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Overview

This subject assessment advice, based on the 2024 assessment cycle, gives an overview of how students performed in their school and external assessments in relation to the learning requirements, assessment design criteria, and performance standards set out in the relevant subject outline. It provides information and advice regarding the assessment types, the application of the performance standards in school and external assessments, and the quality of student performance.

As part of the subject renewal program, changes have been made to some subjects for 2025; these changes can be found at the change log in the front of the subject outline. There are no changes to Stage 2 Business Innovation for 2025. Teachers are reminded that the adjustments that were in place for 2024 no longer apply.

General

* It is important that teachers and students are working from the current subject outline. 2025 Subject outlines can be found on the subject specific mini-site via <https://www.sace.sa.edu.au/>
* Teachers should note that, tasks and learning and support materials that were applicable to the previous Business and Enterprise subject do not meet the intent or requirements or assessment design criteria of the Business Innovation course.
* An increasing number of students are exceeding the word counts/time limits or multimodal equivalents prescribed in the subject outline. Word counts are identified as maximum. Work that exceeds the prescribed word count disadvantages students and impacts their ability to address all specific features. Please see the *Word Count Policy* on the SACE Website for more information.
* Teachers are encouraged to provide students a high degree of agency in the Business Innovation course. particularly in their use of tools, templates, or scaffolds. Students can be disadvantaged from using a template or scaffold that is not relevant or appropriate to the student’s business.
* The nature of collaboration should extend beyond group work. Students are encouraged to work collaboratively to refine ideas and collect business intelligence, however they must present evidence of individual summative assessments. Collaboration should include a range of stakeholders relevant to the specific business.
* Teachers are encouraged to ensure there is opportunity for students to successfully meet all assessment design criteria on more than one occasion and that the requirements of the task provide opportunity for students to meet the assessment design criteria at all band grades.
* Teachers are encouraged to develop assessment tasks that allow students the opportunity to demonstrate their work in creative formats or in a lean manner.

School Assessment

Teachers can improve the moderation process and the online process by:

* ensuring all student materials are loaded correctly and labelling of work corresponds with the correct task
* including marks sheets and comments for student work
* ensuring all LAPs and tasks meet the requirements of the most current subject outline
* thoroughly checking that all grades entered in Schools Online are correct, and accurately reflected in the corresponding Performance Standards Record shading
* ensuring that the Performance Standards Record shading is an accurate reflection of the mark sheets and shaded performance standards
* ensuring all assessment tasks, any relevant VMMs, LAPs etc are uploaded and that any changes to LAPs have been recorded in the addendum. Where individual student variations have been implemented these should be recorded in a Variation to Moderation Materials (VMM) form.

Assessment Type 1: Business Skills

Students are required to complete three business skills tasks which demonstrate learning across all four learning strands and cover at least two contexts selected for study. At least one business skills task should be a collaborative task.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* ensuring two contexts are covered from Designing, Sustaining and/or Transforming
* providing opportunities for students to demonstrate learning in a range of diverse ways and encouraging creative development of work
* facilitating collaboration amongst students in at least one task, as outlined by subject requirements Students are encouraged to involve a diverse range of stakeholders; collaboration can include simple interactions with peers, teamwork aimed at achieving shared goals or engagement with external stakeholders
* developing diverse tasks that enable students to identify and explore real-world problems relevant to their lives, apply design-thinking processes, conduct meaningful research, and generate meaningful business intelligence to make informed decisions and propose viable solutions
* encouraging the effective use of business tools to develop relevant business intelligence
* designing tasks that focus on fewer assessment design criteria to allow students to demonstrate greater depth in their responses.

