| **Criteria** | **Ratings** | **Pts** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| This criterion is linked to a learning outcome GitHub repository | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **10 to >8.5 Pts**  **HD**  The GitHub repository has been logically structured, and follows best practice conventions for naming directories and files. The README file contains an excellent and thorough description of the repository and all of it's elements. The viewer is able to navigate through the repository without any confusion. The GitHub repository may provide more than the minimum required elements (e.g. it may include a `funcs` or R folder for additional scripts/loops, a `figs` or `images` folder etc). | **8.5 to >7.5 Pts**  **D**  The GitHub repository has been logically structured, and follows best practice conventions for naming directories and files. The README file contains a good description of the repository and it's elements, but may require further description on some aspects. The viewer is able to navigate through the repository without any confusion. The GitHub repository contains the minimum required elements. | **7.5 to >6.5 Pts**  **CR**  There may be some minor confusion for the viewer when navigating the GitHub repository. There may be some minor inconsistencies in the naming of files and folders. The README file may require some further development to provide a thorough explanation of the repo's contents and variable descriptions. The GitHub repository contains the minimum required elements. | **6.5 to >5.0 Pts**  **P**  There may be some confusion for the viewer when navigating the GitHub repository. There may be several inconsistencies in the naming of files and folders. The README file may require major further development to provide a thorough explanation of the repo's contents and variable descriptions. The GitHub repository may be missing one or more of the required elements. | **5 to >0.0 Pts**  **<P**  There is major confusion for the viewer when navigating the GitHub repository. Files and directories do not follow best practice naming conventions. The README file may be missing, or does not provide adequate information for the viewer to be able to understand the purpose of the repo and its contents. The GitHub repository is missing one or more of the required elements. | **0 Pts**  **No marks**  GitHub has not been used to host the data analysis project. | | 10 pts |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| This criterion is linked to a learning outcome Justification, flow and cohesiveness of arguments | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **10 to >8.5 Pts**  **HD**  An outstanding description of the scenario, relevant background information, justification and importance of the project, aim, limitations, and summary of the project has been presented. Argumentation throughout is logical and justified, and is presented in a cohesive way. | **8.5 to >7.5 Pts**  **D**  A high level description of the scenario, relevant background information, justification and importance of the project, aim, limitations, and summary of the project has been presented, with only minor inconsistencies Argumentation throughout is mostly logical and justified, and is mostly presented in a cohesive way. | **7.5 to >6.5 Pts**  **CR**  Some relevant information regarding the scenario, background information, justification and importance of the project, aim, limitation and summary of the project may be missing. Argumentation throughout may sometimes lack logic or justification, or may lack cohesion in the way it is presented. | **6.5 to >5.0 Pts**  **P**  Further development of the scenario, relevant background information, justification and importance of the project, aim, limitations and/or summary is required for the reader to understand these aspects. Argumentation throughout may lack logic or cohesion in the way it is presented. | **5 to >0.0 Pts**  **<P**  Major relevant information regarding the scenario, relevant background information, justification and importance of the project, aim, limitations and/or summary is missing and these aspects are not able to be understood by the reader. Argumentation throughout lack logic and cohesion in the way it is presented. | **0 Pts**  **No marks**  No introduction or summary has been provided. | | 10 pts |
| This criterion is linked to a learning outcome Analytic approach, justification and interpretation | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **30 to >25.5 Pts**  **HD**  The analytic approach used in the report demonstrates an outstanding understanding of best-practice analytic and data science methods. Decision-making surrounding the data analysis is well justified, and demonstrates an outstanding level of critical thinking. All data analysis outputs (e.g. numeric values, visualisations etc) are accurately and effectively interpreted and translated. All stages of the data analysis process are thoroughly and effectively reported. | **25.5 to >22.5 Pts**  **D**  The analytic approach used in the report demonstrates a high level of understanding of best-practice analytic and data science methods, with some minor