"A1. RESEARCH QUESTION OR ORGANIZATIONAL NEED Approaching Competence Approaching CompetenceThe research question or organizational need is not clearly described. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 The submission rightly includes a discussion on which game factors may correlate with higher owner counts. A clearly described research question is not evident. A2. CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND Approaching Competence Approaching CompetenceThe submission does not describe the background of the project or the context in which the project occurs. Or the description is missing essential details, contains inaccuracies, or contains information that is not relevant to the project. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 The submission aptly contains background on challenges faced by indie developers and the context of Steam's digital marketplace. A full description of the project's context is not discernable. A3. SUMMARY OF PUBLISHED WORKS Approaching Competence Approaching CompetenceA summary of 3 different published works is provided, but the summary of 1 or more works is missing essential details or contains inaccuracies. Or 1 or more of the works do not relate to the research question or organizational need in part A1. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 The submission includes a summary of three published works relevant to the research question. However, one or more summaries are missing essential details and the full scope is not evident. A3a. RELATION OF PUBLISHED WORKS TO PROJECT Approaching Competence Approaching CompetenceThe description does not logically address how each published work relates to the research question or organizational need from part A1. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 The explanation accurately explains how each source supports the project's premise. A logical connection between all works and the research question is not fully apparent. A4. SUMMARY OF DELIVERABLES OF A DATA ANALYTICS SOLUTION Approaching Competence Approaching CompetenceThe described deliverables for the solution are not appropriate for the question or need in part A1. Or they would not be able to be realistically implemented, or they would not logically address the question or need. Or the description is not detailed, or it contains inaccuracies. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 The submission rightly highlights a set of deliverables including regression and clustering models, along with visualizations. A fully detailed and logically aligned set of deliverables is not evident. A5. BENEFITS AND SUPPORT OF DECISION-MAKING PROCESS Approaching Competence Approaching CompetenceThe submission explains how the proposed solution will benefit the organization or how the solution will support a decision-making process but not both. Or the explanation is illogical. Either the benefit or the decision-making process is unrealistic or is unlikely to occur as a result of the proposed data analytics solution. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 The submission rightly includes a discussion on how the project will guide developers’ strategies. A complete explanation of both benefits and decision-making support is not discernable. B1. GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND DELIVERABLES Approaching Competence Approaching Competence1 or more of the goals, objectives, or deliverables are vague, unrealistic, or not logically aligned with the project. Or the goals, objectives, or deliverables do not relate to the scope of the project or are not aligned with each other. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 Goals and deliverables are correctly discussed in terms of their relevance to indie developers. Alignment and specificity of these elements is not fully evident. B2. SCOPE OF PROJECT Approaching Competence Approaching CompetenceThe description of the project scope does not include what the project will or will not entail. Or the scope details do not logically align with the goals of the project. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 The submission aptly contains a general outline of the project’s scope. A detailed breakdown of what the project will and will not include is not apparent. B3. STANDARD METHODOLOGY Approaching Competence Approaching CompetenceThe submission does not logically explain how a specific project planning methodology will be used for project implementation. Or the explanation does not include specific details on how the methodology will organize the work. Or the methodology is not appropriate or relevant for the implementation of the proposed project. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 The submission includes discussion of regression and clustering as part of the methodology. A logical explanation of how these methods will organize the work is not fully present. B4. TIMELINE AND MILESTONES Approaching Competence Approaching CompetenceThe provided timeline is missing 1 or more project milestones or does not include the duration and start and end dates for each milestone. Or each milestone is not logically organized or logically sequenced by date. Or 1 or more of the milestones are unrealistic or irrelevant to the project. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 A general project timeline is discussed. Specific milestones with start/end dates and sequencing are not evident. B5. RESOURCES AND COSTS Approaching Competence Approaching CompetenceThe provided list does not include all necessary resources and all associated costs to implement the project. Or 1 or more of the resources and costs are unrealistic or irrelevant for the proposed project. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 The submission includes a list of tools and platforms such as Python and Tableau. A full list of associated costs and necessary resources is not discernable. B6. CRITERIA FOR SUCCESS Approaching Competence Approaching CompetenceThe submission describes the criteria for evaluating the success of project execution, but the criteria are not specific, measurable, or relevant to the proposed project. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 The submission rightly includes model performance and visual clarity as success criteria. Specific, measurable evaluation benchmarks are not fully evident. C1. HYPOTHESIS Approaching Competence Approaching CompetenceThe hypothesis is not clearly stated or is not aligned with the research question or organizational need identified in part A1. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 The hypothesis is identified with a corresponding justification that addresses how ownership relates to pricing and timing. Clear alignment between the hypothesis and research question is not discernable. C2. ANALYTICAL METHODS Approaching Competence Approaching CompetenceThe identified analytical methods do not align with the proposed solution. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 The submission rightly includes regression and clustering as primary analytical techniques. Full alignment between these methods and the problem statement is not apparent. C2a. JUSTIFICATION OF ANALYTICAL METHODS Approaching Competence Approaching CompetenceThe submission attempts to justify the chosen analytical methods, but the justification does not include specific, logical reasons for why the chosen analytical methods are appropriate for addressing the research question or organizational need identified in part A. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 The submission rightly includes a justification for the chosen methods based on their analytical strengths. However, specific logical reasoning for each method’s appropriateness is not fully evident. C3. TOOLS AND ENVIRONMENTS OF SOLUTION Approaching Competence Approaching CompetenceThe description does not include all tools and environments used to produce the data analytics solution, or 1 or more of the tools or environments are not relevant to the project. Or the description is missing third-party code that should have been included. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 The submission includes tools such as Python, Pandas, and Tableau. However, a comprehensive description of all tools and environments used is not fully present. C4. METHODS AND METRICS TO EVALUATE OUTPUT Approaching Competence Approaching CompetenceThe submission does not accurately describe the methods and metrics. Or the description does not include specific details on how the methods and metrics will evaluate the output of the data analytics solution or model. Or the description of the methods and metrics is vague or contains inaccuracies. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 Evaluation metrics like R² and MAE are discussed. Specifics on how these metrics validate model performance are not evident. C4a. JUSTIFICATION OF METHODS AND METRICS Approaching Competence Approaching CompetenceThe submission attempts to justify the chosen methods or metrics, but the justification does not include specific, logical reasons for why the chosen methods and metrics are appropriate for the data analytics solution. Or the methods or metrics are poorly supported. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 The justification for selected metrics is provided. Specific, logical support for why these are the most suitable is not fully discernable. C5. PRACTICAL SIGNIFICANCE Approaching Competence Approaching CompetenceThe submission does not logically describe how the practical significance of the data analytics solution will be assessed. Or the submission does not include specific criteria regarding whether the solution has provided the expected benefits or supported a decision-making process in the context of the chosen research question or organizational need. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 The submission rightly highlights how developers might apply the results to improve game visibility. A full description of how practical significance will be assessed is not evident. C6. VISUAL COMMUNICATION Approaching Competence Approaching CompetenceThe submission describes the tools and the graphical representations that will visually communicate the findings of the data analytics solution, but the description is missing key details for 1 or more of the described tools or graphical representations. Or the described tools and graphical representations will not effectively communicate the expected findings. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 The lesson plan incorporates multiple visual elements like scatter plots and heatmaps. Descriptions of how each visual effectively communicates findings are not fully discernable. D1. SOURCE OF DATA Approaching Competence Approaching CompetenceNot applicable. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 The submission rightly includes the dataset source as a Kaggle-hosted file. A full and correct identification of each dataset used is not apparent. D2. APPROPRIATENESS OF DATASET Approaching Competence Approaching CompetenceThe discussion does not provide reasons for why the dataset is appropriate for the stated goals of the project. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 The dataset’s inclusion of relevant variables is discussed. A clear justification for the dataset’s appropriateness is not fully evident. D3. DATA COLLECTION METHODS Approaching Competence Approaching CompetenceThe described data collection methods are vague. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 The submission includes an overview of how files were downloaded and processed. A thorough description of collection methods is not apparent. D4. DATA QUALITY Approaching Competence Approaching CompetenceThe summary includes observations on the quality or completeness of the data but not both. Or the observations of either the quality or completeness of the data are not logical or contain inaccuracies. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 Data cleaning steps and feature engineering are discussed. A complete summary evaluating both quality and completeness is not evident. D5. DATA GOVERNANCE; PRIVACY AND SECURITY; AND ETHICAL, LEGAL, AND REGULATORY COMPLIANCE Approaching Competence Approaching CompetenceThe discussion addresses data governance; data privacy and security; and ethical, legal, and regulatory compliance considerations, but 1 or more of these do not relate to the dataset or the proposed project. Or the discussion contains inaccuracies. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 Governance and data privacy considerations are present. A fully accurate and relevant discussion of all required areas is not discernable. D5a. PRECAUTIONS Approaching Competence Approaching Competence1 or more of the described precautions do not include specific details about working with and communicating about the data, or there is not a precaution described for each of the considerations discussed in part D5. Or 1 or more of the described precautions do not reasonably manage the risk associated with the considerations discussed in part D5. Evaluator Comments: Attempt 1 The submission rightly includes general precautions about data handling. Specific details about managing risks for each category are not evident.