The more successful responses commonly:

* included a clear customer focus and established a genuine problem,
* effectively used a range of models and tools to refine assumptions about their customers and their problems to develop viable solutions
* tested, iterated, and validated their proposed solutions through a variety of mediums to develop a solution that was of unique value to the customer
* evaluated the desirability, feasibility and viability of their proposed solutions using customer-focused approaches.
* generated a range of business intelligence using a range of tools specific to the problem/business and proposed solutions
* clearly communicated iterations and pivots supported by evidence of extensive business intelligence and decision-making
* effectively extracted data from the variety of tools and utilised this to make informed decisions by utilising relevant quality business intelligence and business strategies
* communicated work that was succinct and lean in nature, with findings presented creatively and innovatively
* used a variety of innovative ways to convey and communicate information including the use of graphics, charts, graphs, and infographics
* effectively used a variety of communication methods (audio, website, visuals, and diagrams) and integrated appropriate terminology
* demonstrated clear evidence of innovation or added value to an existing business model in the Sustaining and Transforming context, rather than just listing recommendations
* went beyond simply listing recommendations by including specific examples of how the proposed changes enhanced or transformed the business model in meaningful ways
* demonstrated application and validation of customer-focused approaches including identification of customers’ needs, wants and existing market solutions and their limitations
* interpreted and critically evaluated business intelligence through the use of decision-making tools and strategies and communicated these effectively through a variety of forms
* directed their report/pitch/advice to a specific stakeholder, showing an understanding of the stakeholder needs and interests
* effectively engaged with a variety of relevant stakeholders beyond just their peers
* critically analysed and evaluated challenges and opportunities in the digital age specific to their business and identified methods to mitigate the risks. This included assessing emerging digital trends and the potential impact of digital disruption
* were discerning in their analysis and evaluation of social, economic, environmental, ethical, and/or political factors, specific to the chosen problem/business
* demonstrated a high level of attention to FSP criteria, identifying customer needs/wants and real problems that need solving.

The less successful responses commonly:

* followed a scaffold that limited opportunities for the l student to independently develop and refine the chosen business or concept
* relied on generic tools and templates provided by the teacher that lacked relevance to the specific problem or solution. As a result, there was limited analysis of pertinent business intelligence
* provided no evidence of addressing problems with a customer-focused mindset. Proposals were made without proper stakeholder engagement, assumption testing, or validation of the solutions which impacted the depth of analysis and evaluation of their product/solution development
* displayed limited use of business intelligence or strategies when making decisions
* demonstrated a lack of insight and limited consideration of the market by proposing solutions that already exist, without testing them with key stakeholders
* selected a business to transform but provided no evidence of the transformation
* described processes and tools used without evaluating findings and insights derived from using the tools or applying the data to the business solution
* demonstrated limited analysis and evaluation of opportunities and challenges in the digital age specific to the business situation, often resorting to a SWOT analysis that did not meet the assessment criteria
* communicated findings without specificity to a particular stakeholder, resulting in a generic response that lacked detailed supporting evidence
* dedicated a significant portion of the word count to reciting theory, defining tools, and discussing generic content rather than focusing on the business intelligence developed using the tools and its impact on the decision-making process
* conducted generic market research that lacked focus and was not tailored to the context of the business or the specific needs of the customer, limiting its effectiveness in generating meaningful business intelligence or addressing the identified problem
* selected an idea, in the designing business context, that already exists in the market, and made no attempt to generate business intelligence or data to support enhancement of it
* maintained the same prototype/solution, with limited evidence of pivoting or iteration even when suggested by the evidence
* included a generic PESTLE analysis that was not specific to the chosen problem/business, lacked evaluation of impacts relevant to their business/problem, and proposed no mitigation strategies
* limited collaboration to group work, often unrelated or irrelevant to their problem, rather than collaborating with a broader range of stakeholders
* had completed tasks as a group activity, without providing any clarity about the contributions of members. This limited the opportunity for individual evaluation/analysis and resulted in work that lacked the detail and depth necessary to achieve a more successful result
* exceeded the word count or scope of the multimodal equivalent
* provided consultancy reports that proposed recommendations for transforming an existing business that were unsupported by any evidence of finding problems using a customer-focused approach, the iterative development of solutions and the creation of business intelligence that supports the recommendations. Such reports do not meet the requirements of the subject.

Assessment Type 2: Business Model

The business model has two parts, the business model development, and the business model evaluation.

Students work individually or collaboratively to develop a viable business model and individually evaluate the business model and its development.

