In a group of 5, you have created an e-business for Business Proposal Presentation. This is the write-up of e-Business Plan.

You have the option to construct the written Business Proposal on your own OR in the same group of your Business Proposal Presentation. If you choose to complete the written Business Proposal in a group, make sure you include all group members' student ID and full name on the Title page. Only one student from each group should submit the proposal.

This project relates to your understanding of the technological infrastructure and functional requirements of a small to medium size e-business and to allow you to demonstrate your ability to research, analyse, synthesize, evaluate, and specify the requirements of a proposed e-business website in the plan. It is expected that you will demonstrate your learning, integration incorporation of the knowledge from this unit to establish a high quality e-business.

* Prepare a full e-Business Plan. [**Template provided here**](https://unicanberra.instructure.com/courses/10830/files/2869478?wrap=1)[Download Template provided here](https://unicanberra.instructure.com/courses/10830/files/2869478/download?download_frd=1)
* Word limit: 2000 words (+/- 10%) excluding end of text references.
* Late submission will result in a penalty of 5% reduced marks (per calendar day late).
* Use at least 10 sources including 5 academic sources to write a high quality e-Business Plan.
* In-text citations and reference list used in the e-Business Plan must follow UC Harvard author-date referencing system. The guide to UC Harvard author-date referencing is at <http://canberra.libguides.com/referencing/harvard>

Rubric

**Full E-Business Plan**

| Full E-Business Plan | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Ratings** | **Pts** |
| This criterion is linked to a learning outcomeIntroduction | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **10 to >8.4 Pts**  **HD**  Summary generated excitement, was brief, provided an overview of the business, and outlined main points. | **8.4 to >7.4 Pts**  **DI**  Summary was brief, provided an overview of the business, and outlined main points. | **7.4 to >6.4 Pts**  **CR**  Summary was brief, provided an overview of the business, and outlined most main points. | **6.4 to >4.9 Pts**  **Pass**  Summary was brief, provided an overview of the business, and outlined some main points. | **4.9 to >0.0 Pts**  **Fail**  Summary was brief and provided only an overview of the business OR an outline of main points. | **0 Pts**  **No marks** | | 10 pts |
| This criterion is linked to a learning outcomeThe E-Business: Product/service Plan | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **20 to >16.8 Pts**  **HD**  Description of the business, its main product/service, and its unique features was highly effective and detailed. | **16.8 to >14.8 Pts**  **DI**  Description of the business, its main product/service, and its unique features was effective and detailed. | **14.8 to >12.8 Pts**  **CR**  Description of the business, its main product/service, and its unique features were provided, but not effective. | **12.8 to >9.8 Pts**  **Pass**  Description of the business, its main product/service, and its unique features were provided, but without sufficient detail. | **9.8 to >0.0 Pts**  **Fail**  Description of the business, it was provided, but unique features were not. | **0 Pts**  **No marks** | | 20 pts |
| This criterion is linked to a learning outcomeIndustry and Market Analysis  (SWOT Analysis inclusive) | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **20 to >16.8 Pts**  **HD**  Analysis identified and described target consumer and competitors, as well as industry and/or product/service outlook. SWOT Analysis identified and described the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges. Personal and business strengths and weaknesses were considered. | **16.8 to >14.8 Pts**  **DI**  Analysis identified and described target consumer and competitors in detail. SWOT Analysis identified the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges. Either personal or business strengths or weaknesses were considered. | **14.8 to >12.8 Pts**  **CR**  Analysis identified and described target consumer and competitors in less detail. SWOT Analysis identified the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges. However, it is unclear whether it is for personal or business analysis. | **12.8 to >9.8 Pts**  **Pass**  Analysis identified target consumer and competitors. SWOT Analysis briefly covered the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges. | **9.8 to >0.0 Pts**  **Fail**  Analysis failed to provide at least one aspect of required information. SWOT Analysis failed to address at least one aspect. | **0 Pts**  **No marks** | | 20 pts |
| This criterion is linked to a learning outcomeMarketing and Web Presence | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **20 to >16.8 Pts**  **HD**  Desired company and/or product/service image was described. Marketing channels were described and appropriate for product/service. | **16.8 to >14.8 Pts**  **DI**  Desired image was described. Some marketing channels were described and appropriate for product/service. | **14.8 to >12.8 Pts**  **CR**  Some marketing channels were described and appropriate for product/service. Desired image was not described. | **12.8 to >9.8 Pts**  **Pass**  Some marketing channels were described but inappropriate for product/service. Desired image was not discussed. | **9.8 to >0.0 Pts**  **Fail**  Marketing channels provided weren’t described and/or were inappropriate for product/service. Image wasn’t discussed. | **0 Pts**  **No marks** | | 20 pts |
| This criterion is linked to a learning outcomeTaxation, Legal and Ethical Issues | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **10 to >8.4 Pts**  **HD**  Possible taxation, legal and ethical issues were identified and solutions described in detail. | **8.4 to >7.4 Pts**  **DI**  Possible taxation, legal and ethical issues were identified and some solutions provided. | **7.4 to >6.4 Pts**  **CR**  Some taxation, legal and ethical issues were identified and less than sufficient solutions provided. | **6.4 to >4.9 Pts**  **Pass**  Some taxation, legal and ethical issues were identified and no solutions provided. | **4.9 to >0.0 Pts**  **Fail**  Section failed to identify at least one aspect of required information. | **0 Pts**  **No marks** | | 10 pts |
| This criterion is linked to a learning outcomeConclusion | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **10 to >8.4 Pts**  **HD**  Plan was presented in great detail and it was consistently obvious there was great thought behind it. | **8.4 to >7.4 Pts**  **DI**  Plan was generally presented in great detail and appeared to have great thought behind it. | **7.4 to >6.4 Pts**  **CR**  Plan was generally presented in great detail and appeared to have some thought behind it. | **6.4 to >4.9 Pts**  **Pass**  Business plan was presented in some detail with some thought behind it. | **4.9 to >0.0 Pts**  **Fail**  Business plan was somewhat lacking in detail and seemed to lack much thought behind it. | **0 Pts**  **No marks** | | 10 pts |
| This criterion is linked to a learning outcomeProfessionalism: References and Grammar | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **10 to >8.4 Pts**  **HD**  Plan had no spelling or grammatical errors. The report follows a referencing style that complies with the Harvard author-date style, and the in-text citations are made purposefully. | **8.4 to >7.4 Pts**  **DI**  Plan had few spelling or grammatical errors. The report follows a referencing style that complies with the Harvard author-date style, and the in-text citations are mostly purposeful. | **7.4 to >6.4 Pts**  **CR**  Plan had few spelling or grammatical errors. The report follows a referencing style that mostly complies with the Harvard author-date style, though the intext citations are not made purposefully. | **6.4 to >4.9 Pts**  **Pass**  Plan was disorganised and had some spelling or grammatical errors. The report follows a referencing style that mostly complies with the Harvard author-date style, though the intext citations are not made purposefully. | **4.9 to >0.0 Pts**  **Fail**  Plan was disorganised and/or had many spelling or grammatical errors. The report follows a referencing style that does not comply with the Harvard author-date style, or only includes either the in-text citations or the reference list. | **0 Pts**  **No marks** | | 10 pts |
| Total points: 100 | | |