**Assessment Brief**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Academic year and term:** | 2022/23 – Semester A |
| **Module title:** | Global Strategic Management  |
| For further module description see above Module Brief. |
| **Type of assessment:** | Strategic report |
| **Assessment deadline:** | Formative assessment (Presentation slides): Friday 28th October 2022, 2pm through Turnitin Link**Summative Assessment** (Strategic report on CSR): **Tuesday 10th January 2023, 2pm through Turnitin link**  |

**Instructions for assessment: Summative components overview**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Components of summative assessment** | **Individual or group submission?** | **Word count** | **Weighting** | **Must Attempt****Y/N** | **Must Pass****Y/N** | **Sub-components** |
| Report (Strategic report on CSR) | Individual | max. 3,500 words | 100% | Yes | Yes | n/a |

Note that above table does not include the formative assessments and that formative assessments are not graded.

**Instructions for assessment**

You will systematically compare and contrast the two chosen companies with regards opportunities for developing corporate social responsibility initiatives and social and environmental innovations that can help to enhance their organisational success.

**Structure of submission**

Your strategic report should focus on two specific large global companies from the same sector/industry that have international operations. The report should address three questions (see below). Formative work in weekly seminars will guide students through analytical techniques and processes required to complete the task. Your strategic report should:

**Task 1:** Evaluate the external business environment and compare the dynamic capabilities of the two chosen companies. Contextualising (a) their relative competitiveness and (b) responses to globalisation of markets and technology (20%).

**Task 2:** Critically analyse and compare their current CSR initiatives and social and environmental innovations, in the context of their international operations, pointing out the relative advantages and risks of these (40%).
Make sure you evaluate the different stakeholders involved in sustainability and compare three CSR initiatives of your choice, all initiated or in partnership with the chosen two global companies.

**Task 3:** Assess and compare potential CSR strategies that enhance organisational success. Discuss the role of the sustainability offerings for a) long-term profitability and b) strategic partnering with society and governments in growth markets (30%).

A further 10% is available for clarity, structure, grammar, correct Harvard referencing and overall professional presentation showing clear report style.

Best answers will draw explicitly on Strategy, International Business and CSR concepts, tools, theories and analysis from the module and apply them to the chosen organisations. Clear referencing (Harvard system), professional presentation with appropriate diagrams/tables are required.

**Feedback upon summative draft in progress**

You may also seek oral feedback of your summative draft in progress.

Note that we will not provide any written or marks indicative feedback on drafts for summative assessment at any time. Should you perceive any formative feedback such way, then please note that it is not binding for your marking. Markers can also always change and you have no entitlement to be marked by the module convener or tutors.

**Additional instructions for re-sit**

The same assignment task as for the main assignment period applies to the re-sit, with further instructions see below.

**Re-sit deadlines will be published via Moodle. Visit the module’s Moodle site and check your Roehampton email account on a regular basis.** The school is not obliged to check whether you have noticed re-sit deadlines.

You are required to improve and resubmit your original work as well as adding a further reflective commentary in form of a 400-700 words Essay. You must resubmit your work using the specific re-sit Turnitin link on Moodle. This additional word count can be added on top of the original word count of this assignment, if you used the full word count.

The original marking criteria will still apply (see marking grid in Appendix) except that the 10% weighting for Presentation will be awarded instead to your additional Reflective Essay section. That is, a statement demonstrating how you learnt from the feedback and what you did differently the second time. Also reflect how the module contents could be beneficial as knowledge of best practices for a future management, public administration or advisory career.

If you did not submit work at the first opportunity, you cannot reflect on your feedback. However, in such case, your Reflection Essay section should reflect upon a) how the module’s concepts are informing the professions and open up areas of future empirical research and b) how the module contents could be beneficial as knowledge of best practices for your future management, public administration or advisory career.

If you were deferred at the first assessment opportunity you do not need to include the reflective piece as this is a first submission at a later date, not a re-sit.

The Reflective Essay is marked based on the criteria of Criticality and Evidence-based Logic of arguments. It is an independent writing task and no supervision will be provided for conducting the essay.

**Presentation**The strategic report should NOT exceed 3,500 words (excluding abstract and the list of references at the end) and demonstrate clear report style with relevant Harvard references. Appendices are allowed outside this limit but NO MORE than 6 pages.

Any written work should be spell-checked and a contents page should be included. Please use one font size throughout the report (e.g. Arial size 11 or Times New Roman size 12) in black ink. Use DIN A4 format and page margins of at least 2.5 cm or 1 inch.

**Reading list**

**Essential readings**

**Carroll, A & Shabana, K (2010)** The Business Case for Corporate Social Responsibility: A Review of Concepts, Research and Practice, *International Journal of Management Reviews,* 12(1), 85-105

**Chandler, D. (2016)** *Strategic Corporate Social Responsibility: Sustainable Value Creation.* London, Sage.

**Johnson, G., Whittington, R., Scholes, K., Angwin, D. & Regner, P. (2017).** *Exploring Strategy: Texts and Cases. (*11h ed.) London: Pearson.

