

**BCS Higher Education Qualification**  
**Profession Graduate Diploma**  
**April 2019**  
**EXAMINERS' REPORT**  
**System Design Methods**

<b>Question number: A1</b>
<b>Total marks allocated: 25</b>
<b>Examiners' Guidance Notes</b>
Some candidates answered part (a) reasonably well. However, many candidates provided very general answers. Many candidates also confused formal methods with e.g. the waterfall approach to systems development. Part (b) was answered reasonably well by some candidates. However many candidates provided answers which were too general, insufficient or incorrect and/or irrelevant.

<b>Question number: A2</b>
<b>Total marks allocated: 25</b>
<b>Examiners' Guidance Notes</b>
Part (a). (i) only a small number of candidates properly identified suitable techniques; (ii) many candidates identified suitable techniques; (iii) most candidates identified suitable techniques (ERD, Class diagrams), but some discussed wrong techniques e.g. DFDs; (iv) many candidates provided reasonable answers.  Part (b). Some answers were relatively good, but many candidates discussed allocation of non UML techniques (e.g. DFDs). Some candidates allocated modelling techniques to wrong stages. Only a small number of candidates properly justified their answers.

<b>Question number: A3</b>
<b>Total marks allocated: 25</b>
<b>Examiners' Guidance Notes</b>
Part (a). Many candidates answered this part reasonably well. However a substantial number of candidates placed too much emphasis on explaining evolutionary and throw away prototyping.  Part (b). Most candidates properly identified 'user involvement' as one of the main benefits. However 'increased productivity' was mentioned only by a few candidates.  Part (c). Many candidates provided reasonable answers, but their explanations were insufficient.

<b>Question number: B4</b>
<b>Total marks allocated: 25</b>
<b>Examiners' Guidance Notes</b>
<p>Most candidates answered part (a) reasonably well and appropriately discussed approaches that could be used for training IT staff in the company in the use of UML.</p> <p>Most candidates answered part (b) reasonably well and appropriately discussed the difference between reverse engineering and re-engineering.</p> <p>Some candidates answered part (c) well, correctly identifying the appropriate stages of the methodology to be used. However, most candidates poorly identified the appropriate stages relevant to the different projects.</p>

<b>Question number: B5</b>
<b>Total marks allocated: 25</b>
<b>Examiners' Guidance Notes</b>
<p>Only one candidate answered this question. The answers provided to both part (a) and part (b) were weak and indicated a limited understanding of the topic.</p>