

Assessment Type	Report – Case Study
Assessment Number	1
Assessment	Individual Assessment
Weighting	20%

Alignment with Unit and Course

Unit Learning Outcomes

ULO1: Apply knowledge and skills to complex problem solving in strategic marketing situation.
 ULO3: Recommend innovative marketing strategies to achieve desired goals and objectives
 ULO4: Persuasively argue proposition solutions and recommendations to professional peers

Graduate Attributes Assessed

GA 1: Communication
 GA 3: Research
 GA 4: Critical Thinking
 GA5: Ethical Behaviour
 GA6: Flexibility

Due Date/Time

Session 4

Process, structure and content:

The process of the case study analysis is as follows:

- The students will have to search for the Coca-Cola “Share a Coke” campaign as the case scenario. You have to identify a problem and recommend a course of action within a business situation. The case represents a complex situation with no apparent solution; therefore, it enables the students to improve their critical thinking and analytical abilities, evaluate source information and enhance their written communication.
- The case analysis has a word limit which will be strictly enforced of 2200 words. The intention is to focus on strategic analysis and consequent recommendation. **A simple reinstatement of case data and facts should be avoided.** Application of ideas with the use relevant marketing theory and concepts, models and frameworks will strengthen the quality of the analysis.
- The details of the case are **NOT** sufficient to respond to the given questions, in addition, it may be found that some of the materials presented in the case is outdated, hence the students are expected to find and use materials from other sources from the most recent and up-to-date information.
- The case should include references from peer-reviewed academic journals, textbooks, business magazines, industry whitepapers credible and reliable websites and marketing textbooks. It is expected that a minimum of **10** references are to be used for the analysis.

The structure of the case study analysis is a 2200-word report, the contents of which are detailed below. The wordcount of 2200 words is subject to plus or minus 10%. The wordcount does not include the executive summary, the table of contents, the list of references or any appendices. However, please note that appendices should be used for supplementary information only: they will NOT be considered for marking.

The report content will comprise of the following sections:

Title page: this must contain the title of the report (e.g. 'Coca Cola Share a Coke'), name and student number, unit name, unit number and date of submission.

Executive summary: an executive summary provides an overview of the ENTIRE report. It is NOT an introduction section. It is NOT a background section. The purpose of an executive summary is to provide an understanding of the case analysis without having to read the complete report. Ideally half to one page in length (but no longer), the executive summary should contain the key findings/key information of the case study. Do not use headings or titles in the executive summary; it should be written in essay narrative format and read seamlessly. The executive summary must be placed before the table of contents.

Table of contents (TOC): ideally, but not necessarily, constructed using the hyperlink functions in Word. Lists of figures and tables are not required.

Introduction to the case: the introduction is set the background information about the strategic marketing issues faced by the company, please note that this is the introduction to the case so DO NOT talk in detail about the chosen company or its industry.

Answer to the case questions: Answer ALL the questions by writing the answer in one section for each question, use the topic of the question as heading, you can also add subheadings to each heading if required:

You need to cover the following:

1. What is Coca-Cola's Marketing Strategy?
2. What is Coca-Cola's Target Audience?
3. What are "Share a Coke" Marketing Techniques?
4. What are the 4 Ps for Coca-Cola's Marketing Mix (Product, Pricing, Place and Promotion Strategies)?

List of references: this should be formatted in **Harvard style**.

For high marks, the case study analysis should show explicit use of MBA5003 theories, concepts and notions. **It is also vital that your work is guided by the marking rubric.**

Research expectation:

- The submission needs to be supported with information by credible sources (at least 10 sources).
- Credible sources should be varied and include, but not limited to, the Textbook, Government reports, Industry reports, Newspaper articles, Books, and Journal articles.
- Use the EBSCO Databases accessed through the Library and Learning Support page on Moodle to find journal articles, case studies and more to help you prepare

your assessment. Speak with the library assistants or email
(academicsuccess@aih.nsw.edu.au)

Assessment 1 – Case Study Analysis - Marking Rubric

Rubrics	Criteria	Marking Criteria				
		HD	D	C	P	F
ULO1: Apply knowledge and skills to complex problem solving in strategic marketing situation ULO3: Recommend innovative marketing strategies to Achieve desired goals and objectives ULO4: Persuasively argue Proposition, solutions and recommendation to professional peers 20 marks	Relevancy (5 marks)	Relevancy of discussion to the case questions is excellent (4.25 - 5 marks)	Relevancy of discussion to the case questions is very good. (3.75 – 4.24 marks)	Relevancy of discussion to the case questions is good. (3.25 – 3.74 marks)	Relevancy of discussion to the case questions is fair (2.5 – 3.24 marks)	Relevancy of discussion to the case questions is poor (0 – 2.49 marks)
	Quality of Case Presentation (5 marks)	Excellent quality and depth of analysis and interpretation (4.25 - 5 marks)	Very good quality and depth of analysis and interpretation (3.75 – 4.24 marks)	Good quality and depth of analysis and interpretation. (3.25 – 3.74 marks)	Fair quality and depth of analysis and interpretation (2.5 – 3.24 marks)	Poor quality and depth of analysis and interpretation (0 – 2.49 marks)
	Recommendation (2 marks)	Excellent quality and depth of analysis and interpretation (1.75 – 2.0 marks)	Very good quality and depth of analysis and interpretation (1.50 – 1.74 marks)	Good quality and depth of analysis and interpretation (1.25 – 1.49 marks)	Fair quality and depth of analysis and interpretation (1 – 1.24)	Poor quality and depth of analysis and interpretation (0 – 0.99 marks)
	Quality of Discussion (5 marks)	Excellent arguments and have addressed all questions (4.25 - 5 marks)	Very good arguments and have addressed all questions (3.75 – 4.24 marks)	Good arguments and have addressed all questions (3.25 – 3.74 marks)	Fair arguments and have addressed some of the questions (2.5 – 3.24 marks)	Poor arguments and do not address the questions (0 – 2.49 marks)
	References (3 marks)	Harvard referencing is accurate and complete. (2.5 - 3 marks)	Harvard referencing is accurate and mostly complete. (1.75 – 2.49 marks)	Harvard referencing is satisfactory. (1.5 – 1.74 marks)	Harvard referencing style is followed with errors. (1.5 – 1.49 marks)	Harvard referencing is full of errors, or not attempted. (0 – 1.49 marks)