IQM4005

LEVEL 4 · INTEGRATED GROUP REPORT AND SUPERVISED ORAL PRESENTATION; REPORT, PRESENTATION, Q&A, AND INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTION ARE ASSESSED AS ONE COMPONENT. NO FIXED MARK SPLIT BETWEEN FORMATS IS PRESCRIBED IN THE GUIDE.

INTO QUALIFICATIONS

Principles of Management and Organisations

Group organisational analysis report and presentation

STAFF ONLY · Staff marking and administration guide

Assessment
IQM4005 A2

Sample set
2026-S

Status
SAMPLE ASSESSMENT

Release timing
at coursework release

Total marks
100

Administration and delivery

- Confirm group membership of 3–4 students and individual roles at the start; retain a contribution record identifying agreed and completed tasks and evidence of participation.
- Provide a supervised progress checkpoint and capture authorship evidence; manage authenticity concerns under academic regulations. The group report is 2,500 words excluding the cover page, reference list and appendices.
- Conduct a 10-minute group presentation followed immediately by an individual structured Q&A of approximately 3 minutes per student: approximately 19 minutes for a group of three and 22 minutes for a group of four, allowing reasonable transitions. Ask each student at least one question about their own contribution and one about the group's evidence or framework. Record the presentation and Q&A securely under current retention rules; the centre retains the recording.
- The assessment is open-resource: students may use selected organisational, academic and professional sources, student-produced slides and visual support, and presentation notes, which may be brought but should not be relied upon. Permitted calculator: not applicable to this assessment. No live external assistance is permitted. AI is permitted only for pre-task planning and organisation under the module guide's Level 2 AI Planning rules; require acknowledgement, independent verification of any preliminary use and retention of evidence where required. Do not permit AI-produced assessed report, slides, visual or spoken content.
- The group presentation must be delivered without generative AI or external prompting. Each individual Q&A response must be answered independently, without generative AI, external prompting or assistance from other group members. Group size determines total session length: approximately 19 minutes for a group of three or 22 minutes for a group of four; apply consistent questions and reasonable transitions. Do not allocate marks through a fixed report/presentation/Q&A split: assess the complete integrated evidence against the four published criteria.

Mark scheme and indicative content

Assessment overview and recommended decision logic

HarbourLoop should use a controlled hybrid operating model and defer the proposed 30% expansion until a 10-week pilot demonstrates that safety, customer outcomes and staff wellbeing remain stable. The evidence indicates shared repair standards may have contributed to improved complaints, while central approval delays, inconsistent hub controls and rising turnover create separate risks. The recommendation protects the enterprise's social purpose while allowing local adaptation.

Integrated written, presented and individually verified evidence: diagnosis, framework application, organisational analysis, evaluation and recommendations

HarbourLoop's growth has increased interdependence between repair, purchasing, customer service, and the hubs. Central purchasing may secure price and safety consistency, but approval delays interrupt repair flow. Local purchasing can respond to demand but risks uneven safety checks. The shared repair checklist provides evidence that standardisation can improve customer outcomes: complaints fell from 11% to 7%. A contingency approach is therefore stronger than choosing uniform centralisation or unrestricted autonomy.

A stakeholder analysis shows technicians need reliable parts and predictable work; customers need safe affordable repairs; community hubs need local responsiveness; the retail partner needs dependable volume; and the board must protect mission and solvency. A balanced scorecard should include quality/safety, customer outcomes, waste avoided, turnaround, staff wellbeing, and cost, rather than output alone. Herzberg's framework helps interpret rising turnover: rota instability and inconsistent resources are hygiene problems; limited development and recognition weaken motivators.

The proposed 30% expansion should be conditional on capacity evidence, not assumed to be beneficial simply because demand exists. We recommend a hybrid model: centralise safety rules, supplier approval and common service definitions; delegate purchasing within approved categories and limits; give each hub a named operations lead; and establish a weekly cross-functional planning meeting. Pilot at one hub and the workshop for 10 weeks. Compare waiting time, repeat repair, safety-check completion, customer complaints, waste diverted, rota changes, absence and staff pulse results. Expand only if quality and wellbeing do not deteriorate.

Weekend shifts should be voluntary where possible, published in advance, fairly compensated under applicable policy, and reviewed with staff. This protects the social mission while allowing evidence-based growth.

