

Case Study 1 Feedback

1. Try to keep the maximum slide number as 11 (cover slide + 10 slides). We have not been reducing the points now if the slide amount was over 10 slides on the Case Study 1
2. It's a good idea to include the title on the cover slide, e.g., "Localization of Method in the Caribbean, 2021". Also keep in mind the goal of this task is to focus on the new market adaptation and not improvements in general. It is not necessary to summarize the current Business Model Canvas components of the case e.g., on its own slide, but it's a good idea to refer to them when explaining the required modifications when localizing – e.g. when explaining revenue streams you can say that "the current Revenue Streams are x, on this new localization y,z are some additional revenue streams"
3. If you use external references, remember to mention them properly (use footnotes if possible)
4. Please elaborate the "observed links between components" (not just drawing lines between components) – e.g., pick 3-4 most important ones and explain them by words
5. Grading (1-5) with two decimals. I have graded each grading component (Knowledge richness, analytical sharpness, professionalism from 1-5 and then calculated a mean from them, e.g., 4.33). You can find the evaluation matrix below.
6. Visuals – make sure the presentation is easy-to-read (coherent text style on slides, same margins etc.)

GRADE 5	GRADE 3	GRADE 1
KNOWLEDGE RICHNESS		
Case business model and market both covered	Localization of components attempted	Business model canvas not covered
Links between business model boxes well explained	Links between business model boxes have some logic	Links between business model boxes not drawn
Clear legislative differences/limitations identified	Adaptation need somewhat specified (e.g. legislation)	Localization not discussed
Actual incumbents as partners discussed	Partnership type suggested	Partnering not discussed
ANALYTICAL SHARPNESS		
Relevant and interesting information, little self-evident text	Solid argumentation but no critical/evaluative value	Mostly self-evident basic stuff
Actual accurate data provided	Some numbers but seem to be for the sake of showing something	Mostly self-evident basic stuff
Intelligent linking or principles and practices	Some deep thinking	Mostly self-evident basic stuff
PROFESSIONALISM		
Text and visuals are both used in a balanced way	Basic M.Sc. level case reporting with some inadequacies	Minimum acceptable student level writing and visuals
Professional level summarizing and crystallizing	Standard writing but no particular merits in crystallizing	Too long/short writing makes report incomprehensible
<u>Proof-read</u> and polished	Some language or editing problems	Bad English and typos

Note: Grades 4 and 2 are between the grades, so e.g., grade 4 is above the requirements of grade 3 but does not meet the requirements of the grade 5.