

Principles of Marketing					
Criteria	Performance descriptors			Total Marks	Marks awarded
	Developing	Proficient	Excellent		
Introduction: Company, Brand and Product	0-1	2-3	4-5	5	
	<p>There is incomplete or no company and brand description.</p> <p>Lacks information on key attributes of the innovative product/service.</p>	<p>Company and brand description is summarised, paraphrased and accurate.</p> <p>Key attributes of the innovative product/service are identified but lack supporting evidence.</p>	<p>Company and brand description is well written, succinct and clear.</p> <p>Key attributes of the innovative product/service are well argued and applied.</p>		
Internal (Micro) Analysis: Customer, Competitor & Company	0-5	6-10	11-15	15	
	<p>Lacks research from mostly relevant, up-to-date and credible sources on customers and competitors and does not build on research on the Company.</p> <p>Competitors' relative Strengths and Weaknesses are not understood in relationship to the reviewed company. Customer feedback on the company is lacking or purely descriptive only with no analysis.</p>	<p>Presents and describes research from mostly relevant, up-to-date and credible sources on customers and competitors and tries to build on research on the Company.</p> <p>Competitors' relative Strengths and Weaknesses are presented but may lack relationship to the reviewed company. Customer feedback on the company is only descriptive with no analysis.</p>	<p>Presents and describes research from relevant, up-to-date and credible sources on customers and competitors and builds on research on the Company.</p> <p>Competitors' relative Strengths and Weaknesses are presented. Customers' Social and other media feedback on the company is described and analysed in relation to company/ product's strengths and weaknesses.</p>		
External (Macro) Analysis: PESTEL	0-5	6-10	11-15	15	
	<p>Lacks research from mostly relevant, up-to-date and credible sources on some or all parts of the PESTEL. These parts are not all clearly described and applied to the product in question. Relationship between the research and the product is lost.</p> <p>Opportunities and Threats for the product/ company are poorly explored. Demographics are not fully comprehended.</p>	<p>Presents and describes research from relevant, up-to-date and credible sources on all parts of the PESTEL but not equally. These parts may not all be clearly described and applied to the product in question.</p> <p>Opportunities and Threats for the product/ company are partially explored. Demographics are not fully comprehended in relation to the consumer/ potential consumer.</p>	<p>Presents and describes research from relevant, up-to-date and credible sources on all parts of the PESTEL. These parts are clearly described and applied to the product in question.</p> <p>Opportunities and Threats for the product/ company are explored. Demographics, in particular, are a focus of the research.</p>		
SWOT Analysis	0-3	4-6	7-10	10	
	<p>Submission has no SWOT analysis or topics are mostly in the wrong sections. Topics mostly stand alone and do not appear in the prior sections.</p>	<p>Topics are mostly in the appropriate sections (e.g. strengths in strengths) but some are not. Some topics are stand alone and do not appear in the report.</p>	<p>All topics are in the appropriate sections. The SWOT is a summary of earlier sections and no items stand alone.</p>		
Marketing Strategy (S,T,D, P) & recommendations	0-9	10-16	17-20	20	
	<p>Market segmentation is applied inaccurately and earlier research is not in evidence or poorly used. The target market is not well defined and may not be measurable or accessible. A clear differentiation form similar products is not in evidence.</p> <p>Recommendations are unoriginal, irrelevant or inappropriate.</p>	<p>The market segments are somewhat defined and based on research presented in earlier sections. The Target market/s is clear but may not be measurable and accessible. The product is somewhat differentiated from its competitor set and positioning attempted.</p> <p>Recommendations demonstrate innovation and relate the product to market and come from research.</p>	<p>The market segments are clearly defined and based on research presented in earlier sections. Target market/s is measurable and accessible and paints a clear picture of the ideal customer. The product is clearly differentiated from its competitor set and a positioning statement is analysed or recommended.</p> <p>Recommendations demonstrate innovation and relate the product to market, and come from research.</p>		

<b>Marketing Mix (4 P's) &amp; recommendations</b>	<b>0-9</b>	<b>10-16</b>	<b>17-20</b>	<b>20</b>	
	<p>Students who receive this mark will be weak in 2 or more of the 4 P's. Their descriptions of product features may be unclear or inaccurate, channel types and intermediary levels might lack examples or a clear diagram.</p> <p>Descriptions of pricing strategies might show a weak understanding of one or more of the 5 main strategies discussed in the module and promotional themes and appeals not fully realised.</p> <p>Recommendations might be unfeasible because of a lack of supporting research or because of an inconsistency with earlier work.</p>	<p>Product branding, packaging, labelling and support (augmented) services are described. A recommendation on strategy for sustaining the product life lacks relevance or evidence. Channel types and levels are described with a diagram. A recommendation on a more effective channel may not show relationship of product to market to channel. The current pricing strategy (one of the 5 main) is loosely defined with examples.</p> <p>Recommendations arguing for another pricing strategy or defending the current one are not strong. Promotion analysis use examples to outline the Theme and Appeal.</p>	<p>Product branding, packaging, labelling and support (augmented) services are succinctly and clearly described. A recommendation on strategy for sustaining the product life is well made. Channel types and levels are described with a clear diagram. A recommendation on a more effective channel shows relationship of product to market to channel. The current pricing strategy (one of the 5 main) is defined with examples.</p> <p>Recommendations might argue for another pricing strategy or defend the current one. Promotion analysis use examples to outline the Theme and Appeal of current promotions. A recommendation here is permitted instead of one of the ones above.</p>		
<b>Clarity of thought</b>	<b>0-1</b>	<b>2-3</b>	<b>4-5</b>	<b>5</b>	
	<p>Viewpoint proffered is unclear, incoherent and under-developed.</p> <p>The author's voice is lacking.</p>	<p>Viewpoint proffered is discernible. However, it could be further elaborated and supporting considerations could be better linked.</p> <p>There is an attempt at putting forth a personal voice.</p>	<p>Viewpoint proffered is clear, coherent and well-developed.</p> <p>The author's voice is recognisable.</p>		
<b>Use of Evidence</b>	<b>0-1</b>	<b>2-3</b>	<b>4-5</b>	<b>5</b>	
	<p>Little or no evidence cited to support viewpoint.</p> <p>Evidence lacks relevance, reliability and recency.</p>	<p>Sufficient evidence cited to support viewpoint.</p> <p>Evidence cited is missing seminal works.</p>	<p>Evidence cited is relevant and sufficiently supports viewpoint put forth.</p> <p>Evidence cited is recent.</p> <p>Evidence cited is from reliable sources.</p>		
<b>Citations &amp; Referencing</b>	<b>0-1</b>	<b>2-3</b>	<b>4-5</b>	<b>5</b>	
	<p>Little or no in-text citations throughout essay. Referencing format does not follow the APA format. Insufficient sources referenced.</p>	<p>In-text citations done according to APA format with some mistakes. Referencing follows the APA format but with some mistakes. Sufficient resources referenced.</p>	<p>In-text citations done according to APA format with little or no mistakes. Referencing follows the APA format but with little or no mistakes. Sufficient and authoritative resources referenced.</p>		
<b>Formative comments on submission</b>				<b>100</b>	