Assessment (non-exam) Brief

Module code/name	MSIN0094 Marketing Analytics
Module leader name	Wei Miao
Academic year	2025/26
Term	1
Assessment title	Individual Assignment 1
Individual/group assessment	Individual

Submission deadlines: Students should submit all work by the published deadline date and time. Students experiencing sudden or unexpected events beyond your control which impact your ability to complete assessed work by the set deadlines may request mitigation via the extenuating circumstances procedure. Students with disabilities or ongoing, long-term conditions should explore reasonable academic adjustments. Students may use the delayed assessment scheme for pre-determined mitigation on a limited number of assessments in a year. Check the Delayed Assessment Scheme area on Portico to see if this assessment is eligible.

Return and status of marked assessments: Students should expect to receive feedback within 20 working days of their submission deadline, as per UCL guidelines. The module team will update you if there are delays through unforeseen circumstances (e.g. ill health). All results when first published are provisional until confirmed by the Examination Board.

Copyright Note to students: Copyright of this assessment brief is with UCL and the module leader(s) named above. If this brief draws upon work by third parties (e.g. Case Study publishers) such third parties also hold copyright. It must not be copied, reproduced, transferred, distributed, leased, licensed or shared with any other individual(s) and/or organisations, including web-based organisations, without permission of the copyright holder(s) at any point in time.

Academic Misconduct: Academic Misconduct is defined as any action or attempted action that may result in a student obtaining an unfair academic advantage. **Academic misconduct includes plagiarism, self-plagiarism, obtaining help from/sharing work with others be they individuals and/or organisations or any other form of cheating that may result in a student obtaining an unfair academic advantage.** Refer to Academic Manual Chapter 6, Section 9: Student Academic Misconduct Procedure - 9.2 Definitions.

Referencing: You must reference and provide full citation for ALL sources used, including articles, text books, lecture slides and module materials. This includes any direct quotes and paraphrased text. If in doubt, reference it. If you need further guidance on referencing please see UCL's referencing guide for students. Failure to cite references correctly may result in your work being referred to the Academic Misconduct Panel. For guidance on how to acknowledge the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) please see next section.

Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Tools in your Assessment: Your module leader will explain to you if and how AI tools can be used to support your assessment. In some assessments, the use of generative AI is **not permitted** at all. In others, AI may be used in an **assistive** role which means students are permitted to use AI tools to support the development of specific skills required for the assessment as specified by the module leader. In others, the use of AI tools may be an **integral** component of the assessment; in these cases the assessment will provide an opportunity to demonstrate effective and responsible use of AI. See page 3 of this brief to check which category use of AI falls into for this assessment. Students should refer to the UCL guidance on acknowledging use of AI and referencing AI. Failure to correctly acknowledge the use of AI in assessments may result in students being reported via the Academic Misconduct procedure. Refer to the section of the UCL Assessment success guide on Engaging with AI in your education and assessment.

Content of this assessment brief

Section	Content
A	Core information
B	Coursework brief and requirements
C	Additional information
D	Module learning outcomes covered in this assessment
E	Groupwork instructions (if applicable)
F	How your work is assessed

Section A: Core information

Submission date	27/10/2025
Submission time	2pm
Assessment is marked out of:	100
% weighting of this assessment within total module mark	30%
Maximum word count/page length/duration	1500 words
Footnotes, appendices, tables, figures, diagrams, charts included in/excluded from word count/page length?	Word count only applies to the plain text in your pdf report, excluding the words in code chunks, tables, figures, and charts. Since Turnitin is unable to differentiate the above, please report your own, accurate word count on the cover page.
Bibliographies, reference lists included in/excluded from word count/page length?	Excluded from word counts.
Penalty for exceeding maximum word count/number of pages specified above	Penalty for exceeding specified word count/number of pages will be a deduction of 10 percentage points, capped at 40% for Levels 4, 5, 6 and 50% for Level 7). Refer to Academic Manual: Module Assessment – Word Counts.
Penalty for late submission	Standard UCL penalties will apply. Students should refer to Academic Manual: Module Assessment – Deadlines and Late Assessment.
Artificial Intelligence (AI) category	Not permitted
Submitting your assessment	Please fill in your answers on the .qmd answer sheet first, and then render the .qmd file to a PDF document, with should include both codes chunks, output from code chunks (if any), and your normal text. Very important: Only submit the PDF document instead of the .qmd file. And please double check your results before rendering (if your code has errors, you will still get a PDF report)Insert instructions for submission
Anonymity of identity. Normally, <u>all</u> submissions are anonymous unless the nature of the submission is such that anonymity is not appropriate, illustratively as in presentations or where minutes of group meetings are required as part of a group work submission	The nature of this assessment is such that anonymity is required.
Feedback release date (Students with extended deadlines may receive feedback later; multiple extensions may delay feedback to the cohort; ill health in the marking	10/11/2025

team may delay feedback; students will be alerted to any delays.)	

