ASSIGNMENT GUIDE

MANAGING STRATEGY, OPERATIONS AND PARTNERSHIPS (SG7001)

Assignment Title: Strategic Report with supportive quizzes
(4500 Words report and Moodle quizzes)

University of East London

Weighting: 100%
Due date / time: **03.01.24 / 23:59 hrs**
and Week 5, 7, and 9.

Assignment Guide

Module:	**Managing Strategy, Operations and Partnerships (SG7001)**
Module Leader:	**Dr Shohail Choudhury**
Assignment Title:	**Strategic Report with supportive quizzes**
Assignment Length:	**4500 Words report and Moodle quizzes**
Issue Date:	**2nd October 2023**
Task 1 Class Quizzes:	**Week 5, 7 and 9 in the seminars.**
Task 2 Submission Deadline:	**3rd January 2024 23.59 hrs. via Turnitin**

Assessment Brief

Background

This assignment gives you the opportunity to think strategically and apply your understanding critically to the operations of a real-world organisation facing a changing contemporary environment. For Task 1, you will undertake a series of quizzes during the module seminars and based on previous weeks' learning. The knowledge you acquire during this process will support you in the substantial Task 2 assignment of producing a strategic report. The knowledge, application, problem-solving and strategic thinking acquired in this module are relevant to the current graduate job market.

Weighting: 100%
Due date / time: 03.01.24 / 23:59 hrs and Week 5, 7, and 9.
Learning outcomes assessed: 1 – 9 (refer to page #9)

ASSESSMENT TASKS

You will complete two different assignment tasks. You will carry out the tasks throughout the term and finally you will submit these as one piece of coursework.

No	Assessment Task	Weighting	Extent	Modality	Deadline	To submit on:
1	Classroom quizzes and activities. Time constrained, in class with tutor.	30%	3 Quizzes	Individual	Week 5, 7, and 9.	**Turnitin**
2	**A strategic report for an organisation.** **Abstract of Report (For Formative feedback)**	70% ----	**Report** **(4500 words)** **500 words**	**Individual** **Individual**	**3rd Jan 2024** **Week 10**	**Turnitin** **Turnitin**

Details of the tasks

Task 1: Classroom Quizzes (30%)

During the seminars you will complete quizzes on Moodle to assess your knowledge of the previous weeks' learning. The quizzes will be mostly multiple-choice questions (MCQs) based on case studies. The seminar tutor will allow you a set amount of time to complete each quiz. The quizzes will help you to apply the theory you have learned and will support you in Task 2.

You will be able to use your mobile phone to take these quizzes on Moodle, but a laptop will be more convenient.

There will be 3 quizzes worth 30% of your total assessment.

Task 2: A Strategic Report (70%): 4500 words

Taking the role of a strategy consultant, hired to help a given organisation achieve sustainable competitive advantage, produce a succinct and compelling report for the attention of the CEO.
- Read the brief for the consultants (provided separately) and identify the strategic problem of the organisation.
- Using appropriate models and frameworks analyse the company's external environment. This includes understanding the company's industry, competitors, and macroeconomic environment.
- Evaluate the company's core competencies. These are the resources and capabilities that give the company a sustainable competitive advantage.
- Based on your analysis develop a set of strategic options that the company can pursue to achieve sustainable competitive advantage.
- Evaluate strategic options in terms of feasibility, attractiveness, and risk.
- Based on your evaluation, recommend a set of realistic and evidence-based options that the company should pursue.
- Write a report for the CEO that outlines your analysis and recommendations. Your recommendations should be logical and feasible, and they should be supported by the evidence.

Formative Submission: Week 10.

You will have the opportunity of getting feedback multiple times from your tutor. So, always bring your work to the seminar sessions.

Finally, in week 10, you will have to submit a brief 500-word abstract of your proposed evaluation. The abstract should detail the following:
- The nature of the external forces that will be analysed.
- The strategic frameworks that will be deployed.
- The operational resources that will be evaluated.
- Your tentative recommendations.

Grading:

To pass this module, you need to identify, analyse and prioritise key strategic challenges that the organisation faces. You can use evidence from the organisation's past performance, its industry, and the competitive landscape to inform your report. You also need to use appropriate tools, models, and theories of strategic management to structure your analysis. Explain why you chose to use these tools and models, and any potential limitations of their use. You will need to consider the operational resources of the organisation and how they can be deployed.

Assignments attracting higher marks will be sophisticated and critical in their analysis by way of considering the impact of the challenges on the organisation's performance, its resources and capability to compete, and its long-term sustainability. You will draw on a range of quality academic and professional sources to evidence your work.