**Porter, M.E. & Kramer, M.R. (2011)** Creating shared value: How to reinvent capitalism and unleash a wave of innovation and growth. *Harvard Business Review* 89(1–2), 62–77.

**Porter, M. (1996)** What is Strategy? *Harvard Business Review*. Nov-Dec pp. 61–78.

**Rugman, A. & Verbeke, A. (2004)** A perspective on regional and global strategies of multinational enterprises. *Journal of International Business Studies* 35(1), 3–18

**Whittington, R., Regner, P., Angwin, D., Johnson, G., & Scholes, K**. (2020) Exploring Strategy: Texts and Cases. (12th ed.) Harlow, Pearson.

**Recommended and Further Readings**

**Bernstein, E., Bunch, J., Canner, N., & Lee, M. (2016)** Beyond the holacracy hype. *Harvard Business Review* 94(7–8), 38–49.

**Cohen, B. & Munoz, P. (2017)** Entering conscious consumer markets: Toward a new generation of sustainability strategies. *California Management Review* 59(4), 23–48.

**Crane, A. & Matten, D. (2016)** *Business Ethics*. (4th ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Fassin, Y. (2008)** The stakeholder model refined. *Journal of Business Ethics* 84(1), 113–135.

**Fisher, C. & Lovell, A. (2013)** *Business Ethics and Values.* (4th ed.) Harlow: Pearson.

**Ghemawat, P. (2001)** Distance still matters: The hard reality of global expansion. Harvard Business Review 79(8), 137–47.

**Goold, M. & Alexander, M. (1998)** Corporate strategy and parenting theory. Long Range Planning 31(2), 308–314.

**Porter, M.E. (1990)** The competitive advantage of nations. Harvard Business Review 68(2), 73–93.

**Porter, M.E. & Kramer, M.R. (2006)** Strategy and society: The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. *Harvard Business Review* 84(12), 78–92.

**Saloner, G., Shepard, A., & Podolny, J. (2001)** *Strategic Management*. New York: Wiley & Sons.

**Taglioni, D. & Winkler, D. (2016)** *Making Global Value Chains Work for Development*. World Bank Group. (https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/24426/9781464801570.pdf)

**World Bank (2017)** *Global Value Chain Development Report 2017*. (https://www.wto.org/english/res\_e/booksp\_e/gvcs\_report\_2017.pdf)

**How will your work be assessed?**

Your work will be assessed by a subject expert who will use both the marking criteria provided in the section “Instructions for assessment” and 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: Mitigating Circumstances Policy

**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
* **Stop Five** – Your mark and feedback is processed by the Office and made available to you.

