

Course Outline: AB0603 Social Entrepreneurship

Academic Year	2022/23	Semester	1
Course Coordinator	Zhao Meng		
Course Code	AB0603		
Course Title	Social Entrepreneurship		
Pre-requisites	N/A		
No of AUs	3		
Contact Hours	3 x 13 = 39 hours		
Proposal Date			

A) Course Aims

This course introduces students to cutting-edge concepts, frameworks and practices that are current in social entrepreneurship, as well as critical issues in business ethics as a knowledge foundation for analysing and practicing social entrepreneurship. The course considers how social entrepreneurship plays out in organizations ranging from conventional companies seeking to adopt corporate social responsibility practices to double-bottom-line businesses and social enterprises.

The course specifies strategic and implementation tensions inherent in aligning business and social/environmental values, and provides frameworks with which to analyse and resolve the tensions at play. Through case-teaching, this course trains students into a quasi-expert of social entrepreneurship by enabling them to apply frameworks to making tough decisions in real business contexts.

The course includes four modules: strategic corporate social responsibility (SCSR); double-bottom-line business (DBL), social enterprise (SE) and business ethics (BE). It begins by analysing and making decisions on the cases of conventional companies conducting social innovation initiatives through SCSR and DBL. We will then move to explore the cases of social enterprises. Students will observe both the common and distinctive challenges facing conventional companies and social enterprises. The modules of SCSR, DBL and SE will be followed by an Entrepreneur Panel where social entrepreneurs introduce their initiatives and engage in a highly interactive conversation with students. The course will finish by taking a look at business ethics theories and issues that provide analytical depth and clarification to the students' understanding of social entrepreneurship.

B) Intended Learning Outcomes (ILO)/Objectives

By the end of this course, you should be able to:

- (a) Explain concepts and frameworks of social entrepreneurship and business ethics in a diversity of institutional, organizational and strategic contexts.
- (b) Analyze key challenges in designing and implementing social entrepreneurship initiatives.
- (c) Evaluate and make decisions on strategy, implementation and ethical issues of social entrepreneurship initiatives with a combination of a variety of frameworks in different management subjects

Develop teamwork capabilities in terms of group communication, group decision-making and making group presentations.

C) Course Content

- Concepts of Social Entrepreneurship and Creating Shared Value
- Strategic corporate social responsibility, double-bottom-line business, social enterprise, social business
- Social impact measurement
- Partnership management
- Open source model
- Social movement strategy
- Leadership vs. management
- Embedded strategy

- Congruence model analysis
- Organizational change stages
- Focused vs. dispersed scope of social innovation programs
- Concepts of business ethics
- Ethical principles
- Moral relativism
- Moral responsibility
- Moral development

D) Assessment (includes both continuous and summative assessment)

Component	ILO Tested	NBS Learning Goal	Weightage	Team/ Individual	Assessment Rubrics
1. Class participation and discussion	ILO (a) (b) (c)	Oral Communication	20%	Individual	Class Participation Rubric
2. Final paper	ILO (a) (c)	Ethical Reasoning	30%	Individual	Ethical Reasoning Rubric
3. Mid-term paper	ILO (a) (b) (c) (d)	Critical and Creative Thinking Teamwork and Interpersonal Skills	30%	Team (all members must get involved in the processes of paper development, data collection and analysis and paper writing)	Critical Thinking Rubric Teamwork and Interpersonal Skills
4. Mid-term paper presentation	ILO (a) (b) (c) (d)	Oral Communication	20%	Individual (All members must present)	Oral Communication Rubric
Total			100%		

a. Class participation and discussion

Participation includes attending the class and actively contributing to the class. Attendance is required in the class. Attendance grades are reduced by a non-attendance penalty of 10% points per class missed. Late arrivals can also lead to points reduction depending on lateness.

Contribution to the class considers both of the quantity and the quality of participations. Quality more than quantity. You are encouraged to ask questions and bring up interesting discussions and examples to the class' attention. The topics could come from something you read, watched or even a video clip. Questioning presenting groups about their topics or contents, opening remarks, participation in debates, wrap-ups/take-aways and so on would count as high-quality participations.

b. Final paper (No more than 8 pages or 3,000 words and 3 exhibits, double-spacing)

- i) Analyze the ethical issues of a case that the instructor will distribute in advance. The analysis should focus on sample questions as follows. The instructor will confirm the specific questions for analysis in the due time.