Assessment Criteria

Learning Outcome	Marking Criteria	Weight
	Task 1: Classroom Quizzes (30%)	
1-9		
	Quiz 2: Week 5	10%
	Quiz 3: Week 7	10%
	Quiz 4: Week 9	10%
	Task 2: Strategic Report (70%)	
1,2,3,	Demonstrate critical understanding of the theory and practice of strategic development and operations.	40% of Task 2
4,5,6,7	Apply a range of tools and techniques of strategic and operational analysis	40% of Task 2
8,9	Submitting a succinct business report applying strategic thinking to suggest a strategic direction of the organization with credible recommendations	20% of Task 2

Marking Rubric:

Criteria	80% and Above	70%	60%	50%	40% and Below
Analysis of External Environment (20%)	- Exceptional use of models and frameworks to comprehensively analyse the company's external environment, showcasing a deep understanding of the industry, competitors, and macroeconomic factors. - Demonstrates an exceptional ability to critically discuss the relevance and application of theoretical concepts. - Outstanding academic writing with precise and accurate referencing. - Presents a well-structured argument with exceptional clarity. - Exceptional presentation structure with no major issues. - Highly engaging and insightful analysis.	- Good use of models and frameworks to analyse the company's external environment, demonstrating a good understanding of the industry, competitors, and macroeconomic factors. - Discusses the relevance and application of theoretical concepts effectively. - Good academic writing with mostly accurate referencing. - Presents a well-structured argument with good clarity. - Good presentation structure with minor issues. - Engaging and insightful analysis.	- Adequate use of models and frameworks to analyse the company's external environment, demonstrating a basic understanding of the industry, competitors, and macroeconomic factors. - Provides a superficial discussion of the relevance and application of theoretical concepts. - Adequate academic writing with some referencing errors. - Presents an argument with limited clarity. - Adequate presentation structure with some issues. - Analysis lacks depth and insights.	- Limited use of models and frameworks to analyse the company's external environment, demonstrating a weak understanding of the industry, competitors, and macroeconomic factors. - Fails to discuss the relevance and application of theoretical concepts effectively. - Poor academic writing with significant referencing errors. - Presents an argument with little clarity. - Poor presentation structure with major issues. - Analysis lacks depth and insights.	- Minimal or no use of models and frameworks to analyse the company's external environment, demonstrating a complete lack of understanding of the industry, competitors, and macroeconomic factors. - Does not discuss the relevance and application of theoretical concepts. - Extremely poor academic writing with severe referencing errors. - Fails to present a coherent argument. - Presentation structure is entirely inadequate. - Analysis is absent or irrelevant.

Criteria	80% and Above	70%	60%	50%	40% and Below
Evaluation of Core Competencies (20%)	- Exceptional evaluation of the company's core competencies, demonstrating a profound insight into the resources and capabilities that provide a sustainable competitive advantage. - Exceptional critical discussion of the application of theory. - Outstanding academic writing with precise and accurate referencing. - Presents a well-structured argument with exceptional clarity. - Exceptional presentation structure with no major issues. - Highly engaging and insightful evaluation.	- Good evaluation of the company's core competencies, demonstrating a strong understanding of the resources and capabilities that provide a sustainable competitive advantage. - Effectively discusses the application of theory. - Good academic writing with mostly accurate referencing. - Presents a well-structured argument with good clarity. - Good presentation structure with minor issues. - Engaging and insightful evaluation.	- Adequate evaluation of the company's core competencies, demonstrating a basic understanding of the resources and capabilities that provide a sustainable competitive advantage. - Provides a superficial discussion of the application of theory. - Adequate academic writing with some referencing errors. - Presents an argument with limited clarity. - Adequate presentation structure with some issues. - Evaluation lacks depth and insights.	- Limited evaluation of the company's core competencies, demonstrating a weak understanding of the resources and capabilities that provide a sustainable competitive advantage. - Fails to discuss the application of theory effectively. - Poor academic writing with significant referencing errors. - Presents an argument with little clarity. - Poor presentation structure with major issues. - Evaluation lacks depth and insights.	- Minimal or no evaluation of the company's core competencies, demonstrating a complete lack of understanding of the resources and capabilities that provide a sustainable competitive advantage. - Does not discuss the application of theory. - Extremely poor academic writing with severe referencing errors. - Fails to present a coherent argument. - Presentation structure is entirely inadequate. - Evaluation is absent or irrelevant.

