# **BCS Higher Education Qualification**

# **Professional Graduate Diploma**

### November 2020<sup>1</sup>

## **EXAMINERS' REPORT**

### Computer Services Management<sup>2</sup>

|          | -       |    |
|----------|---------|----|
| Question | number: | A1 |

Syllabus area:

**Total marks allocated:** 

**Examiners' Guidance Notes** 

This question asks the candidate for FIVE measures of service desk performance. It should be clear from the paper that when a whole question is worth 25 marks, 5 marks will be awarded for each of 5 measures.

A number of candidates failed to note this relationship, and provided fewer measures of service desk performance, resulting in proportionately lower potential marks.

Some candidates scored less well on this question as a result of too much similarity between the measures provided.

Question number: A2

Syllabus area:

Total marks allocated:

Examiners' Guidance Notes

This question was well answered by a number of candidates, but others did not score well as the answers they gave were too brief or did not fully explain themselves.

In part a), some candidates lost marks as the steps they described were too similar. Others failed to provide the number of steps requested in the question – FOUR.

Part b) was answered well by a number of candidates, but others did not distinguish sufficiently clearly between "problem" and "change" management.

**Question number: A3** 

Syllabus area:

Total marks allocated:

**Examiners' Guidance Notes** 

This was the least popular question in section A, but the majority of candidates who attempted it scored well. In most cases, candidates were clear about the nature of the stakeholder groups and their relationship with service providers.

The measures proposed were, in general, satisfactory – although there was some duplication across the four measures in a few cases. Candidates should avoid the re-use of material in multiple parts of the same answer, as it limits their ability to score highly.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Insert sitting and year

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Insert module title in full – no abbreviations

**Question number: B4** 

Syllabus area:

Total marks allocated:

Examiners' Guidance Notes

The biggest challenge with this question was that Part a) asked about PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES yet the majority of candidates answered as if the question said professional attributes.

The answers therefore covered aspects such as qualifications, technical knowledge and past experiences, when the question implied aspects such as attitude, willingness to learn, clear thinker, problem solver, etc.

Since the marking guidelines did not reference this, after initially not awarding marks for professional attributes, I went back and did so, because so many candidates either misunderstood or misinterpreted the question.

Another issue with the candidate's response to the question in general was that many of them interpreted this role as having staff reporting to them, which again, I don't believe was implied in the question, but nonetheless I awarded marks for since this role may well be a sort of Team Leader in the candidate's location.

In Part b) many candidates described a robust selection process but made no actual reference to avoiding bias. The marking guidelines did not tell us how to allow for this, but I felt I couldn't award as many marks as if there were reference to avoiding bias.

# **Question number: B5**

Syllabus area:

Total marks allocated:

**Examiners' Guidance Notes** 

Part a) asked for five ISSUES which I think would have been better if it had said five CONSIDERATIONS since we were getting answer such as ensure it can handle future growth. Nonetheless, most candidates interpreted it as considerations but too few candidates provided sufficient material to justify the award of three marks for the issue/consideration.

One of my biggest concerns of these exams is that candidates feel that they can write little more than a page for a question in two parts worth 25 marks.

In Part b) only a relatively small minority of candidates presented anything like the steps of a project or a project plan. The majority simply offered some random activities and few assumptions.