**Final Report with programming code and slides are worth 12% of your grade**

**Final Video (5%) + Final Report with R code & Slides (12%) = 17%**

3% final project report: choice of topic, business justification

3% final project report: understanding of the data, and data wrangling

3% level of programming, code, and modeling

3% overall presentation, graphics, and visuals

Base Requirements which if not included will face deduction:

* Group team members names listed in report heading/subtitle: -0.5
* Submission includes all relevant code files (at discretion based on missingness)
* Readme/documentation for code files: -1
* Submitted report respects page limits (at discretion based on severity)
* Dataset provided according to “submitting data” section in project instructions: -1
* Works Cited Page: -1

When grading, graders will select the point category which best corresponds to the deliverable.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Section | 0 point | 2 points | 4 points | 5 points |
| **Choice of Topic, Business Justification, and Problem Statement** | ○ Background information and objective not provided | ○ Background information provided but gives the reader little context into the choice of topic   ○ Objective and problem statement not very clear before diving into the analysis | ○ Background information about the topic clearly provide to the reader for context  ○ Objective statement is clear. Main research question is emphasized clearly. | ○ Outstanding background information provided about the topic  ○ Context is set with appropriate market research  ○ Business justification clearly quantified |
| **Understanding of the data and data wrangling** | ○ No mention of the data and datasets to provide context before the analysis | ○ Dataset is not complex enough for the rigor of the project   ○ Data not cleaned or transformed upon for proper analysis  ○ EDA not covered sufficiently  ○ Key features or feature engineering not covered in detail or done at all | ○ Sources of the data cited   ○ Explanation of the dataset(s) explained but not in enough detail   ○ If necessary, proper transformation of the data executed  ○ Good to great coverage of EDA  ○ Good to great coverage of key features and/or feature engineering | ○ Sources of the data explained. Several datasets are used and were merged/wrangled to provide ample details for this project  ○ Excellent overview and implementation of cleaning and/or key data transformations ○ Excellent coverage of EDA  ○ Excellent coverage of key features and/or feature engineering |
| **Approach/Methodology, Level of Programming, and Modeling** | ○ No analysis or approach documented   ○ No supplemental code submitted  ○ Project requires minimal amount of programming rigor  ○ No overview of modeling approach | ○ Approach and methodology are not easy to follow and not documented well   ○ Data models do not make sense with the data provided   ○ Level of programming required of the project is elementary and does not show effort in analysis  ○ Modeling approach is minimal and shows little to no experimentation | ○ Approach and methodology documented but not easy to follow   ○ Data models explained and modeled but does not flow well with the methodology   ○ Project required strong programming completed with diligent analysis  ○ Modeling approach clearly explained and shows experimentation with other models and some hyper parameters or feature selection methods. | ○ Approach and methodology make sense and easy to follow   ○ Data models explained clearly to help analyze the objective and supporting research questions   ○ Project required advanced programming knowledge and implementations  ○ Modeling approach and framework clearly explained and documented across several different approaches/model constructs with detailed hyperparameter and feature selection experimentation. |
| **Results, Overall Presentation, Graphics, Visuals** | ○ Results and conclusion not provided  ○ No visuals, graphics, or plots | ○ Conclusion stated not clear and does not make sense with the results   ○ Interpretation not provided well enough for the reader to understand   ○ Graphics and visuals are not legible or are entirely unhelpful to the understanding of the paper. | ○ Conclusion not stated clearly and left somewhat up to the reader   ○ Interpretation of key variables or results not explained   ○ Graphics are legible, but not necessary very helpful for the paper’s understanding | ○ Conclusion and results clearly displayed and stated and align with statistical results   ○ Graphics and visuals are appropriate to the flow of the analysis and are legible   ○ Graphics and visuals are legible and vastly aid the paper’s flow and understandability/readability |