Criteria	80% and Above	70%	60%	50%	40% and Below
Development of Strategic Options (20%)	- Exceptional development of strategic options, demonstrating creativity and innovation in proposing strategies for achieving sustainable competitive advantage. - Exceptional critical discussion of the feasibility, attractiveness, and risks associated with each option. - Outstanding academic writing with precise and accurate referencing. - Presents a well-structured argument with exceptional clarity. - Exceptional presentation structure with no major issues. - Highly engaging and insightful development of options.	- Good development of strategic options, demonstrating creativity and innovation in proposing strategies for achieving sustainable competitive advantage. - Effectively discusses the feasibility, attractiveness, and risks associated with each option. - Good academic writing with mostly accurate referencing. - Presents a well-structured argument with good clarity. - Good presentation structure with minor issues. - Engaging and insightful development of options.	- Adequate development of strategic options, demonstrating a basic level of creativity in proposing strategies for achieving sustainable competitive advantage. - Provides a superficial discussion of the feasibility, attractiveness, and risks associated with each option. - Adequate academic writing with some referencing errors. - Presents an argument with limited clarity. - Adequate presentation structure with some issues. - Development of options lacks depth and insights.	- Limited development of strategic options, demonstrating a weak level of creativity in proposing strategies for achieving sustainable competitive advantage. - Fails to discuss the feasibility, attractiveness, and risks associated with each option effectively. - Poor academic writing with significant referencing errors. - Presents an argument with little clarity. - Poor presentation structure with major issues. - Development of options lacks depth and insights.	- Minimal or no development of strategic options, demonstrating a complete lack of creativity in proposing strategies for achieving sustainable competitive advantage. - Does not discuss the feasibility, attractiveness, and risks associated with each option. - Extremely poor academic writing with severe referencing errors. - Fails to present a coherent argument. - Presentation structure is entirely inadequate. - Development of options is absent or irrelevant.

Criteria	80% and Above	70%	60%	50%	40% and Below
Recommendations (20%)	- Exceptional recommendations that are logical, feasible, and evidence-based, drawing extensively from the analysis and evaluation. - Exceptional critical discussion of the rationale behind each recommendation. - Outstanding academic writing with precise and accurate referencing. - Presents a well-structured argument with exceptional clarity. - Exceptional presentation structure with no major issues. - Highly engaging and insightful recommendations.	- Good recommendations that are logical, feasible, and evidence-based, well-supported by the analysis and evaluation. - Effectively discusses the rationale behind each recommendation. - Good academic writing with mostly accurate referencing. - Presents a well-structured argument with good clarity. - Good presentation structure with minor issues. - Engaging and insightful recommendations.	- Adequate recommendations that are generally logical and feasible but may lack depth in evidence-based support. - Provides some rationale behind each recommendation. - Adequate academic writing with some referencing errors. - Presents an argument with limited clarity. - Adequate presentation structure with some issues. - Recommendations lack depth and insights.	- Limited recommendations that lack logical feasibility and evidence-based support. - Fails to provide a clear rationale behind each recommendation. - Poor academic writing with significant referencing errors. - Presents an argument with little clarity. - Poor presentation structure with major issues. - Recommendations lack depth and insights.	- Minimal or no recommendations provided. - Recommendations are entirely illogical, infeasible, and lack any evidence-based support. - Does not provide any rationale behind recommendations. - Extremely poor academic writing with severe referencing errors. - Fails to present a coherent argument. - Presentation structure is entirely inadequate. - Recommendations are absent or irrelevant.

Criteria	80% and Above	70%	60%	50%	40% and Below
Report for the CEO (20%)	- Exceptional report for the CEO, characterized by its logical flow, clarity, and relevance. - Exceptional ability to communicate complex ideas in a clear and concise manner. - Outstanding academic writing with precise and accurate referencing. - Exceptional presentation structure with no major issues. - Highly engaging and insightful report.	- Good report for the CEO, demonstrating a logical flow, clarity, and relevance. - Effectively communicates ideas in a clear and concise manner. - Good academic writing with mostly accurate referencing. - Good presentation structure with minor issues. - Engaging and insightful report.	- Adequate report for the CEO, with some issues related to flow, clarity, or relevance. - Communicates ideas with limited clarity. - Adequate academic writing with some referencing errors. - Adequate presentation structure with some issues. - Report lacks depth and insights.	- Limited report for the CEO, with significant issues related to flow, clarity, or relevance. - Communicates ideas with little clarity. - Poor academic writing with significant referencing errors. - Poor presentation structure with major issues. - Report lacks depth and insights.	- Minimal or no report provided for the CEO. - Report is entirely illogical, unclear, or irrelevant. - Fails to communicate ideas effectively. - Extremely poor academic writing with severe referencing errors. - Fails to present a coherent report. - Presentation structure is entirely inadequate. - Report is absent or irrelevant.

MODULE AIMS AND LEARNING OUTCOMES

In this module, you will learn how to create, evaluate, and improve a business strategy and its operations. You will also learn about the challenges and practices of a strategic manager and how organisations manage their day-to-day activities.

