

# Social Entrepreneurship (BUSI-2500W)

## Assignment Rubrics & Skill Development Guide

Winter 2025-26

### Overview: Building Three Core Competencies

Social entrepreneurship requires mastery of three interconnected communication skills:

- **FRAMING:** Defining problems and solutions in compelling, strategic ways
- **PERSUASION:** Convincing diverse stakeholders to support your vision
- **CRITICAL ANALYSIS:** Evaluating claims, identifying assumptions, and thinking rigorously

This rubric document shows how each assignment develops these skills and how they build toward your final portfolio.

## Assignment Calendar

All small writing assignments (1-5) must be submitted via Visible AI. The portfolio integrates and revises these assignments. Plan ahead to manage your workload effectively.

Date	Week	Topic / Assignment Due
Jan 6	1	Historical Emergence
Jan 13	2	Excitement About SE
Jan 20	3	Levers of Positive Change
Jan 27	4	SE Beyond Heroism: Management Under Stress
<b>Feb 3</b>	<b>5</b>	Impact: Trend, Pressure, Reality   <b>DUE: Assignment 1 - Problem Framing Statement (6%)</b>
Feb 10	6	Scaling Wisely: Prioritizing Impact
<i>Feb 17</i>	—	<i>Reading Week</i>
<b>Feb 24</b>	<b>7</b>	Ecosystems, Somewhat Unstitched   <b>DUE: Assignment 2 - Stakeholder Persuasion Deck (6%)</b>
Mar 3	8	Social Value Creators
<b>Mar 10</b>	<b>9</b>	Reporting to Revolution: Choose Your Lens   <b>DUE: Assignment 3 - Critical Analysis of SE Case (6%)</b>
<b>Mar 17</b>	<b>10</b>	Scaling Creatively (Strategy)   <b>DUE: Assignment 4 - Impact Theory of Change (6%)</b>
<b>Mar 24</b>	<b>11</b>	Ecosystems Together/Conclusion (Strategy)   <b>DUE: Assignment 5 - Peer Analysis (6%)</b>
<b>Mar 31</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>FINAL PITCH PRESENTATIONS (20%)</b>
<b>Apr 6</b>	—	<b>DUE: Portfolio - Case Study OR Prototype (25%)</b>

**Note:** Yellow highlighting = Small assignments (via Visible AI). Green highlighting = Major assignments. Portfolio due after presentations so you can incorporate feedback from your pitch.

## Skills Progression Map

Assignment	Framing	Persuasion	Critical Analysis
1. Problem Framing Statement (0.5 pg)	<b>PRIMARY</b>	—	—
2. Stakeholder Persuasion Deck (1-2 pg)	Supporting	<b>PRIMARY</b>	—
3. Critical Analysis of SE Case (1-2 pg)	—	—	<b>PRIMARY</b>
4. Impact Theory of Change (1 pg)	Both	Both	—
5. Peer Analysis (1 review)	—	Supporting	<b>PRIMARY</b>
<b>Portfolio (6-7 pg)</b>	<b>SYNTHESIS</b>	<b>SYNTHESIS</b>	<b>SYNTHESIS</b>

# Assignment 1: Problem Framing Statement (half page, 6%)

## Primary Skill: FRAMING

Frame a social or environmental problem in a way that makes the need for entrepreneurial intervention compelling. Define the problem strategically, identify root causes vs. symptoms, and articulate why your framing matters.

Criteria	Performance Levels
<b>Problem Definition</b>	<p><b>Excellent:</b> Defines a clear, specific problem with compelling evidence; distinguishes root causes from symptoms; explains why this framing matters</p> <p><b>Good:</b> Defines a clear problem with some evidence; mostly distinguishes causes from symptoms</p> <p><b>Satisfactory:</b> Defines a problem but lacks specificity or evidence; may confuse causes and symptoms</p> <p><b>Needs Work:</b> Problem is vague, generic, or poorly defined</p>
<b>Strategic Framing</b>	<p><b>Excellent:</b> Makes strategic choices about scope, scale, and stakeholders; explains why this framing opens opportunities for action</p> <p><b>Good:</b> Shows some strategic thinking about framing; addresses scope or stakeholders</p> <p><b>Satisfactory:</b> Limited strategic thinking; framing is conventional or unclear</p> <p><b>Needs Work:</b> No evidence of strategic framing choices</p>
<b>Writing Quality</b>	<p><b>Excellent:</b> Clear, concise, compelling writing; professional tone; error-free</p> <p><b>Good:</b> Clear writing with minor errors; appropriate tone</p> <p><b>Satisfactory:</b> Adequate writing with some clarity issues or several errors</p> <p><b>Needs Work:</b> Unclear, disorganized, or many errors</p>

## Assignment 2: Stakeholder Persuasion Deck (1-2 pages, 6%)

### Primary Skill: PERSUASION

Write a persuasive pitch deck (written or slide format) to a specific stakeholder (investor, community partner, board member, or potential customer) convincing them to support or engage with your social enterprise. Develop audience awareness, persuasive argumentation, and ability to tailor messages to different stakeholder interests.

Criteria	Performance Levels
<b>Audience Analysis</b>	<p><b>Excellent:</b> Demonstrates deep understanding of stakeholder interests, concerns, and motivations; tailors message precisely</p> <p><b>Good:</b> Shows good understanding of stakeholder; mostly tailors message appropriately</p> <p><b>Satisfactory:</b> Basic understanding of stakeholder; limited tailoring</p> <p><b>Needs Work:</b> Generic message; little evidence of audience analysis</p>
<b>Persuasive Strategy</b>	<p><b>Excellent:</b> Uses compelling evidence, logical arguments, and emotional appeals appropriately; anticipates and addresses objections</p> <p><b>Good:</b> Uses evidence and logical arguments; addresses some objections</p> <p><b>Satisfactory:</b> Some evidence and arguments; limited attention to objections</p> <p><b>Needs Work:</b> Weak or absent argumentation; no evidence or logic</p>
<b>Professional Quality</b>	<p><b>Excellent:</b> Professional presentation; confident tone; appropriate formality; clear call to action; excellent visual design (if slides)</p> <p><b>Good:</b> Mostly professional; adequate tone and formality; has call to action; good visuals</p> <p><b>Satisfactory:</b> Somewhat professional; may be too casual or formal; unclear call to action; basic visuals</p> <p><b>Needs Work:</b> Unprofessional; inappropriate tone; no call to action; poor visuals</p>

## Assignment 3: Critical Analysis of SE Case (1-2 pages, 6%)

### Primary Skill: CRITICAL ANALYSIS

Analyze an existing social enterprise, evaluating its theory of change, business model, and claimed impact. Identify strengths, weaknesses, and unstated assumptions. Develop ability to read critically, question claims, and identify gaps between rhetoric and reality.

Criteria	Performance Levels
<b>Depth of Analysis</b>	<b>Excellent:</b> Thoroughly examines theory of change, business model, and impact claims; identifies unstated assumptions; goes beyond surface-level observations <b>Good:</b> Examines key elements; identifies some assumptions; mostly moves beyond description <b>Satisfactory:</b> Describes more than analyzes; limited examination of assumptions <b>Needs Work:</b> Purely descriptive; no real analysis
<b>Critical Thinking</b>	<b>Excellent:</b> Questions claims with evidence; identifies rhetoric vs. reality; considers alternative perspectives; balanced assessment <b>Good:</b> Questions some claims; notices some gaps; attempts balance <b>Satisfactory:</b> Limited questioning; mostly accepts claims at face value; unbalanced <b>Needs Work:</b> No critical questioning; accepts all claims uncritically
<b>Evidence &amp; Support</b>	<b>Excellent:</b> Uses specific evidence from the enterprise and external sources to support analysis; properly cited <b>Good:</b> Uses evidence to support most claims; mostly cited properly <b>Satisfactory:</b> Limited evidence; some citations missing <b>Needs Work:</b> Little or no evidence; poor or no citations

## Assignment 4: Impact Theory of Change (1 page, 6%)

### Primary Skills: FRAMING + PERSUASION

Create a written theory of change that explains the causal pathways from your social enterprise's activities to its intended long-term social/environmental impact. This assignment combines framing (how you define the problem and solution) with persuasion (convincing readers your logic is sound).