What are the ethical problems that happened in the case?

If the ethically controversial behavior in the case was widely accepted and practiced in the local community, should or should not the protagonist change it? Why?

What options did the protagonist have in dealing with the ethical issues?

- ii) Use one or more frameworks taught in the course to do the analysis.
- iii) All submissions must be made through Turnitin

c. Mid-term paper (No more than 15 pages or 5,000 words and 3 exhibits, double-spacing)

- i) Analyze the social or environmental activities of a selected company (either an established company or a startup), describe what the key issues are in these activities, how you would go about implementing improvements, and how you would measure their impact and success.
- ii) Use one or more frameworks taught in the course to do the analysis.
- iii) A group up to five members is allowed.
- iv) All submissions must be made through Turnitin

d. Mid-term paper presentation (10 min followed by 5-10 min Q&A)

Students will present the progress of their mid-term papers to a panel of entrepreneurs. All members must present. The purpose is maximizing students’ learning about how to analyze and make decisions on social innovation activities.

E) Formative feedback

1. The course will be available fully online via Zoom online delivery may be modified to include physical classes if needed.
2. You will receive verbal feedback on your group presentations.
3. You will receive formative feedback through Eureka based on the Rubrics as follows:
 - 1) Critical thinking rubric for the mid-term paper
 - 2) Ethical reasoning rubric for the final paper

F) Learning and Teaching approach

Approach	
Case teaching	<i>The interactive case session (online) where there are ample opportunities for open discussion on the conceptual questions raised in the class allows you to think critical and share their ideas and concept with the class. This also allows me to get the concepts clearly through the entire class by involving you and ensure that the targeted learning outcomes are being achieved</i>
Individual assignment(s)	<i>The assignments require you to generate, analyze and deliver materials in a guided manner and to provide further insights.</i>
In-Class activities	<i>Some learning outcomes for this course are skills which are practical in nature and cannot be achieved by reading and writing. The achievement of such learning outcomes requires hands-on experience, in-class activities provide such opportunities.</i>

G) Reading and References

Textbook:

There is no textbook for SCSR, DBL and SE modules.

The textbook for the BE module: Velasquez, M. G. 2012. *Business Ethics Concepts and Cases*, 7th Edition. Pearson Education Asia. Students are required to read Chapter 1 & 2.

Lee Wee Nan Library. Call no. HF5387.V434 2012 (OUTPRES)

For ebook : https://ntu-sp.primo.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/65NTU_INST/3es15n/alma991016408207105146

Cases:

Harvard Business Publishing (HBP) cases must be purchased online. Students need to register for their own HBP account one time and the rest of the process will be seamless. The step-by-step guide is available on the following website: <http://intranet3.ntu.edu.sg/NBS/Undergraduate/Pages/Useful-Links-and-Resources.aspx>

The instructor will post a reminder about HBP account registration and case purchasing on NTULearn in due time.

Other readings

All readings and references will be posted through NTULearn.

Other Resources

Students should read widely on articles, news reports and watch relevant videos, and do their own research. This course is designed in line with current teaching and learning pedagogy, with resources drawn from the internet and other published domain.

H) Course Policies and Student Responsibilities

(1) General

You are expected to complete all assigned pre-class readings and activities, attend all seminar classes punctually and take all scheduled assignments by due dates. You are expected to take responsibility to follow up with course notes, assignments and course related announcements for seminar sessions you have missed. You are expected to participate in all seminar discussions and activities.

(2) Absenteeism

Absence from class without a valid reason will affect your overall course grade. Valid reasons include falling sick supported by a medical certificate and participation in NTU's approved activities supported by an excuse letter from the relevant bodies.

If you miss a lecture, you must inform the course instructor via email prior to the start of the class.

I) Academic Integrity

Good academic work depends on honesty and ethical behaviour. The quality of your work as a student relies on adhering to the principles of academic integrity and to the NTU Honour Code, a set of values shared by the whole university community. Truth, Trust and Justice are at the core of NTU's shared values.