Each student presents an individual evaluation of the business model. This evaluation should be supported by evidence of the development of the business model, identifying the business intelligence they have generated to support/validate/pivot their assumptions and reflecting upon the desirability, feasibility, and viability of the solution.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* supporting students to adopt an integrated approach to business model evaluation. This enables students to showcase criteria specific to the business
* encouraging students to go beyond simple descriptions and definitions of tools to explaining how they used the business intelligence generated by using the tools (such as the Business Model Canvas) to inform decisions
* supporting students to demonstrate collaboration with a diverse range of both internal and external stakeholders
* ensuring all assessment design criteria in the subject outline are addressed including Contextual Application and Analysis and Evaluation
* providing clear guidance to students about task requirements, particularly word counts. Word counts are identified as maximum. Work that exceeds the prescribed word count disadvantages students and impacts their ability to address all specific features
* ensuring that students evaluate the impact of key pivots and iterations of the business model collectively rather than addressing each of the points individually.

The more successful responses commonly:

* understood that the task did not require them to describe in detail all of the elements of their business model but to evaluate the business model using specific examples
* clearly understood that there was a difference between the business model canvas (a tool) and the business model
* understood the portfolio was not being assessed
* were able to discuss how the business intelligence developed in the portfolio was used as a justification for decision-making
* managed the development of the business model using a range of tools to support the decision-making process and manage the project such as GANTT Charts, risk analyses, PESTLEs, SWOTs, cost benefit analyses etc
* effectively extracted and communicated business intelligence developed through the use of project management and decision-making tools rather than simply including the tools
* generated a range of business intelligence and extracted relevant data to make informed decisions about pivots and iterations. They were able to support evaluation of these in the development of the business model using specific examples
* conducted targeted market research and incorporated their findings in their decision making and their assessment of the potential success or viability of the business model
* effectively used business intelligence to evaluate and validate the desirability, feasibility, and viability of their business model
* critically analysed the business model, making balanced judgements about its features. The evaluation was purposeful, focusing on key aspects of the model and using explicit examples to support the analysis
* strategically selected relevant pivots and iterations of the business model to focus on rather than incorporating discussion of all aspects of the business model
* acknowledged future plans and addressed how these will change the business’s risk profile
* used the opportunity to present in formats other than a report using a range of platforms and programs (such as infographics, Padlet, Thinglink, Prezi). Multimodal methods of presentation enabled students the opportunity to use visuals effectively to support their evaluation
* clearly understood the challenges and/or opportunities for the business in the digital age; identifying and evaluating industry digital trends and proposing digital transformations and how to capitalise on these.

The less successful responses commonly:

* exceeded the word count. The student invested too many words discussing the business model and left the evaluation to the end of the discussion which often fell outside of the maximum word limit or referred to material contained in the appendix which was not assessed
* incorporated theories or definitions of the tools rather than evaluating the impact of these on the development of the business model. This approach limited the student’s ability to thoroughly evaluate the development of the business model
* described the business model canvas tool, rather than critically evaluating the iterative development of the business model itself
* addressed each individual dot point listed in the subject outline in isolation, rather than evaluating how they contributed to the iterative development of the business model as a whole
* limited collaboration to working in a group rather than collaborating with internal and external stakeholders to iteratively develop the business model. This has a number of implications; it limits the ability to establish the contribution each member has made, and it means the business model is not a true representation of a viable solution to a valid problem informed by a range of data
* tended to describe the tools and recount processes undertaken, rather than evaluating the impact of findings and insights derived from using the tools and undertaking market research on the business model
* lacked analysis of the desirability, feasibility, and viability of the business model, including the pivots/iterations made
* offered a recount of what was done, rather than evaluating why decisions were made and the evidence that supported the decision-making
* lacked evaluation of potential risks and opportunities in digital age, the possible implications for the business model or how they might mitigate these. Instead, these responses included a SWOT analysis which does not address the assessment design criteria
* did not specifically discuss internal and external factors such as social, economic, environmental, and/or ethical factors relating to the business model or how they intended to respond to them
* focused more on what they personally did rather than evaluating the ‘business model’
* did not provide a problem/solution fit that met customer needs, rather the business model was focused on what they student thought rather than what the data suggested
* (for those who chose to transform a business) presented the current business model rather than transforming the business, often missed opportunities to consider the digital age context or explore the potential of digital disruption
* provided a recount of what they did, repeating what decisions they made instead of analysing the iterative development of the business model
* included a range of tools such as SWOT, PESTLE and Get Keep Grow without connecting to the development of the business model or providing analysis of these
* placed extensive information in appendices, this proved ineffective in meeting the ADC as appendices is not assessed.

