IQM4007

LEVEL 4 · INDIVIDUAL WRITTEN DOSSIER WITH THREE REQUIRED PARTS.

INTO QUALIFICATIONS

Business Law and Governance

Legal case brief and governance report

Candidate assessment pack

Assessment
IQM4007 A1

Sample set
2026-S

Status
SAMPLE ASSESSMENT

Response length
Indicative 2,000 words; maximum 2,200 words (+10%), excluding references and appendices unless current local instructions state otherwise.

Total marks
100

Release timing
at coursework release

About this sample assessment

Individual integrated dossier analysing a business-law dispute and governance challenge. Module-guide weighting 50%; assesses LO1-LO5. Total 100 marks.

Instructions for candidates

- Title and short executive summary
- A: facts, issues, rules, application, likely outcome/remedies, business significance
- B: governance/control gaps, risk and consequence analysis, options, recommendations
- C: usable board checklist or policy extract
- OSCOLA footnotes and bibliography

Academic practice and permitted AI use

This assessment is Level 2 – AI Planning. Generative AI may support brainstorming, research-question refinement, orientation to sources you have already identified, note structuring and outlining.

All legal analysis, interpretation, evaluation, recommendations, document drafting and final wording must be produced independently by you. Do not use AI to select or invent legal authorities, case details or citations without independent verification, or present AI-generated assessed content as your own.

Independently select, read and understand your sources; verify legal accuracy, case details and citations; and acknowledge any AI use in accordance with the assessment instructions.

Retain appropriate evidence of your development, including planning, source selection and relevant working files. Complete at least one supervised progress checkpoint. A short verification discussion may be used where necessary to confirm your understanding, analytical choices and authorship.

Assessment context and task

Case Title: Northbank Cycle Works and the failed booking system

Facts: Northbank Cycle Works Ltd is a fictional UK cycle-repair retailer with 28 employees. It contracted with BrightPath Software Ltd for an online booking system. On 3 March, BrightPath emailed a proposal for £18,000, describing delivery by 1 June, staff training, and a monthly support fee of £400. Northbank's operations manager replied, 'We accept the scope and price, provided the system can export repair history in CSV; please confirm.' BrightPath replied the same day: 'Confirmed; CSV export is included. We will send our standard terms tomorrow.' Northbank paid a £3,000 deposit.

The standard terms, first sent 8 March and signed electronically by both companies on 10 March, stated target launch 1 June, a 30-day cure period for material defects, liability capped at fees paid in the previous three months, and English law/jurisdiction. No clause expressly made the launch date a condition. The system went live 20 July and failed to export repair history. Northbank gave written notice on 25 July and allowed 30 days to cure. BrightPath delivered a partial export on 24 August; repair histories for two years remained unusable.

Northbank hired a temporary administrator for £2,400 and estimates £1,600 lost contribution from cancelled bookings, with records supporting £1,000 of that estimate. It claims £8,000 for replacement software but has not obtained a quote. It has paid £18,000 implementation and £400 for one month of support. The board approved the project without a written risk assessment, did not assign a data-protection lead, and left customer repair histories in a shared test environment accessible to all supplier staff. No evidence yet shows unauthorised access. The board asks whether to terminate, seek a negotiated remedy, or continue with safeguards.

The case supplies no facts about limitation clauses' negotiation, the supplier's exact costs, mitigation steps beyond the temporary administrator, or actual data access. Candidates must identify these as evidence gaps rather than assume their answers.

Part A 35 Marks

Write a case brief: material facts; legal issues; applicable principles; reasoned likely outcome/remedies; business significance.

Part B 50 Marks

Analyse the governance/compliance weaknesses, legal/operational/ethical risks and consequences; evaluate options; recommend controls and actions.

Part C 15 Marks

Draft a practical board-facing supplier oversight and data-access checklist (or equivalent approved governance document element) that translates the analysis into action.