As a student, it is important that you recognize your responsibilities in understanding and applying the principles of academic integrity in all the work you do at NTU. Not knowing what is involved in maintaining academic integrity does not excuse academic dishonesty. You need to actively equip yourself with strategies to avoid all forms of academic dishonesty, including plagiarism, academic fraud, collusion and cheating. If you are uncertain of the definitions of any of these terms, you should go to the [academic integrity website](#) for more information. Consult your instructor(s) if you need any clarification about the requirements of academic integrity in the course.

J) Course Instructors

Instructor	Office Location	Phone	Email	Consultation Hours
Zhao Meng	S3-B1C-112	67906116	meng.zhao@ntu.edu.sg	By appointment

K) Planned Weekly Schedule

Week	Topic	ILO	Readings/ Activities
1	Introduction and Overview	ILO (a)	Refer to the NTULearn course website throughout all the weekly sessions
2	SCSR Module: Managing social entrepreneurship through employee engagement	ILO (a) (b) (c)	Case discussion
3	SCSR Module: Managing social entrepreneurship through social impact measurement	ILO (a) (b) (c)	Case discussion
4	DBL Module: Managing social entrepreneurship through effective implementation	ILO (a) (b) (c)	Case discussion
5	DBL Module: Managing social entrepreneurship through system-level change	ILO (a) (b) (c)	Case discussion
6	SE Module: Managing social entrepreneurship through open source model	ILO (a) (b) (c)	Case discussion
7	SE Module: Managing social entrepreneurship when an organization changes	ILO (a) (b) (c)	Case discussion
8	Entrepreneur Panel	ILO (b) (c) (d)	One hour for entrepreneur speeches, two hours for mid-term paper presentations and entrepreneur comments.
9	E-Learning	ILO (b) (c) (d)	Comments on other teams' mid-term paper in progress.
10	BE Module: Introduction to business ethics	ILO (a) (b) (c)	Lecturing on business ethics concepts Case discussion
11	BE Module: Ethical principles	ILO (a) (b) (c)	Lecturing on ethical principles. Case discussion
12	BE Module: Morality development	ILO (a) (b) (c)	Lecturing on morality development Case discussion
13	Moral Reasoning Exercise	ILO (a) (b) (c) (d)	Lecturing on moral reasoning. Group practices of moral reasoning.

Note: Cases, case discussion questions and additional readings are posted on the NTULearn course website.

L) Group Peer Evaluation

All members are required to complete a peer evaluation for each team member for the mid-term paper's teamwork (i.e., including a self-assessment). The completed peer evaluation form must be submitted individually to the instructor.

Identity of appraisers (i.e., group members) will be kept confidential and will not be revealed to other team members. It is **absolutely essential for you to submit your peer evaluation form to get marks for your group-based assignments**.

We will use a member's ratings (on a scale ranging from 1 to 7) to award marks for the team project to other members by computing the average rating that a member receives from other members (i.e., excluding each member's self-rating). Each member will be informed of his/her average rating. A member's mark for the team project will be computed as follows:

1. If a member's average rating is ≥ 4 , the member will receive **100%** of the overall mark awarded to the team project.
2. If a member's average rating is < 4 but ≥ 3 , the member will receive **80%** of the overall mark awarded to the team project.
3. If a member's average rating is < 3 but ≥ 2 , the member will receive **50%** of the overall mark awarded to the team project.
4. If a member's average rating is < 2 , the member will receive **30%** of the overall mark awarded to the team project.

Your instructor reserves the right to review the student ratings for questionable circumstances, which include, but are not limited to, acts of discrimination or malice. A member who has concerns with the ratings given by other team members and/or his/her average rating should immediately consult his/her instructor upon receiving his/her peer evaluation feedback within one week upon receiving the average rating.

Example:

Assume the overall group assignment is 60 marks. A student with an average rating of 6 gets 100% of 60 marks, i.e., 60 marks. An average rating of 3 means that a student gets 80% of 60 marks, i.e., 48marks.

