IQM4001

LEVEL 4 · SAMPLE ASSESSMENT

INTO QUALIFICATIONS

Global Business, Sustainability and Society

Individual Oral Presentation on a Sustainability Case

STAFF ONLY · Staff marking and administration guide

Assessment
IQM4001 A2

Sample set
2026-S

Status
SAMPLE ASSESSMENT

Release timing
at coursework release

Duration
Approximately 15 minutes: 10-minute presentation followed immediately by 5-minute structured viva

Response length
Not applicable

Total marks
100

Weighting
40% of module

AI condition
Level 2 – AI Planning: planning/rehearsal support only; slides, spoken analysis, evaluation, recommendations and viva answers are the candidate's own; no AI or external assistance during live assessment.

Administration and delivery

- Supervise individually; record presentation and assessed questioning and retain securely under current retention rules.
- Allow 10 minutes for the presentation and 5 minutes for the structured viva. Ask all four published core questions V1–V4; use only neutral follow-ups and comparable time. Record brief evidence against each question, then award the aggregate viva marks once across the whole viva.
- Do not provide live prompts, AI, external assistance or coaching during the assessment.
- Check slides are student-produced and references are legible; assess spoken understanding rather than slide density. Confirm that the presentation contains no more than 12 slides in total, including relevant in-text citations and a brief reference list.
- Check the guide's permitted-materials rule: open-resource preparation and live assessment, accurately referenced student-produced slides, credible organisational and sustainability evidence, optional presentation notes that should not be relied upon, no live external assistance, and calculator not applicable.
- Accept any defensible, evidence-led recommendation; no illustrative response is mandatory. If authenticity, prohibited assistance or recording failure raises an assessment incident, preserve available evidence and refer it through the centre's established procedure before finalising a mark.

Mark scheme and indicative content

P1 criterion 1 [15 marks]

Indicative evidence: explain the reuse challenge and the potential emissions, transport, water, convenience and handling-time effects, with a clear global and organisational context. Do not assume reuse is automatically better.

Mark allocation

- Challenge and concept accuracy 7
- Global/organisational significance 5
- Case focus 3

Acceptable alternatives

- Accept accurate explanations of the challenge and context from different relevant perspectives. Do not require a numerical conclusion for criterion 1.

P1 criterion 2 [25 marks]

Indicative evidence: apply at least two suitable frameworks to the supplied case and stakeholder evidence. SDG, ESG, CSR, stakeholder, PESTLE and circular-economy approaches are possible; award for accurate application and recognition of limitations, not names alone.

Mark allocation

- Relevant framework choice and explanation 7
- Accurate application of at least two frameworks to stakeholders/evidence 12
- Framework limitations acknowledged 6

Acceptable alternatives

- Accept any two suitable frameworks accurately applied to the case. Do not require a break-even explanation to award framework marks.

P1 criterion 3 [30 marks]

Indicative numerical evidence: 420/1,000 = 42% returned by day 30; (420+70)/1,000 = 49% by day 60. For completed uses n per container, 115+6n<82n gives n>115/76 (about 1.51), so two whole completed uses meet the strict reduction test. A return is not proof of a second use; the pilot gives no realised reuse count, so realised emissions savings cannot be established. Credit coherent assumptions and evidence limits.

Mark allocation

- Correct return rates, use-based break-even and bounded inference 10
- Causal/trade-off and stakeholder analysis 10
- Evidence limits/uncertainty 10

Acceptable alternatives

- Accept equivalent valid arithmetic and explicit distinction between returns and subsequent completed uses. Mark a coherent stated assumption and uncertainty; do not infer realised savings from return counts alone.

P1 criterion 4 [20 marks]

Indicative evidence: weigh emissions, water, transport, convenience and worker impacts; recommend a feasible scale, redesign, further pilot or pause decision with measures and risks. Judge slide support, timing and oral clarity from the observed presentation, not an assumed model answer.

Mark allocation

- Balanced evaluation 5
- Feasible, measurable recommendation 8
- Slide support, structure, timing and oral clarity 7

Acceptable alternatives

- Accept different feasible, evidence-led recommendations. Assess evaluation and delivery on their own evidence; do not make full credit conditional on one numerical conclusion.

Structured viva criterion [10 marks total]

Ask V1–V4. V1 may identify evidence that would change the decision; V2 should bound transport and washing claims; V3 should justify an underrepresented stakeholder and remedy; V4 should respond to completed-use performance below the model threshold. Score relevant answers (4), justification (4) and independent follow-up judgement (2) holistically once across the viva, recording evidence for each core question.

Mark allocation

- Relevant accurate answers 4
- Justification of method/recommendation 4
- Independent judgement under follow-up 2

Acceptable alternatives

- Accept well-justified alternative answers to V1–V4. Award the aggregate 4+4+2 once across the viva; do not double-count prepared presentation content or use follow-ups as coaching.

Assessment rubric

criterion	marks	allocation
Understanding of Sustainability Challenge and Context	15	Challenge and concept accuracy (7); global/organisational significance (5); case focus (3)
Application of Frameworks	25	Relevant framework choice and explanation (7); accurate application of at least two frameworks to stakeholders/evidence (12); framework limitations acknowledged (6)
Analysis and Interpretation	30	Correct return rates, use-based break-even and bounded inference (10); causal/trade-off and stakeholder analysis (10); evidence limits/uncertainty (10)
Evaluation, Recommendations and Professional Delivery	20	Balanced evaluation (5); feasible, measurable recommendation (8); slide support, structure, timing and oral clarity (7)
Structured Viva: Understanding, Application and Justification	10	Relevant accurate answers (4); justification of method/recommendation (4); independent judgement under follow-up (2)

Standardisation guidance

- Apply consequential credit for coherent reasoning following an identified arithmetic error; do not double-penalise the same error across criteria.
- Accept equivalent valid analytical approaches and properly justified conclusions.
- P1 carries 90 marks (15+25+30+20). The structured viva carries 10 marks (4+4+2) across V1–V4, not 10 marks per question. Check the recorded criterion totals equal 100 before use. The assessed learning outcomes are LO3–LO5.