

BCOBM111 BUSINESS MANAGEMENT (5 ECTS)

Academic year	2025/26
Semester/Term	Summer I

Participation in all assessment activities stated in this document is required. The minimum pass grade for the course is 70. Deadlines are always in Geneva time.

MINOR ASSESSMENTS

Task 2.1: Leadership and Motivation Discussion
Assessment type: Forum
Due: 10 July 14:00 CEST
Weight: 5%

Description: Which type of decision-making approach do you think is the best and which is your personal approach when taking business decisions?

Task 2.2: Main Challenges of Globalization
Assessment type: Forum
Due: 17 July 14:00 CEST
Weight: 5%

Description: Assess two key challenges that companies commonly face when they decide to expand internationally. For each challenge, explain its nature and discuss why it creates difficulties for firms operating across national borders.

Your forum posts must meet the following requirements:
 Submit a post (150-215 words) and respond to a peer (75-110 words)

ASSESSMENT 2 (FINAL)

Task 2.3: Strategic Analysis
Assessment type: Written assignment
Due: 27 July 14:00 CEST
Weight: 50%

Description: Choose one of the companies provided and undertake a strategic assessment using established analytical models such as PESTEL, Porter's Five Forces, and SWOT analysis to evaluate its internal and external environment.

INSTRUCTIONS

You will complete this task as an **individual piece of work**. For this assessment, you should assume the role of a **junior business analyst** working for a consultancy firm that has been asked to evaluate the strategic position of an international company.

As part of this consultancy project, you are required to select **one company** from the list below. Please note that work based on any company not included in this list **will not be accepted**:

1. Nike
2. Coca-Cola
3. Netflix
4. Microsoft

5. Meta Platforms

Your task is to prepare a **strategic assessment** of your chosen company to support managerial decision-making. To do this, you will analyse both the **external and internal business environment** using established business analysis frameworks:

- **PESTEL Analysis** - to examine the key political, economic, social, technological, environmental, and legal factors influencing the organisation's external macro-environment.
- **Porter's Five Forces Model** - to assess the competitiveness and structural characteristics of the industry in which the company operates.
- **SWOT Analysis** - to identify the company's internal strengths and weaknesses, as well as external opportunities and threats.

Your analysis should be presented in a **clear and logical structure** and demonstrate that you understand **how and why** each analytical model is applied. You should:

- Apply each framework accurately and appropriately to the chosen company.
- Use relevant real-world examples and supporting evidence where appropriate.
- Include suitable academic or credible business sources, referenced using **Harvard referencing** style.

This assessment provides you with an opportunity to demonstrate your ability to apply core business analysis tools to a real-world organisation and to communicate your findings in a clear, structured, and professional manner.

FORMAT

Your submission must meet the following formatting requirements:

Written Assignment

- **Number of files for submission:** 1
- **Required file format for submission:** PDF
 - **Word count:** 2,500 ±10% (excluding references and appendices)

All referencing and citations require **Harvard referencing style**. Students must avoid plagiarism and use the Harvard Referencing Guide and Turnitin to ensure that their sources are correctly cited.

Plagiarism includes the use of artificial intelligence tools (e.g. ChatGPT, Grammarly, or similar) when output is copied and pasted from these sites.

Students should also note that they must submit **new and original work** for every attempt. Submitting the same work for multiple assessments is considered an academic offence and may result in disciplinary action.

For further guidance, please refer to the **Academic Policies and Procedures Manual** and the **Student Good Practice Manual in AI Literacy** available on the Student Services page for further details.

