

Comments on Candidate Performance on the Performance Management Elective (March 2018)

Most candidates understood the requirements within the two cases and identified, and analyzed the directed requirements within both cases.

Many candidates failed to recognize the mission/vision of a company and integrate it into their response, simply identifying the existence of the mission/vision but ignoring it in making their recommendation.

Weaker candidates struggled with qualitative analysis and provided a biased analysis that suited their recommendation. For example, if they recommended to not move forward with an alternative, their qualitative analysis ignored any pros and discussed only cons. To demonstrate competence, candidates need to discuss and analyze both the positive and negative facets of an opportunity.

Candidates were asked to assess a company's performance against a list of various companies (benchmarks). While there were many figures provided, many candidates simply assessed performance by saying the company was higher or lower and provided no further discussion. To demonstrate competence candidates needed to discuss their analysis with more depth and explain the significance of being higher/lower to the client.

Many of the weaker candidates provided minimal depth in their discussions only providing bullet points or short sentences.

Performance on the MCQs was at expectations.

Comments on Skills

Assess the Situation: Some candidates struggled addressing all the issues in the cases. This was demonstrated with a higher-than-usual amount in Not addressed and Nominal Competence for several AOs.

Analyze Major Issue(s): Weaker candidates struggled with their qualitative analysis by providing one-sided analysis (pros-only or cons-only) and/or ignoring the mission/vision of the company.

Weaker candidates also provided brief bullet point lists that included little or no discussion. Candidates need to elaborate on why the points they are bringing up are relevant to the client.

Conclude and Advise: Most candidates provided a recommendation that was consistent with their analysis. Some candidates ignored the mission/vision in their recommendation and based their recommendation on just quantitative analysis or one-sided qualitative discussion.

Communicate: Candidates communicated well with few candidates providing poorly written responses.

CPA Mindset: Nearly all candidates understood their role and what was required to adequately address the user's needs.