External Assessment

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* ensuring students are clear on the expectations outlined in the Subject Outline. It is not expected that all elements of the business plan are covered equally
* encouraging students to display work creatively and innovatively, particularly in a lean format.
* ensuring that evidence for the Business Plan and Pitch are submitted for each student. The Business Plan and the Pitch are assessed against different criteria and students will be disadvantaged if they do not submit both
* loading a replacement document in Schools Online, for students who have **not submitted** both a Business Plan and Pitch, that includes the student registration number and a statement that the student has not submitted the task

Assessment Type 3: Business Plan and Pitch

Students individually complete one business plan and pitch within one context.

A business plan builds on the information contained in a business model. It is a document that describes the goals and objectives of a business and the strategies it will use to achieve these. It is a road map to provide direction and a reflective tool to measure progress and future direction.

Students create and present a pitch to support and promote their business plan to an audience of potential stakeholders. The pitch outlines the key elements of the plan, specifically the value proposition, the purpose and goals of the business and the future aspirations of the business.

Business Plan

The more successful responses commonly:

* clearly outlined their business concept, identified issues relevant to current trends and developed a product or solution of difference
* strategically selected relevant elements of the business plan for the chosen business to evaluate without finding the need to include all the possibilities articulated in the subject outline
* strategically selected tools and strategies to generate a range of business intelligence to support their business model/plan
* demonstrated evidence of utilising insightful and extensive business intelligence to create a carefully considered business model/plan
* had a clear research focus and a range of customer interviews and/or data to support pivots and changes to plans as they worked through their model
* focused on areas that were specific to their business model and the future direction of their business
* were discerning in the selection of business intelligence used in the development and evaluation of their business model/plan
* communicated business intelligence used in the development and evaluation of their business model/plan in creative and innovative ways
* provided realistic financial details based on assumptions that had been carefully considered and explored
* provided simple explanations of pertinent financial information such as calculations to estimate break-even point
* concisely communicated the development of their business model/plan without recounting the entire process or including the entire model and all of the tools they had used
* only included conclusions/decisions or insights relevant to their business model
* did not use a scaffold of a traditional business plan
* provided a lean presentation using visual elements such as graphics, charts, graphs, etc to communicate relevant information
* effectively utilised a range of formats included oral, website, imagery, flow diagrams, analytical dot points etc to communicate information
* evaluated strategies used to develop the business model, and analysed how external factors, such as market tends and competition, influenced the development of these in the business plan
* included measurable targets and detailed strategies for achieving them to ensure the successful development and implementation of future plans
* collaborated effectively with a range of internal and external stakeholders, potential and actual, and were able to utilise insights to develop a future ready business plan
* presented a variety of business intelligence, specifically linking their findings to their business model/plan and decisions made in response to their findings
* clearly identified and addressed market risks, challenges, and opportunities, including challenges and opportunities for the business in a digital age. Such responses discussed how these factors would be mitigated or capitalised on to successfully develop the business plan
* included examples of proposals (e.g. example prototypes of marketing visuals), explaining how it worked and what the customer feedback was in response to the proposal
* evaluated a range of internal and external factors and in response developed a plan for the future direction of the business
* strategically selected key points from business intelligence generated through tools such as PESTLE, SWOT, risk assessments, to analyse the potential impact of social, legal, economic, environmental and/or ethical factors on the business model/plan
* clearly articulated potential opportunities and challenges for their business model in the digital age and proposed mitigation strategies to counteract potential risks.

