IQM4001

LEVEL 4 · SAMPLE ASSESSMENT

Global Business, Sustainability and Society

Individual Policy Briefing Report

STAFF ONLY · Staff marking and administration guide

Assessment
IQM4001 A1

Sample set
2026-S

Status
SAMPLE ASSESSMENT

Release timing
at coursework release

Duration
Not time-limited; centre submission deadline applies

Response length
2,000 words indicative; sample uses 1,800-2,200 words, excluding references and appendices

Total marks
100

Weighting
60% of module

AI condition
Level 2 – AI Planning: planning, ideation and source orientation may be supported; assessed analysis, evaluation, recommendations and the final report must be independently produced. Any AI-suggested sources must be independently read, verified and cited. Apply institutional acknowledgement rules.

Administration and delivery

- Candidate brief must state the permitted Level 2 AI planning, ideation and source-orientation uses and prohibit AI generation of assessed analysis, evaluation, recommendations or the final report; require independent reading and verification of sources and acknowledgement where institutional rules require it.
- Check that the candidate brief states the guide's permitted-materials rule: open-resource coursework, independently selected and verified credible academic, policy, organisational, sustainability and ESG sources, normal research notes and planning materials, and calculator not applicable.
- Assess the accuracy and consistency of citations and the reference list, and the quality of the sources used. Do not require a referencing style that was not specified to candidates.
- The synthetic Northwind case facts must be supplied unchanged to all candidates using this sample. Do not describe the fictional company as a real organisation.
- Word-count convention excludes references and appendices; confirm whether tables count under local rules before use.
- Any illustrative response is a possible approach, not a mandatory answer or authoritative company claim. Mark using the criteria and indicative evidence in this guide. This fictional case is for sample teaching only; it does not establish approval of a live real-organisation task. Confirm the academic owner's sample-specific scope decision before reuse.

Mark scheme and indicative content

AO1 Knowledge and Understanding [20 marks]

Indicative evidence: explain two material globalisation, policy or sustainability trends and their implications for Northwind's operating choices; use accurate ethical and sustainability concepts. The candidate must use at least six independently located credible sources, including two academic, one policy/standards, and company or sector evidence. Check substantive use and verification, not citation count alone.

Mark allocation

- Two material globalisation, policy or sustainability trends linked to Northwind's operating choices 8
- Ethics, ESG/CSR and terminology used accurately 7
- Relevant scope/limitations recognised 5

Acceptable alternatives

- Accept different well-supported trends and contextual examples. Award for accurate explanation and a clear link to operating choices; do not require a particular policy or institution by name.

AO2 Application of Frameworks [30 marks]

Indicative evidence: a focused PESTLE analysis tied to the supplied apparel case plus at least two further suitable frameworks, applied to decisions and stakeholder evidence rather than merely defined. Credit coherent selection, integration and recognition of limitations.

Mark allocation

- Focused PESTLE tied to material case evidence 10
- Purposeful use of at least two further suitable frameworks beyond PESTLE 12
- Framework selection, integration and contextual fit 8

Acceptable alternatives

- Accept other suitable framework combinations beyond PESTLE when at least two further frameworks are applied purposefully. Do not credit framework name-checking as application.

AO3 Analysis of Issues and Evidence [30 marks]

Indicative evidence: link climate, water, labour and sustainability-claims facts to choices, risks and stakeholder conflict. Reported Scope 1–2 falls while absolute Scope 3 rises; audit coverage, action closure, grievance closure and take-back figures are activities or partial indicators, not proof of outcome. Credit explicit evidence limits and synthesis.

Mark allocation

- Evidence chains across climate, water, labour and claims linked to organisational choices and risks 10
- Stakeholder impacts/conflicts and ethical implications 8
- Reported activity distinguished from outcomes and evidence limits interpreted 7
- Coherent synthesis across issues 5

Acceptable alternatives

- Accept defensible interpretations of synthetic facts and different stakeholder conflicts. Do not treat company-reported activity as demonstrated impact without supporting evidence.

AO4 Evaluation Recommendations and Professional Communication [20 marks]

Indicative evidence: balanced judgement on the credibility and adequacy of the current response and three ranked recommendations. Each recommendation should identify an owner, first action, measurable indicator and material trade-off or implementation risk, with clear links to the analysis. Judge briefing structure and verified referencing.

Mark allocation

- Balanced evaluation of current response and trade-offs 5
- Three ranked recommendations each with owner, first action, measurable indicator and trade-off or risk, linked to analysis 9
- Professional briefing structure, concise expression and referencing 6

Acceptable alternatives

- Accept different feasible priorities where each is evidence-linked and satisfies the stated candidate fields. Do not require the same recommendation as an illustrative response.

Assessment rubric

criterion	marks	allocation
Knowledge and Understanding (AO1)	20	Allocation: Two material globalisation, policy or sustainability trends linked to Northwind's operating choices 8; ethics, ESG/CSR and terminology used accurately 7; relevant scope/limitations recognised 5.
Application of Frameworks (AO2)	30	Allocation: Focused PESTLE tied to material case evidence 10; purposeful use of at least two further suitable frameworks beyond PESTLE 12; framework selection, integration and contextual fit 8.
Analysis of Issues and Evidence (AO3)	30	Allocation: Evidence chains across climate, water, labour and claims linked to organisational choices and risks 10; stakeholder impacts/conflicts and ethical implications 8; reported activity distinguished from outcomes and evidence limits interpreted 7; coherent synthesis across issues 5.
Evaluation, Recommendations and Professional Communication (AO4)	20	Allocation: Balanced evaluation of current response and trade-offs 5; three ranked recommendations each with owner, first action, measurable indicator and trade-off or risk, linked to analysis 9; professional briefing structure, concise expression and referencing 6.

Standardisation guidance

- Apply consequential credit for coherent reasoning following an identified error; do not double-penalise the same error across criteria.
- Accept equivalent valid analytical approaches and properly justified conclusions.
- Check criterion/subquestion totals equal the published total before use.

Authenticity controls: before or during delivery, arrange at least one supervised progress checkpoint for each candidate and retain the checkpoint record. Candidates must retain planning, source-selection notes, relevant working files and source-verification evidence in line with the centre retention process. Review these records where authorship or source use needs clarification.