Go to the next page.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

	Fail 0-59%	Borderline fail 60-69%	Fair 70-79%	Good 80-89%	Exceptional 90-100%
Forum	Posts reflect limited or inaccurate understanding of content, with frequent errors in terminology and minimal use of relevant concepts. Connections to course material or peers' posts are weak, unclear, or absent, and contributions do not advance the discussion. Collaboration is minimal, with little or no meaningful engagement with others' posts, often limited to brief agreement or irrelevant comments. Posts are inconsistently on time or frequently late, reducing their value to the forum. Professional conventions are often disregarded, with tone or language that lacks clarity, respect, or adherence to online communication standards.	Posts reflect basic understanding, with partial or vague use of key concepts and limited examples. Connections to course material and peers' contributions are minimal and may lack depth or clarity. Engagement with others is limited, mostly agreeing without adding new perspectives or elaboration. Posts are generally on time, though often submitted near the deadline, which may limit interaction. Shows inconsistent observance of conventions, with occasional issues in tone, grammar, or respect.	Posts show adequate understanding of content, using relevant concepts but with some inaccuracies or insufficient detail. Connections to course material and peers' posts are evident, though they may not consistently deepen discussion. Engagement with peers occurs, usually through agreement or limited elaboration. Posts are mostly timely, though not always early enough to stimulate extended interaction. Follows conventions generally, with a respectful tone and occasional minor lapses in clarity.	Posts reflect solid content knowledge, demonstrating appropriate use of concepts and terminology across most contributions. Ideas connect well to course topics and show relevance to professional practice. Contributions engage with peers effectively, often adding details, examples, or thoughtful questions that promote discussion. Posts are timely, submitted within deadlines, and support active participation. Mostly adheres to conventions, with clear, polite, and respectful communication; minor grammar or style issues may appear.	Posts demonstrate sophisticated understanding of content, with thorough and accurate use of relevant concepts and terminology. Contributions clearly link to course material and professional practice, offering insightful examples, critical reflections, or creative ideas. Engagement with peers is consistent and proactive, often prompting new perspectives or extending discussions. All posts are timely, fostering an active, ongoing forum dialogue. Exemplary adherence to online conventions, with respectful, polished, and professional communication throughout.

Written Assignment	Fail 0-59%	Borderline fail 60-69%	Fair 70-79%	Good 80-89%	Exceptional 90-100%
Purpose, Understanding & Content 25%	Work lacks a clear objective or relevance. Demonstrates limited understanding of basic concepts, with frequent factual errors and no real engagement with the topic. Content is sparse or off-topic, and lacks supporting evidence.	Some recognition of the task, but purpose is vague or weakly conveyed. Knowledge is superficial and patchy, with little integration of ideas or sources. Content may contain inaccuracies or generalisations.	Shows a basic grasp of the topic, with a mostly clear purpose. Some content is appropriate and relevant, though analysis is limited. Key ideas are addressed but not fully developed.	Demonstrates a sound understanding and a clear focus. Content is appropriate, generally accurate, and supported by relevant evidence. Shows engagement and some insight.	Purpose is clearly defined and sustained throughout. Demonstrates strong foundational knowledge and insight. Work is thoughtful, relevant, and well-supported by evidence. Shows emerging independent thinking.
Organisation & Coherence	Lacks structure or logical flow. Ideas are disjointed, with unclear	Some effort to structure the work, but ideas lack clear	Work follows a basic structure, with some logical progression of ideas. Introduction and	Ideas are logically organised with clear paragraphs and transitions.	Work is well-organised and coherent throughout. Structure enhances understanding and

ASSESSMENT BRIEF 2

20%	progression. Little or no attempt at introduction or conclusion.	sequence. Transitions are weak and may confuse the reader.	conclusion are present but may lack clarity.	Introduction and conclusion support the overall argument.	communication. Clear framing and effective transitions.
Communication & Expression 15%	Poor grammar and language use severely affect clarity. Tone is inappropriate. Writing or speaking is hard to follow.	Frequent language errors and inconsistent tone hinder communication. Presentation or writing lacks clarity or engagement.	Communication is generally clear with some minor errors. Tone is mostly appropriate, but expression may be clumsy or uneven.	Clear and effective communication. Few language errors. Presentation or writing is structured and mostly engaging.	Fluent, accurate, and engaging communication. Professional tone and strong audience awareness. Presentation is confident and effective.
Authenticity, Critical Thinking & Integration 20%	No evidence of critical thought. Work may be copied or rely on unexamined opinions. No integration of perspectives.	Limited independent thinking. Ideas may be borrowed or uncritical. Connections between concepts are weak.	Some basic critical thinking is evident. Attempts to explain or evaluate are present but undeveloped.	Work shows analysis and developing originality. Ideas are supported and connections are emerging.	Evidence of originality and reflection. Demonstrates sound judgement and early synthesis of ideas. Analytical engagement with the topic.
Use of Sources & Referencing 20%	Little or no use of sources. Referencing is incorrect or missing. May include plagiarism.	Sources are poorly chosen or used mechanically. Citation may be inconsistent. Weak grasp of academic integrity.	Uses appropriate sources with some citation errors. Integration is basic but generally appropriate.	Good range of relevant sources. Referencing is mostly correct and supports arguments. Shows awareness of academic practices.	Sources are well-integrated and relevant. Accurate referencing and strong understanding of academic conventions. Enhances argument.