The less successful responses commonly:

* prepared a report as per the previous Business and Enterprise subject outline which limited the demonstration of the assessment design criteria of Business Innovation
* utilised a template to complete the report, wasting valuable word count by including elements not required or assessed (e.g. contents page, executive summary etc)
* included theory of concepts or excessive information about a current business rather than analysis of the business plan
* outlined the generic requirements for establishing a business rather than a detailed business plan for a product/service/solution developed in response to a specific customer problem or need
* provided a superficial, generalised discussion of an idea without providing any business intelligence to support the validity or viability of the proposed product in meeting a specific customer need or problem
* those that transformed a business, presented information on the existing business rather than identifying and developing a transformation strategy for the business
* lacked a clear outline or identification of the business concept, as well limited engagement in a customer-focused approach to finding and solving problems
* limited evidence of FSP using a customer focused approach; for example, did not develop a solution, outline how it worked or detail the impact it would, instead using a solution that already existed
* provided limited or no evidence of validating customer assumptions or testing of proposed products or solutions
* demonstrated limited or no development of business intelligence
* demonstrated minimal evidence of any stakeholder engagement, often limited to peers
* included unnecessary information such as definitions of terms or tools, limiting opportunity to discuss the development of business intelligence and decisions made
* often repeated similar information
* doubled up on word count by repeating the plan and pitch using both text and voice. Repetition of evidence in different modes did not demonstrate evidence of learning at higher grade levels
* demonstrated a lack of understanding of the concepts and confused basic financial terminology
* proposed unrealistic solutions which were not supported with evidence
* presented limited evidence of the iterative development of their business model and plan
* did not address or had limited analysis and evaluation of the opportunities and challenges the business might face in the digital age or the potential social, economic, environmental and/or ethical impacts the business might face
* outlined plans for a solution or product that already exists without establishing how their version was innovative or added value for the customer
* used tools such as SWOT or PESTLE analysis which were generically developed and not specific to their business model/plan. Did not provide insight into the potential impacts on their business model nor propose strategies of how they would respond and develop their business plan for the future
* provided limited or no business intelligence relevant to the chosen business, using research general to the industry rather than research applied to the specific proposal; often tools used were generic and not relevant to their business plan
* presented a recount of what they did, rather than an evaluation of the decisions they made and their market position
* used basic KPIs such as profit without establishing data-driven goals or referring to the business plan or strategy
* did not explore the external factors which impacted the decisions they made or the development of aspects of their business concept
* did not consider or seek stakeholder feedback on the feasibility or viability of proposed solutions
* did not utilise the word count effectively often focusing on unnecessary or irrelevant details (for example providing detailed, 200 word explanations of registration of the business)
* excessively breached the word count. Completing a 10-minute video accompanied by extensive written components in the presentation does not meet the word/time requirements prescribed in the subject outline and disadvantages the student
* included material, such as the Business Model Canvas and Value Proposition Canvas, which had been previously assessed. Students should not include the tools but rather incorporate the relevant data/business intelligence they have generated through using the tools into their plan
* submitted generic work that was AI generated without evaluating and extracting the business intelligence relevant to that business.

Pitch

The more successful responses commonly:

* addressed the pitch to a specific stakeholder. This allowed students to thoughtfully address stakeholder concerns and articulate how the product/business addressed the consumer’s problem or need
* used a range of tools to support communication and effectively utilised the full 2-minute time allocation
* presented a seamless presentation — it was clear that the student had engaged extensively with the stakeholder, understood their problems, or needs and was confident that they were proposing a valid and viable solution
* included pertinent business intelligence to confirm the validity of their solution
* effectively integrated the criteria into a cohesive and well-rounded pitch.

The less successful responses commonly:

* referred to a business concept/idea that lacked clarity
* used AI to produce a commentary that was generic and provided no evidence of having engaged with the iterative development of a solution to a specific problem for a specific customer
* developed a generic pitch that was directed towards a general audience
* developed a pitch that whilst visually appealing, was superficial and very generic, and lacked specific evidence of the student’s own work
* did not present relevant business intelligence that confirmed their proposal as a tested and valid solution
* duplicated the business plan and thus did not address the requirements of the pitch or add any value to the response
* were structured in a way that did not allow them to meet the criteria stated in the subject outline
* provided limited commentary or text to support visuals.