



Moderator's Assignment Feedback – Strategic Planning

After each series, we ask our moderators to provide a report on each assignment-based unit to identify:

- Any questions which were usually answered particularly well, including main points and qualities that characterised good answers.
- Any questions which were usually answered badly and main weaknesses in candidates' answers.
- Common errors or misconceptions made by candidates.

We hope that this will be of assistance when completing your Collections Team Management assignment.

General feedback to candidates

A range of responses this series shows that the candidates who undertake extensive reading and research into the subject and both apply and analyse this in the context of the tasks, are able to secure high marks in this subject. Conversely, those who rely on their existing knowledge of workplace strategies or who pay minimal lip service to comments within the CICM study text are unable to secure a pass at the required level.

It is worth mentioning that marks can only be awarded for responses that answer the specific questions asked. Several candidates failed to follow the task requirements and mark descriptions and did not demonstrate subject knowledge in the context of the assignment.

Several candidates used their appendix as an extension to their answer, which is not correct use. Candidates should use appendix items to support and evidence their answer, selecting appropriate items that add value to the body of their answer.

It should also be noted that the 'suggested areas for consideration' are there to guide the candidates toward potential subject areas and candidates are not expected to write everything they know about each suggested area in a separate document. At this level, candidates are expected instead, to select the relevant areas and adapt them to specifically answer the task given them.

Referencing should be consistent and in Harvard format.

Feedback for each assignment question

Task1. Using both PESTEL and SWOT analysis techniques, together with other useful and appropriate analytical models, investigate and fully evaluate the factors influencing an organisation.

T1 – Most answers gave a general overview of the subject but few showed a depth of knowledge or application to the task. Those who were able to demonstrate purposeful reading and research fared best.

At a technical level there was some understanding of PESTEL, SWOT and in several cases, Porters competitive analysis. However, candidates who simply wrote all they knew about a given subject without considering the question, lost opportunities to secure marks.

Task 2. Assess departmental performance against a range of benchmarks for an area of work.

T2 – Very few answers to this task actually measured performance. There was some knowledge of external benchmarking organisations but very few were actually used to benchmark performance in the department.

A number of responses to this task did attempt to discuss internal measures but most relied on existing knowledge of internal performance measurements and did not display any wider understanding. There was very little evidence of actual benchmarking in most responses and analysis of results was poor in the main

Task 3. Using the outcomes from Tasks 1 and 2 above, write a report that communicates a scheme of improvement to relevant stakeholders.

T3 – There were some attempts to make recommendations for improvement but often these were not developed beyond the idea stage. Some of these ideas did not appear to link back to their findings in the previous tasks, which undermined their viability. Few candidates were able to offer a comprehensive report with workable solutions.

Candidates who answered tasks 1 and 2 poorly, had minimal data with which to substantiate their report in this task and struggled as a result.