

## Management Level Case Study – Examiner’s report

November 2024 – February 2025 exam session

This document should be read in conjunction with the examiner’s suggested answers and marking guidance.

### General comments

The Management Case Study examinations for November 2024 and February 2025 were based on a pre-seen scenario relating to Shinyglas, a company that fabricates double-glazed windows and doors. This is a complicated business that requires fabricators to develop strong business relationships with suppliers of components, including sealed glazing units, and fitters. The business is further complicated by the fact that double glazing is an expensive purchase, particularly for domestic customers.

Six variants were set on Shinyglas:

- Variant 1: Shinyglas is considering an opportunity to make its owned sealed units that offer significant heat savings in buildings. At present, it buys sealed units from a third-party manufacturer.
- Variant 2: Shinyglas is considering creating an in-house sales team for large commercial contracts, such as supplying double glazed doors and windows to builders.
- Variant 3: Shinyglas wishes to improve the reliability of the feedback that it collects in relation to the fitting companies that Shinyglas relies on for the installation of its products.
- Variant 4: Shinyglas is developing a new coating that improves the heat loss from its windows and doors.
- Variant 5: Shinyglas wishes to improve the motivation of its sales staff.
- Variant 6: Shinyglas is considering the development of a new glazing product that would be suitable for use in conservation areas.

All six variants complied with the published blueprint and covered the core activities in the prescribed weightings. Each variant consisted of four tasks and each task was further subdivided into two separate requirements. The weighting attached to each requirement was stated and candidates were advised to allocate the time available for each requirement on the basis of those weightings. Markers were instructed to adopt a holistic approach to marking, which meant that the answer to each requirement was read and judged on its merits. Markers were provided with specific guidance as to the characteristics of level 1, level 2 and level 3 answers for each separate requirement.

From the candidate's perspective, the key to scoring well is to read and then answer the questions. The expectation is that candidates will be familiar with the context of the company and its industry from their prior study of the pre-seen. Shinyglas is a large fabricator. It relies heavily on suppliers of sealed units and of fitting services in order to provide reliable customer service. It sells to both domestic and commercial customers. It is important to address the specific requirements set in each task. Higher marks are awarded to fuller answers that are relevant and correct. Relevance and correctness are frequently judged in the context of the scenario, taking account of the nature of the business and the specific issues raised by the new information provided in the variant itself and the tasks set by the requirements.

It is important that candidates are familiar with all areas of the syllabus. The F pillar topics often score low marks as the level of knowledge and application is poor. Some of the more technical tasks on the P pillar can also be poorly answered.

A level 3 score generally requires a combination of good technical understanding and good application to the issues arising from the scenario. Scripts that receive level 3 scores generally demonstrate clear and comprehensive discussion and frequently offer an explanation or justification for the candidate's recommendations or arguments. Candidates should always bear in mind that the Management Case Study is essentially a simulation of a series of work-based tasks that represent the professional competence appropriate to this level.

Level 1 scores tended to be awarded to answers that demonstrated some or all of the following:

- failure to address the requirement in the task.
- limited technical understanding of the syllabus content.
- unsupported assertions that had little or no justification.
- illogical or unrealistic application to the issues arising from the scenario.