Criteria	Performance Levels
<b>Logical Flow</b>	<b>Excellent:</b> Clear causal chain from activities → outputs → outcomes → impact; each link is logical and explained <b>Good:</b> Mostly clear causal chain; most links are logical <b>Satisfactory:</b> Some causal connections; some logical gaps <b>Needs Work:</b> Unclear or missing causal connections; illogical jumps
<b>Assumptions &amp; Evidence</b>	<b>Excellent:</b> Identifies key assumptions and supports them with evidence; acknowledges uncertainties <b>Good:</b> Identifies some assumptions; provides some evidence <b>Satisfactory:</b> Limited attention to assumptions or evidence <b>Needs Work:</b> Makes unexamined assumptions; no supporting evidence
<b>Clarity &amp; Persuasiveness</b>	<b>Excellent:</b> Explains complex causal logic clearly; persuasively demonstrates how change will happen <b>Good:</b> Mostly clear explanation; reasonably persuasive <b>Satisfactory:</b> Somewhat clear; limited persuasiveness <b>Needs Work:</b> Unclear or unpersuasive

## Assignment 5: Peer Analysis (1 review, 6%)

### Primary Skill: CRITICAL ANALYSIS

Write a constructive, professional peer review of a classmate's case study or feasibility study. Develop critical thinking, professional feedback skills, and ability to analyze others' framing and persuasive strategies.

Criteria	Performance Levels
<b>Substantive Feedback</b>	<b>Excellent:</b> Identifies specific strengths and weaknesses; analyzes framing, persuasion, and logic; offers concrete suggestions for improvement <b>Good:</b> Identifies strengths and weaknesses; offers some suggestions <b>Satisfactory:</b> Generic observations; limited specific feedback <b>Needs Work:</b> Vague or superficial; no actionable feedback
<b>Professional Tone</b>	<b>Excellent:</b> Constructive, respectful, encouraging tone; balances critique with support; professional language <b>Good:</b> Mostly constructive and respectful; professional <b>Satisfactory:</b> Somewhat constructive; may be overly critical or vague <b>Needs Work:</b> Harsh, dismissive, or unprofessional
<b>Critical Analysis</b>	<b>Excellent:</b> Examines underlying assumptions, logic, and evidence; questions claims appropriately; considers alternatives <b>Good:</b> Some examination of assumptions and logic; some questioning <b>Satisfactory:</b> Limited critical analysis; mostly surface-level observations <b>Needs Work:</b> No critical analysis; purely subjective reactions

## Portfolio: Case Study or Prototype (6-7 pages, 25%)

**Skills: SYNTHESIS of FRAMING + PERSUASION + CRITICAL ANALYSIS**

This portfolio brings together and revises your semester work, demonstrating growth in framing, persuasion, and critical analysis. Choose one option: (A) Case Study Portfolio analyzing an existing social enterprise, or (B) Prototype Portfolio developing a feasibility study for a new social enterprise. Both options require substantial revision based on feedback, integration of multiple assignments, and a reflection on your development.

### Overall Portfolio Criteria

Criteria (40%)	Performance Levels
<b>Integration &amp; Synthesis (15%)</b>	<p><b>Excellent:</b> Seamlessly integrates multiple assignments into cohesive document; clear through-line; well-organized; not just stapled together</p> <p><b>Good:</b> Integrates most elements; mostly cohesive; generally well-organized</p> <p><b>Satisfactory:</b> Some integration; somewhat disjointed; organization needs work</p> <p><b>Needs Work:</b> Little integration; just pieces stuck together; poor organization</p>
<b>Revision Quality (10%)</b>	<p><b>Excellent:</b> Substantial revision based on feedback; clear improvements; demonstrates learning and growth</p> <p><b>Good:</b> Good revision; addresses most feedback; shows improvement</p> <p><b>Satisfactory:</b> Minor revision; addresses some feedback</p> <p><b>Needs Work:</b> Little or no revision; ignores feedback</p>
<b>Reflection (10%)</b>	<p><b>Excellent:</b> Thoughtful reflection on development in framing, persuasion, and critical analysis; specific examples; honest self-assessment</p> <p><b>Good:</b> Good reflection with some specifics; addresses all three skills</p> <p><b>Satisfactory:</b> Basic reflection; limited specifics; may miss some skills</p> <p><b>Needs Work:</b> Superficial or missing reflection</p>
<b>Professional Quality (5%)</b>	<p><b>Excellent:</b> Publication-ready; clear writing; error-free; professional formatting; proper citations</p> <p><b>Good:</b> Professional quality with minor errors; good formatting; mostly proper citations</p> <p><b>Satisfactory:</b> Adequate quality; some errors; basic formatting; some citation issues</p> <p><b>Needs Work:</b> Poor quality; many errors; weak formatting; citation problems</p>

