Rubric to Evaluate Peer Project Drafts

Performance Element	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Emerging (1)	Not Present (0)
Communication	Problem is well-defined, motivated and its context is clear. Provides numerous supporting details, graphs, tables, etc. and examples are organized logically and coherently. No grammatical, spelling, or formatting errors. Visualizations are high quality images that fit the document and style perfectly. An exemplary scholarly work.	Problem is defined and context provided. Provides some supporting details, graphs, tables, etc. and examples in an organized manner. Information and visualizations are presented in a thoughtful and useful way. No obvious grammatical, spelling, or formatting errors. Visualizations are good quality and formatted well within the document.	The problem/context are partially defined, but somewhat uncler. Provides few details or examples in somewhat organized manner. Style and presentation should be improved. Somewhat difficult to navigate. Obvious grammatical, spelling, or formatting errors exist.	Poor problem definition and/or little context provided. Written in a narrative form (akin to a diary entry) as opposed to scholarly work. Many grammatical, spelling, or formatting errors throughout. Visualizations and/or their fit within the document could be vastly improved.	Problem is not definted or poorly defined. Difficult to read, appreciate and navigate through the results. The grammatical, spelling, and/or formatting errors and/or the visualizations make the document difficult to read and seriously detract from the credibility of the work.
Analysis	The analysis plan is logical, thorough, and at least 75% implemented. The CRISP-DM steps of data understanding, data prepration, and modeling are clearly demonstrated in a masterful way: appropriate methods, professional-level presentation, curated results, and the key findings are clearly and concisely communicated and supported.	The analysis plan is logical, thorough and at least 75% implemented. The CRISP-DM steps of data understanding, data prepration, and modeling are clearly demonstrated and the presentation is high quality. The key findings are easily identified.	The analysis plan is present but somewhat confusing or hard to follow. It is at least 50% implemented. The CRISP-DM steps of data understanding, data prepration, and modeling are likely used, but contain irrelevant elements and/or are not presented well. While findings are identified, they are difficult to understand or not well supported.	The analysis is poorly planned and disconnected but is implemented in part (at least 25%). The analysis contains multiple errors and does not reprseent CRISP-DM well. Authors unsuccessfully attempt to present their findings.	Analysis plan is missing and/or is implemented less than 25%. No key findings and little to no potential to identify key findings are apparent.
Evaluation	Insightfully interprets data/info/models; Uses and interprets appropriate model performance diagnostics. Identifies assumptions, issues, error diagnosis. interpretaion, and/or limitations. Correct usage of resampling to tune models and to generalize performance is implemented.	Accurately interprets data/info/models; Uses appropriate model performance diagnostics. Correct usage of resampling to tune models and to generalize performance is implemented.	Makes some errors in data/info/model interpretation; Questionable model performance diagnostics. Partially correct usage of resampling to tune models or to generalize performance.	Interprets data/info/models incorrectly. Incorrect model performance diagnostics. Incorrect usage of resampling to tune models or to generalize performance.	Does not evaluate data, info or models.

Predicting Time of Arrival for Food Delivery Service

Communication (4):
- The problem statement and background are well defined.
- A table of the data description (summary) can be useful.
- No grammatical errors.

Analysis (3):
- Provides plots to analyse the data.
- Please increase the font size of the plots' axis.
- You can decrease a bit the size of the plots in order to avoid having multiple empty spaces.

Evaluation (4):
- Methodology was clearly described.
- A summary table with the performance of the models used for training was provided.
- The future scope of work was mentioned.