

## QC Evaluation / Compliance Sheet

VU SP3 '25

Unit Code: ITSG4012

Online Facilitator: Gargi Datta

### 1. Discussion Forum Compliance

I = Initiated discussion on the weekly forum thread by Tuesday noon of the week

R = Responded to 90% of the student posts on the forum within 24 hrs. in the given week

Week-0		Week-1		Week-2		Week-3		Week-4		Week-5		Week-6	
I	R	I	R	I	R	I	R	I	R	I	R	I	R
Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N

### 2. Grading Timeline Compliance

M = Moderation grading completed prior to the meeting with the UC

I = Student names (3) shared for the Initial QC within 24 hrs. after the assessment due date/time

F = All grading-related activities (grading, incorporation of QC comments, double marking, etc.) completed as per suggested timeline in the email sent by LINC Ops

A1			A2			A3		
M	I	F	M	I	F	M	I	F
Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N

### 3. Grading Feedback: QC Evaluation

- [Assessment 1](#)
- [Assessment-2](#)
- [Assessment-3](#)

#	Parameter	Instructions for the Facilitator
1	Correct grammar, punctuation, Australian English etc.	<p><u>This check will be conducted on Grammarly:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Add Grammarly as an extension on your browser (Chrome etc.)</li> <li>2. Change the language to "Australian English"</li> <li>3. The icon of Grammarly will be present on the bottom right of the window</li> <li>4. After adding the feedback on Collaborate, check for errors and make the necessary changes.</li> </ol>
2	Adherence to template	<p><u>Ensure you have included all parts of the template, which include:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Student name</li> <li>2. Introduction (choosing which criterion you likes best)</li> <li>3. Points of improvement :Facilitator to provide constructive(c) feedback for the criteria. The mix can be roughly as follows – 1) HD Grade &lt; 0-1 C&gt;, 2) D Grade &lt; 1-2 C&gt;, 3) C and P Grade &lt;2-3 C&gt;, N Grade &lt;3-4 C&gt;</li> <li>3. Areas of focus for the next assessment</li> <li>4. Concluding remark</li> </ol>
3	Customisation of feedback	<p><u>Ensure that:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Examples have been provided for all criterion included in areas of improvement</li> <li>2. Each example are specific to the student's report, and not a repetition of the criterion feedback</li> <li>3. Customised concluding remark has been included</li> </ol>
4	Correct formatting	<p><u>Ensure the following:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Areas of improvement have been bulleted</li> <li>2. Proper paragraph breaks used</li> <li>3. All unnecessary text from the template (including "&lt;", "&gt;" etc.) has been removed</li> </ol>

## 1. Assessment 1

		Initial QC			Final QC (Used for Bonus calculation)				
		Shyamlee Anbalagan	Zhi Hui	Rupal Mathur	JIE	Tan	Shayne	<student name>	<student name>
Parameter		Acceptable / Unacceptable	Acceptable / Unacceptable	Acceptable / Unacceptable	Acceptable / Unacceptable	Acceptable / Unacceptable	Acceptable / Unacceptable	Acceptable / Unacceptable	Acceptable / Unacceptable
1	Grammar, punctuation, Aus-English etc.	A	A	A	A	A	A		
2	Adherence to template	UA	UA	UA	A	A	A		
3	Customisation of feedback	A	A	A	A	A	A		
4	Correct formatting	A	A	A	A	A	A		
<b>Overall</b>		UA	UA	UA	A	A	A		

Feedback Texts will be pasted below -

### 1. Shyamlee Anbalagan

Thank you for submitting your first assessment for this module. Below is a breakdown of your performance across each criterion, including what was done well and areas that need improvement. This structured feedback is intended to help you strengthen your understanding and approach for future submissions.

What went well

C1: Key Items Purchased from Bean Buzz — Very Good

Your response to this criterion was very good since you identified the top products with some visuals and brief interpretation. For example, you created a graph to represent item-wise purchase counts. However, the graph could be further improved by adding clearly labeled axes and deeper interpretation beyond the tabular data. Overall, this was a commendable effort.

#### C5: Report Presentation & Visuals — Very Good

You scored a good in this criterion since you articulated acceptable structure and presentation but lack polish. For example, you thoughtfully separated questions to aid readability and included relevant visual graphs to support your analysis. However, some key elements were missing — such as legends, titles, and a polished visual format. Additionally, incorporating an annexure at the end of your report for supplementary tables or Excel sheets would enhance clarity and professionalism.

#### Area of Improvement

##### C2: Market Basket Analysis (Includes Peak Time + Bundles) — Pass

You scored a pass on this criterion since there are noticeable errors in your analysis with vague insights. For example, you did identify bundles and included some screenshots, the bundles were not used in the actual analysis — instead, calculations were performed on individual items. The analysis lacks clarity, as the count values are not linked to specific items, and the reported values for support and confidence are incorrect. Additionally, the methodology steps were not clearly outlined, and relevant supporting screenshots were missing.

##### C3: Marketing Strategy Based on Bundle — Pass

You scored a pass on this criterion as you identified weak strategy with poor link to data insights. For example, the strategy proposed ("Morning Bagel Combo: Save \$1 before 11 a.m.") lacked a solid foundation in data insights. The total item counts were reported, but no bundles were actually identified or used to support the strategy. Furthermore, the incorrect reporting of support and confidence values undermines the validity of the recommendation. A stronger strategy would incorporate broader marketing concepts covered in Weeks 1 and 2 — such as demand elasticity and consumer behavior roles — to ensure relevance and depth.

Please feel free to send me an email if you have any specific questions.

Regards,  
Gargi Datta

## 2. Zhi Hui

Thank you for submitting your first assessment for this module. Below is a breakdown of your performance across each criterion, including what was done well and areas that need improvement. This structured feedback is intended to help you strengthen your understanding and approach for future submissions.