ANNEX A: ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

A NOTE ON TEAMWORK ASSESSMENT & PEER EVALUATION

** For course coordinator/instructor's note & not to be included in the course outline*

A student's ability to work in, and lead, a team is an important skill for his/her future career progression and development. As such, courses are encouraged to incorporate team activities as part of the course continuous assessment.

Consistent with the outcome-based teaching and learning pedagogy, course instructors that plan to incorporate teamwork will need to think through the learning objectives that they want to achieve through the team activities including behaviors that students should exhibit during teamwork.

To motivate and assess students' learning in teamwork, assessment should be aligned with the planned learning objectives and meaningful feedback should be provided to the students. As instructors may not be able to directly observe, assess and provide feedback to students in terms of their performance in teams, peer evaluation is likely the best alternate form of assessment and feedback to help students develop their teamwork skills. Courses are strongly encouraged to conduct peer evaluation or put in place other means for students to learn and receive feedback from their team members.

In aligning teamwork assessment with peer evaluation, different assessment methods are likely to have their own pros and cons. As such, instructors should discuss and agree on the teamwork assessment method to be used in a course. In deciding on a teamwork assessment method, considerations should be given to circumstances under which and how a member's teamwork mark may be increased, unchanged and/or decreased in light of student peer evaluations and free-riding concerns (including the availability of evidence and opportunities provided to affected members to voice their side of the story). Where peer evaluation is not compulsory, instructors are encouraged to request a positive confirmation from all members that every member has contributed significantly to the team assignment (as opposed to a negative confirmation where students inform instructors only of free-riding issues in their teams). The adopted assessment method for team assignments should be clearly conveyed to all students upfront and stated in the course outline together with the other course assessment components. In addition, changes in assessment criteria and methods (including team assignments) midway in the course should be avoided unless all students are informed and agreeable.

For illustration purposes, attached is a sample of peer evaluation method used in an undergraduate course where members' marks are reduced if their average peer rating is found to be on the low side (<4 on a scale of 1 to 7).

Instructors are strongly recommended to use the online Teamwork & Interpersonal Skills Rubric available in eUreka.

Sample Peer Evaluation Used in an Undergraduate Course

Peer Evaluation Instructions

All members are required to complete a peer evaluation for each member of the team (i.e., including a self-assessment). The completed peer evaluation form must be submitted individually to the instructor immediately after the team project has been submitted for grading. Identity of appraisers will be kept **confidential** and will not be revealed to other team members.

We will use a member's ratings (on a scale ranging from 1 to 7) to award marks for the team project to other members by computing the average rating that a member receives from other members (i.e., excluding each member's self-rating). Each member will be informed of his/her average rating. A member's mark for the team project will be computed as follows:

5. If a member's average rating is ≥ 4 , the member will receive **100%** of the overall mark awarded to the team project.
6. If a member's average rating is < 4 but ≥ 3 , the member will receive **80%** of the overall mark awarded to the team project.
7. If a member's average rating is < 3 but ≥ 2 , the member will receive **50%** of the overall mark awarded to the team project.
8. If a member's average rating is < 2 , the member will receive **30%** of the overall mark awarded to the team project.

A member who has concerns with the ratings given by other team members and/or his/her average rating should immediately consult his/her instructor upon receiving his/her peer evaluation feedback.

CONFIDENTIAL PEER EVALUATION FORM
(It will be held in the strictest confidence)

Member's name: _____

Seminar group and team number: _____

For the mid-term paper's teamwork, please use the attached **Teamwork & Interpersonal Skills (Peer Evaluation) Rubric** to evaluate yourself and your team members on each of the 5 stated attributes (on a scale of 1 to 7). State your ratings for yourself and each of your team members in the table below. For your self-assessment, insert "(Self)" after your name in the table below.

Index #	Name of team members	1 - RR	2 - CM	3 - CR	4 - CT	5 - RS	Average Rating
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							

If any of your ratings above is < 4, please provide a brief explanation to justify the ratings.

Index #	Brief explanation to justify a rating of < 4

You may attach supporting documents (like emails and screen shots), if any, to support your explanations above.