**Appendix: Marking rubric for Summative assessment**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rubric category**(range)**Assigned mark >>****\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_****Marking criteria****(weight out of 100** | **Outstanding****100** | **Excellent**(80-89)**85** | **Very Good**(70-79)**75** | **Good****(**60-69)**65** | **Adequate**(50-59**)****55** | **Marginal fail**(40-49)**45** | **Fail**(30-39)**35** | **Fail**(20-29)**25** | **Not Done****0** |
| **Refers to Task 1:** Compare the external business environments and the dynamic capabilities of the two chosen companies…**(20%)** | Impressive elaboration with all aspects of the task fully addressed in detail. Excellent work with data and critical inquiry that demonstrates superior knowledge of the literature as well as the firms analysed.  | Excellent elaboration with all aspects of the task fully addressed. Good work with data and critical inquiry.  | Robust link between external environment and the two chosen companies is established. Very good elaboration of facts, detail and critical analysis; a) relative competitiveness and b) globalisation are addressed appropriately. | Sufficient link between external environment and the two chosen companies is established. Good elaboration of facts, detail and critical analysis; a) relative competitiveness and b) globalisation are addressed appropriately. | Fair work with a less effective introduction to the report, companies and industry. A patchy grasp of business environment (internal & external) and strategic issues. However, a) relative competitiveness and b) globalisation are addressed in a relevant manner. | Some relevant comments made but no systematic addressing of a) relative competitiveness and b) globalisation. | Failed to sufficiently discuss two chosen companies in relevant context and not addressing either a) relative competitiveness *or* b) globalisation. | Failed to discuss two chosen companies in relevant context and not addressing a) relative competitiveness and b) globalisation. | No attempt to include any relevant material. |
| **Refers to Task 2:** Critically analyse and compare their current CSR initiatives and social and environmental innovations…**(40%)** | Work of outstanding quality that is fluent, extremely well structured & question focused. A fully reasoned identification, definition and comparison of at least 3 CSR initiatives and social environmental innovations plus first class understanding and application of Stakeholder mapping. Outstanding application of relevant strategy and CSR theories.Outstanding discussion of advantages and risks. Overall, an outstanding section. | High quality work with an excellent identification, definition and comparison of at least 3 CSR initiatives and social environmental innovations plus an excellent understanding of Stakeholder mapping. Excellent application of relevant strategy and CSR theories. Excellent discussion of advantages and risks. Overall, an excellent section.  | Quality work with a very good identification, definition and comparison of at least 3 CSR initiatives and social environmental innovations plus a very good understanding of Stakeholder mapping. Very good application of relevant strategy and CSR theories. Very good discussion of advantages and risks. Overall, a very good section.  | Sound work with a good identification, definition and comparison of at least 3 CSR initiatives and social environmental innovations plus a good understanding of Stakeholder mapping. Good application of relevant strategy and CSR theories. Good discussion of advantages and risks. Overall, a good section.  | Fair work with adequate identification, definition and comparison of at least 3 CSR initiatives and social environmental innovations plus adequate understanding of Stakeholder mapping. Adequate application of relevant strategy and CSR theories. Adequate discussion of advantages and risks. Overall, an average section.  | Basic work with a superficial identification, definition and comparison of at least 3 CSR initiatives and social environmental innovations plus a limited understanding of Stakeholder mapping. Insufficient and weak application of relevant strategy and CSR theories. Unconvincing discussion of advantages and risks. Overall, only a basic section.  | Inadequate work with a poor or limited identification, definition and comparison of at least 3 CSR initiatives and social environmental innovations plus a poor/limited understanding of Stakeholder mapping. Poor/limited/no application of relevant strategy and CSR theories. Poor/limited discussion of advantages and risks. Overall, a weak section.  | Obviously poor work with no/ very limited identification, definition and comparison of at least 3 CSR initiatives and social environmental innovations plus a no/limited understanding of Stakeholder mapping. No/very limited application of relevant strategy and CSR theories. No/very limited discussion of advantages and risks. Overall, an excellent section. Overall, an obviously failing section.  | No attempt to include any relevant material. |
| **Refers to Task 3:** Assess and compare potential CSR strategies that enhance organisational success…**(30%)** | Work of outstanding quality that is fluent, extremely well structured & question focused.There is an outstanding analysis of how CSR strategies can improve policies and practices as well as enhance organisational success. Outstanding application of relevant knowledge of the nexus between strategy and CSR as a business activity. Ends with an outstanding contextually concise conclusion. Critical writing. | High quality work with an excellent analysis of how CSR strategies can improve policies and practices as well as enhance organisational success. Excellent application of relevant knowledge of the nexus between strategy and CSR as a business activity. Ends with an excellent contextually concise conclusion. Critical writing. | Quality work with a sound analysis of how CSR strategies can improve policies and practices as well as enhance organisational success. A very good application of relevant knowledge of the nexus between strategy and CSR as a business activity. Ends with a very good contextual conclusion. Critical writing. | Sound work with a fair analysis of how CSR strategies can improve policies and practices as well as enhance organisational success. A good application of relevant knowledge of the nexus between strategy and CSR as a business activity. Ends with a good contextual conclusion. Critical writing.  | Fair work with a reasonable analysis of how CSR strategies can improve policies and practices as well as enhance organisational success. An adequate application of relevant knowledge of the nexus between strategy and CSR as a business activity. Ends with a satisfactory contextual conclusion. Critical writing. | Basic work with only a superficial grasp of analysis of how CSR strategies can improve policies and practices as well as enhance organisational success. A superficial application of relevant knowledge of the nexus between strategy and CSR as a business activity. Ends with a satisfactory conclusion. Uncritical about CSR from a profits, reputation vs. costs appraisal. | Inadequate work with a poor grasp of analysis of how CSR strategies can improve policies and practices as well as enhance organisational success. Inadequate application of relevant knowledge of the nexus between strategy and CSR as a business activity. Ends with a poor conclusion. Uncritical about CSR from a profits, reputation vs. costs appraisal. | Obviously, poor work with no grasp of analysis of how CSR strategies can improve policies and practices as well as enhance organisational success. No application of relevant knowledge of the nexus between strategy and CSR as a business activity. Ends with a no conclusion. Uncritical about CSR from a profits, reputation vs. costs appraisal. | No attempt to include any relevant material |
| **Refers to all tasks:****Presentation****(10%)*****(This marking criterion does not apply to Re-sit.)*** | Outstanding and flawless. | Professional presentation. Clear, concise, and effectively argued within the length allowed; skilled use of academic conventions; accurate proof-reading. | Very good presentation, control of length; skilled use of academic conventions; nearly all errors eliminated in proof-reading. | Competent presentation, control of length; good use of academic conventions; accurate spelling, grammar, etc.; careful proof-reading. | Length requirements observed; appropriate use of academic conventions; minor errors in spelling, grammar etc.; quite careful proof-reading.  | Presentation is either too long or too short; some errors in application of academic conventions; some errors in spelling, grammar etc.; some indication of proof-reading.  | Poorly presented work; presentation is either too short or too long (waffling); missing several elements or parts; major errors in spelling, grammar etc.; little indication of proof-reading. | Very poorly presented work; presentation is inadequate, unfocused, and not at all clear; missing several key elements or parts; poor spelling; no indication of proof-reading. | Missing. Wholly incorrect or not attempted. |