**Assessment Brief**

|  |  |
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| **Module title:** | Strategic Investment Appraisal |
| **Type of assessment:** | Project appraisal report |
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**Instructions for assessment**

The assessment is an individual **project appraisal report**. The project is a business takeover or merger to be investigated in detail. The report should be **3,000 words plus appendices containing slides, spreadsheet analysis and learning logs**.

Assignment scenario:

The case study is a takeover bid by Caesars of William Hill for £2.9 billion – You may make use of newspaper sources ([Caesars agrees £2.9bn William Hill takeover - but will sell off UK betting shops | Business News | Sky News](https://news.sky.com/story/william-hill-in-2-9bn-takeover-but-uk-bookmaker-to-be-sold-off-after-deal-completes-12085648)), company websites, bid document and stock market data, but the annual reports for 2019 & 2020 should be the main source of financial data (<https://www.williamhillplc.com/historical-investor-centre/results-reports-and-presentations/2021/>). There are three team roles for the interim assessment: Chief executive (CEO); Chief finance officer (CFO); & Chief Risk officer (CRO) **For the MBA, you may choose the CEO or CRO role and for the MSc GFM you may choose the CFO or CRO role**.

Required elements of the project appraisal report:

1. A **business case** should be made to justify the takeover bid. Present **ONE** view from:
   1. The CEO should present a strategic/market (competitor) analysis
   2. The CRO should present an analysis of the business, financial and takeover risks
   3. The CFO should present a preliminary financial analysis, stating the assumptions required to value the target company using DCF analysis (2 power-point slides which address one of the above should be appended to your report) - **15 marks**
2. A **business valuation**, based on your own financial analysis of the target company, to justify the bid price offered for William Hill. You should append 2 pages from an excel spreadsheet valuation model (results & formulae) to your report – **30 marks**
3. **What if?** Identify a possible rival bidder (usually from the same sector). Explainwhy the rival bidder may have made different assumptions in their **business valuation** and hence a different bid price – **10 marks**
4. A **critique** of business valuation methods and relevant research, explaining why the anticipated bidder gains may not come to fruition, especially given the economic crisis due to Covid-19. Refer to relevant research and cite journal articles to support your **discussion** – **20 marks**
5. A **learning log** or blog based on the module content to reflect on what you have learnt from each session, including reference to Moodle materials, showing how you have applied this learning to the assessment task, to be appended to your report – **15 marks**
6. A supporting **bibliography** and professional style of report (presentation) – **10 marks**

**A** **business case** should be made to justify the takeover bid. Your **report** should contain:

**Structure and presentation**

The individual report should be 3000 words plus references and appendices. The report must be a word document, but you are expected to use a spreadsheet for the financial analysis. You should submit screenshots of your spreadsheet results view and formulae view in an appendix.

Any written work should be spell-checked and a contents page should be included. Do not use various font sizes and colours Black ink, Arial, size 11, 1.5 lines spaced is recommended. Use DIN A4 format and page margins of 2.5 cm or 1 inch.
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**How will your work be assessed?**

Your work will be assessed by a subject expert who will use either the marking criteria provided in the section “Instructions for assessment” or the Marking rubric enclosed in the Appendix, as appropriate for this module. When you access your marked work it is important that you reflect on the feedback so that you can use it to improve future assignments.

**Referencing and submission**

You must use the **Harvard System**.

The Business School requires a digital version of all assignment submissions. These must be submitted via Turnitin on the module’s Moodle site. They must be submitted as a Word file (not as a pdf) and must not include scanned in text or text boxes. They must be submitted by 2pm on the given date. For further general details on coursework preparation refer to the online information at StudentZone, <http://studentzone.roehampton.ac.uk/howtostudy/index.html>.

**Mitigating circumstances/what to do if you cannot submit a piece of work or attend your presentation**

The University Mitigating Circumstances Policy can be found on the University website: [Mitigatin](http://www.roehampton.ac.uk/uploadedFiles/Pages_Assets/PDFs_and_Word_Docs/Quality_and_Standards/Mitigat)g [Circumstances Polic](http://www.roehampton.ac.uk/uploadedFiles/Pages_Assets/PDFs_and_Word_Docs/Quality_and_Standards/Mitigating%20circumstances%20policy%20August%202013.pdf)y

**Marking and feedback process**

Between you handing in your work and then receiving your feedback and marks within 20 days, there are a number of quality assurance processes that we go through to ensure that students receive marks which reflects their work. A brief summary is provided below.

* **Step One** – The module and marking team meet to agree standards, expectations and how feedback will be provided.
* **Step Two** – A subject expert will mark your work using the criteria provided in the assessment brief.
* **Step Three** – A moderation meeting takes place where all members of the teaching and marking team will review the marking of others to confirm whether they agree with the mark and feedback
* **Step Four** – Work then goes to an external examiner who will review a sample of work to confirm that the marking between different staff is consistent and fair.
* **Step Five** – Your mark and feedback is processed by the Office and made available to you.