Report sections and evidence for the complete integrated assessment

heading	text
Evidence and limits	HarbourLoop Repairs is a 74-person repair-and-reuse social enterprise operating one workshop and two neighbourhood hubs. The retail partnership doubled demand, creating an opportunity to increase volume by a forecast 30%, but also greater coordination and capacity requirements. The available evidence is mixed. Customer complaints fell from 11% to 7% after a shared repair checklist was introduced, a four-percentage-point decline. This is consistent with a quality benefit from standard work, but timing alone does not prove causation; other changes or demand mix could have contributed. Turnover rose from 10% to 17%, a seven-percentage-point increase, while staff mention rota changes, limited development and low recognition. These exit comments indicate concerns but do not quantify how many employees experienced each issue. The workshop's purchasing delays and the hubs' different stock experiences show that one rule may not fit all operating conditions. The board should therefore distinguish case facts, interpretation and proposed tests. This sample uses only the synthetic case evidence; a real group report should cite its management literature and verify any external factual claims rather than inventing sources.

heading	text
Structure and coordination	The founder's original informal structure supported direct technician problem-solving while the organisation was small. Growth and doubled demand have made coordination across purchasing, repair, customer service and hubs more important. Central purchasing may strengthen bargaining power, supplier due diligence and consistency of safety-critical parts. However, the workshop reports waiting for approval, which can leave technicians idle and lengthen customer turnaround. A hub reports that central stock limits cause unnecessary transport, while the other says local buying produces inconsistent safety checks. A purely functional hierarchy may concentrate expertise but create hand-offs; full local autonomy may shorten response time while fragmenting control. A contingency perspective asks which decisions benefit from standardisation and which depend on local knowledge. We recommend central approval of suppliers, safety specifications, spending limits and repair standards, with site-level authority for scheduling and approved routine purchases. Each hub should have a named operations lead who owns daily decisions and escalates exceptions to one central sponsor. A weekly cross-functional planning meeting should review stock-outs, repeat customer follow-up, capacity and safety exceptions. A short decision-rights table should state who recommends, approves, executes and reviews a decision. This reduces ambiguity without requiring every local choice to wait for head office.

heading	text
Culture, leadership and teams	A stakeholder map places technicians and hub staff alongside customers, the retail partner, volunteers/community users, suppliers and the board. Technicians need safe, predictable work and suitable parts; customers need affordable, reliable repairs; the partner expects dependable volume; and the board must protect mission, safety and financial viability. These interests are not interchangeable, so output growth cannot be the sole success measure. The culture previously relied on technician judgement, but added targets, central purchasing and cross-functional teams may feel like reduced trust if decision reasons are not explained. There is no shared meeting schedule, and teams duplicate customer follow-up. A leader should establish a brief weekly operational huddle with owners and due dates for open cases, while keeping a monthly staff forum for broader improvement and workload concerns. Teams should share one customer case record and agreed handover fields, reducing repeat contacts. Leaders should explain why common safety rules are non-negotiable, invite staff to shape practical work methods and publish how suggestions were handled. This participative approach does not mean every decision is made by consensus; it gives employees a clear route to raise operational evidence and leaders remain accountable for a timely decision. Cross-functional teams need a shared purpose, clear roles, and a regular review cadence to convert diverse expertise into coordination rather than duplicated work.

heading	text
Motivation, ethics and evaluation	Turnover rose from 10% to 17%, while exit comments name weekend rota changes, few development opportunities and low recognition. Herzberg's two-factor framework suggests that rota predictability, manageable workload, fair supervision and dependable tools are hygiene conditions: their failure can cause dissatisfaction, although improving them alone may not create commitment. Development, responsibility and recognition can act as motivators. HarbourLoop should publish rosters with a defined notice period, make extra weekend work voluntary where operationally possible, explain compensation under its existing policy, create a technician skills pathway, and recognise verified safety, repair quality and mentoring rather than raw volume. The social-purpose commitments create a CSR obligation to avoid transferring expansion costs onto insecure working patterns or unsafe repair. Customers are also stakeholders: affordability is important, but a repair should not be rushed or represented as safe before checks are complete. A balanced scorecard should measure first-time repair completion, repeat repair, complaints, safety-check completion, turnaround, waste diverted, cost per completed repair, rota changes at short notice and staff pulse feedback. Definitions and denominators must be consistent across sites. For example, complaints per 100 completed repairs is more comparable than raw complaint totals if the hubs have different volumes. Central control has benefits for safety and purchasing discipline but risks approval delay and low local ownership. Unrestricted autonomy may improve responsiveness but risks inconsistent parts and checks. A hybrid model best balances the evidence; its success depends on clear minimum controls and permission for staff to surface exceptions without penalty.

