

**BCS Higher Education Qualification**

**Diploma**

**October 2023**

**EXAMINERS' REPORT**

**Professional Issues**

**Questions Report:**

<b>A1</b>	
	<p>Many candidates attempted this question.</p> <p>In part a) candidates identified a limited number of points such as importance of integrity. However, full marks were often not awarded due to a lack of relevant points as several candidates focused on professional qualifications and listed these rather than discussing professionalism and behaviours surrounding this.</p> <p>In part b) several candidates listed code of conduct items rather than providing a discussion on its purpose.</p> <p>In part c) candidates provided good points and linked these to the scenario, maximum marks were limited due to repeat examples and a limited quantity.</p>
	<p>This question was answered poorly.</p> <p>In part a) the meaning of professionalism was often confused with profession, and in in part b) candidates gave a description of a code of conduct rather than its purpose. In part c) some candidates answered the question well however, some others appeared unfamiliar with the duty to relevant authority.</p>
<b>A2</b>	
	<p>In part a) candidates showed a good understanding of anti-discrimination law however, many focused on the law itself rather than discussing how this would apply to the two roles defined within the question. This limited the number of marks awarded.</p> <p>Part b) was poorly answered by candidates with only a limited number demonstrating awareness of SFIPlus or its uses.</p>
	<p>Part a) of this question was generally answered well. Candidates showed understanding of anti-discrimination legislation and its application in practice. Part b) of the question was generally answered poorly as only a few candidates showed awareness of the SFIPlus framework.</p>
<b>A3</b>	
	<p>Several candidates answered this question and most of them received all marks available.</p> <p>In part a) Some candidates did not provide full working or year breakdowns for the straight-line calculations. This limited the number of marks awarded. Reducing balance calculations were well answered with full working shown.</p> <p>In part b) candidates tended to understand and provide suitable examples for direct and indirect costs however, detailed explanations of working capital were limited with few discussing liabilities in its calculation.</p>

	In general, the question was answered quite well. Most candidates showed awareness of the two types of depreciation, direct and indirect costs and working capital.
<b>B4</b>	
	<p>Several candidates answered this question.</p> <p>Part a) and part b) were generally well answered however, some candidates listed multiple disadvantages for each type of entity when the question asks for multiple advantages and only one disadvantage.</p> <p>Part c) some candidates found this question challenging. They chose the incorrect type of entity for the scenario, by falsely believing shares can be issued in partnerships.</p> <p>Marks were limited due to candidates repeating items from part a and b rather than fully discussing equity raising considerations.</p>
	<p>This seemed to be a very popular question with the candidates. Overall, they performed well and provided good answers, however. some mixed up the structure of partnerships and limited companies.</p> <p>Part c) Candidates did not appear to understand this question. They wrote their own views about partnership problems which did not reflect a good understanding of the question.</p>
<b>B5</b>	
	<p>Part a) Most candidates answered this question reasonably well. Those who received fewer marks tended to focus on specific procedures for raising FOI requests rather than explaining the Acts purpose and components in a wider discussion.</p> <p>In part b) many candidates listed elements of GDPR legislation rather than discussing how these can be enforced and monitored by the ICO.</p>
	<p>Several candidates attempted this question and answered the first part more effectively compared to the second part.</p> <p>Some candidates wrote lengthy answers for Freedom of information Act but gave comparatively shorter and less accurate answers about the role of ICO, despite it carrying more marks. The answers lacked depth and proper understating about the actions ICO can take in case of a breach.</p>
<b>B6</b>	
	<p>In part a) candidates raised valid points on how the legislation would influence the design of the app however, many focused on providing specific examples of how this could be implemented in part i) which was the focus of part ii).</p> <p>For the ii) element of this part of the question, candidates provided mostly valid suggestions, however, some focused on hardware based assistive technologies outside of the direct control of the application itself, which limited marks awarded.</p> <p>Part b) of the question was not well answered by several candidates. Many focused on the role of social media companies in governing content rather than defamation and its focus on individuals involved.</p>
	Part a) of this question was answered well but some candidates focused more on social media marketing campaigns to promote the app rather than answering the question.

	The word 'accessibility' was misinterpreted by some which resulted in this confusion. Part b) was poorly attempted and did not have solid answers in relation to defamation.
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------