IQM4005

LEVEL 4 · INDIVIDUAL SECURE INVIGILATED WRITTEN EXAMINATION; ONE COMPULSORY INTEGRATED CASE WITH FOUR STRUCTURED REQUIREMENTS.

INTO QUALIFICATIONS

Principles of Management and Organisations

Restricted open-book organisational case analysis

STAFF ONLY · Staff marking and administration guide

Assessment
IQM4005 A1

Sample set
2026-S

Status
SAMPLE ASSESSMENT

Release timing
exam release

Duration
2 hours

Total marks
100

Administration and delivery

- Supply the complete case text with the paper. Permitted materials are handwritten notes and the supplied case-study text only; no internet access or additional sources are permitted. No generative AI or external assistance is permitted at any stage. Permitted calculator: not applicable to this assessment.
- Invigilators announce the start/end time and collect both paper and answer booklet under secure examination procedures.
- Markers apply the AO1-AO4 criteria consistently. Minor language errors are not penalised when meaning is clear.
- Sample answers are exemplars, not exhaustive scripts; moderation should consider other defensible readings of the case.

Mark scheme and indicative content

Q1 [See allocation marks]

Juniper's central issue is a mismatch between the organisation's present scale and the clarity of its management arrangements. At 12 staff and one kitchen, informal conversation could coordinate work quickly; with 96 employees at three sites, the same approach is less reliable unless decision rights are explicit. The functional structure can build specialist expertise, but the dual reporting of site supervisors to both a function lead and local manager creates two sources of priority. The survey figures show the resulting ambiguity: only 29% know who can approve schedule changes, while 41% report conflicting priorities.

These are not merely communication symptoms; they point to overlapping accountability and insufficiently designed coordination. Staff turnover has risen from 8% to 19%, more than doubling. Exit comments identify last-minute rota changes, limited recognition and unclear progression, suggesting problems in predictability, voice and development. Herzberg's two-factor theory offers a useful diagnosis: rota fairness and reliable supervision are hygiene conditions whose absence can create dissatisfaction, whereas recognition, responsibility and progression can support motivation.

The dashboard measures meal output and late orders, and one site reduced late orders from 14% to 9%, so measurement may help. But two sites report that allergen checks and volunteer training are not recognised in targets. A narrow metric can create pressure to maximise count at the expense of safety or service quality. Finally, one email is weak consultation for a change that affects schedules, authority and workload. This risks resistance and conflicts with Juniper's stated values of dignity and inclusion.

The underlying problems are therefore unclear authority, incomplete performance measures, inconsistent communication and limited participation, with turnover and conflicting priorities as visible consequences.

Q2 [See allocation marks]

A stakeholder analysis first clarifies whose interests a redesign must balance. Employees need predictable rotas, fair workload, development and a clear manager; site managers need enough authority to respond to local demand; central function leads need consistent safety, cost and reporting; consumers and local shops need reliable affordable meals; volunteers need safe induction and support; and the board needs sustainable growth and reputational protection. These interests overlap but are not identical.

A stakeholder map would place food safety and worker wellbeing high because harm could be serious, while affordability, timely delivery and waste reduction are also central to the social purpose. The map points towards consultation before choosing between central and local control. Herzberg's two-factor theory explains why a single reward will not solve the problem. Last-minute rota changes,

conflicting instructions and uncertainty over approval are hygiene failures: addressing them may reduce dissatisfaction but will not by itself create stronger engagement.

Recognition for safe service, progression pathways and meaningful responsibility are motivators. Juniper could pair published rota lead times and one escalation route with training opportunities and recognition of safe, low-waste improvement. A third useful lens is Lewin's change model. Juniper appears to have moved directly into implementation by changing structure and targets, without first explaining why the old informal arrangements no longer scale or involving affected staff.

A stronger process would establish the need for clearer coordination, co-design a bounded pilot, then reinforce the successful routines through role descriptions, training and regular review. The frameworks are useful because they lead to specific actions, not because their labels diagnose the organisation by themselves.

Q3 [See allocation marks]

The interaction between structure and culture helps explain why the redesign has produced uneven results. A functional structure can improve purchasing expertise, food-safety oversight and financial control, but Juniper's matrix-like dual reporting has not specified which manager decides when priorities conflict. A production lead may focus on output while a site manager protects volunteer training or local demand; without a final decision owner, employees may wait, repeat work or follow the more forceful instruction.

That uncertainty can make the organisation feel less trusting than it was under the founder, particularly when the dashboard is introduced without meaningful consultation. The dashboard has one useful result: late orders at the third site fell from 14% to 9%. That is evidence of improvement at that site, not proof that the dashboard caused it or that all sites benefit equally. Because allergen checks and volunteer training consume time but are absent from the main target, employees may experience a conflict between measured productivity and professional responsibility.