At the end of this module, you will be able to:

Knowledge
1. Demonstrate critical understanding of the theory and practice of strategic development and operations.
2. Evaluate the impact of current and emerging trends on organizations.

Thinking skills
3. Demonstrate the ability to effectively analyse problems and issues employing a range of appropriate concepts, theories and approaches.
4. Analyse and synthesize contextual information.
5. Think strategically and assess the impact of strategic change processes.

Subject-based practical skills
6. Apply tools and techniques of strategic and operations analysis.
7. Explain how to influence the strategic direction of an organization. Skills for life and work (general skills)
8. Developing succinct business reports.
9. Judging complexity, diversity, and a multiplicity of perspectives accommodated in management decisions.

GENERAL RULES AND GUIDANCE FOR UEL ASSESSMENTS

Format, referencing and use of quotations.

Your work should be word processed in accordance with the following:

- Font size 12, using a Calibri sans serif font such as Arial or similar.
- 1.5 (minimum) line spacing or double line spacing is preferable
- The page orientation should be 'portrait' (large diagrams and tables can be in landscape orientation if that enables them to fit on fewer pages)
- Margins on both sides of the page should be no less than 2 cm.
- Pages should be numbered.
- **Your name should not appear on the script. – just student number (in some cases where your asked to provide certificates / evidence with you name on this usual rule does not apply)**
- Your student number should be included on every page.
- Harvard Style referencing shown Cite Them Right must be followed. https://www.citethemrightonline.com/

ASSESSMENT SUBMISSION

We strongly suggest that you try to submit all coursework by the deadline set as meeting deadlines will be expected in employment. However, in our regulations, UEL has permitted students to be able to submit their coursework up to 24 hours after the deadline. The deadline is published in this module guide. Coursework which is submitted late, but within 24 hours of the deadline, will be assessed but subjected to a fixed penalty of 5% of the total marks available (as opposed to marks obtained). If you submit twice, once before the deadline and once during the 24 hour late period, then the second submission will be marked and 5% deducted. If you miss the deadline for a genuine reason, you will need to apply for extenuating circumstances. Further information is available in the Assessment & Feedback Polic y at https://www.uel.ac.uk/Discover/Governance/Policies-Regulations-Corporate-documents/Student- Policies (click on other policies)

Use of Turnitin
Your assessment should be submitted on Turnitin. If you fail to submit, in accordance with the guidance provided you will be awarded a mark of 0.
There are two main reasons we want you to use Turnitin:

- Turnitin can help you avoid academic breaches and plagiarism. When you use Turnitin *before* a submission deadline, you can use the Originality Report feature to compare your work to thousands of other sources (like websites, Wikipedia, and even other student papers). Anything in your work that identically matches another source is highlighted for you to see. When you use this feature *before the deadline,* you will have time to revise your work to avoid an instance of academic breach/plagiarism.
- Turnitin saves paper. In using Turnitin to electronically submit your leadership assessment, you will not have to submit a paper copy.

Late Submissions Using Turnitin

UEL allows students to submit their coursework up to 24 hours after the deadline. Assessments that are submitted up to 24 hours late are still marked, but with a 5% deduction. However, you

have to *be very careful when you are submitting your assessment*. If you submit your work twice, once using the original deadline link and then again using the late submission link on Turnitin, your assignment will be graded as late with the 5% deduction.

Turnitin System Failure

Best advice: Don't wait until the last minute to submit your assessment electronically. If you experience a problem submitting your work with Turnitin, you should notify your lecturer/tutor by email immediately. However, deadlines are not extended unless there is a significant systems problem with Turnitin. UEL has specific plans in place to address these issues. If UEL finds that the issue with the system was significant, **you will receive an email notifying you that you have been given a 24 hour extension**. **If you don't receive an email the original deadline will NOT have been extended.**

Guidance on Referencing

Cite them Right is the standard Harvard referencing style at UEL This book will teach you all you need to know about Harvard referencing, plagiarism and collusion. The electronic version of "Cite Them Right: *the essential referencing guide"* 9th edition, can be accessed whilst on or off campus, via UEL Direct. The book can only be read online and no part of it can be printed nor downloaded.
Further information is available at:
https://uelac.sharepoint.com/LibraryandLearningServices/Pages/default.aspx

J. STUDENT FEEDBACK

UEL values student feedback and there are lots of channels for gathering your views. Module evaluation is your opportunity to provide feedback on your learning and teaching experience of studying on your modules. All undergraduate and taught postgraduate students are provided with the opportunity to contribute feedback on their experience for each module that they study.

Opportunities for student feedback on the module including end of module evaluation. If you consider you have feedback to give that points to something you feel you are needing to assist in your studies, please also discuss it with your module leader or seminar tutor.