Social Entrepreneurship for Local Change
Online Seminar 2018 – Assessment Sheet Assignment 3

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

Evaluation of the Business Plan (1) – Group Part

Group name	
Group members	
Suggested grade	Passed/ Not Passed
Name tutor/assessor	
Assessment date	
Signature tutor/assessor	
The Business Plan (written documents) assessment criteria	
1. Logic and consistence *Is the feasibility likely?*	
2. Comprehensiveness *Have all chapters been addressed with similar quality?*	
4. Clarity of expression *(easy to comprehend, good articulation)*	
5. Formal quality of report *(orthography, readability, use of figures/tables)*	
6. Business model template	
Overall Comments	

Evaluation of the Business Plan (2) – Individual Part – compulsory assignment for maximum "Good+".

Name group member 1		
Individual part submitted	Yes/ No	
Logic and consistence *Is the feasibility likely*		30%
Comprehensiveness (key activities, key resources, partner and stakeholder network, financing needs, financial summary and P&L, social/environmental impact; master students only: social and ethical values, risk management) *Have all chapters been addressed with similar quality?*		60%
Overall Comment		
Grade:	Maximum "Good+" (90%)	

Grading scheme used:

Very good, very good- | Good+, good, good - | Satisfactory+, satisfactory, satisfactory- | Sufficient+, sufficient | Not passed

Name group member 2		
Individual part submitted	Yes/ No	
Logic and consistence *Is the feasibility likely*		30%
Comprehensiveness (key activities, key resources, partner and stakeholder network, financing needs, financial summary and P&L, social/environmental impact; master students only: social and ethical values, risk management) *Have all chapters been addressed with similar quality?*		60%

Overall Comment		
Grade:	**Maximum "Good+" (90%)**	
Grading scheme used: Very good, very good-	Good+, good, good -	Satisfactory+, satisfactory, satisfactory-	Sufficient+, sufficient	Not passed		
Name group member 3		
Individual part submitted	Yes/ No	
Logic and consistence *Is the feasibility likely*		30%
Comprehensiveness (key activities, key resources, partner and stakeholder network, financing needs, financial summary and P&L, social/environmental impact; master students only: social and ethical values, risk management) *Have all chapters been addressed with similar quality?*		60%
Overall Comment		
Grade:	**Maximum "Good+" (90%)**	
Grading scheme used: Very good, very good-	Good+, good, good -	Satisfactory+, satisfactory, satisfactory-	Sufficient+, sufficient	Not passed		
Name group member 4		
Individual part submitted	Yes/ No	
Logic and consistence *Is the feasibility likely*		30%
Comprehensiveness (key activities, key resources, partner and stakeholder network, financing		60%

needs, financial summary and P&L, social/environmental impact; master students only: social and ethical values, risk management) *Have all chapters been addressed with similar quality?*		
Overall Comment		
Grade:	**Maximum "Good+" (90%)**	

Grading scheme used:

Very good, very good- | Good+, good, good - | Satisfactory+, satisfactory, satisfactory- | Sufficient+, sufficient | Not passed

Evaluation of the Business Plan (2) – Individual Part – optional assignment for "Very good-" and "Very good".

Name group member 1		
Compulsory parts submitted	Yes/ No	
Comprehensiveness (decision-making process, marketing plan, financial management)		10%
Overall Comment		
Grade:	**"Very good-" to "Very good"** (only if all compulsory parts are "good+")	

Grading scheme used:

Very good, very good- | Good+, good, good - | Satisfactory+, satisfactory, satisfactory- | Sufficient+, sufficient | Not passed

Name group member 2		
Compulsory parts submitted	Yes/ No	
Comprehensiveness (decision-making process, marketing plan,		10%

financial management)		
Overall Comment		
Grade:	**"Very good-" to "Very good"** (only if all compulsory parts are "good+")	
Grading scheme used: Very good, very good- | Good+, good, good - | Satisfactory+, satisfactory, satisfactory- | Sufficient+, sufficient | Not passed		
Name group member 3		
Compulsory parts submitted	Yes/ No	
Comprehensiveness (decision-making process, marketing plan, financial management)		10%
Overall Comment		
Grade:	**"Very good-" to "Very good"** (only if all compulsory parts are "good+")	
Grading scheme used: Very good, very good- | Good+, good, good - | Satisfactory+, satisfactory, satisfactory- | Sufficient+, sufficient | Not passed		
Name group member 4		
Compulsory parts submitted	Yes/ No	
Comprehensiveness (decision-making process, marketing plan, financial management)		10%
Overall Comment		
Grade:	**"Very good-" to "Very good"** (only if all compulsory parts are "good+")	
Grading scheme used: Very good, very good- | Good+, good, good - | Satisfactory+, satisfactory, satisfactory- | Sufficient+, sufficient | Not passed		

Note: If the grades fall below "good+" in compulsory parts and above "very good-" in optional parts, the overall grade should be the average of all parts (both compulsory and optional).

Grading scheme used:

Very good, very good- / 100%, 95%

Good+, good, good- / 90%, 85%, 80%

Satisfactory+, satisfactory, satisfactory- / 70%, 60%, 55%

Sufficient+, sufficient | Not passed / 52%, 50% | <50%