Teamwork & Interpersonal Skills (Peer Evaluation) Rubric

Learning Objective: The ability to work effectively with others in a group setting.

Traits	Performance	
<p><u>1. Roles and Responsibility (RR)</u> Behaves professionally by upholding responsibility and assuming accountability for self and others in progressing towards the team's goal.</p>	<p>Scant Unclear about his/her own role; refuses to take a role in the group; insists to work individually and has limited coordination or communication with others.</p>	<p>Substantially Developed Always fulfills responsibilities; performs his/her role within the group with enthusiasm and demonstrates willingness to work collaboratively.</p>
<p>Evaluation: Scant <u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u> <u>4</u> <u>5</u> <u>6</u> <u>7</u> Substantially Developed</p>		
<p><u>2. Communication (CM)</u> Identifies appropriate mechanisms to coordinate and correspond with team members.</p>	<p>Scant Modes of communication are not appropriate, causing confusion and miscommunication among team members.</p>	<p>Substantially Developed Modes of communication are appropriate, and maintaining timely communication and correspondence with team members.</p>
<p>Evaluation: Scant <u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u> <u>4</u> <u>5</u> <u>6</u> <u>7</u> Substantially Developed</p>		
<p><u>3. Conflict Resolution (CR)</u> Resolves conflicts using a variety of approaches.</p>	<p>Scant Does not recognize conflicts or is unwilling to resolve conflicts.</p>	<p>Substantially Developed Consistently resolves conflicts through facilitating open discussion and compromise.</p>
<p>Evaluation: Scant <u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u> <u>4</u> <u>5</u> <u>6</u> <u>7</u> Substantially Developed</p>		
<p><u>4. Contributions (CT)</u> Contributes positive input for the team; effectively utilizes one's knowledge and expertise.</p>	<p>Scant Largely disinterested in working in a group and refuses to participate; observes passively or is unwilling to share information with other team members.</p>	<p>Substantially Developed Actively attends and participates in all activities and provides meaningful contribution in articulating ideas and opinions.</p>
<p>Evaluation: Scant <u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u> <u>4</u> <u>5</u> <u>6</u> <u>7</u> Substantially Developed</p>		
<p><u>5. Relationship (RS)</u> Maintains cooperative interaction with other team members regardless of individual /cultural differences and respects diverse perspectives.</p>	<p>Scant Rarely listens to others and does not acknowledge the opinions that differ from his/her own.</p>	<p>Substantially Developed Engages in respectful relationships with all other members in the team. Embraces and accepts diverse points of view without prejudice.</p>
<p>Evaluation: Scant <u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u> <u>4</u> <u>5</u> <u>6</u> <u>7</u> Substantially Developed</p>		

References: *Teamwork Value Rubric - Association of American Colleges and Universities*. Retrieved from <http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/pdf/teamwork.pdf>

Class Participation Rubric

Learning Objective: The class participation rubric is meant to assess students' contribution and engagement in discussion of business sustainability issues in class.

Traits	Performance Levels		
	Exceed expectations	Good	Below expectations
Contribution frequency	Speaks up /contributes in all classes.	Occasionally speaks up/contributes in class.	Does not speak up /contribute in class.
	Feedback: Below expectations <u> 1 </u> <u> 2 </u> <u> 3 </u> Exceed expectations		
Contribution quality	Contributions are constructive and insightful.	Contributions demonstrate knowledge of subject matter.	No contributions /Contributions lack substance.
	Feedback: Below expectations <u> 1 </u> <u> 2 </u> <u> 3 </u> Exceed expectations		
Engagement	Engages fully in class.	Occasionally engages in distracting activities (e.g. internet surfing, unnecessary chatting).	Hardly focuses in class (e.g. internet surfing, unnecessary chatting).
	Feedback: Below expectations <u> 1 </u> <u> 2 </u> <u> 3 </u> Exceed expectations		

Critical Thinking Rubric

Learning Objective: The ability to define, examine, evaluate, analyze and synthesize various arguments and knowledge to form independent judgment.

