

## **Comments on Candidate Performance on the Performance Measurement Elective (July 2017)**

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

In the analysis of alternatives, many candidates provided an unbalanced qualitative discussion. i.e. only discussed cons or only discussed the pros of the alternative. It's important that candidates provide a balanced, unbiased discussion to better support their recommendations to the client.

One of the cases provided relatively uncomplicated numbers and perhaps because of the simplicity, many candidates did very little quantitative analysis and instead just discussed the numbers. A discussion is not considered sufficient to be considered a quantitative analysis.

### **Comments on Skills**

**Identification:** Most candidates were able to identify all the relevant issues within the cases.

**Analysis:** Generally, candidates demonstrated adequate analysis but a higher than normal number of candidates had weak analysis in both their quantitative analysis and in their qualitative discussion (pros/cons).

**Integration:** Generally, candidates demonstrated adequate integration of case facts in their responses.

**Conclusion:** Most candidates included reasonable conclusions for their analyses.

**Communication:** Nearly all candidates adequately communicated within their response. Very few responses were difficult to read and understand.