**School of Business and Economics** 

**22BSC524**

**Entrepreneurship and Small Business Planning**

**Business Plan**

**Coursework Weight: 100%**

**Coursework Deadline(s): 17 May 2023**

Coursework Task

This module is assessed through one group assignment (100%). Students will be expected to work ideally in groups of five to prepare and present a business plan for a real or imaginary business. The business idea should be thoroughly researched with primary and secondary data collected and analysed using appropriate business tools.

The assessment is in three stages:

* The completed business plan to be submitted by 11 am on Wednesday 17 May 2023 (75%).
* The plan will be pitched during a group oral presentation held during week 12 i.e. w/c 22 May 2023 (25%). This may be in person or over Teams depending on the situation at the time
* There is an element of peer assessment included in the overall assessment of this module.

Guidance Notes

The expected structure and content of your business plan and requirements for the oral presentation will be covered in detail in the lectures and your group tutorials, but a summary is given here for guidance.

**Business Plan (75%):**

* Clear description of business idea and business model
* Evidence of appropriate primary and secondary research to demonstrate commercial viability
* Thorough industry and competitor analysis including use of appropriate business tools
* Logical operation plans including marketing, Intellectual Property, human resources
* Appropriate business strategy and financial projections
* Company governance, CSR, risk management and future development (growth/exit strategy)

**Oral Presentation (25%):**

* Company image: coherence of group, clear outline of vision and purpose
* Content: Identification of key points, evidence for decision-making
* Presentation: Engaging, visually stimulating, participation by all group members
* Discussion: Understanding of questions, relevance of answers, constructive dialogue.

**Peer review**

* After submission of your business plan, you will be required to assess the contribution of your team members using WebPA. The individual final marks between members of a group may vary, if there is evidence of significant unequal effort.

Word Count and Format

**Business Plan (75%)**

* A document of max 25 pages (not including title page, table of contents and appendices)
* Appendix to business plan containing research and evidence (not included in the 25 page limit)

**Oral Presentation (25%)**

* 15 minutes (plus 10 mins Q + A) to a panel including the tutors and invited guest experts. All team members required to present but not necessarily for equal time.
* Depending on the situation at the time of the presentation it could take place in person or over Teams
* The presentation may include a variety of visual aids appropriate to the business being presented e.g. prototypes, marketing leaflets, mock Apps or websites.
* As part of the presentation a short video is permitted if appropriate to the business being presented but this should be no more than 2 minutes in length.

**Peer review**

* The peer review will be available in WebPA during week 12. Students are advised to log in and “take a tour” of the system prior to Week 12 for familiarisation purposes. Your usual login ID and password will give you access. A penalty of a 5 % deduction from an individual’s overall assessed mark will be made if that individual fails to submit a Peer Review entry. Individual marks for each member of the group will be calculated based on the combined mark for the group business plan and oral presentation and the Peer Review score for each individual.

Coursework Marking Rubric

Please see the two rubrics at the end of this coursework brief for further details of the criteria against which you will be assessed, and descriptors of performance on the coursework for each assessment criterion.

Coursework Submission

The deadline date for the business is provided above. **One member of the group only should upload an electronic copy of the business plan to the submission point for the module on LEARN by the submission deadline**.

You must use the following file naming convention for your work. **You should not include your name anywhere on your assignment**. You should also include the filename in the header of your assignment.

**Group Number – Module code – Coursework component** (e.g. Group1-22BSC524-CW1)

Your submission should be either a Word document or a pdf (preferred to preserve formatting). The file size limit for your submission is 20MB. If your business plan including the appendix is larger than this, you may split the document and submit the appendix as a separate file.

**IMPORTANT NOTE:** You need to ensure you back up your coursework and any other important documents.   Information on data storage can be found here: <http://www.lboro.ac.uk/services/it/student/storage/>.

Losing your work through technical failure is not a valid reason for a Mitigating Circumstances claim or a coursework extension request.

Extensions and Mitigating Circumstances

If you have any other problems with meeting the deadline for this coursework you may wish to request a 48-hour extension and/or submit a Mitigating Circumstances claim. This must be requested in advance via:

Coursework Extension Link: <https://www.lboro.ac.uk/students/handbook/exams/extensions/>

Mitigating Circumstances Link: <https://www.lboro.ac.uk/students/handbook/exams/mitigating-circumstances/>

Consultation and Feedback

Tutors will advise on the format and content of the business plan and pitch with individual groups in tutorial sessions. Tutors will **not** comment on a full draft version of the plan but will comment on individual draft sections and the overall plan layout/structure/branding if you want some reassurance that your approach is viable.

Provisional marks and feedback should be available by 9th June 2022. All marks are provisional until ratified by the formal examination boards.

