
2010	1284
2009	1476
2008	1687
2007	1836
2006	1729
2005	1714
2004	1919

2003	1282
2002	666
2001	689
2000	589

2010

NUMBER OF STUDENTS SITTING THE EXAM 2010 1284

(Aegrotat applications presented to Exam. Board = 18)

104 students did not sit the exam

Pass rate (986 students) 77%

Failure rate (298 students) 23%

Grade passes 2010

-Achieve grade (579/986) 58.7%

-Merit grade (304/986) 30.8%

-Excellence grade (103/986) 10.5%

Average 57.8%

Median 60%

Average mark for each question (out of 25)

Q. 1 14.25

Q. 2 13.7

Q. 3 12.5

Q. 4 12.6

2009

NUMBER OF STUDENTS SITTING THE EXAM 2009 1476

(Aegrotat applications presented to Exam. Board = 19)

Pass rate (1259 students) 85.3%

Failure rate (217 students) 14.7%

Grade passes 2009

-Achieve grade (673/1259) 53.5%

-Merit grade (479/1259) 38%

-Excellence grade	(107/1259)	8.5%
<u>Average</u>		61.29%
<u>Median</u>		64%

2008

NUMBER OF STUDENTS SITTING THE EXAM 2008 1687 (Aegrotat applications presented to Exam. Board = 28)

Pass rate	(1361 students)	80.7%
Failure rate	(326 students)	19.3%

Grade passes 2008

-Achieve grade	(861/1361)	63.3%
-Merit grade	(433/1361)	31.8%
-Excellence grade	(67/1361)	4.9%
<u>Average</u>		58.2%
<u>Median</u>		61%

2007

NUMBER OF STUDENTS SITTING THE EXAM 2007 1836 (Aegrotat applications presented to Exam. Board = 12)

Pass rate	(1508 students)	81.6%
Failure rate	(340 students)	18.4%

Grade passes 2007

-Achieve grade	(842/1508)	55.83%
-Merit grade	(536/1508)	35.54%
-Excellence grade	(130/1508)	8.62%
<u>Average</u>		59.9%
<u>Median</u>		62%

2006

NUMBER OF STUDENTS SITTING THE EXAM 2006 1729

(Aegrotat applications presented to Exam. Board = 28)

Pass rate (1446 students) **83.6%**

Failure rate (283 students) **16.4%**

Grade passes 2006

-Achieve grade (869/1446) **60.00%**

-Merit grade (500/1446) **34.6%**

-Excellence grade (77/1446) **5.4%**

Average **60.2%**

Median **62%**

AWARD WINNERS 2010

Top Scholar

Holly Eden (201270) Pukekohe High School (96 marks)

Leadership

Vivian Nouri (201994) Long Bay College

GENERAL COMMENTS ON SCRIPTS

The standard was slightly lower this year with a higher amount of fails (under 50%) and a slight decrease in the average marks and medium marks. Students on average handled the first two questions (leadership and planning) better than the last two (Innovation/Enterprise and Marketing).

There were 104 students who did not attempt the exam at all which is disappointing as they had registered. Some schools (11) had not prepared the students with the majority of the students from these schools struggling to answer the questions properly. Generally they would leave out part of the required answer, either the experience from their own company or reasonable suggestions and recommendations.

Most schools had prepared students by getting them to follow the “formula” for answering the questions. The disappointing part is that some students had obviously prepared answers for the questions prior to the exam as most made the same comments and the solutions were very similar. They all reached band 7 easily and were only distinguished from each other in how they incorporated their own experience.

Feedback from markers suggest that students do not understand that marketing can cover more topics than advertising or promotion and that marketing answers couldn't be used in most cases as an innovative solution.

As in the past, students struggled to reach band 8 by offering “exceptional insight” and using their own experience to make recommendations.

Some students also tried to get to band 7 by saying “in my experience” and then saying what it was. This was not good enough and has been a problem over previous years a well. Experience should be explicit on what they have learnt from their own company.

There seemed to be a lot of students who didn't read the question correctly and gave an answer relating to another question. Leadership (Q1) and Planning (Q2) were sometimes interchanged when the solutions came up. The case very clearly showed that the Longside Sunscreen Company did not do any real business or financial planning from the beginning and throughout they had problems with production planning and logistics. There were many solutions that could have been suggested here.

Question three covered Innovation and Enterprise. While there were some very good suggestions there were also some who gave answers that would not be considered innovative. Markers commented that some students used the same solution for this question as for other questions, especially in the marketing area.

“Doing more advertising” relates to marketing and did not get marks if used for question three. There were some good comments on the use of social networking techniques which were seen as innovative but could also be used for the Marketing question.

Many students seemed to come up with a number of good solutions but couldn't finish the answer by making a justified recommendation. Often they would say they recommended one of the solutions, but without a reason or referring back to their own experience. This meant they only reached band 6 or if they made a weak attempt at a recommendation then the bottom of band 7.

Russell Harray
Chief Examiner
5 October 2010