heading	text
Implementation recommendation	Do not approve the full 30% volume expansion until the board has tested staffing, stock, space and safety capacity. Run a 10-week pilot at one hub and the central workshop, selecting locations with different demand or stock conditions. In weeks 1-2, appoint an executive sponsor and local owners, consult technicians, map current decisions and collect baseline measures. In weeks 3-8, use the hybrid purchasing and scheduling rules, retain existing safety controls, and review exceptions weekly. In weeks 9-10, compare results with baseline and document staff and customer feedback. The board should receive a concise dashboard with waiting time, first-time repair, repeat repair, complaints per 100 repairs, safety-check completion, waste diverted, stock-outs, cost per repair, rota notice and absence. Expand only if safety completion remains at the required standard, customer outcomes do not deteriorate, stock availability and turnaround improve or remain stable, and rota/workload indicators show no material harm. If any safety measure falls, stop the affected process and investigate; if staff workload worsens, revise the rota and capacity assumptions before continuing. Set a review owner and decision date now. Weekend shifts should be forecast, published in advance, consulted on with staff and treated consistently with applicable employment arrangements. The expansion forecast is not a binding commitment: a staged decision preserves the option to scale after evidence while avoiding mission drift or exposing customers and workers to untested capacity.

Decision logic and evidence note

The recommendation follows from the competing evidence rather than from a preference for decentralisation. The checklist trend is consistent with a benefit from common practice, so the pilot keeps safety and repair standards common. The workshop delay and hub stock concerns indicate a cost to central approval, so routine choices are delegated within explicit limits. The turnover trend and exit comments mean that growth should be assessed against fair work as well as customer volume. A suitable evidence appendix would state each metric's definition, owner, baseline, data source and review date.

For complaints, use complaints divided by completed repairs and report the period and site; for turnover, confirm whether the organisation counts leavers as a proportion of average headcount. Do not merge absolute totals from a 74-person organisation with percentages unless their denominator is clear. The proposed 30% expansion should be tested with a staffing and stock forecast, including weekend availability and the time required for safe repair checks. If the pilot produces mixed results, the board can preserve common safety controls while revising purchasing thresholds or rota notice.

The decision is reversible and has a pre-set review date, so it gives HarbourLoop a short route to learning without presenting the forecast as a guarantee. The group should cite the management sources it actually consulted in its final submission; this synthetic exemplar supplies no fabricated bibliography or external case facts.

