Marketing Strategy UMKDWA-15-M Assessment Criteria

Student number: 23042987	**Marker: Mario Vafeas**

Criteria / Grading	Analysis and evaluation, Q1. (30%)	Recommendations, Q1. (40%)	Structure, presentation, referencing, Q1 (10%)	Reflection, Q2. (20%)
70-100% Distinction	Comprehensive identification, analysis, and evaluation of key issues. Thorough identification and assessment of alternative strategies. Excellent selection and application of theory.	Excellent and appropriate, with originality of thought. Excellent justification and detail. Consistent with issues raised in the analysis. Supported by accurate application of theory. Consideration of practical implications and how any constraints might be overcome.	Excellent standard of literacy, organization of material, and presentation. Referencing is excellent. Excellent integration of relevant literature from outside the module reading list.	Excellent analysis and evaluation of selected theory, identifying issues and practical implications, and recommending improvements. Contextualised to the case and to Nespresso.
60-69% Merit	Identifies most of the key issues in the case, and demonstrates good analysis and evaluation. Some consideration given to alternative strategies. Good selection and application of theory.	Good and largely appropriate. Good justification and reasonable detail. Largely consistent with issues raised in the analysis. Supported by largely accurate application of theory. Consideration of practical implications though may lack suggestions as to how any constraints might be overcome.	Good standard of literacy, organization of material, and presentation. Just a few referencing errors. Evidence of reading beyond the lecture slides.	Good analysis and evaluation of selected theory, identifying issues and practical implications, and recommending improvements. Contextualised to the case and to Nespresso.
50-59% Pass	Adequate analysis and evaluation but lacking depth. May miss some important issues. May not discuss alternative strategies. Limited selection and application of theory.	Adequate but not always realistic. Level of justification and detail could be improved. Not always consistent with issues raised in the analysis. Adequate, though not always accurate, application of theory to support recommendations. Limited consideration of practical implications and how constraints might be overcome.	Adequate standard of literacy, organization of material, and presentation. Referencing is adequate but there may be several errors or omissions. Limited evidence of reading beyond the lecture slides.	Adequate analysis and evaluation of selected theory, but with limited identification of issues and practical implications. May not identify improvements. May be general rather than contextualised.
<50% FAIL	Superficial analysis and evaluation, lacking breadth and depth. Misses important issues. No consideration of alternative strategies. Limited, unsystematic, and/or inaccurate application of theory.	Inadequate, mostly inappropriate, and lacking clarity. Lack of consistency with issues raised in the analysis. Limited theoretical support. Little or no consideration of challenges and risks associated with implementation.	Weak level of literacy, organization of material, and presentation. Several instances of incorrect or omitted references. Little or no evidence of reading beyond the lecture slides. May be significantly under or over word count.	Weak assessment of selected theory. Little or no attempt to identify implications or to recommend improvements. Likely to be general rather than contextualised.

	Feedback
Q1 **Report**	An excellent analysis and evaluation of the situation. You highlight key issues. It is well written. To improve this section, you could integrate more theory to help with your interpretation of your analysis. I like your positioning statement/strapline – very good! You argue the case well. The pricing strategy (maintaining a premium) is sensible but your argument for starting lower then raising the price, needs justification – it is difficult to raise prices at a faster rate than the competition unless your customers are unlikely to feel the pain. Do you have ideas for relationship building besides the loyalty card. Regarding the remaining 4Ps, some very good ideas which are feasible for a small business. Overall, good evidence of engaging with marketing theory.
Q2 **Reflection**	Excellent – some very good points with good contextualisation to the two case studies.