IQM3007 A4 Teacher marking reference

Accounting Viva confidential internal synthetic practice pack

This reference supports discussion of the selected exercise extracts. Marks and bands are proposed documentary judgements, subject to human subject review.

STAFF ONLY — confidential controlled-bank practice. Source basis: IQM3007_2026_Sample_Assessment_4_Staff_Question_Bank_v2 (filename version v2; staff pack index version 2.0), Candidate Viva Guide v2 and Staff Marking Comments Sheet v2. The assessment set is Sample 2026; the separate Staff Delivery Record uses identifier “2026-S”. These identifiers remain distinct. This synthetic practice pack does not complete a delivery record or assert bank approval. Do not distribute controlled questions or responses to candidates.

Staff-only reference for selected extracts. It is not an approval, delivery record, question-level scoring key or substitute for whole-viva recorded evidence.

Extract level reference not a scoring key

The notes below identify criterion-relevant evidence and limitations in four selected written extracts. Apply the exact whole-viva definitions and descriptors that follow to the complete observed performance. Do not convert these extracts into individual question marks.

Extract	Evidence, limitations and criterion relevance	Focused feedback / boundary
A — S1 Q2	Correctly treats design as sunk, compares future incremental materials/overtime with order revenue, and recognises capacity displacement and longer-term pricing. Applies to the one-off order and reaches a conditional accept/reject rule.	Strength: relevant cost reasoning is clear. Feedback: identify whether capacity displaces another order and use that contribution in the comparison. The extract is not a question score or whole-viva result.
B — S2 Q3	Explains that discounts lower receipts and higher ingredient prices may raise break-even volume; recommends comparing the estimate with demand and capacity. It is relevant and conditional but gives limited scenario detail and sensitivity comparison.	Strength: applies assumptions to café launch planning. Feedback: explain contribution per lunch and compare at least two plausible price/cost cases. No question-level mark is assigned.
C — S3 Q4	Confuses profitability with cash availability, describes the cash budget as a profit report, and treats depreciation as a cash payment. It ignores the stated timing gap and reaches an unsupported purchase recommendation.	Limitation: knowledge and application are materially inaccurate; there is no credible timing analysis. Feedback: distinguish profit from cash and map actual receipts/payments by due date before deciding.

Extract	Evidence, limitations and criterion relevance	Focused feedback / boundary
D — S1 Q5 + required neutral follow-up	Identifies the foregone repair contribution as opportunity cost, distinguishes relevant order revenue/costs, weighs repeat potential against repair commitments, and asks for evidence before a conditional conclusion. The follow-up seeks customer-order schedule, urgency, history and prior commitments rather than assuming effects.	Strength: the answer integrates financial and non-financial evidence without inventing amounts. Feedback: name a clear decision threshold or review point. Written text cannot establish spoken communication or a complete criterion result.

Controlled whole viva criteria and raw band descriptors

The following criterion definitions and descriptors reproduce the current Staff Marking Comments Sheet v2. The four criteria are independent whole-performance judgements. There are no individual question scores or numerical AO splits.

Criterion / maximum	Verbatim criterion definition and controlled raw ranges
Subject Knowledge and Understanding /30	Explains relevant accounting concepts, methods and terminology accurately, with sufficient breadth, depth and detail for the question. Controlled ranges — Excellent 24–30; Good 18–23; Adequate 12–17; Limited 0–11
Application of Knowledge /30	Applies accounting concepts, methods or calculations to the business decision context and explains their relevance. Controlled ranges — Excellent 24–30; Good 18–23; Adequate 12–17; Limited 0–11
Critical Thinking and Analysis /20	Interprets accounting information, analyses strengths, limitations and implications, considers alternatives and reaches a justified judgement. Controlled ranges — Excellent 16–20; Good 12–15; Adequate 8–11; Limited 0–7
Communication /20	Gives direct, coherent spoken responses, uses appropriate accounting terminology and responds relevantly to follow-up questions. Controlled ranges — Excellent 16–20; Good 12–15; Adequate 8–11; Limited 0–7

Subject Knowledge and Understanding maximum 30

Explains relevant accounting concepts, methods and terminology accurately, with sufficient breadth, depth and detail for the question.

Band / raw range	Verbatim controlled descriptor
Excellent / 24–30	Comprehensive, consistently accurate and precise accounting knowledge. well-selected detail demonstrates secure depth of understanding.
Good / 18–23	Generally accurate and secure accounting knowledge with relevant detail. minor gaps or imprecision do not undermine the response.
Adequate / 12–17	Basic, broadly accurate accounting knowledge with partial explanation. depth is uneven and there are some gaps or imprecision.
Limited / 0–11	Fragmentary, superficial or inaccurate accounting knowledge. weak explanation and little relevant detail.

Application of Knowledge maximum 30

Applies accounting concepts, methods or calculations to the business decision context and explains their relevance.

Band / raw range	Verbatim controlled descriptor
Excellent / 24–30	Consistently precise and well-developed application to the decision context. methods, calculations or examples are relevant and fully explained.
Good / 18–23	Relevant and appropriate application that is usually context-specific and developed, with only minor generalisation or omission. Performance is generally secure, with only minor gaps or unevenness.
Adequate / 12–17	Some relevant application, but contextual links, methods or calculations are generic, uneven or only partly developed. Performance is broadly adequate but uneven in development or control.
Limited / 0–11	Little or no credible application. methods, calculations or examples are absent, irrelevant or not connected to the decision.

Critical Thinking and Analysis maximum 20

Interprets accounting information, analyses strengths, limitations and implications, considers alternatives and reaches a justified judgement.

Band / raw range	Verbatim controlled descriptor
Excellent / 16–20	Sustained interpretation and logical analysis. implications and limitations are developed, alternatives are weighed and judgement is compelling and justified.
Good / 12–15	Clear interpretation and analysis with a supported judgement. implications and limitations are developed, although depth may be uneven.
Adequate / 8–11	Some relevant interpretation, but the response is often descriptive. analytical links and judgement are only partly supported.
Limited / 0–7	Little meaningful interpretation or analysis. assertions are unsupported and there is no credible, reasoned judgement.

Communication maximum 20

Gives direct, coherent spoken responses, uses appropriate accounting terminology and responds relevantly to follow-up questions.

Band / raw range	Verbatim controlled descriptor
Excellent / 16–20	Consistently direct, coherent and concise. terminology is precise and responses adapt persuasively to follow-up questions.
Good / 12–15	Clear and organised communication with appropriate terminology. follow-up responses are relevant with only minor lapses.
Adequate / 8–11	Understandable but uneven communication. some organisation and appropriate terminology, with partly relevant follow-up responses.
Limited / 0–7	Unclear, fragmented or off-topic communication. terminology is weak and relevant responses cannot be sustained.