Presentation outline and script

- Slide 1 (0:00-1:00, speaker 1): Board members, we are asking you to approve a 10-week controlled hybrid pilot and defer the 30% expansion decision until capacity and staff outcomes are evidenced. HarbourLoop has a genuine growth opportunity, but the current coordination model is already showing delays, duplicated customer contact and rising turnover. We will show why a bounded pilot is a more responsible decision than immediate centralisation or unrestricted autonomy.
- Slide 2 (1:00-2:30, speaker 1): The case gives us three useful signals. Customer complaints moved from 11% to 7% after a shared repair checklist was introduced. That is a four-percentage-point improvement, but we cannot claim the checklist alone caused it. Turnover moved from 10% to 17%, and exit comments mention weekend rota changes, few development opportunities and low recognition. The workshop waits for purchase approval; the hubs describe different stock and safety problems. These observations suggest that one measure or one purchasing rule will not address all the causes.
- Slide 3 (2:30-4:00, speaker 2): A stakeholder map identifies technicians, hub teams, customers, the retail partner, community users, suppliers and the board. Customers need affordable and safe repairs. Technicians need parts and predictable work. The board needs reliable growth without compromising the mission. Our contingency analysis indicates that safety specifications, supplier approval and service definitions should be common, while scheduling and routine approved purchases need local responsiveness. Clear decision rights connect the two.
- Slide 4 (4:00-5:30, speaker 2): Full central control could improve purchasing leverage and consistency, but current approval delays would remain a risk and local peaks may be missed. Full local autonomy may speed response but could produce inconsistent safety checks and supplier quality. The hybrid option has a control boundary: central safety and spending rules, local action within approved categories, and a named operations lead at each site. This is not a compromise without accountability; it specifies which decisions sit where.
- Slide 5 (5:30-7:30, speaker 3): We propose a 10-week pilot at one hub and the workshop. Collect two weeks of baseline information, then operate the new rules for six weeks, followed by a two-week review. A weekly dashboard covers waiting time, first-time and repeat repair, complaints per 100 repairs, safety-check completion, waste diverted, stock-outs, cost, rota notice and absence. The executive sponsor owns the decision; site leads own daily logs; staff representatives review workload and safety evidence. Existing safety rules remain in force throughout.
- Slide 6 (7:30-9:00, speaker 3): Expansion should proceed only if safety checks remain at standard, complaints and repeat repairs do not worsen, and service time and stock availability are stable or better without deteriorating staff indicators. Any fall in a safety control triggers an immediate pause for the affected process. If capacity or weekend staffing is inadequate, revise the expansion plan rather than relying on unstable shifts. The forecast increase is an opportunity, not proof that the organisation is ready.
- Slide 7 (9:00-10:00, all speakers): Our recommendation is to approve the bounded pilot, staff consultation, and a board review date before any scale-up. It protects affordability, safe repair, reduced waste and fair work while producing evidence on whether the hybrid model works. We will now answer questions individually; each member can explain the framework and evidence behind their section.

Individual structured Q&A model

Q: Why not centralise everything if complaints fell after a shared checklist? A: The complaint change supports common repair standards, but does not prove central control caused it. Approval delay and local stock differences are distinct evidence that a uniform process can slow or misfit operations. Q: What if the 30% demand forecast is lost by waiting? A: The recommendation is a 10-week pilot, not indefinite delay. It tests the bottleneck quickly and preserves a scale-up decision at a published date.

The board can consider a limited capacity reservation if it is reversible and affordable, but must not commit without safe staffing and stock evidence. Q: How will the group protect workers during additional weekend work? A: Publish rotas in advance, consult staff, track short-notice changes and absence, and do not treat overtime as a substitute for capacity planning. Any expansion must follow applicable employment arrangements. Q: What evidence is insufficient? A: The complaint trend lacks a counterfactual, turnover comments do not quantify each cause, and the 30% volume is a forecast.

We need consistent site-level denominators, workforce data and demand/stock forecasts. Q: Who is accountable? A: The board names an executive sponsor; each site operations lead owns local decisions and weekly data; the sponsor presents the scale-up recommendation. Each student should identify their individual contribution in the group record and answer from the shared evidence, not claim work they did not complete.

Assessment rubric

Criterion	Marks	Marking focus
Knowledge and Understanding (AO1)	15	Accurate understanding of relevant management, organisational behaviour, motivation, leadership, team and change concepts. Credit evidence across the report, presentation and Q&A, using precise terminology and recognising relevant assumptions or limits.
Application of Frameworks (AO2)	25	Purposeful selection and application of appropriate management and organisational frameworks to HarbourLoop or the extended case. The report, visuals, spoken delivery and Q&A should show why the frameworks fit and how they inform the analysis.
Analysis of Organisational Issues and Evidence (AO3)	35	Clear, connected analysis of structural, cultural, leadership, team, motivation and change issues using the supplied case facts and relevant independent evidence. Credit interpretation of causes, consequences, stakeholder implications, limitations and individual understanding demonstrated in Q&A.
Evaluation, Recommendations and Professional Communication (AO4)	25	Balanced evaluation of options and ethical or CSR implications; feasible, prioritised recommendations linked to the analysis and implementation measures. Assess the professional report, visual presentation, group delivery, contribution evidence and structured Q&A as complete evidence.

Standardisation guidance

- Apply the four published AO criteria and marks above to the complete integrated evidence. Credit a different recommended operating model where framework application and evidence justify it. Equivalent management frameworks and credible sources are acceptable. Do not create a separate fixed allocation between report, presentation and Q&A.