The Rubric for GA2

Task 1 & Task 2 (85%)

	HD	D	C	P	F
Complete Task 3 Interview	This is the HURDLE of A2, fail to present /show-up will result in ZERO of A2.				
Correct structure for the output files as specified in the specs	It is a must. Note that the output files should be parsable and also be in the pre-defined structure and with the same column names. Unparsable outputs and the output files that have any deviations from the specification, will receive zero marks for the output.				
Output (50%) — Dirty Data (30%)	90% or more of the errors are fixed accurately.	75% - 89% of the errors are fixed accurately.	60% - 74% of the errors are fixed accurately	50% - 59% of the errors are fixed accurately	0% - 49% of the errors are fixed accurately
Output (50%) — Missing Values (10%)	90% or more of the missing values are imputed correctly.	75% - 89% of the missing values are imputed correctly.	60% - 74% of the missing values are imputed correctly.	50% - 59% of the missing values are imputed correctly.	0% - 49% of the missing values are imputed correctly.
Output (50%) — Outliers (10%)	90% or more of the outliers are removed.	75% - 89% of the outliers are removed.	60% - 74% of the outliers are removed.	50% - 59% of the outliers are removed.	0% - 49% of the outliers are removed.
Task 1 Methodology (10%)	The report demonstrated a good solution in a proper way. No error or only minor errors are found in the methodology. The methodology consists of all required steps for the tasks, and produces output with HD scores.	The methodology consists of all required steps for the tasks, and produces output with above C scores.	The report has provided a fair solution. Three key steps are missing or lead to incorrect output (above P).	The report has provided a poor solution. Four key steps are missing or lead to incorrect output.	The report has provided a bad solution. Only one or two steps are demonstrated, which clearly cannot achieve the correct output..
Task 2 Data Reshape (15%) Exploratory Task of Data Reshaping	Different methods for data reshaping are well analysed. The effects of using different data-reshaping methods are shown in detail. The student uses different attributes to evaluate the performance of linear regression models and gives details explanations. The student has made a convincing recommendation to the readers based on the observation in the analysis.	Different methods for data reshaping are reasonably analysed. The effects of using different data-reshaping methods have been demonstrated. The student uses different attributes to evaluate the performance of linear regression models and gives a detailed explanation. The student has made a	Different methods for data reshaping are fairly analysed. The effects of using different data-reshaping methods have been demonstrated. The student uses different attributes to evaluate the performance of linear regression models and gives little explanation. The student has made a recommendation to the readers	Different methods for data reshaping are poorly analysed. The effects of using different data-reshaping methods have been demonstrated. The student builds a simple linear regression model without much consideration and explanation. The student then rushes to a recommendation to the readers.	Different methods for data reshaping are badly analysed. The effects of using different data-reshaping methods have not been demonstrated. The student builds a simple linear regression model without any explanation. The student then rushes to a recommendatio

		reasonable recommendation to the readers based on the observation in the analysis.	based on the observation in the analysis.		n to the readers.
Documentation (10%)	The report has proper sections and subsections (e.g. introduction, methodology, conclusion,...). The methodology is explained properly and the code is well commented.	The report has proper sections and subsections (e.g. introduction, methodology, conclusion,...). The methodology is explained fairly and the code is fairly commented. The report can be improved.	The report has some sectioning but it is not well organised. The explanation of the report is limited and the code is well commented.	The report has some sectioning but it is not well organised. The explanation of the report is poor and the code is well commented.	The report has poor/no sectioning and it is not well organised. The explanation of the report is poor and the code is poorly commented.

Note: Both non-fixed errors and newly introduced errors would be penalised (i.e. if while attempting to fix one of the anomalies - dirty data, missing value, and outliers- you introduced another error, you will lose marks accordingly)

Task 3 (15% + Hurdle)

Reflective Report on Feedbacks (10%)

Criterion	Good (2)	Average (1)	Not Satisfied (0)
Attend the week 10 feedback session	Attend the session together with the teammate(if any), able to present your current progress, any future planning you wish to undertake.	Attend the session but fail to present the current progress/future planning, OR not the entire group shown up.	Not attend
Record the feedbacks provided in applied session	All of TA's feedback has been recorded and shown in the report.	Only part of the feedback has been recorded in the report OR feedback is poorly organised.	Not to mention the feedback in the report.
Reflection on feedbacks	The report recorded the tailored solution/follow-ups or justification (if not solved) regarding the suggestions provided by TA.	The report mentioned some/part of the solution/follow-ups regarding the feedbacks, OR the solution/follow-ups are not solid/ need improvement.	Not to mention the reflections on feedback, OR the reflection is not making sense.
Reflective Report structure	The report has proper sections and subsections (e.g. introduction, feedback, reflection, future improvements,...). Every section is well explained with evidence and support (if any).	The report has some sectioning but it is not well organised. OR the explanation of the report is limited	The report has poor/no sectioning and it is not well organised. The explanation of the report is poor.
Reflective Report quality	Include the feedback and reflections on feedback in the reports (both meet the Good standard). All solutions, follow-ups are presented with data evidence/ EDA/ investigation of the dataset.	Include the feedback and reflections on feedback in the reports (both meet the average standard). Only some solution, follow-ups are presented with data evidence/ EDA/ investigation of the dataset.	None of feedback and reflections on feedback in the report (both not meet the average standard). OR no data evidence/ EDA/ investigation are provided to support the solution/follow-ups.

Presentation (5% + Hurdle)

	Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (0)
Time Limit (Approx. 5 min)	5-10 minutes	Less than 4 minutes, or over 10 minutes
Attendance	Entire team Show up	Not show up
Contribution	Both members (if any) talk about their A2	Not both member talk about A2
Coverage of A2	At least cover majority of A2 (80%): - All three files for task 1 - 2 files for task1 + task 2	Less than 80% of A2 was covered.
Quality of presentation	Able to present the overall methodology clearly, if any questions from TA, able to answer it.	Fail to present the A2 overall methodology, OR fail to answer questions from TA (if any)