Traits	Performance	
Identifies and summarizes the issue at hand.	Below expectations Does not identify and summarize the issue, is confused or represents the issue inaccurately.	Exceed expectations Identifies the main issue and its implicit aspects, addresses their relationships to each other and recognizes nuances of the issue.
Feedback: Below expectations <u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u> Exceed expectations		
Identifies and considers <u>frameworks</u> and applies them to analyze the issue.	Below expectations Deals only with a single perspective and fails to discuss other possible perspectives, especially those salient to the issue. Fails to identify or hastily dismisses strong, relevant counter-arguments.	Exceed expectations Addresses perspectives noted previously, and additional diverse perspectives drawn from outside information. Identifies the salient arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con.
Feedback: Below expectations <u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u> Exceed expectations		
Identifies and assesses the quality of supporting <u>data/evidence</u> and provides additional data/evidence related to the issue.	Below expectations Merely repeats information provided, taking it as truth, or denies evidence without adequate justification. Confuses associations and correlations with cause and effect.	Exceed expectations Examines the evidence and source of evidence; questions its accuracy, precision, relevance, and completeness. Observes cause and effect and addresses existing or potential consequences.

	Feedback: Below expectations			1	2	3	Exceed expectations
Identifies and considers <u>key assumptions</u> and the influence of the <u>context</u> on the issue.	Below expectations	Does not surface the assumptions of the author and does not examine the contexts, e.g., cultural, and political.					Exceed expectations
Identifies and assesses <u>conclusions, implications</u> and consequences	Below expectations	Fails to identify conclusions, implications, and consequences of the issue or the key relationships among the various elements such as context, evidence or assumptions. Regardless of the evidence or reasons, maintains or defends views based on self-interest or preconceptions.					Exceed expectations
	Feedback: Below expectations			1	2	3	Exceed expectations

Ethical Reasoning Rubric

Learning Objective: The ability to recognize and understand ethical issues and apply sound ethical reasoning.

Traits	Performance	
Identifies and summarizes <u>ethical issue</u>.	Below expectations Identifies issue too narrowly or broadly, or embedded in personal biases.	Exceed expectations Defines the issue holistically and impartially, with elaboration on important nuances that drive the issue.
	Feedback: Below expectations <u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u> Exceed expectations	
Assesses ethical issue using <u>alternative theoretical frameworks</u>, and provides logical <u>reasoning and insights</u>	Below expectations Identifies only one framework, elaborates weakly or incorrectly on frameworks, or misinterprets how to apply the framework. Provides weak logic or evidence to support insights.	Exceed expectations Identifies several ethical frameworks that provide fresh insight into the issue, and applies framework correctly. Supports with logical reasoning and information. Provides meaningful insights from the analysis.
	Feedback: Below expectations <u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u> Exceed expectations	
Identifies and elaborates on <u>uncertainties</u> and the <u>contextual factors</u>	Below expectations Unable to identify what uncertainties arise in the ethical situation, or how context affects the issue. Fails to provide logical reasoning for this assessment.	Exceed expectations Incorporates comprehensive assessment of uncertainties and contextual factors that affect the ethical issue. Backs up with logical arguments/facts.
	Feedback: Below expectations <u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u> Exceed expectations	

<p>Considers and evaluates effects on <u>key stakeholders</u></p>	<p>Below expectations Fails to identify the relevant stakeholders, how the issue affects them, or the relevance of their 'stake' in the issue.</p>	<p>Exceed expectations Identifies key stakeholders, addresses their interests and concerns. Provides evidence/support of how the issue affects them.</p>
	<p>Feedback: Below expectations <u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u> Exceed expectations</p>	
<p>Draws a <u>conclusion</u>, and clarifies way forward, assessing <u>trade-offs</u></p>	<p>Below expectations Fails to evaluate some options to go forward, or show the trade-offs involved. Suggests a path forward that is not feasible or realistic, or is vague.</p>	<p>Exceed expectations Logically concludes a way forward and discusses the trade-offs holistically. Reconciles conflicts of interest. Proposes a feasible, workable solution and justifies trade-offs to be made.</p>
	<p>Feedback: Below expectations <u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u> Exceed expectations</p>	

Oral Communication Rubric

Learning Objective: The ability to join public conversation, engage with others around you, and capitalize on the ideas of others.

