

| Criterion | Weighting(%) | Distinction(70%)A | Merit(60-70%)B | Pass(50-60%)C | Fail(40-49)D |
|---|--------------|---|---|---|---|
| EB Sturcture and Presentation | 10 | Excellent awareness, implementation and balance of the elements within the model of the data briefing. The linkage between sections is obvious and there is a strong narrative throughout. | Clear and logical structure of the report following the model of the data briefing. The balance, linkage and narrative between sections are evident, but could be improved upon considering the nuances of the topic. | Good structure of the report following the model of the data briefing. There is a narrative and linkage between sections but it is not directly obvious with some unbalance. | Poor report structure that vaguely follows the model of the data briefing. There is no obvious linkage between sections, with little narrative throughout. |
| EB Research Problem Framing | 20 | The research problem is highly pertinent or topical to a commercial or policy context and has been framed appropriately for the chosen audience based upon logical reasoning. There is a broad range of background research evaluating multiple credible sources to produce a convincing framing of the topic appropriate to the chosen audience. | The research problem is pertinent or topical to a commercial or policy context. The background, results and conclusions have been framed and summarised somewhat appropriately for the chosen audience in the executive summary but with some assumptions and limited reasoning. There is a range of background research evaluating multiple credible sources to produce a legitimate framing of the topic appropriate to the chosen audience. | The research problem is somewhat pertinent or topical to a commercial or policy context. The background, results and conclusions have framed and summarised for the chosen audience in the executive summary but with some assumptions and limited reasoning. The background research considers some credible sources to produce a plausible framing of the topic appropriate to the chosen audience. | The research problem and spatial scale should be completely reconsidered. There is limited background research considering few credible sources, producing an unreasonable and illogical framing of the research question. |
| EB Data analysis results and interpretation | 30 | The analysis is entirely appropriate to the problem. It demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of an appropriate approach and choice of techniques. Interpretations of results are very well constructed, clear and focused in relation to the research problem. Figures, maps, and diagrams are entirely appropriate for data the analysis being clear and well labelled. Maps and figures are excellent additions to the commuication of the excuvite summary | The analysis is appropriate to the problem, demonstrating a sound technical knowledge with some additional learning that could be built upon. Interpretations of results are logical and contain a well constructed discussion with linkage to the research problem. Figures and diagrams are fairly appropriate but could be improved upon (e.g. unnecessarily complex / too much irrelevant detail) and may contain minor errors. | The analysis might not be as pertinent as it could be. It demonstrates technical knowledge but may be limited and not appropriate to the research problem. Interpretations of results are largely correct and there with limited refrected to the research problem. Figures and diagrams are adequate but more appropriate visualisations could have been implemented. There might also be multiple errors that detract from their usefulness. | An attempt at analysis is made but does not address the problem effectively and demonstrates that the material covered in class has not been understood correctly. Interpretations of results are invalid, containing vagueness and ambiguity. Figures and diagrams are poor and do not aid understanding in any way. |
| RA Reproducibility | 20 | Your workbook runs without errors | Your workbook runs without errors | Your workbook runs with minor errors | Your workbook does not run. errors are major. (Eg the workbook would not run without major adjustments to original code. |
| RA Quality of Script and the outputs | 20 | The analysis undertaken in the notebook is fully reproducible. The code is well commented, each step of the analysis is highlighted in a logical structured way. Another data scientist could understand and use your code with minimal effort. Outputs are entirely appropriate for data the analysis being clear and well labelled. The script is highly efficient, demonstrating a comprehensive understanding of the best practices taught on the course E.g. intelligent creation of functions where appropriate, iterations to work efficiently with data(loops) or includes advanced programming techniques. Clever and creative use of the packages taught on the course. | The analysis undertaken in the notebook is fully reproducible. The code is well commented, commented, each step of the analysis is highlighted. Another data scientist could understand and use your code with some effort. Outputs are mostly appropriate for data the analysis being clear and well labelled. Demonstrating good engagement with the course material. The script is efficient, demonstrating a good understanding of the best practice taught on the course. E.g. creating of functions where appropriate. Good use of the packages taught on the course in data prep/Analysis. | The analysis undertaken in the notebook is somewhat reproducible. The code is well commented, but in places unstructured. Another data scientist could understand and use your code but would require a lot of effort on their part. Outputs are adequate for the analysis but more appropriate visualisations could have been implemented. Demonstrating some engagement with the course material. The script is efficient in places, but in parts more efficient ways could have been used to generate results. E.g. repeated code that could have been made a function. Poor practice using the packages taught of the course in data prep/Analysis. | The analysis undertaken in the notebook is not reproducible. The code is uncommented/ sparsely commented. Another data scientist could not understand and use your code. Attempts are made at outputs but they do not add to understanding in any way. Script is generally poor and riddled with Errors |