

APTITUDE TEST

Instructions for Candidates

1. This is an **open-book examination**. Candidates may consult books, notes, policy documents, and publicly available academic or professional resources.
2. **AI-generated responses are strictly prohibited.**
3. All submitted answers will be subjected to **AI-detection and plagiarism-checking software**.
4. Candidates must ensure that all responses are **original, self-written, and properly referenced** where applicable.
5. Each sub-question must be answered **clearly, logically, and concisely**, with arguments supported strictly by information and reasoning derived from the given case study.
6. Answers should demonstrate **analytical depth, logical coherence, and professional judgment** relevant to an educational institution.
7. Any instance of plagiarism, misrepresentation, or unethical assistance will result in **immediate disqualification**.

Structure of the Test

- **Total Questions:** 2
- **Total Marks:** 100
- **Marks per Question:** 50
- **Sub-questions per Question:** 5
- **Marks per Sub-question:** 10

Question 1: Analytical Ability (50 Marks)

Case Study

A newly established private educational institution, **AI-Nexis Institute of Skills and Technology (ANIST)**, was launched with the objective of providing diploma programs, short skill-based courses, and academic support services across multiple disciplines, including engineering technologies, information technology, business studies, and general education. The institute operates from a central campus with plans to expand into regional sub-campuses within three years.

During its first academic year, ANIST recruited instructors, accountants, lab assistants, and reception staff on a contractual basis. The management structure consists of a Principal, an Academic Coordinator, a Finance Manager, an HR Officer, and a Campus Operations Supervisor. While student enrollment exceeded initial projections by 18%, the institution began experiencing operational inefficiencies by the end of the second academic term.

From an academic perspective, instructors reported uneven class sizes, inconsistent timetables, and frequent last-minute room changes due to poor coordination between academic and administrative units. Some instructors expressed concerns that practical lab sessions were shortened or canceled due to unavailable equipment or lab assistants being assigned to multiple labs simultaneously. Lab assistants, on the other hand, reported that they were not informed in advance about revised schedules and often received verbal instructions without written documentation.

The finance department faced its own challenges. The accountants identified discrepancies between projected and actual expenditures, particularly in consumables, utility bills, and overtime payments. While fee collection increased due to higher enrollment, cash flow remained inconsistent. The Finance Manager suspected that weak internal controls and delayed reporting from various departments contributed to budget overruns. Monthly financial statements were frequently submitted late, limiting management's ability to take timely corrective action.

At the front desk, receptionists played a critical role as the first point of contact for students, parents, and external visitors. However, complaints began to surface regarding misinformation about class schedules, fee deadlines, and examination dates. Receptionists indicated that they were not included in internal briefings and relied on informal updates from instructors or students themselves. This resulted in inconsistent communication, which negatively affected the institution's public image.

The HR Officer conducted an internal review and found that job descriptions existed but were not consistently followed. Performance evaluation criteria were unclear, and there was no standardized reporting mechanism across departments. While staff members were individually qualified, coordination among instructors, accountants, lab assistants, and receptionists was weak. The absence of documented standard operating procedures (SOPs) further aggravated the situation.

Management is now considering several corrective measures, including restructuring departmental workflows, introducing standardized reporting formats, investing in a centralized academic and financial management system, and revising staff training and orientation programs. However, budget constraints, resistance to change among staff, and the pressure to maintain academic continuity complicate decision-making.

The leadership team must decide how to prioritize interventions, allocate limited resources, and design policies that improve efficiency without disrupting ongoing academic activities. Any decision taken will have direct implications for instructional quality, financial sustainability, operational coordination, and institutional reputation.

Sub-Questions

(Answer all questions. Each sub-question carries 10 marks.)

- Analyze the key operational and administrative problems faced by ANIST and categorize them according to academic, financial, and administrative functions.
- Evaluate the role of internal communication failures in contributing to inefficiencies across instructors, lab assistants, accountants, and reception staff.
- Using the information provided, assess how weak financial controls may affect the long-term sustainability of the institution.
- Compare at least two alternative strategies that management could adopt to improve coordination and performance, highlighting their potential advantages and limitations.
- Recommend an evidence-based action plan for ANIST that prioritizes interventions while considering budgetary and human resource constraints.

Question 2: Logical Reasoning (50 Marks)

Case Study

Bright Horizon College (BHC) is a mid-sized educational institution offering diploma programs, certification courses, and short-term training workshops. The college operates six days a week and serves a diverse population of students from different academic and socioeconomic backgrounds. The institution employs instructors for academic delivery, accountants for financial management, lab assistants for technical and practical support, and receptionists for administrative coordination and public interaction.

At the start of the academic year, BHC implemented a revised operational framework intended to improve efficiency. This framework included staggered class timings, shared laboratory resources, centralized fee processing, and a single-point information desk managed by reception staff. However, within three months, a series of operational conflicts emerged.

The revised timetable introduced overlapping lab sessions for different programs, assuming that lab assistants could manage parallel activities. In practice, this led to delays, as certain labs required specialized equipment and one-on-one supervision. Instructors frequently adjusted lesson plans to accommodate lab availability, but these adjustments were not consistently communicated to the reception desk or finance office.

The finance department introduced a new fee installment policy. Students were allowed to pay fees in three phases, provided deadlines were met. However, receptionists received incomplete instructions about exceptions, late payment penalties, and documentation requirements. As a result, students were given conflicting information depending on whom they consulted. Accountants later found inconsistencies between recorded payments and actual deposits, not due to fraud, but due to procedural confusion and timing mismatches.

Meanwhile, lab assistants were assigned rotating duties across departments without a clear prioritization system. When simultaneous demands arose, decisions were made on an ad hoc basis, often favoring departments that escalated issues more aggressively. This created perceptions of unfairness and reduced cooperation among staff.

The administration noticed that while individual departments attempted to solve problems independently, their solutions often created new issues elsewhere. For example, when instructors rescheduled classes to resolve lab conflicts, students missed scheduled fee payment windows. When accountants enforced stricter documentation rules, receptionists experienced longer queues and increased complaints.

The Principal requested a comprehensive internal report to understand how a well-intentioned operational framework resulted in systemic inefficiencies. The core challenge is not a lack of resources, but the logical alignment of processes, roles, priorities, and information flow. Decisions must now be made to realign responsibilities, establish sequencing of tasks, define escalation protocols, and ensure consistency across all functions without increasing staff numbers.

Sub-Questions

(Answer all questions. Each sub-question carries 10 marks.)

- Identify the logical inconsistencies in task sequencing and responsibility allocation described in the case.
- Analyze how cause-and-effect relationships between departmental decisions contributed to system-wide inefficiencies.
- Determine which operational constraints had the greatest impact on coordination and explain why.
- Assess how unclear prioritization affected decision-making among lab assistants, instructors, accountants, and receptionists.
- Propose a logically consistent framework for aligning processes and information flow across departments based strictly on the case details.

End of Test