Traits	Performance	
Explanation of Ideas (EI)	Below expectations Ideas not presented logically or coherently, arguments lack support, information selected inappropriate, biased presentation of ideas	Exceed expectations Clear evidence, arguments, and support given for ideas, line of reasoning is logical, appropriate information selected, holistically addresses issue(s)
	Feedback: Below expectations 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Exceed expectations	
Organization of Material (OM)	Below expectations Information not presented logically, material disconnected, poor use of time/space (too short, too long), incorrect or confusing material included. Uses too many slides/materials, dense text, graphs/pictures.	Exceed expectations Logical organization, such as introduction and conclusion, sequence of material presented, good use of time/space, material clearly presented. Slides or material edited appropriately for audience viewing.
	Feedback: Below expectations 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Exceed expectations	
Engagement of Audience (EA)	Below expectations Fails to engage audience or stimulate debate, difficult or boring to follow, repetitive and unable to push further thinking and discussion. Fails to control the room, either in person or via activities.	Exceed expectations Captured interest of audience, sparks conversation, keeps attention of class, creative use of materials (PowerPoint, boards, space in classroom, audience, etc.), stimulates further thinking. Timed activities well for student interest. Able to keep order and control over the room.
	Feedback: Below expectations 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Exceed expectations	

<p>Active Listening (AL)</p>	<p>Below expectations</p> <p>Enters discussion without paying attention to what went before, repeats points rather than building on them, takes discussion on irrelevant tangent, speaks up for the sake of speaking up without adding quality to the discussion. Repeats what others have said.</p>	<p>Exceed expectations</p> <p>Listens to what others have to say and builds on them by adding, critiquing (not criticizing), or extending the points, stays on topic, brings in useful information or thinking for further thinking. Does not repeat unnecessarily, but instead builds on what others have said. Keeps to the point.</p>
	<p>Feedback: Below expectations 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Exceed expectations</p>	
<p>Self-Presentation (SP)</p>	<p>Below expectations</p> <p>Fidgets, looks down, reads from slides/notes; poor pronunciation and body language; presents material that is rushed, unpolished, or sloppy.</p>	<p>Exceed expectations</p> <p>Uses good body language, elocution; displays confidence. Presents material in digestible and professional manner.</p>
	<p>Feedback: Below expectations 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Exceed expectations</p>	

SAMPLE OF ASSESSMENT COMPONENT**e. Team Case Research Study Presentation (30 min)**

- i. Pick an Asia-based company (e.g. Shopee, BreadTalk, Osim) that are currently regional/international but with the potential to be more global in their business (therefore, no SIA, Keppel, Sembawang and others that are already fairly well established globally). Give a brief description of its business.
- ii. Outline in what ways this company can become more global (i.e. what should its strategy be to become a global player). In doing so, also highlight its comparative advantages, its unique business propositions, its key success factors, the challenges it will face, etc. Use all research means, including interviewing the company (if need be) to complete the study.

f. Individual Research Essay (10 to 15 pages, double-spacing):

You are to write an essay on one of the suggested topics (below). The following are some suggested topics. Students can opt to write on any global marketing-related topics so long as permission is obtained from your instructor.

1. Can politics ever be detached from business? Why and why not? Cite examples, including those from various industries, to support your arguments. How then can companies overcome the influence of politics in developing global business strategies?
2. What's the roles of creativity and innovation in the development of global business strategies and markets? What practical ways/steps can companies (especially those from Asia) take to ensure that they can improve in these areas? What roles can governments and tertiary institutions play in these areas?
3. High technology, digitalization and artificial intelligence have arrived in the world in the most impressive and massive ways. How would they affect the ways businesses will be conducted globally?
4. In global business competition, is there scope for smaller players? How can smaller players grow in this highly competitive world (Note: All global companies started as small, e.g. Dell, Microsoft, Kentucky Fried Chicken, etc.)
5. What is your assessment of the current US-China trade frictions? Will it get better or worse in the future, and who will win? How would such frictions affect the relationships of these two countries in other areas?
6. Any other topic approved by your instructor. You need to speak to your instructor by Week 05.