

Pitch Topic: Systematic “Betting Against Beta”

Final Grade: 85% (47.18 / 55.50)

Faculty Feedback:

The Ute Capital Systematic Pitch proposal recommends against proceeding with the investment. The team demonstrated strong thoughtfulness and deep knowledge of the thesis foundation during the introduction, setting a solid tone. The inclusion of a Monte Carlo simulation was a valuable supplemental element that sparked useful discussion, but it slightly deviated from the core systematic framework outlined in the "How to Systematic" template. While appreciated as occasional food for thought, such additions should be reserved rather than incorporated into every pitch to maintain focus on the established scope.

Presentation-wise, the slides showed promise but require polishing for clarity and professionalism. Slide 9 featured an excellent graph marred by a poor table format, with similar readability tweaks needed for Slide 10. Increasing font size on Slide 11 would also enhance readability. Slide 12 suffered from awkward graphic positioning, Slide 13 from an isolated bulleted list within a table, and Slide 14 from unnecessary bullet points overall. Streamlining these elements would significantly improve the deck's impact.

Peer Feedback Unedited:

Overall Delivery

- The team spoke at a good pace, which made the presentation easy to follow.
- One team member referred to a 3x5 card. While this is acceptable, it was noticeable and slightly detracted from the professional flow.
- There appeared to be an imbalance in speaking time among presenters — consider dividing sections more evenly to maintain engagement across the team.

Content and Strategy

- The strategy appeared to focus on purchasing 15 specific stocks rather than implementing a fully systematic strategy. It would be helpful to clarify whether the approach is discretionary, or rules based.
- The team used a portfolio performance analyzer to evaluate performance under their beta strategy, but it was unclear how this tied into the systematic methodology expected for fund proposals.

- It was also confusing that the supporting academic paper had fundamental differences from the investment constraints of our fund. Consider selecting research that aligns more closely with the fund's mandate.

Backtesting and Analysis

- Backtesting was a good inclusion, but some of the calculations — particularly the max drawdown — caused confusion and slowed the presentation. Be sure to verify all calculations before presenting.
- The appendix should include all backtests in full detail for reference and validation. Appendix lacked some additional support, but that expectation wasn't quite clear.

Additional Observations

- The team measured the performance of stocks they ultimately recommended not buying due to fund constraints. This was an interesting approach because the team chose research that is beyond our capabilities.
- Avoid attempts to replicate Monte Carlo simulations unless they add clear analytical value or are directly tied to the fund's approved tools and methodology.