#### What went well

##### C1: Key Items Purchased from Bean Buzz — Very Good

Your response to this criterion was very good since you identified the top products with some visuals and brief interpretation. For example, you created a graph to represent item-wise purchase counts. You also gave an interpretation of data by incorporating literature to support. Overall, this was a good effort.

##### C5: Report Presentation & Visuals —Good

You scored a good in this criterion since you articulated acceptable structure and presentation but lack polish. For example, you thoughtfully created graphs and represented your data in tabular forms. However, you did not separate questions to aid readability. Additionally, incorporating an annexure at the end of your report for supplementary tables or Excel sheets would enhance clarity and professionalism.

#### Area of Improvement

##### C2: Market Basket Analysis (Includes Peak Time + Bundles) — Pass

You scored a pass on this criterion since there are noticeable errors in your analysis with vague insights. For example, you did identify bundles and included screenshots, the calculations are done incorrectly. The analysis lacks clarity, as the bundle values are incorrect, and the reported values for support and confidence are incorrect. Figure 3 is ambiguous and does not clearly specify the item bundles. Additionally, the methodology steps were not clearly outlined, and relevant supporting screenshots were missing. Though the lift values were calculated but they values reported are incorrect.

##### C3: Marketing Strategy Based on Bundle — Pass

You scored a pass on this criterion as you identified weak strategy with poor link to data insights. For example, the strategy proposed "evening, weekend" lacked a solid foundation in data insights. Furthermore, the incorrect reporting of support and confidence values undermines the validity of the recommendation, like the idea of set meals is positive but since data supporting it is incorrect the same cannot be validated. A stronger strategy would incorporate broader marketing concepts covered in Weeks 1 and 2 — such as demand elasticity and consumer behavior roles — to ensure relevance and depth.

Regards,  
Gargi Datta

3. Rupal Mathur

Thank you for submitting your first assessment for this module. Below is a breakdown of your performance across each criterion, including what was done well and areas that need improvement. This structured feedback is intended to help you strengthen your understanding and approach for future submissions.

#### What went well

##### C1: Key Items Purchased from Bean Buzz — Excellent

Your response to this criterion was excellent since you gave a clear identification of top-selling products with strong visual support and clear interpretation of trends. For example, you created a graph to represent item-wise purchase counts. You also gave screenshots and formulae for understanding. Well Done!

##### C5: Report Presentation & Visuals — Very Good

You scored a very good in this criterion since you articulated a well-structured report with some formatting or visual clarity issues. For example, you thoughtfully created graphs and represented your data in tabular forms, however labels were not added. However, incorporating an annexure at the end of your report for supplementary tables or Excel sheets would enhance clarity and professionalism.

#### Area of Improvement

##### C2: Market Basket Analysis (Includes Peak Time + Bundles) — Very Good

You scored a good on this criterion since the analysis is mostly correct with minor calculation/interpretation errors; identifies key bundles and peak times. For example, you identified the bundles and included screenshots, the calculations were done correctly. The reported values for support and confidence are correct and you have also calculated lift. Additionally, the methodology steps were clearly outlined, and relevant supporting screenshots were added. The conclusion section added towards the end enhanced the whole report. However, the analysis lacks clarity for the peak time as the bundles are not clearly mentioned.

##### C3: Marketing Strategy Based on Bundle — Very Good

You scored a very good on this criterion as you identified a good strategy aligned with findings, with reasonable justification. For example, the first strategy proposed "intentional bundling" is good as it was backed by solid foundation in data insights. However, the promotion of juice and sandwich bundle during evening time needs to be relooked as it is not validated through your findings. The second strategy is well aligned with your findings. However, this could benefit from incorporating broader marketing concepts covered in Weeks 1 and 2 — such as demand elasticity and consumer behavior roles — to ensure relevance and depth.

Regards,  
Gargi Datta

## Final QC

### 1. Jie

Dear Jie Thing Ng,

Thank you for submitting the first assessment for this module! Please find below criterion-wise grades and some important feedback on your submission:

#### C1: Key Items Purchased from Bean Buzz — Excellent

Your response to this criterion was excellent since you gave a clear identification of top-selling products with strong visual support and a clear interpretation of trends. For example, you created a graph to represent item-wise purchase counts. You also gave screenshots and formulae for understanding. You also provided description to support your data added business acumen as to how the findings can be used. Well Done!

#### C2: Market Basket Analysis (Includes Peak Time + Bundles) — Pass

Your response to this criterion was pass since you attempted analysis with noticeable errors, vague insights. For example, you did identify bundles and included some screenshots, though the bundles were not used in the actual analysis — instead, calculations were performed on individual items. You identified peak times, but it would have made better sense if this was performed for the bundles identified. However, no calculations with respect to market basket analysis were done. No values were reported for support and confidence.

#### C3: Marketing Strategy Based on Bundle — Pass

Your response to this criterion was pass since strategy provided with basic links to findings but limited justification. For example, while the proposed strategy — “Promotions like breakfast combos or morning specials could help further boost performance” — is grounded in data insights, it lacks specificity in terms of real-time, actionable implementation. Moreover, the analysis is incomplete due to the omission of market basket analysis, which weakens the validation of the strategic recommendations. To strengthen both relevance and analytical depth, it is recommended that you integrate broader marketing concepts introduced in Weeks 1 and 2, such as demand elasticity and the role of consumer behaviour. This would ensure a more comprehensive and conceptually aligned response.

#### C4: Report Presentation & Visuals —Good

Your response to this criterion was good since you articulated acceptable structure and presentation but lack polish. For example, you thoughtfully created graphs and represented the data in tabular forms. However, the absence of market basket analysis affects the overall completeness of the assignment. To further enhance clarity and professionalism, consider including an annexure at the end of your report to house supplementary tables or Excel outputs. This would provide clearer context to your analysis and strengthen the report’s coherence and depth.

