

Team Name \_\_\_\_\_

**Part 2 Feasibility Plan Analyses Grading Rubric (print and submit as a separately stapled doc with your plan)**

Requirements Each section is also evaluated for use of class terminology	Possible percent	Actual Percent	Exceeds expectation	Meets expectation	Below expectation	What happened?
	<b>Company summary:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concise and accurate understanding of the company strengths/weaknesses</li> <li>• Strengths/weaknesses of brand/product line</li> </ul>	10%		10	8-9	6-7
<b>Technical feasibility:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough discussion of raw materials, land, labor, etc., needed to produce the product in country with comments about their adequacy.</li> <li>• Reasonable list and discussion about potential intermediaries, channel structures, and transportation options.</li> </ul>	20%		20	16-19	11-15	0-10
<b>Financial feasibility:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concise, thorough, and well-applied (versus purely facts) country economic analysis.</li> <li>• Production cost estimate relate to market potential figures in the market analysis section (part 1).</li> <li>• Facilitating payments addressed</li> <li>• Company analysis applied to financial capability for product introduction.</li> </ul>	20%		20	16-19	11-15	0-10
<b>Organizational feasibility:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legal and political issues described well and related to the marketing effort whenever possible.</li> <li>• Company organization recommendation is logical from previous discussions. Pros/cons and details thoroughly discussed.</li> </ul>	20%		20	16-19	11-15	0-10
(next page)						

Team Name \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Conclusion:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SWOT is insightful, thorough, well justified, and a good summary everything in parts 1 and 2 of this study (neither a long laundry list nor nothing new).</li> <li>• Entry risks are logical and likely</li> <li>• Clear recommendation that follows previous analyses</li> </ul>	15%		15	12-14	10-11	0-10
<b>Research depth:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary research good (if needed)</li> <li>• Secondary research substantial and high quality</li> <li>• Research used well to support the text</li> </ul>	10%		10	8-9	6-7	0-5
<b>Overall professionalism and depth:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insightful (versus pure data dump)</li> <li>• Writing and grammatical errors/typos</li> <li>• Overall logic and flow of plan</li> <li>• Within 8 page limit</li> </ul>	5%					
Total points	<b>100%</b>					

**Comments**