If staff fear criticism for slower output, they may rush checks or fail to surface capacity concerns. This is a governance and ethical risk, not simply a morale issue. Motivation and performance can then reinforce one another negatively. Unpredictable rotas reduce perceived fairness and control; unclear progression and little recognition reduce the perceived return from extra effort. Higher turnover removes experience, shifts more work to remaining staff and makes last-minute scheduling more likely. That can increase late orders and pressure to chase the output metric.

Leadership can interrupt the loop by explaining the purpose of common standards, listening to site-level evidence, and ensuring each role has one accountable manager and a clear escalation route. Option A, a single central rota and output system, could make schedules and reporting more consistent, but risks slow approval and poor fit with local workload. Option B, site scheduling within common safety, cost and service standards, better fits local conditions but needs audit and clear boundaries.

A federated approach is the strongest synthesis: centrally define allergen controls, budget limits, common service definitions and a small balanced set of measures; delegate day-to-day scheduling to site managers within those guardrails. Co-design measures for timely orders, safety-check completion, waste, volunteer induction and rota notice. Pilot at contrasting sites, compare against baselines and retain an escalation route for exceptions. This ties autonomy to responsibility and helps leadership rebuild trust through visible follow-through.

Q4 [See allocation marks]

I recommend Option B within a controlled hybrid model, rather than unrestricted local discretion. The ethical case is that staff and volunteers should have safe, predictable working arrangements and consumers should receive affordable meals that meet allergen controls. The CSR case is broader than charity or reputation: dependable meals, lower food waste and fair employment are part of the

enterprise's stated purpose. Central control could protect common food-safety requirements but may ignore local training time; local discretion may improve responsiveness but can create inconsistent controls.

The board should appoint one accountable manager for each employee and publish a decision-rights matrix for rotas, purchasing and safety exceptions. A practical safeguard is an eight-week pilot at one high-volume and one lower-volume site, with current safety rules remaining mandatory. Review weekly: late-order rate, allergen-check completion, volunteer-training completion, food waste, rota changes with less than the agreed notice, absence and short staff pulse results. Set thresholds before the pilot; pause or revise if safety completion falls below the agreed standard or short-notice changes and absence worsen.

Invite staff and volunteers to review the findings and record the board's response. This recommendation allows adaptation while testing whether service and wellbeing improve together.

implementation_detail [See allocation marks]

Before the pilot, the board should publish one rota notice standard and define who can approve an exception. Each site records the same seven measures using the same reporting period and denominators; a simple weekly trend chart should show site results separately and combined. The staff pulse should be anonymous, voluntary and limited to clear questions on priority conflict, rota predictability and ability to raise a safety concern. At week four, the sponsor checks for emerging harms and can adjust workload. At week eight, the board compares the measures with baseline and records a proceed, revise or stop decision with reasons.

This turns the safeguard into a testable governance mechanism rather than an aspiration.

Assessment rubric

Criterion	Marks	Marking focus
Q1	25	Up to 5 each for accurate, case-linked explanation of structure/accountability, culture/change, motivation/wellbeing, leadership/communication, and performance measurement/ethical responsibility. Award explanation and causal relevance, not unsupported labels.
Q2	30	Up to 15 per framework: accurate framework elements (up to 4); specific evidence links (up to 6); interpretive insight (up to 5). Alternative valid frameworks include stakeholder theory, Herzberg, Lewin, goal-setting, systems thinking, or an appropriate leadership/team framework.

Criterion	Marks	Marking focus
Q3	35	Use the module guide AO3 criterion: sustained causal chains linking structure, culture, motivation, leadership, teams/change and outcomes. Indicatively award up to 8 for structure/accountability, 7 for culture/communication, 7 for motivation/wellbeing, 7 for change/performance interactions, and 6 for balanced options and case evidence. Do not require every named topic if the analysis is coherent and relevant.
Q4	10	Options accurately compared (3); ethical/CSR and stakeholder implications (2); feasible, justified recommendation (3); measurable safeguard/pilot or review (2). Accept a reasoned version of A or a hybrid where evidence supports it.

Standardisation guidance

- Credit equivalent management theories and different recommendations when they are accurately explained, anchored in the supplied evidence, and evaluated. Do not credit generic model descriptions that are not applied.
- 70-100: accurate, integrated knowledge, insightful framework application, sustained analysis and balanced justified action. 60-69: clear and mostly accurate, with developed case links and sound judgement. 50-59: relevant but uneven or partly descriptive. 40-49: basic, limited application/analysis, with significant gaps. 0-39: substantially inaccurate, irrelevant, or insufficient evidence.