



Moderator's Assignment Feedback –Cash collections

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 Cash Collections assignment.

General feedback to candidates

Overall a good level of understanding shown amongst candidates. Additional points could have been awarded if candidates had shown more awareness of different approaches.

Higher marks may have been gained if the marking scheme had been considered and questions fully answered.

As an example Q2 mentioned referring to legal and organisational procedures but these were not always mentioned. Also, it mentions vulnerable debtors but a significant number of candidates did not mention these. Even when only dealing with business customers there will be opportunities to discuss procedures for dealing with financial distress.

It would be good practice for candidates to ensure when using appendices they do not just include links or insert documents as an image, as we cannot open these on Turnitin platform, and this will result in an administration error where no marks can be awarded.

Appendices can be added at the end of the assignment provided they are signposted in the answer.

Candidates need to refer to the guidelines and ensure the correct version of the assignment is being used and the plagiarism declaration is ticked.

Feedback for each assignment question

Q1. In the context of cash collections, describe the organisation that you work for and explain your role and function

Q1 – This question prompted some good answers across the range marked; the better responses included a good awareness of their function and role within the organisation.

Q2. Explain how you carry out the following work:

Refer where relevant to any organisational and legal requirements, and attach evidence to support your statements and indicate the range of work involved

- a) Ensure prompt payment through liaison with customers, including vulnerable debtors**
- b) Initiate appropriate follow-up action when initial approaches fail to elicit an adequate response**
- c) Undertake appropriate communication with relevant personnel**
- d) Maintain customer records**

Q2 a-d – Not everyone referred to legal or organisational requirements or vulnerable debtors. This was especially true of 2d) which produced the weakest answers.

Q3. Compare your work processes against the attached National Occupational Standards for Credit Management (see overleaf), explaining the extent to which they match, and any discrepancies you have found

Q3 – A high percentage of candidates did not use the form provided to mark those standards that their company match against or not.

Where candidates are able to explain the extent to which the National Occupational Standards match, higher marks are awarded to those who identified any discrepancies in work processes and any potential amendments to the National Occupational Standards.

Q4. Explain the importance of any organisational and legal requirements in relation to cash collections

Q4 – Almost all candidates were able to identify and explain this importance of legal and organisational requirements. Those who achieved higher marks tended to also include the penalties for non-adherence and the impact on the company.

Q5. Explain how your approach and outcomes have evolved as your experience in cash collections has increased

Q5 – Those candidates that explained the difference from their old approach to their new, rather than concentrating on what they are doing today, received the higher marks.

Q6. Working with your line manager, where possible, but answering in your own words, assess your performance in relation to cash collections, and identify areas for development

Q6 – Both parts of the question were not always answered. Those candidates who scored higher marks gave tangible examples of performance and clearly identified areas for development with a structured plan.