Section B: Assessment Brief and Requirements

This assignment gives students a real-life business case study in which a marketing manager has to use profitability analysis tools, customer lifetime value, etc. to make optimal marketing decisions. Students are given a full case study background and the variables/datasets/business information needed to make the calculation/coding.

Write-up tips:

-   Word count 1500 only applies to your normal text answers, excluding code blocks and R outputs. Please allocate the word count to each question at your own discretion. At the beginning of the assignment answer sheet, please write down your student number and self-reported word count.

-   For any clarification questions regarding the assignment, please refrain from directly emailing me or TAs. Please post your questions in the MS Teams channel "Assignment 1 Questions" instead. This is to avoid information advantage to individuals and ensure fairness of information to everyone.

-   Double check your PDF file before submission for any missing codes or wrong outputs. I have set the YAML header not to stop rendering even if there are code errors. Try to submit at least a few hours before the deadline to avoid any last-minute technical issues.

-   If a single line of code is too long and get cut, you can try to break the line of code into 2 lines.

-   Turnitin similarity score may look high due to similar code blocks across submissions, so it's totally fine to see a high similarity score after submission. Don't worry about it!

- If you cite any external sources, please make sure to include the references at the end of the assignment. Use Chicago style for references.

- For open questions, there is no single correct answer. You will be graded based on the quality of your arguments and the depth of your analysis. For calculation questions, you will be graded based on the correctness of your calculations and the clarity of your explanations.

Section C: Additional information from module leader (as appropriate)

Section D: Module Learning Outcomes covered in this Assessment

This assessment contributes towards the achievement of the following stated module Learning Outcomes as highlighted below:
- How to conduct marketing planning and profitability analysis at the firm level (week 1)
- How to compute CLV and use CLV to guide marketing decisions (week 2)
- How to use data wrangling and descriptive analytics to guide marketing decisions (week 3)

Section E: Groupwork Instructions (where relevant/appropriate)

Specific requirements for groupwork are available here. If this section is blank, no specific requirements for groupwork are applicable to this assessment.

Section F: How your work is assessed

Within each section of this assessment you may be assessed on the following aspects, as applicable and appropriate to this assessment, and should thus consider these aspects when fulfilling the requirements of each section:

- The accuracy of any calculations required.
- The strengths and quality of your overall analysis and evaluation;
- Appropriate use of relevant theoretical models, concepts and frameworks;
- The rationale and evidence that you provide in support of your arguments;
- The credibility and viability of the evidenced conclusions/recommendations/plans of action you put forward;
- Structure and coherence of your considerations and reports;
- Appropriate and relevant use of, as and where relevant and appropriate, real world examples, academic materials and referenced sources. Any references should use either the Harvard OR Vancouver referencing system (see References, Citations and Avoiding Plagiarism)
- Academic judgement regarding the blend of scope, thrust and communication of ideas, contentions, evidence, knowledge, arguments, conclusions.
- Each assessment requirement(s) has allocated marks/weightings.

Student submissions are reviewed/scrutinised by an internal assessor and are available to an External Examiner for further review/scrutiny before consideration by the relevant Examination Board.

It is not uncommon for some students to feel that their submissions deserve higher marks (irrespective of whether they actually deserve higher marks). To help you assess the relative strengths and weaknesses of your submission please refer to SOM Assessment Criteria Guidelines. This information is also located on the Assessment tab of the SOM Student Information Centre Moodle site (Moodle log in required).
The above is an important link as it specifies the criteria for attaining the pass/fail bandings shown below:
At UG Levels 4, 5 and 6:
80% to 100%: Outstanding Pass - 1st; 70% to 79%: Excellent Pass - 1st; 60%-69%: Very Good Pass - 2.1; 50% to 59%: Good Pass - 2.2; 40% to 49%: Satisfactory Pass - 3rd; 20% to 39%: Insufficient to Pass - Fail; 0% to 19%: Poor and Insufficient to Pass - Fail.
At PG Level 7:
86% to 100%: Outstanding Pass - Distinction; 70% to 85%: Excellent Pass - Distinction; 60%-69%: Good Pass - Merit; 50% to 59%: Satisfactory - Pass; 40% to 49%: Insufficient to Pass - Fail; 0% to 39%: Poor and Insufficient to Pass - Fail.

You are strongly advised to review these criteria **before you start your work** and **during your work**, and **before you submit**.

Upon receipt of your mark, you are strongly advised to **not** compare your mark with marks of other submissions from your student colleagues. Each submission has its own range of characteristics which differ from others in terms of breadth, scope, depth, insights, and subtleties and nuances. On the surface one submission may appear to be similar to another but invariably, digging beneath the surface reveals a range of differing characteristics.

Students who wish to request a review of a decision made by the Board of Examiners should refer to the UCL Academic Appeals Procedure, taking note of the acceptable grounds for such appeals.
Note that the purpose of this procedure is not to dispute academic judgement – it is to ensure correct application of UCL's regulations and procedures. The appeals process is evidence-based and circumstances must be supported by independent evidence.