Please feel free to send me an email if you have any specific questions.

Regards,  
Gargi Datta

2. Tan

Dear Jennifer Tan,

Thank you for submitting the first assessment for this module! Please find below criterion-wise grades and some important feedback on your submission:

C1: Key Items Purchased from Bean Buzz — Excellent

Your response to this criterion was excellent since you gave a clear identification of top-selling products with strong visual support and a clear interpretation of trends. For example, you created a graph to represent item-wise purchase counts. You also gave screenshots and formulae for understanding. Well Done!

C2: Market Basket Analysis (Includes Peak Time + Bundles) — Excellent

Your response to this criterion was excellent since you accurately performed market basket analysis (support, confidence); identified peak times & frequently purchased bundles with clear justification and correct metrics. For example, you identified the bundles and included screenshots, the calculations were done correctly. The reported values for support and confidence are correct and you have also calculated lift. Additionally, the methodology steps were clearly outlined, and relevant supporting screenshots were added. However, the analysis lacks clarity for the peak time as the bundles are not clearly mentioned, whereas you have reported individual items only.

C3: Marketing Strategy Based on Bundle — Good

Your response to this criterion was good since you provided strategy with basic links to findings but limited justification. For example, the strategy proposed “To attract new online customers, BeanBuzz can implement targeted first-time buyer incentives by offering discounts on popular bundles” was good but overall, the strategies you provided were very generic and broad. Actionable strategies would have added more value to your findings. Your work could have benefitted from incorporating broader marketing concepts covered in Weeks 1 and 2 — such as demand elasticity and consumer behavior roles — to ensure relevance and depth.

C4: Report Presentation & Visuals — Very Good

Your response to this criterion was very good since you articulated a well-structured with some formatting or visual clarity issues. For example, you thoughtfully created graphs and represented your data in tabular forms, which enhanced readability. However, list of references is to be in Harvard style which needs to be relooked. You did incorporate appendices which was a good initiative.

Please feel free to send me an email if you have any specific questions.

Regards,  
Gargi Datta

### 3. Shayne

Dear Shyane Tan,

Thank you for submitting the first assessment for this module! Please find below criterion-wise grades and some important feedback on your submission:

#### C1: Key Items Purchased from Bean Buzz — Very Good

Your response to this criterion was very good since you identified top products with some visuals and brief interpretation. For example, you created a graph to represent item-wise purchase counts. You also gave screenshots for understanding. However, you could have provided description to support your data which would have highlighted the business acumen as to how the findings can be used. Good Attempt!

#### C2: Market Basket Analysis (Includes Peak Time + Bundles) — Pass

Your response to this criterion was pass since you attempted analysis with noticeable errors, vague insights. The analysis of product bundles was inaccurate, and calculations were conducted on individual items rather than on actual item combinations, which undermines the objective of market basket analysis. While peak purchase times were identified, this insight would have been more meaningful if it were linked to correctly derived product bundles. Additionally, key metrics such as support and confidence were not calculated or reported, further limiting the analytical rigor and relevance of the findings.

#### C3: Marketing Strategy Based on Bundle — Pass

Your response to this criterion was pass since strategy provided with basic links to findings but limited justification. For example, the proposed strategy — “Buy any 2 pastries and get 10% off” or “Bundle 2 iced beverages for \$X” — is not grounded in data insights, as the bundles reported are incorrect. Moreover, the analysis is incomplete due to the omission of market basket analysis, which weakens the validation of the strategic recommendations.

To strengthen both relevance and analytical depth, it is recommended that you integrate broader marketing concepts introduced in Weeks 1 and 2, such as demand elasticity and the role of consumer behaviour. This would ensure a more comprehensive and conceptually aligned response.

**C4: Report Presentation & Visuals — Pass**

Your response to this criterion was pass since your report had a poor structure or visuals; lacks clear format. For example, you thoughtfully created graphs and represented the data in tabular forms briefly. However, the absence of market basket analysis affects the overall completeness of the assignment. To further enhance clarity and professionalism, consider including an annexure at the end of your report to house supplementary tables or Excel outputs. This would provide clearer context to your analysis and strengthen the report’s coherence and depth.

Please feel free to send me an email if you have any specific questions.

Regards,  
Gargi Datta

## 2. Assessment-2

		<i>Initial QC</i>			<i>Final QC (Used for Bonus calculation)</i>				
		<i>SHYAMLEE ANBALAGAN</i>	<i>(HE ZHIHUI) HO</i>	<i>RUPAL MATHUR</i>	<i>Jie</i>	<i>Jennifer</i>	<i>Shayne</i>	<i>&lt;student name&gt;</i>	<i>&lt;student name&gt;</i>
	Parameter	Acceptable / Unacceptable	Acceptable / Unacceptable	Acceptable / Unacceptable	Acceptable / Unacceptable	Acceptable / Unacceptable	Acceptable / Unacceptable	Acceptable / Unacceptable	Acceptable / Unacceptable
1	Grammar,	A	A	A	A	A	A		

	punctuation, Aus-English etc.								
2	Adherence to template	A	A	A	A	A	A		
3	Customisation of feedback	A	A	A	A	A	A		
4	Correct formatting	A	A	A	A	A	A		
	<b>Overall</b>	A	A	A	A	A	A		

Feedback Texts will be pasted below -

1. Shyamlee

Dear Shyamlee Anbalagan,

Thank you for submitting the second assessment for this module! Please find below criterion-wise grades and some important feedback on your submission:

• C1: Customer Churn – Logistic Regression- Pass

Your response to this criterion was pass since basic regression attempts with errors were made having vague interpretation of churn probability. For example, the regression was applied with limited accuracy, and key aspects such as model assumptions were not addressed. For instance, you did not explain critical assumptions of logistic regression, such as linearity in the logit, independence of observations, or multicollinearity, which are essential for ensuring the validity of the model. Additionally, the regression coefficients reported appear to have inconsistencies, and the churn probability was not calculated or interpreted in percentage terms—this is a significant omission, as it limits the ability to derive actionable business insights from the model. Although you carried out exploratory data analysis, it was insufficient on its own to explain churn without a well-executed predictive model. Furthermore, the analysis lacked essential model diagnostics and performance metrics such as pseudo-R<sup>2</sup>, model fit indicators, or ANOVA statistics, which are critical to evaluating the effectiveness and reliability of the model. Without these, the predictive power and practical application of your findings remain unclear.

• C2: Model Analysis & Business Insights - Good

Your response to this criterion was good since it had basic interpretation of coefficients; business insights are generic. Some suggestions for data improvement were also included. For example, while you did carry out the logistic regression, the model itself was not adequately explained—key aspects such as the meaning and significance of the coefficients were either unclear or inaccurately reported. Importantly, churn probabilities were not calculated or discussed, which is essential for translating model outputs into actionable business decisions. Although your business insights were detailed, the impact of those insights was diminished due to incorrect coefficient values and a lack of statistical clarity. As a result, the overall narrative and business relevance of the analysis were not effectively communicated. Additionally, the section on data improvement was underdeveloped and missed the opportunity to recommend meaningful enhancements, such as customer segmentation based on significant churn predictors. Including such suggestions could have strengthened the strategic implications of your analysis.

• C3: Conclusion & Academic Integration – Good

Your response to this criterion was good since it had basic conclusions having minimal or unclear academic support. For example, the conclusion is structured and attempts to link analysis with practical implications, which is commendable. However, it lacks the necessary depth and rigor expected at this level. The incorrect coefficient values undermine the technical validity of the conclusions drawn, and the absence of churn probability calculation limits the practical relevance of the insights for business decision-making. While the inclusion of academic references is a strength, they were not fully leveraged to demonstrate how BookNook could operationalize these insights—such as integrating them into customer lifecycle value (CLV) models or loyalty strategies. Additionally, reference formatting needs refinement, and the theoretical frameworks cited could be more directly connected to actionable business outcomes. A more thorough integration of theory with practice would have significantly elevated the impact of your conclusion. Also, an annexure in the end may have been added to give supporting screenshots or calculations used in the analysis.

Please feel free to send me an email if you have any specific questions.

Regards,  
Gargi Datta

2. Zhu Hui

Dear Zhi Hui,

Thank you for submitting the second assessment for this module! Please find below criterion-wise grades and some important feedback on your submission:

• C1: Customer Churn – Logistic Regression- Good

Your response to this criterion was good since regression is attempted with limited explanation or partial accuracy. For example, you identified the dependent variable (Churn) and selected a comprehensive set of independent variables, showing a solid understanding of regression structure. You correctly applied linear regression using Excel, and included a clear summary output with coefficients, p-values,  $R^2$ , F-statistic, and standard error. You also organized the variables into meaningful categories—demographic, behavioral, and engagement—and use the regression output to interpret relationships between variables and customer churn. Furthermore, the analysis could have benefitted if you would have calculated churn probability values or predictions are shown or explained, which limits the real-world application of the regression. Without these, the predictive power and practical application of your findings remain mostly unclear.

• C2: Model Analysis & Business Insights - Good

Your response to this criterion was good since basic interpretation of coefficients; business insights are general. Some suggestions for data improvement were included. For example, you did a commendable job in interpreting the direction and business relevance of each variable's coefficient, grouped by category (demographic, shopping, engagement, psychographic). You also discussed the statistical significance with p-values correctly interpreted (e.g., "Satisfaction score has a low p-value of  $\sim 0.000$ , so it's significant."). You also translated statistical findings into tangible business recommendations, such as improving customer service and returns handling, or personalizing email campaigns. There is a thoughtful discussion on engagement variables like returns and service calls—clearly identifying them as major churn drivers. The interpretation of the model output reflects a reasonable grasp of how variables impact churn, especially in the engagement category, where they correctly highlight "satisfaction score," "returns count," and "customer service calls" as significant. Additionally, you could have used logistic regression to make valid interpretations, convert coefficients to churn probability ratios, and include targeted segmentation strategies (e.g., high-risk by satisfaction level or service call frequency). The section on data improvement was underdeveloped and missed the opportunity to recommend meaningful enhancements, such as customer segmentation based on significant churn predictors. Including such suggestions could have strengthened the strategic implications of your analysis.

• C3: Conclusion & Academic Integration – Good

Your response to this criterion was good since conclusion lacks depth and few/no references are used effectively. For example, the conclusion is logically written and summarizes key insights—emphasizing real-time monitoring, loyalty program improvements, and personalized customer engagement. The practical recommendations (e.g., improving email targeting, enhancing customer service) are consistent with the analysis. The conclusion reiterates actionable steps that align well with findings, such as omnichannel support and loyalty incentives. However, the academic grounding is weak—the references used are mostly non-academic or popular blogs, not peer-reviewed articles or journals. The analysis does not critically reflect on the limitations of the dataset or model, which is expected at this level. You could have incorporated academic literature (journal articles, textbooks), reflected critically on model and data limitations, and linked findings to frameworks like CLV, RFM analysis, or churn prediction lifecycle models.

Please feel free to send me an email if you have any specific questions.

Regards,  
Gargi Datta

3. Rupal

Dear Rupal Mathur,

Thank you for submitting the second assessment for this module! Please find below criterion-wise grades and some important feedback on your submission:

• C1: Customer Churn – Logistic Regression- Excellent

Your response to this criterion was excellent since logistic regression is applied correctly, with all variables and assumptions clearly stated. Churn probability is interpreted with clarity. For example, you correctly applied the logistic regression model using Excel and explicitly stated the formula for churn probability, including a clear coefficient mapping table (Annexure A). The calculation of churn probability is demonstrated and interpreted meaningfully, with visual representation of risk levels (e.g., % of customers in high vs. low churn brackets). There is conceptual clarity regarding the purpose of logistic regression, use of the logit function, and how the model estimates probabilities between 0 and 1. You also commented on the implications of high churn probability for BookNook, tying it back to actionable strategy. Furthermore, the analysis could have benefitted if you would have utilized the calculated churn probability values or predictions to create cohorts/segments, which limits the real-world application of the regression. This would have enhanced, the predictive power and practical application of your findings.

• C2: Model Analysis & Business Insights – Very Good

Your response to this criterion was very good since most coefficients are interpreted well, with a strong linkage to business context with some minor gaps. Future data ideas are relevant. For example, the regression output is comprehensively interpreted:  $R^2$  (0.36), Adjusted  $R^2$ , F-statistic, and Standard Error are correctly described in context. You also calculated ANOVA and coefficient tables are broken down clearly. The statistical significance ( $p < 0.05$ ) is used correctly to focus on variables like age, satisfaction score, returns count, and service calls. The business insights are thorough, linking data patterns with specific operational recommendations (e.g., improving product quality to reduce returns, enhancing customer service to minimize call frequency). You used good visualizations (e.g., churn probability by age bucket, satisfaction score distribution). The section on data improvement was very nicely developed presenting an opportunity to recommend meaningful enhancements, such as customer segmentation based on significant churn predictors. Additionally, you could have used the churn probability ratios, and included targeted segmentation strategies

(e.g., high risk by satisfaction level or service call frequency) such as customer segmentation based on significant churn predictors. Including such suggestions could have strengthened the strategic implications of your analysis.

• C3: Conclusion & Academic Integration – Good

Your response to this criterion was good since conclusion lacks depth and few references are used effectively. For example, the conclusion recaps the analytical journey well and connects it to real-time CRM decision-making. Annexures are well-structured and reinforce technical execution. However, the academic grounding is weak—the references used are mostly non-academic or popular blogs, not peer-reviewed articles or journals. You could have incorporated academic literature (journal articles, textbooks), reflected critically on model and data limitations, The analysis could be better anchored in theoretical marketing models like CLV, RFM, or AIDA to demonstrate academic depth.

Please feel free to send me an email if you have any specific questions.

Regards,  
Gargi Datta

Final QC

1. Jie

Dear Jie Thing Ng,

Thank you for submitting the final assessment for this module! Please find below criterion-wise grades and some important feedback on your submission:

•C1: Apply quantitative methods to examine routine problems – Good

Your response to this criterion was good since you applied some quantitative methods. There were minor inconsistencies or gaps in explanation, but the approach was generally sound. For example, you defined how customers making purchases between 1600–1899 days ago received an R-score of 1, and how those making 33–40 purchases received an F-score of 5 (Page 3–5). However, your submission lacked screenshots of your Excel work or summaries showing actual RFM values per customer. In the video, you mentioned that the Excel work was completed, but you didn't walk through the file or visually show how RFM scores were derived across the customer base, which limited transparency and evidence of execution.

•C2: Interpret quantitative info and draw inferences - Pass

Your response to this criterion was pass, as limited RFM scoring and segment creation were carried out. The Interpretation of results was underdeveloped. For example, you described the segmentation strategy and grouped customers into five broad labels: Champions, Potential Loyal, Promising, At Risk, and Hibernating. However, your logic was heavily Recency-biased and not backed by any segment size, frequency analysis, or

customer count distribution. You mentioned that “we have identified 102 mutually exclusive RFM scores,” but did not show how these were grouped into segments. In the video, you mentioned “we are focusing on Recency because it helps us identify engagement,” but the lack of data-backed examples or customer count per segment weakens the analysis. For instance, no visual like a pie chart or table was shown to justify which segment was most populated or most valuable.

•C3: Marketing Strategy & Analysis Improvement. Evaluate data, alternative views, and propose improvements – Good

Your response to this criterion was good, with a basic marketing strategy proposed but lacking full justification. Limited discussion on data limitations or improvement is mentioned. For example, you proposed A/B testing for the “Promising” segment to trial promotional strategies like free trials, curated bundles, and personalised nudges before mealtimes. You also discussed Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) for the “Potential Loyal” segment to understand psychological loyalty factors. These are creative approaches. However, you only focused on two customer segments and ignored “At Risk” and “Champions,” which would have been important for a balanced retention and value-maximisation strategy. In the video, your explanation of A/B testing was brief and abstract; you could have improved this by showing which variations would be tested or what Daily Dine could learn from it.

•C4: Report Presentation – Good

Your response to this criterion was good, as the report had acceptable formatting and structure. Visualisation was done, but could have been clearer. For example, the definitions of RFM (with source citations like Wright 2021, Shopify 2023, and Tableau 2022) were appropriate. The layout was clean and sectioned with subheadings. However, it lacked visuals like segment distribution graphs, bar charts for RFM scores, or sample customer score tables. Adding such elements would have improved the visual and analytical appeal of your work.

•C5: Video Presentation – Pass

Your response to this criterion was pass, as there was limited clarity. For example, you spoke clearly and outlined the core logic of your report, including justification for focusing on “Promising” and “Potential Loyal” segments. However, the video had no visual support—no charts, screen-sharing of Excel data, or animation to highlight segment-specific strategies. Like, when you mentioned “exclusive benefits like birthday vouchers and loyalty points,” these ideas were strong, but unsupported visually. A walkthrough of one customer’s RFM journey or a mock-up of campaign messaging could have elevated the impact of your pitch.