### Content-Specific Criteria

Criteria (60%)	Performance Levels
<b>Framing (20%)</b>	<p><b>Excellent:</b> Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of how framing shapes understanding; strategic choices are clear and justified; problem/solution framing is compelling</p> <p><b>Good:</b> Shows good understanding of framing; makes reasonable strategic choices; framing is clear</p> <p><b>Satisfactory:</b> Basic understanding of framing; limited strategic thinking; framing is conventional</p> <p><b>Needs Work:</b> Weak or absent framing; no strategic thinking</p>
<b>Persuasion (20%)</b>	<p><b>Excellent:</b> Compelling case for the venture; uses evidence, logic, and appropriate emotional appeals; anticipates and addresses objections; clear stakeholder analysis</p> <p><b>Good:</b> Makes good case; uses evidence and logic; considers stakeholders</p> <p><b>Satisfactory:</b> Basic case; limited evidence; limited stakeholder consideration</p> <p><b>Needs Work:</b> Weak or unconvincing case; little evidence or logic</p>
<b>Critical Analysis (20%)</b>	<p><b>Excellent:</b> Rigorous analysis of theory of change, business model, and impact; questions assumptions; identifies strengths AND weaknesses; considers context; balanced assessment</p> <p><b>Good:</b> Good analysis of key elements; questions some assumptions; mostly balanced</p> <p><b>Satisfactory:</b> Basic analysis; limited questioning; unbalanced</p> <p><b>Needs Work:</b> Weak or superficial analysis; no critical thinking</p>

## Final Pitch Presentation (20%)

### Skills: Oral communication of FRAMING + PERSUASION + CRITICAL ANALYSIS

Each individual/group will present their case study or prototype during the final class of this course. Presentations should be 8-10 minutes and should effectively communicate your framing, make a persuasive case, and demonstrate critical awareness of limitations and challenges.

Criteria	Performance Levels & Points
<b>Substance (10 points)</b>	<b>9-10 pts:</b> Comprehensive coverage; demonstrates mastery of framing, persuasion, and critical analysis; insightful <b>7-8 pts:</b> Good coverage; demonstrates competence in all three skills <b>5-6 pts:</b> Adequate coverage; limited demonstration of skills <b>0-4 pts:</b> Insufficient content; skills not demonstrated
<b>Clarity (5 points)</b>	<b>5 pts:</b> Crystal clear; well-organized; easy to follow; effective use of visuals <b>3-4 pts:</b> Mostly clear; generally organized; adequate visuals <b>2 pts:</b> Somewhat unclear; disorganized; weak visuals <b>0-1 pts:</b> Confusing; very disorganized; poor or no visuals
<b>Style (5 points)</b>	<b>5 pts:</b> Confident, professional delivery; engaging; good eye contact; appropriate pace and volume <b>3-4 pts:</b> Professional delivery; mostly engaging; adequate presentation skills <b>2 pts:</b> Somewhat professional; limited engagement; presentation skills need work <b>0-1 pts:</b> Unprofessional; not engaging; poor presentation skills

### **Note on AI Use and Visible AI**

All small writing assignments (Assignments 1-5) must be submitted through Visible AI. This platform allows both you and the instructor to see how you're collaborating with AI tools. The goal is to help you develop effective, ethical AI collaboration skills while maintaining your own voice and critical thinking. Remember: you should be able to explain and defend every part of your work, whether AI-assisted or not.