inconsistencies. Decision-making surrounding the data analysis is justified, and demonstrates a good level of critical thinking. Most data analysis outputs (e.g. numeric values, visualisations etc) are accurately interpreted and translated. All stages of the data analysis process are thoroughly reported. | **22.5 to >19.5 Pts**  **CR**  The analytic approach used in the report demonstrates some misunderstanding of best-practice analytic and data science methods. Decision-making surrounding the data analysis may lack justification and/or critical thinking. Some data analysis outputs (e.g. numeric values, visualisations etc) are accurately interpreted and translated. There may be some stages of the data analysis process that have not been thoroughly reported. | **19.5 to >15.0 Pts**  **P**  The analytic approach used in the report demonstrates misunderstanding of several aspects of best-practice analytic and data science methods. Decision-making surrounding the data analysis may lack justification and/or critical thinking. A number of data analysis outputs (e.g. numeric values, visualisations etc) may lack accurate interpretation and translation. There may be some stages of the data analysis process that have not been thoroughly reported. | **15 to >0.0 Pts**  **<P**  The analytic approach used in the report demonstrates major misunderstanding of several aspects of best-practice analytic and data science methods. Justification for decision-making may not have not been presented. Data analysis outputs (e.g. numeric values, visualisations etc) may not be interpreted and translated. There may be several stages of the data analysis process that have not been reported. | **0 Pts**  **No marks**  The analytic approach has not been presented. | | 30 pts |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| This criterion is linked to a learning outcomePlayer recommendations | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **20 to >17.0 Pts**  **HD**  Outstanding interpretation of the data analysis has been presented and appropriate player recommendations have been made. Interpretation and translation of the project is an accurate reflection of the evidence presented throughout the analysis. All relevant information has been presented effectively, showing an outstanding level of originality and creativity. The information presented is appropriate for and would be easily understood by the intended audience. | **17 to >15.0 Pts**  **D**  A high-level interpretation of the data analysis has been presented and appropriate player recommendations have been made. Interpretation and translation of the project is an accurate reflection of the evidence presented throughout the analysis. Most relevant information has been presented effectively, showing a good level of originality and creativity. The information presented is appropriate for and would be easily understood by the intended audience. | **15 to >13.0 Pts**  **CR**  Appropriate player recommendations have been made, and the interpretation of and translation of the project is an accurate reflection of the evidence presented throughout the analysis, but may require some further development. There may be some relevant information missing, and the presentation of information may be lacking originality and creativity. The information presented is mostly appropriate for and would be understood by the intended audience. | **13 to >10.0 Pts**  **P**  Player recommendations are mostly appropriate, but there may be aspects of the interpretation and translation of the project that do not accurately reflect the evidence presented. The information presented may be missing some important aspects, and may be lacking originality and creativity. The information presented may not be completely appropriate for the intended audience. | **10 to >0.0 Pts**  **<P**  Player recommendations are not appropriate and do not reflect the evidence presented in the data analysis. The information presented suggests a lack of understanding of the data analysis, and may not be appropriate for the intended audience. | **0 Pts**  **No marks**  There are no player recommendations presented. | | 20 pts |
| This criterion is linked to a learning outcomeWriting style, grammar, structure and overall appearance | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **10 to >8.5 Pts**  **HD**  Outstanding writing quality, showing no grammatical or spelling errors throughout. The report is structured in a logical way, allowing the reader to follow the information and content presented with ease. The report shows an outstanding level of visual appeal, with an appropriate and effective knitr report template used that is not the default template. | **8.5 to >7.5 Pts**  **D**  High-level writing quality, showing only minor grammatical and/or spelling errors, or minor structural confusion. The reader is mostly able to follow the information and content presented with ease. The report shows a high-level of visual appeal, with an appropriate and effective knitr report template used that is not the default template. | **7.5 to >6.5 Pts**  **CR**  The writing shows some grammatical errors, spelling errors and/or structural