Please feel free to send me an email if you have any specific questions.

Regards,  
Gargi Datta

2. Jennifer  
Dear Jennifer Tan,

Thank you for submitting the final assessment for this module! Please find below criterion-wise grades and some important feedback on your submission:

•C1: Apply quantitative methods to examine routine problems – Excellent

Your response to this criterion was excellent since you demonstrated a comprehensive understanding and application of relevant quantitative methods, clearly linked to business goals. All calculations are correct and well-explained, reflecting an advanced grasp of analytical problem-solving. For example, customers who placed 33 to 40 orders were scored as F5, while those who spent \$1601 to \$2000 were assigned M5, and those whose last purchase occurred within 400–699 days received an R5 score. This scoring logic was consistent throughout your dataset and aligned well with RFM principles. The RFM model was applied with precision, and your scoring methodology was transparent and clearly defined. Your dataset (Appendix A) showed full RFM calculations for all 250 customers. This level of detail in the calculation, combined with consistent segment labelling (Champion, Loyal Customer, Potential Loyalist, etc.), demonstrated a strong command of RFM logic and execution.

•C2: Interpret quantitative info and draw inferences – Very Good

Your response to this criterion was very good since RFM values are mostly accurate, with a logical approach to segment creation. The interpretation is generally strong with relevant inferences. For example, you grouped the entire dataset into 10 segments and supported this with a pivot chart in Appendix B, making the segmentation logic easy to follow. You reported 60 Loyal Customers, 57 in Needs Attention, and 39 Potential Loyalists. The mapping of customers such as DDC0015 (524 = Potential Loyalist) and DDC0048 (144 = Can't Lose Them) showed thoughtful classification. However, your main report could have included a deeper interpretation of segment behaviour—for instance, analysis of which groups pose the greatest retention risk, or which are most likely to drive revenue growth. While your segmentation was technically sound, a stronger business-layer interpretation would have added strategic depth.

•C3: Marketing Strategy & Analysis Improvement. Evaluate data, alternative views, and propose improvements – Very Good

Your response to this criterion was very good, as the marketing strategy is clear and based on data, with moderate reflection on improvements or alternate views. For example, you selected Potential Loyalists and At-Risk customers for campaign focus, which was logical based on their volume and strategic potential. Your proposed strategies—like loyalty points, birthday vouchers, feedback-based rewards, and early access to new menu launches—were actionable and well aligned with each segment's characteristics. The strategy was clearly derived from the data and business context. However, the analysis could have been improved by projecting outcomes (e.g., estimated increase in repeat orders or reduction in churn) or prioritising actions based on expected ROI. Additionally, extending your plan to other segments, such as "Can't Lose Them" or "Promising," would have added completeness.

•C4: Report Presentation – Excellent

Your response to this criterion was excellent, as the report is professionally formatted, visually engaging, free from errors, and fully referenced. Charts and tables were integrated effectively. For example, the report was professionally formatted, visually neat, and well-structured. You made strong use of appendices to present your Excel calculations and segment summaries. Harvard-style referencing was used correctly, and sources such as Tableau, Shopify, and CleverTap were appropriate and relevant. Figures were well placed and easy to interpret, particularly the segmentation breakdown table

in Appendix B. The only minor suggestion for improvement would be to bring some of the summary visuals (like customer count charts) into the main report body for more immediate insight.

•C5: Video Presentation – Very Good

Your response to this criterion was very good, having a clear presentation with minor delivery issues. You covered the report content well. For example, you communicated your findings clearly and followed a logical structure. Your visuals were well-designed and helped convey the narrative. You explained your RFM segmentation logic and strategy rationale effectively. However, the impact of your presentation could be improved by using more dynamic visual elements, such as a quick walkthrough of your Excel dashboard or a highlighted case study of a sample customer journey. These enhancements would have made the delivery more engaging and persuasive.

Please feel free to send me an email if you have any specific questions.

Regards,  
Gargi Datta

3. Shayne

Dear Shyane Tan,

Thank you for submitting the final assessment for this module! Please find below criterion-wise grades and some important feedback on your submission:

•C1: Apply quantitative methods to examine routine problems – Pass

Your response to this criterion was pass since you attempted to apply basic quantitative methods, but with several inaccuracies or limited explanation. There were weak links to analysis objectives. For example, you provided a clear explanation of the RFM framework and laid out your quintile-based scoring method (e.g., Frequency 30–40 = F5; Spend \$1669–1996 = M5). However, the absence of any Excel outputs, customer tables, or screenshots means there was no evidence that these scores were applied correctly. The lack of data-driven demonstration made it difficult to evaluate whether the logic translated into accurate segment scoring or not. Albeit, even one table with calculated RFM values would have improved the transparency and credibility of your analysis significantly.

•C2: Interpret quantitative info and draw inferences - Pass

Your response to this criterion was pass since there was limited or inconsistent RFM scoring and segment creation. Interpretation of results was underdeveloped or unclear. For example, you identified 12 well-labelled segments (e.g., “Dormant Potential,” “Big Spenders,” “At Risk”) and described each group in a thoughtful way. However, your report lacked visual segmentation outputs—such as customer counts per segment, RFM score breakdowns, or pivot summaries—that would validate the classification. As it stands, the segmentation reads as a hypothetical construct rather than a

data-driven insight. Stronger evidence, such as a distribution chart or even one example mapping RFM to a real segment, would have strengthened this section.

•C3: Marketing Strategy & Analysis Improvement. Evaluate data, alternative views, and propose improvements – Good

Your response to this criterion was good, with a basic marketing strategy proposed but lacking full justification. Limited discussion on data limitations or improvement is mentioned. For example, you selected relevant segments—Potential Loyalists, Loyal Customers, and Big Spenders—and presented a coherent set of strategies for each. The use of loyalty incentives, subscription-based retention, and email personalisation was appropriate for the business context. The inclusion of a risk-based CLV matrix added thoughtful segmentation logic. However, the strategies were described at a high level and not linked to expected performance outcomes (e.g., revenue lift, churn reduction). Including specific metrics or timelines for your campaigns would have taken this to a higher level of strategic depth.

•C4: Report Presentation – Good

Your response to this criterion was Good with acceptable formatting and structure. The visuals are present, but could have been clearer. For example, your report was well written, logically structured, and cited current references using the Harvard format. The tone was professional, and your content was organised clearly. However, the report lacked supporting visuals such as charts, customer dashboards, or appendices containing the RFM scoring logic. These omissions made the document feel incomplete from a data validation standpoint, even though the narrative was coherent.

•C5: Video Presentation – Pass

Your response to this criterion was pass, as there was limited clarity. For example, the structure followed the report logically, and you attempted to explain your segment choices and marketing strategies. However, the audio was too low, and there were no visual elements—your video was off, and there were no segment illustrations. For a presentation focused on data analytics, this undermined its effectiveness. A visual walkthrough, even of a single segment or sample strategy, would have added significant value to the delivery.

Please feel free to send me an email if you have any specific questions.

Regards,  
Gargi Datta

### 3. Assessment-3

		<i>Initial QC</i>	<i>Final QC</i>
--	--	-------------------	-----------------

		<i>Shyamlee Anbalagan</i>	<i>Zhi Hui</i>	<i>Rupal Mathur</i>		<student name>	<student name>	<student name>	<student name>
	Parameter	Acceptable / Unacceptable	Acceptable / Unacceptable	Acceptable / Unacceptable	Acceptable / Unacceptable	Acceptable / Unacceptable	Acceptable / Unacceptable	Acceptable / Unacceptable	Acceptable / Unacceptable
1	Grammar, punctuation, Aus-English etc.	A	A	A					
2	Adherence to template	A	A	A					
3	Customisation of feedback	A	A	A					
4	Correct formatting	A	A	A					
	<b>Overall</b>	A	A	A					

Feedback Texts will be pasted below -

### 1. Shyamlee Anbalagan -

Dear Shyamlee Anbalagan,

Thank you for submitting the final assessment for this module! Please find below criterion-wise grades and some important feedback on your submission:

•C1: Apply quantitative methods to examine routine problems – Good

Your response to this criterion was good since you applied some quantitative methods. There were minor inconsistencies or gaps in explanation, but the approach was generally sound. For example, on Page 2, you detail how Recency scores were assigned based on recent customer visits and how Excel's PERCENTILE and IF functions were used. However, your submission lacks sufficient screenshots or examples of the actual Excel outputs (e.g., full RFM table, visual scoring matrix), which limits the clarity and validation of your quantitative method.

•C2: Interpret quantitative info and draw inferences - Good

Your response to this criterion was good since RFM analysis is attempted, and it is partially correct. The segmentation was basic but functional, and interpretation may have lacked depth. For example, the segmentation logic (Champions, Loyal, At Risk, etc.) is clearly described with good linkage to the RFM codes. The Segment distribution percentages are mentioned. You also presented strategies that are tailored for each segment, showing application of insight. However, the interpretation is more descriptive than analytical. You could have added charts (e.g., a pie chart of segment % distribution) to improve visual communication. Also, the discussion lacked customer behavioural nuance beyond what Retain Up suggests.

•C3: Marketing Strategy & Analysis Improvement. Evaluate data, alternative views, and propose improvements – Good

Your response to this criterion was good, with a basic marketing strategy proposed but lacking full justification. Limited discussion on data limitations or improvement is mentioned. For example, the strategy for Champions and Loyalists is well thought-out (e.g., exclusive access, bundles, personalisation). The write-up included realistic suggestions for hibernating and at-risk segments. Data improvement ideas are sound: CLV, engagement metrics, churn reasons, and app usage. However, the strategy presented is sound but not innovative or data-enhanced (e.g., no integration of churn probabilities or RFM clustering). It could have included a visual funnel or a decision matrix for targeting prioritisation.

•C4: Report Presentation – Pass

Your response to this criterion was pass, as the report shows a lack of structure. The visuals were poorly presented or unclear, and the referencing was limited. For example, the structure and formatting were mostly correct (headings, spacing, font). The reference list is present and well-formed in Harvard style. Some grammar and typing inconsistencies (e.g., random capitalisation like “CustOmers”, “ChaMpion”). Also, Snipped Excel visuals are insufficient, and no clear charts or dashboards are visible. You could have cleaned up typos, inconsistent capitalisations, and some awkward phrasing.

•C5: Video Presentation – Pass

Your response to this criterion was pass, as there was limited clarity. For example, you delivered a complete 5-minute presentation, and the content aligned well with the written report. However, the delivery was flat, lacking energy and engagement. Minimal use of visuals, you could’ve shown an Excel dashboard walkthrough, highlighted key customer segments graphically, or used a storyline to structure the pitch. These inclusions could have enhanced the quality of your presentation.

Please feel free to send me an email if you have any specific questions.

Regards,  
Gargi Datta

2. Zhi Hui -

Dear Zhi Hui (He ZhiHui) Ho,

Thank you for submitting the final assessment for this module! Please find below criterion-wise grades and some important feedback on your submission:

•C1: Apply quantitative methods to examine routine problems – Very Good

Your response to this criterion was very good since most of the quantitative methods were applied accurately with sound explanations. Minor errors existed, but that did not affect the quality of the analysis. The methods used aligned well with the analysis objectives. For example, the RFM model was correctly implemented using percentile-based logic. You provided clear-cut-off tables for Recency, Frequency, and Monetary values using Excel's PERCENTILE.INC() function (Page 1–2). The logic behind score assignment is sound, and Table 7 provides a helpful example of score formation. However, the lack of embedded Excel screenshots or raw data output limits the transparency of your analysis. Including visuals of how scoring was applied across the dataset would have strengthened the submission.

C2: Interpret quantitative info and draw inferences - Good

Your response to this criterion was good since RFM analysis is attempted, and it is partially correct. The segmentation was basic but functional, and interpretation may have lacked depth. For example, the segmentation was based on logical and reasonable RFM groupings. You correctly identified 10 well-known customer segments (e.g., Champions, Hibernating, At Risk) and matched RFM codes with segment types in Tables 8 and 9. While the mapping is systematic and accurate, the interpretation could be more insightful. For instance, behavioural context—like why some segments behave the way they do or trends in their lifecycle—was not deeply explored.

C3: Marketing Strategy & Analysis Improvement. Evaluate data, alternative views, and propose improvements – Good

Your response to this criterion was good, with a basic marketing strategy proposed but lacking full justification. Limited discussion on data limitations or improvement was mentioned. For example, you proposed practical, well-aligned strategies for four key segments: At Risk, Frequent Low Spenders, Hibernating, and Loyal Customers. Strategies such as personalised emails, churn prediction using clustering algorithms, tiered pricing, and AI-based recommendations demonstrated applied thinking. However, the strategies can be enhanced by clearly tying actions to expected outcomes (e.g., conversion or retention metrics) or segment profitability potential.

•C4: Report Presentation – Very Good

Your response to this criterion was very good, as the report only had minor formatting issues. The charts/tables supported the report, and the referencing was mostly correct. For example, the report was well-formatted, clearly structured, and mostly free from grammatical errors. The use of tables and charts, such as Figure 1 (Customer Segment Distribution), aids readability. Harvard referencing was applied accurately. Slight improvements in visual presentation—such as bolding key metrics or colour-coding segment tables—would further elevate the professional polish of your work.

•C5: Video Presentation – Pass

Your response to this criterion was pass, as there was limited clarity. For example, the video covered the required elements and was logically structured, aligning with the written report. However, the presentation delivery lacked energy and was mostly monotone. There was limited use of visual engagement—no walkthrough of the Excel dashboard, charts, or even title slide transitions. Increasing the pace, tone variation, and incorporating on-screen visuals would help boost future presentations.

Please feel free to send me an email if you have any specific questions.

Regards,  
Gargi Datta

### 3. Rupal Mathur

Dear Rupal Mathur,

Thank you for submitting the final assessment for this module! Please find below criterion-wise grades and some important feedback on your submission:

•C1: Apply quantitative methods to examine routine problems – Excellent

Your response to this criterion was excellent since you demonstrated a comprehensive understanding and application of relevant quantitative methods, clearly linked to business goals. All calculations are correct and well-explained, reflecting an advanced grasp of analytical problem-solving. For example, your RFM calculation was methodical, with a clear explanation of how Recency, Frequency, and Monetary scores were derived using quintile brackets (Page 5). The score definitions were well contextualised (e.g., R=5 for “Most recent”) and aligned with business objectives. The mapping of RFM scores to customer IDs via Excel, described in Annexure A, reflects practical application skills. However, more sample screenshots or dataset snippets showing the Excel formulas in action would have further strengthened the auditability of your quantitative work.

•C2: Interpret quantitative info and draw inferences – Very Good

Your response to this criterion was very good since RFM values are mostly accurate, with a logical approach to segment creation. The interpretation is generally strong with relevant inferences. For example, you implemented a thoughtful segmentation model (Page 9–11), and you went beyond generic labels by adding business-relevant insights. For instance, segment observations such as “Loyal + New = 102 – a good and healthy pipeline” and “At Risk + Can’t Lose Them = 83 – Needs immediate action” demonstrated excellent contextual judgment (Page 12). However, a more critical evaluation of segment behaviour trends over time or linking segments to actual business risks (e.g., expected revenue loss if churn occurs) would have elevated this to “Excellent.”

•C3: Marketing Strategy & Analysis Improvement. Evaluate data, alternative views, and propose improvements – Very Good

Your response to this criterion was very good, as the marketing strategy is clear and based on data, with moderate reflection on improvements or alternate views. For example, the marketing strategies proposed for each key segment (Potential Loyalists, At Risk, Can’t Lose Them) were tailored and operationally sound. You mentioned using incentives like referral bonuses and feedback-linked discounts that showed a strong customer-centric

approach (Page 15). You also layered strategies across levels of engagement, from “win-back” campaigns to “VIP gifts,” which is commendable. However, these strategies could be elevated by tying them to performance metrics or prioritising based on expected CLV uplift or ROI.

•C4: Report Presentation – Excellent

Your response to this criterion was excellent, as the report is professionally formatted, visually engaging, free from errors, and fully referenced. Charts and tables were integrated effectively. For example, you effectively used figures like Figure 2 (Top RFM Scores) and visuals for segment subscription status (Page 20) to communicate patterns clearly. References were correctly formatted, and sections were logically ordered with a clean Table of Contents. Minor formatting inconsistencies (e.g., inconsistent use of “Can’t Lose Them” in figure legends vs. text) can be polished further to enhance presentation uniformity.

•C5: Video Presentation – Very Good

Your response to this criterion was very good, having a clear presentation with minor delivery issues. You covered the report content well. For example, you delivered content confidently, integrated key report insights, and maintained a professional tone throughout. However, to reach an “Excellent” standard, you could enhance engagement by incorporating live visual elements, such as scrolling through Excel dashboards or animating transitions between segment strategies.

Please feel free to send me an email if you have any specific questions.

Regards,  
Gargi Datta