

# IVEY CEMS RESPONSIBLE LEADERSHIP CHALLENGE 2017

## CASE COMPETITION INSTRUCTIONS

---

### WELCOME

The CEMS Student Board is pleased to present the inaugural CEMS Responsible Leadership Challenge 2017, a responsible leadership case competition conducted entirely remotely. This virtual case competition provides an equal opportunity for all CEMS students across the globe to participate in the first CEMS event of its kind. The CEMS Student Board would also like to express its gratitude to the Ivey Business School without whom this challenge would not be possible.

**LEADERSHIP CHALLENGE COORDINATOR:** Josh Lebacqz, CEMS MIM Candidate 2018, Ivey Business School, Canada

Email: [Jlebacqz@uwo.ca](mailto:Jlebacqz@uwo.ca)

### TIMELINES

Date	Action
	<b>ROUND 1</b>
October 23	Registered teams gain access to the business case
October 29	Deadline to submit the completed deck to <a href="mailto:Jlebacqz@uwo.ca">Jlebacqz@uwo.ca</a>
	<b>ROUND 2</b>
November 9	Finalists are notified of their participation in the final round.
November 15	Deadline to submit the completed video to <a href="mailto:Jlebacqz@uwo.ca">Jlebacqz@uwo.ca</a>
Late November	<b>Winning Team is Announced</b>

### TEAMS

- Team size: 3 to 5 students per team.
- Students may form their own teams.
- Home CEMS students and visiting CEMS students at each school are eligible to be on a team.
- Multiple teams from one school are permitted.
- All team members must participate in the analysis of the case, in the preparation of the submission, and speak on the video.

### JUDGES

- Faculty from CEMS schools and corporate partners will be the judges.
- Josh will select the judges in consultation with CEMS Head Office.
- There will be an uneven number of judges, e.g. 3 or 5 judges.

### CASE PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

- The competition consists of two rounds - a first round for all teams and a final round for the short listed teams.
- All teams will prepare PowerPoint slides for their submission.

- The first slide of the PowerPoint submission must include Team name, CEMS School, and team member names.
- PowerPoint submissions submitted after the deadline will be penalized.  
Teams may prepare their video at the same time when preparing their PowerPoint slides.  
Short listed teams will prepare a 10 minute video presentation for review during the final round.

**Internet usage:** Teams are allowed to use public source data, through the Internet if desired. Teams are not allowed to access privileged teaching materials (e.g., teaching notes), contact the company that is the source of the case, use notes from other students, etc. As always, use your good judgment. You are also allowed to use textbooks and lecture materials from your courses.

### VIDEO PRESENTATION

- Teams which are short listed will provide a video presentation to be judged during the final round.
- The video should be no longer than 10 minutes.
- Each team member must present on the video. Dress code on the video is business attire.
- Each team is to say their team name, CEMS School, and team member names at the beginning of their video presentation.

**Teams email their completed presentations and videos Josh Lebacqz at [jlebacq@uwo.ca](mailto:jlebacq@uwo.ca) by the deadlines noted above.**

### SCORING

Each team will be evaluated based on the quality of their case analysis and presentation submissions. Judges will use the following scoring guidelines.

Score Range	Scoring Guidelines
90 - 100	An experienced group of consultants could not have done a better job with the analysis and presentation given the time constraints.
80 - 89	The analysis and presentation were competent and exceeded expectations, e.g. Presentation was done in a novel way that distinguished the team positively. Case facts were used in an unusually insightful piece of analysis.
70 - 79	The analysis and presentation were what would be expected of an MSc team. The analysis was thorough, accurate and without superfluous elements. The presentation was polished and clearly communicated all elements of the analysis in a compelling manner.
60 - 69	The analysis and presentation were competent but at least one significant element was missing, e.g. important case facts were missed or a relevant analytical opportunity may not have been taken.
59 and below	The analysis was weak and the presentation was poor and did not represent the minimum standard expected of a graduate student.