confusion, causing some difficulty for the reader to follow the information and argumentation in parts of the report. The default knitr report template may have been used. | **6.5 to >5.0 Pts**  **P**  Writing shows some grammatical errors, spelling errors and/or structural confusion, causing difficulty for the reader to follow the information and argumentation in several parts of the report. The default knitr report template has been used. | **5 to >0.0 Pts**  **<P**  Unsatisfactory quality of writing, showing many grammatical errors, spelling errors and structural confusion, causing difficulty for the reader to follow the information presented in the report. The default knitr report template has been used. If R Markdown has not been used to generate the knitr report, the student will receive a relevant mark in the range of 0-5 marks for this criteria. | **0 Pts**  **No marks**  No written report provided. | | 10 pts |
| This criterion is linked to a learning outcomeR coding style | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **15 to >12.75 Pts**  **HD**  Outstanding coding style, demonstrating the use of best-practice recommendations throughout. The code is completely reproducible and does not contain any errors. Where relevant, loops and user-defined functions have been used instead of repeating code. Comments have been used to clearly and concisely describe code. The length of each individual code chunk is appropriate. The Markdown language and R Markdown code chunk options have been used accurately and effectively where relevant. | **12.75 to >11.25 Pts**  **D**  High level coding style, demonstrating the use of best-practice recommendations throughout, with only minor inconsistencies. The code is completely reproducible and does not contain any errors. Code may have been repeated instead of using loops or user-defined functions. Comments have been used to clearly and concisely describe code. The length of each individual code chunk is appropriate. The Markdown language and R Markdown code chunk options have mostly been used accurately and effectively where relevant. | **11.25 to >9.75 Pts**  **CR**  The code may demonstrate some inconsistencies with best-practice recommendations. The code may not be completely reproducible, or may contain some errors. Code has been repeated instead of using loops or user-defined functions. Further commenting may be required for the reader to understand the what the code does. The length of each individual code chunk may be too long. The Markdown language and R Markdown code chunk options may not have been used where relevant. | **9.75 to >7.5 Pts**  **P**  The code demonstrates several inconsistencies with best-practice recommendations. The code may not be completely reproducible or may contain some errors. Code has been repeated instead of using loops or user-defined functions. Comments may be missing. The length of individual code chunks is not appropriate in some instances. The Markdown language and R Markdown code chunk options may not have been used where relevant. | **7.5 to >0.0 Pts**  **<P**  Code has been repeated instead of using loops or user-defined functions. Comments may be missing. The length of individual code chunks may not be appropriate. The Markdown language and R Markdown code chunk options may not have been used where relevant. | **0 Pts**  **No marks**  R code has not been provided. | | 15 pts |
| This criterion is linked to a learning outcomeReferencing | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **5 to >4.25 Pts**  **HD**  In-text referencing has been provided for all relevant statements, claims and sources. In-text referencing and the reference list are both formatted correctly using the Vancouver referencing style. Effective paraphrasing has been used throughout. Hyperlinks have been used effectively where relevant. | **4.25 to >4.0 Pts**  **D**  In-text referencing has been provided for most statements, claims and sources. In-text referencing and the reference list are both formatted correctly using the Vancouver referencing style, with minor errors only. Mostly effective paraphrasing has been used throughout. Hyperlinks have mostly been used effectively where relevant. | **4 to >3.25 Pts**  **CR**  There may be some statements and claims lacking in-text citations, a number of errors in the formatting of the reference list and/or in-text citations. Direct quotes may have been used rather than paraphrasing. Hyperlinks may not have been used appropriately. | **3.25 to >2.5 Pts**  **P**  There may be a number of statements and claims lacking in-text citations, and a number of errors in the formatting of the reference list and/or in text citations. Direct quotes may have been used a number of times rather than paraphrasing. Hyperlinks may not have been used. | **2.5 to >0.0 Pts**  **<P**  There are several errors and inconsistencies in the in-text referencing and reference list. In-text referencing or the reference list may have not been provided. There is no attempt to paraphrase. Hyperlinks may not have been used. | **0 Pts**  **No marks**  There is no reference list or in-text citations provided. | | 5 pts |

Total points: 100