 **School of Business and Economics**

# Marking rubric for Business Plan (75%)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Aspects** (not equally weighted) | **<40%** | **40-49%** | **50-59%** | **60-69%** | **70-79%** | **80-100%** |
| Plan content | Concepts unclear, missing information, poor description of business idea and operations | Business idea explained well but operational aspects unclear or insufficient detail | Clear attempt to explain the business idea and how the business will operate but more detail required | Good attempt to explain the business idea and its current and future operational aspects | Thorough introduction and operation sections with good detail on all required aspects of business idea | Excellent coverage of business operations and future development, business idea explained clearly and thoroughly |
| Research | Very little research evident. Plan based mainly on assumptions | Some research evident but insufficient and poorly presented | Statements supported by some research using primary and /or secondary research methods | Evidence of appropriate primary and secondary research to demonstrate commercial viability | Thorough and appropriate multimodal research undertaken to establish viability with a range of potential customer groups | Excellent, appropriate, multi modal level research undertaken with appropriate variety and numbers of participants |
| Analysis | No attempt to use any business tools | Some business tools used but failure to analyse appropriately | Appropriate business tools used but failed to sufficiently interpret outcome | Good use of appropriate business tools with some interpretation of output | Appropriate tools used consistently, output interpreted and woven into strategy | Excellent use of appropriate business tools to inform strategy |
| Financial aspects | No attempt to quantify cost of production of product/service or likely income | Some attempt to quantify costs and potential income but lacking detail and evidence | Good attempt to quantify costs and derive pricing structure using evidence but projections unrealistic | Good attempt to quantify costs and derive pricing using well-constructed evidence and well explained assumptions with realistic projections | Thorough financial analysis underpinning the whole plan. Costs and pricing derived using well-constructed evidence and well explained assumptions with realistic projections | Excellent financial analysis underpinning the whole plan with realistic projections, logically derived costing and pricing based on substantial evidence |
| Narrative | Disjointed writing which fails to entice the reader to engage with the business offering | Some attempt to engage the reader with the proposition on offer but language not persuasive | Clear story-telling that attempts to entice the reader to engage with the business proposition | Good narrative with persuasive language that entices the reader to engage with the business proposition | Engaging narrative that ‘sells’ the concept to the reader and convinces them of the advantages of the offering | Persuasive narrative that would attract external interest in a new business proposition |
| Presentation | Unstructured writing, hard to follow, littered with spelling and grammar mistakes. | Neatly presented but with no real structure.  Some spelling/grammar errors. | Well presented with minimal errors. Room for improvement in structure and signposting | Well presented with logical sections and signposting | Good logical structure, professionally presented with good signposting and one voice throughout | Professional document worthy of presentation to VC or Business Angel. Excellent signposting and cross referencing with clear logical sections |

# Marking rubric for Pitch (25%)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Aspects** (not equally weighted) | **<40%** | **40-49%** | **50-59%** | **60-69%** | **70-79%** | **80-100%** |
| Content | Fails to draw out key findings from the plan and convey these to the audience. Contains substantial amounts of irrelevant information that detracts from the key message | Minimal key content and findings are drawn out from the plan and conveyed to the audience. Contains irrelevant content and may concentrate on the product only rather than the whole business | Key findings are presented but these are not fully developed or focused. Contains irrelevant content focusing only on the product/service rather than the whole business | Good attempt to pitch the plan rather than just the product. Key findings for investor drawn out and conveyed concisely | Excellent content with the key findings identified and delivered in an accessible way. Shows good understanding of the audience and the level of detail required | Excellent content with key findings presented in a professional way with all angles justified. Shows maturity and understanding of the audience and the level of detail required |
| Creativity | Poor presentation style with no attempt at creativity | Basic presentation style, with minimal creativity | Some attempt at creative delivery of the presentation to engage the listener | Good attempt to make the presentation creative to engage the audience | Excellent creative presentation, original approach which is engaging and entertaining | Excellent innovative presentation that ensures the audience remembers it. Creative and well designed |
| Delivery of presentation | Poor cohesion and professionalism of the team. Handovers and timekeeping poor | Some evidence of cohesion between team members but generally poor. Handovers and time-keeping adequate but required more rehearsal | Handovers clearly rehearsed and timekeeping reasonable showing team cooperation and understanding | Good teamwork evident with well-rehearsed handovers and good timekeeping | Excellent performance from the whole team. Well-rehearsed handovers and good timekeeping | Professional performance from the whole team. Faultless handovers and timekeeping worthy of external audience |
| Identification of risks and mitigation | Poor risk analysis and no evidence of how risk will be mitigated | Limited evidence of risk analysis and little or no evidence of how risk will be mitigated | Limited evidence of risk analysis. Limited evidence of how risk will be mitigated | Good evidence of risk analysis and how risk will be mitigated but there may be some risks that are omitted | Excellent level of risk analysis with a clear plan for mitigation of the major hurdles | Excellent analysis of the key risks together with a feasible risk mitigation plan leaving the audience in no doubt that all angles have been considered |
| Visual aids | Poor visual aids that have clearly had very little effort put into them | Poor visual aids with either too much detail making the slides overwhelming or too little information | Clear visual aids with adequate content that are helpful to the audience | Good visual aids appropriate to the message. Clear and concise. Helpful and well structured | Excellent visual aids appropriate to the business being presented comprising more than just presentation slides | Excellent multiple visual aids appropriate to the business being presented and relevant to the audience |
| Understanding of questions & relevance of answers | Limited grasp or knowledge of the subject matter. Vague knowledge of relevant material. Poorly focused answers | Some attempt to answer questions but mainly a repeat of content already presented | Answers that demonstrate that the context of the question has been understood but is not fully developed. The answer may not be totally focused on the question asked. May demonstrate a gap in evidence of knowledge and understanding | Good answers that are applied to the questions asked and that show evidence of good knowledge and understanding. There may be some minor misconceptions and misunderstandings but the team generally well prepared for helpful discussion | Excellent answers with evidence of good understanding of the underlying research and analysis. All team members prepared to engage in constructive dialogue with panel | Excellent demonstration of knowledge and understanding with original answers conveying additional material not already presented. Constructive dialogue between team and panel showing exceptional understanding of the whole business plan, value proposition and potential challenges |