

10-12 June 2022

Dell Technologies Management Challenge 2022 Case Study Management task

Dear Dell Technologies Management Challenge Participant:

As part of the Dell Technologies Management Challenge 2022, we would like to cordially welcome you to the Case Study Management Challenge element of the competition which focuses on this year's theme of **sustainability**.

This guidance is designed to accompany the PDF case study entitled **DTMC 22 - Shake Shack Case Study**. You are required to read this case study before you attempt to answer the questions below. Be aware that no further research beyond the details provided in the case is necessary. It is not beneficial, and no additional scores will be provided for doing so. The case study itself provides the basis for what you need and the rest comes from your team discussion and the analysis you undertake of the data and insights provided in the case study.

Case Study Summary:

In 2021 Shake Shack was a fast, casual restaurant chain with a strong focus and great efforts on sustainability and corporate responsibility. Despite its stated environmental commitments, however, its core product offering—the hamburger—was extremely taxing on the environment.

Between 2009 and 2021, various new alternative protein sources had emerged that were much more sustainable and environmentally friendly. Shake Shack's chief executive officer had to make some decisions. Should the company's products shift away from beef toward alternative protein sources? If so, which of these new products should Shake Shack consider and over what timeline?

Your case study questions

1. *Is Shake Shack an environmentally friendly company? Justify your answer.*
2. *Could Shake Shack be accused of 'greenwashing'?*
3. *Should Shake Shack shift away from primarily offering beef hamburgers to offering 'hamburgers' made from plant-based meat, lab meat or insect protein? If yes, when should the company make this shift?*
4. *What promotional tactics would you recommend for companies that are trying to introduce alternative products?*

The format of your response

When developing your analysis to address these questions, please compile your response either in a Word document or PowerPoint slide deck with a 1,000 word limit. You can submit your case analysis at **ANY** time before the **deadline on Saturday 11th June 2022 at 7.30pm**

HOW TO SUBMIT?

Please email your submissions to Gareth.ludkin@run4wales.org before the deadline stated above.

- Please save your case study analysis file (*MS Word or PowerPoint*) with your team name.
- Email your case study submission to Gareth.ludkin@run4wales.org
- Once emailed, please send a text to 07906 888599 confirming email sent (*we may need to check junk files*)
- Please inform Hattie Jardine at registration that you have emailed your submission, if you have completed this before arriving at the event.
- Strong 4G signal is available at Racquety Farm for all teams but, unfortunately, we are not able to offer wi-fi.

GUIDELINES

Work time: You may use any time from receiving the case study to the submission deadline to work on your case analysis. Tables, and time in a quiet working space at our event HQ will be provided for teams who arrive on Friday 10th June between 2pm and 5pm to work on the case analysis as a team.

Support: Please do not hesitate to contact any member of the Event Management Team if you wish to discuss any questions related to the case analysis at your convenience. Account Manager Hattie Jardine will be on hand at the registration desk for any advice on submission of the case analysis.

Scoring: Teams have the opportunity to reduce their overall time score by up to 60 minutes based on their performance on this case study which will be scored as follows. The number of minutes allocated to your team and thereby deducted from your total time in final count back is calibrated as follows:

Scoring Band (%)	Minutes deducted from final score
90 to 100	60
80 to 89	54
70 to 79	48
60 to 69	42
50 to 59	36
40 to 49	30
30 to 39	24
20 to 29	18
10 to 19	12
0 to 9	6

Good luck with your deliberations and we look forward to reading your case analyses.

Professor Rob Morgan, Cardiff Business School
Gareth Ludkin, Event Manager

Case study sponsored by:



Assessment Rubric for Case Analysis

Criterion	Poor (<49%)	Pass (50-59%)	Satisfactory (60-69%)	Good (70-79%)	Excellent (80%+)
Key issues identified	Problem definition is unclear or not logical; Little attempt to define the focus chosen; is too simple or too limited.	Problem definition is not fully clear; limited attempt to define the focus chosen and/or focus is too wide; lacks sufficient level of ambition.	Problem definition is clear; attempt to define the focus chosen; set at a minimum level of ambition.	Clear and well-defined problem and focus, set at a level of ambition broadly appropriate.	Clear and well-defined problem definition and focus; displaying unusual insight and skill to identify focus and argue for choice made. Set at a level of ambition at the top level.
Quality of the case analysis (beyond description)	Discussion of the case is lacking; no demonstration of critical skills in assessing and reviewing the case.	Insufficient and mostly intuitive discussion of the case; limited demonstration of critical skills in assessing and reviewing the case.	Sufficient discussion of the case; moderate demonstration of critical skills in assessing and reviewing the case.	Extensive and mostly correct discussion of the case; clear demonstration of critical skills and good use of analysis in assessing and reviewing the case.	Exhaustive discussion of the case; excellent demonstration of critical skills and analysis in assessing and reviewing the case.
Overall argumentation and coherence	Argumentation quality and consistency across sections is poor. No real arguments are given, or all arguments given had significant problems.	Argumentation quality and consistency across sections insufficient. Very few arguments given, and some arguments given had major problems.	Argumentation quality and consistency across sections sufficient. There were some reasonable arguments, yet a few had minor problems.	Argumentation quality and consistency across sections good. Many good arguments were given, with only minor problems.	Argumentation quality and consistency across sections excellent. Very strong and persuasive arguments throughout. An engrossing read, a powerfully expressed and persuasive argument with strong analytical rigour.



Creativity & originality	Little evidence of creativity or originality.	Some attempt to present creative ideas and points of view, but they distract from the purpose of the case answers.	Attempts to present creative ideas and original points of view, but they do not substantially add to the value of the case answers.	Shows some level of creativity in ideas presented, limited original points of view that enhance the value of case answers.	Shows a high level of creativity in ideas presented with very original points of view that enhance the value of the case answers.
Structure	Very poorly conceived structure of paragraphs and sections. Incohesive, unclear, and disorganized throughout.	Poorly conceived structure of many paragraphs and sections. Incohesive, mostly disorganized presentation.	Somewhat cohesive structure of paragraphs and sections; clear presentation in some parts but not overall.	Cohesive structure; organization of presentation is mostly clear and orderly in all parts.	Consistently cohesive structure; completely clear and orderly presentation.

Case study sponsored by:

