

Marking Scheme

The marking scheme for this submission has two parts:

1. The *Executive Briefing* (60% of total mark for this submission) will be assessed as an essay incorporating analytical elements, with consideration given to the language, presentation, and content of the essay as befits a data-led briefing for a busy executive or policy-maker.
2. The *Reproducible Analysis* will be assessed on the following criteria:
 - *Reproducibility* (20% of total mark): we are able to run the entire notebook without errors. Inability to reproduce the output of the notebook may affect our ability to evaluate the student submission in the other two areas.
 - *Accuracy & Legibility* (10% of total mark): the outputs of the notebook (figures and maps, primarily) used in the *Executive Briefing* are of a high quality in terms of clarity, colour, layout, fonts, labelling, etc.
 - *Quality of Code* (10% of total mark): a holistic view will be taken of the code in terms of its clarity, efficiency, and legibility.

Reproducible Notebook

Code: Reproducibility (20% of total mark)

We are able to run the entire notebook without errors.

Note that it should *not* be possible to achieve a mark above 13 for submissions that **ignored or exceeded the 10MB single Zip file limit or 50MB overall Zip file limit unless it is specifically and clearly explained why this was necessary**. The students affected by this are listed at the bottom of this document.

One student emailed to say that their NLP analysis would take too long on the full data set so they've included the code they ran but commented it out and included a processed data file but I cannot find this email at the moment. This is an acceptable explanation.

Marking Scheme

Mark	Guidance
0	The notebook cannot be run even <i>after</i> manual intervention (<i>e.g.</i> to correct for obvious errors near the start of the <i>Reproducible Analysis</i>) and no documentation or other guidance has been provided. Code quality is exceptionally poor.
5	The notebook runs with <i>limited</i> manual intervention (<i>e.g.</i> to correct for missing paths or other trivial errors near the start of the <i>Reproducible Analysis</i>) and no documentation or other guidance has been provided. For example, the notebook requires the marker to <i>do</i> things in order to replicate their analysis (it is not ‘auto-/self-replicating’).
10	The notebook runs <i>without</i> manual intervention but there is <i>no</i> evidence of thinking about reproducibility. No documentation or other guidance has been provided. It is possible to achieve a mark of 10 with a run-time error later in the analysis.
15	The notebook runs <i>without</i> manual intervention and there is <i>some</i> evidence of thinking about reproducibility (<i>e.g.</i> there are notes about the use of Docker, or basic information about the data source, etc.). Code may not be fully portable (<i>e.g.</i> the path is platform-specific, or other assumptions about the operating context are made) or documentation, intermediate checks (<i>e.g.</i> outputs to check results of operations), and supporting information may be quite limited.
20	The notebook demonstrates substantial thought about reproducibility: documentation and guidance are provided at appropriate points, potential error conditions are identified, and the code is fully portable (<i>e.g.</i> <code>os.path.join</code> and <code>os.path.expand('~')</code> are used in place of platform-specific strings).

Code: Quality of Output (10% of total mark)

The outputs of the notebook are of a high quality in terms of formatting, clarity, colour, layout, fonts, precision, labelling, etc. This includes figures and tables created in the *Reproducible* section, but with a particular focus on those used in the *Briefing*.

Mark	Guidance
0	The default output is used ‘as is’ and no consideration has been given to clarity, colouring, fonts, layout, labelling, etc.
5	Some adjustments have been made to outputs but the results are uneven/poorly presented.
10	Considerable attention given to all aspects of the figures, maps, and tables, including labelling, precision, colour schemes, fonts, layout, etc.

Code: Quality of Code (10% of total mark)

A holistic view will be taken of the code in terms of its clarity, efficiency, and legibility. This is irrespective of the amount of documentation provided.

Mark	Guidance
0	The code appears to be largely copy+pasted from other sources and no consideration has been given to legibility or interpretability.
5	The code is clear with appropriately-chosen variable names, but it is inefficient with limited use of for loops, dictionaries/lists, functions and other techniques that could streamline the code.
10	The code is clear, variable names are appropriate, and attention has been given to data structures, use of loops or functions, and other techniques to create clear, legible, and efficient code.

