



Module report

Level 6: Diploma in Professional Marketing

Module: Mastering Metrics

Please refer to the July 2017 assessment

Overarching performance:

The majority of candidates offered a sound overview of current data sharing practices in their respective organisations and detailed specific metrics which could be employed in an offline promotional activity.

Many candidates are conducting extensive research as witnessed by some very detailed bibliographies, with most clearly addressing the key issues given in the scenario. There are still a limited number who present an executive summary and some who fail to offer a bibliography, whilst some also provide unnecessary appendices.

The biggest problem, as always, is candidates who cite specific metrics and what they aim to measure but fail to offer any analysis of the data presented. There were some strong submissions offered with regard to the pitfalls of employing and using metrics which are not fit for purpose, though some failed to apply these to the organisation in question. The comparison with online promotion techniques was handled well by many though a major shortfall was for candidates to talk about specific methods rather than the metrics employed.

For many candidates there was an emphasis on the tactical rather than the strategic along with more narrative than evaluation.

Key points:

With this cohort, there remained a lack of theory support for answers.

Evaluation was lacking with narrative descriptions taking its place.

A significant number of candidates discussed 'metrics' in Task 3 and not the process of 'metric analysis' which meant effectively that the question was not answered.

Stronger candidates presented an integrated coverage of all three tasks with a focus on offline promotional activity, i.e. the context of the assignment. This was supported by good critical analysis, recommendations and justification through a high level of detail.

The weaker candidates often fell well short of a pass as a result of an overall lack of understanding of the subject. Here also was seen an inappropriate level of detail, a limited ability to undertake analysis and a lack of focus on the context of the assignment.

Task	Strengths	Weaknesses
Task 1	(a) The majority of candidates provided good coverage of the requirements for the organisation overview; well presented with some insights and headings used appropriately. (b) Data sharing within the organisation well explained, with a linkage to metrics and supported by appropriate theory. Linkage to metrics only occurred with better candidate assignments. Stronger candidates used marketing models (McKinsey, McDonald & Mouncey) to demonstrate the organisation's inner workings. Those candidates who tabulated the key metrics were able to give maximum benefit to the task. (c) Metrics used to justify a promotional activity, well described with an emphasis on how they were used and why used. In addition to the description of the metrics requested better candidates provided a critical evaluation. Metrics suggested included a broad range; financial (ROI/Cost), sales, customer and particular communication metrics (awareness, reach, attitude etc.) These were presented in a structured way with strategic and operational level focus, clearly linked to an offline promotional activity/campaign. Overall, appropriate theory utilised and referenced as a means of underpinning comments made. Stronger candidates used tables well to both analyse in Sub-task 1(b) and provide description and	(a) Lack of detail on all requirements for the company overview. b) Lack of understanding and application of theory. Whilst data sharing practices within the organisation might have been reasonably presented, no linkage to metrics was provided. Tendency for candidates to substitute data sharing critique with extensive coverage of the organisations structures with expansive diagrams but neglected to demonstrate and critique how interaction took place in data sharing. (c) Metrics suggested as a means of justifying a promotional activity merely focussing on financial, sales and general marketing metrics without reference to those for communication, i.e. key metrics missing. Many candidates used metrics more appropriate for assessing the success of a promotional activity post campaign, with little justification for a proposed activity. There was a tendency to detail the current metrics in place without any indication of how they could be applied or employed in a future marketing campaign. Weaker candidates tended to use nearly every metric available, thus giving theoretically some limited space to develop in any depth.

	justification in Sub-task 1(c). making clear statement and logical process of the task requirement.	
Task 2	(a) A comprehensive, strategic and operational set of metrics presented, covering all aspects and particularly associated with those of offline promotion was provided by stronger candidates. This was often combined with a Balanced Scorecard structure applied to the metrics with good arguments made for the need to have a balanced set of metrics. Good critical evaluation of the metrics included in the context of the chosen organisation and an offline promotion campaign rather than just a description of them. (b) These metrics then taken forward with data provided and a critical evaluation of individual aspects of the activity and of the activity overall. Strong candidates recognised the need to provide a form of statistical input into b) to justify the creation and execution of the dashboard. (c) An appropriate dashboard presented and explained with a minority of candidates indicating the usage of metrics/dashboard for future promotional activities. Candidates who did well recognised the need for continuity throughout	(a) Missing key metrics for use as a basis for all three sub-tasks, particularly those related to offline promotion. Weaker candidates listed and described the metrics but failed to evaluate, often including them in tabular form with merely a description. Tendency for weaker candidates to give a considerable number of potential metrics with the consequence of usually small amounts of supportive reasoning, where possibly fewer metrics with greater support would have been of benefit. Weaker candidates did not choose metrics appropriate to measuring an offline promotional activity – also many did not measure an offline activity but chose to focus on an online activity. (b) Data only presented, often with a lack of detail, without any analysis. Little regard was given to the performance of the campaign/activity carried out. Lack of focus on analysis into the impact of the offline promotional activity, instead considering a broad range of marketing or organisation data which did not demonstrate the impact of the campaign specifically. (c) Lack of a dashboard that has any value or does not include metrics appropriate for an offline promotion. Marked tendency to supplement graphics in Sub-task 2(c) with in

	all three sections of the task providing linkage across all these subtasks; using the same metrics in all three tasks.	some cases a considerable amount of textual support, thus negating the point of supplying graphics in dashboard style. Lack of a summary to demonstrate the performance of the activity, generally combined with little or no focus on how the metrics/ dashboard may be applied to future promotions Lack of linkage across the subtasks.
Task 3	(a) Many candidates gave a very detailed and informative overview of using and applying metrics incorrectly or not using appropriate ones per se. A comprehensive set of problems with metrics presented with a good analysis of the risks that might arise, clearly related to the context of the organisation and offline promotion. Good basis of appropriately referenced theory used to underpin the content provided. (b) Stronger candidates provided a list of appropriate offline and online metrics and a comparison of the effectiveness of each as applied to promotional activity. Within this, online and offline promotions were both addressed using appropriate metrics and tabulated findings in an appropriate format. Some candidates went back to the earlier metrics reported on in Task 2 for reference which demonstrated clear thinking. Clear analysis of the data sources for both online and offline metrics included. (c) At the heart of this sub-task were the data sources and associated metrics and included in	(a) A list, often in tabular form, of the problems that might arise with metrics without any commentary on the associated risks. Some candidates made little or no reference to the risks of using the results from metrics incorrectly, merely just detailing different types of measurement. (b) A common shortcoming in this task was that many did not compare the two activities, or did but failed to offer any metrics to support their arguments. Others provided a list of online and offline metrics, with little/no evaluation, just a description without any comparison on effectiveness. Some candidates focussed on promotion methods rather than metrics in this subtask. (c) A lack of understanding of the value of metrics in decision making. Very little attempt

	the better assignments was a clear explanation and evaluation as to their strengths/weaknesses particularly in making strategic decisions.	throughout the majority of examination papers being made to support strategic decision making. Weaker candidates often provided an evaluation, merely of the strengths and weaknesses of metrics, i.e. almost a repeat of the earlier task.
Format and presentation	A comprehensive report presented with linkage/cross referencing between tasks. Clarity of presentation with tasks/subtasks clearly identified. Good inclusion and application of frameworks supporting/justifying comments and recommendations made.	Some centres answered tasks with long paragraphing, failing to use headings or tables/charts when these would have assisted clarity and improved answers. Many candidates continue to append the organisation summary for Sub-task 1(a) rather than including it within the main body of the assignment. Some candidates continue to include an Executive Summary which is not required. Appendices for material not required were included by many candidates – marks are awarded for the main body of content only.
Task	General Issues	
Task 1	Candidates seem to forget they are taking a marketing qualification and in this case embedded with data, therefore in Sub-task 1(a) organisational information should reflect this in for example products and services, customer base and competitors. Failure to distinguish between 'pre' and 'post' metrics. Inability to contextualise analysis and overall content to offline promotional activity. Candidates did not fully take the implication of data sharing or were negative about the capacity the chosen organisation had in data. Not all types of data were considered and maximised. A poor ability to analyse metrics (and broader aspects) as a result of a lack of understanding of what is required, i.e. what is meant by analyse.	

Task 2	With a small number of candidates, a lack of data for analysis and application. Lack of understanding that this task asks for integration/flow across the subtasks, from sub-task 2(a) to 2(c). As mentioned earlier, candidates appeared unable to complete an evaluation/analysis of data. In addition, they failed to understand what is meant by a dashboard. Candidates still need to understand what constitutes a dashboard; there has been a marked increase in supportive narrative to the graphics shown which at times negates the dashboard philosophy. As scripts are marked in hard copy form, both colour and size definition is important to maximise marks for a dashboard.
Task 3	Few/if any frameworks and references to theory included in the assignment to support arguments made. Content way beyond that required as a result of candidate belief that more content equals more marks.
Format and presentation	Lack of indication of which task element is being answered continues to be an issue with some candidates. Small margins on pages are often used which do not meet the guideline sizes given by CIM, this often makes it harder to read the content, making it harder to understand the points being made.
Task	General Recommendations
Task 1	Theory support in answers is essential. Simply examining the organisation is not enough; all assignments are a test of how well marketing knowledge has been absorbed and understood and candidates MUST demonstrate this. Relevance to context, in this brief the offline promotion activity, must be included throughout the assignment. Ensure any of the metrics employed in the assignment are applied and justified.
Task 2	The importance of data in questions asking for 'application' has to be stressed. Narrative in itself is not enough. Candidates need to be reminded that the focus of the assignment is to demonstrate in part how a particular issue can be addressed and to transfer this as much as possible to real life applications through supporting and guiding to their own organisation.

	The dashboard is integral to this section so ensure it records the key information cited here and ensure it is recorded on the appropriate fields within the dashboard.
Task 3	Candidates should ensure they execute what the question has requested them to do. This required a briefing paper, not a report which some candidates did.
Format and presentation	Ensure the guidelines from the CIM are followed with regard to structure, word count and method of presentation.