Executive Briefing

I've discovered that my guidance was unclear as to whether the *Executive Summary* was or was not included in the word count. In the event of uncertainty please do not include it towards the overall limit.

Briefing: Relevance (15% of total mark)

The topic of the briefing is one that would interest the target audience.

Mark	Guidance
0	It is not possible to identify why the topic would be of interest to the target audience because neither the audience nor the relevance of the briefing are clearly identified.
5	Although the topic is clearly identified (this may be one of the provided topics, that's fine), its relevance to the target audience is not clearly established (perhaps because the latter is not clearly stated or no wider connections are drawn).
10	The intended audience is clearly identified and the value of the briefing to this audience is clearly established but is non-specific in terms of regulatory or market features. Basically, the relevance is obvious, but largely asserted.

Marking Scheme

Mark	Guidance
15	The intended audience is clearly identified and the value of the briefing to this audience is clearly established with specific reference to existing or planned regulation(s), or to features of Airbnb's market (<i>e.g.</i> professionalisation via management firms). Ideally, these are established by referencing recent newspaper articles or other grey literature.

Briefing: Context (10% of total mark)

The briefing is clearly connected to, and positioned within, a wider context.

Mark	Guidance
0	There briefing shows no awareness of the wider context, and there is no reference to other relevant scales (<i>e.g.</i> to local [Borough], regional [City], national, or international). The bibliography ranges between 0 and 4 articles, the majority of which are technical in nature.
5	The briefing establishes only a limited context as it is focused entirely on the London (regional) scale and demonstrates limited awareness of the local, national, international scales. The bibliography ranges between 3 and 7 articles, with at least one entry for the London regulatory framework.
10	The briefing is clearly aware of the wider context with links made to other scales and contexts such that it is clearly positioned within these different contexts. The bibliography ranges between 7 and n articles, with entries of the London and U.K. regulatory frameworks.

Briefing: Analysis & Recommendations (25% of total mark)

The analysis is clear and focussed, with evidence judiciously selected to support the conclusions and recommendations advanced (as appropriate) to the target audience.

Mark	Guidance
0	The analysis presented is poor-to-nonexistent and unfocussed with no obvious connection between the work and any conclusions or recommendations made (if any).
5	The analysis is weak, with the connection between the analysis and any conclusions or recommendations left largely implicit. Evidence is presented without context and with no regard for the audience.

Mark	Guidance
10	Although the analysis is weak, direct links to conclusions or recommendations advanced are nonetheless still made. However, there is a reliance on ‘facts’ largely shorn of context and they offer, at best, weak support for the findings presented. There is simply narration of the results of charts and tables with no sense of robust evidence (however indirect) being developed.
15	The analysis demonstrates clear attempts to connect to any conclusions or recommendations advanced, but weaknesses in the selection or communication of evidence mean that opportunities to strengthen the case are missed.
20	The analysis is clearly connected to the conclusions and recommendations advanced, but there is a missed opportunity for a ‘less is more’ approach: in other words, there is too much reliance on presenting (relevant) ‘facts’ and not enough space to properly communicate the findings.
25	The analysis is tightly focussed and evidence has been judiciously selected to support the conclusions and recommendations advanced. There is a clear focus on communicating the relevance of these findings to a non-academic audience.

Briefing: Quality (10% of total mark)

A holistic view is taken of the briefing in terms of its clarity and impact.

Mark	Guidance
0	The briefing follows a standard essay format and the quality of writing is poor.
5	There are obvious attempts to adjust to the briefing format, but poor choices in terms of 1) the number and quality of figures and tables; 2) the academic tone of the language used; and 3) the overall ‘style’ of the briefing; all work against the overall quality of the submission.
10	The briefing is well-organised and clear, with figures and tables well-chosen for impact; it is essentially a model for what a data-led briefing could and should look like.

