

Rubric for Big Data Analysis Group Assessment Task

Criterion 1: Technical Implementation of Data Analysis (45%)

- **Outstanding:** Solutions are fully functional, efficient, and demonstrate innovative use of Spark/Databricks features. Code is clean, well-documented, and reflects a deep understanding of Big Data principles. Assumptions are verified and clearly explained.
- **Excellent:** Solutions are functional, efficient, and use Spark/Databricks features appropriately. Code is well-structured and mostly well-documented. Assumptions are verified and explained, with minor gaps.
- **Very Good:** Solutions are functional and use appropriate Spark/Databricks features, though not optimally. Code is functional but could use minor improvements in structure or documentation. Assumptions are mostly verified and explained.
- **Good:** Solutions are mostly functional but may contain inefficiencies or minor errors. Code is somewhat clear, with some areas needing better structure or documentation. Assumptions are partially verified and explained.
- **Satisfactory:** Solutions show effort but may contain significant inefficiencies, errors, or incomplete implementations. Code is functional but poorly structured or documented. Assumptions are stated but not well-verified.
- **Needs Improvement:** Solutions are incomplete or mostly incorrect, showing a lack of understanding of Spark/Databricks. Code is poorly written, with minimal effort to explain or verify assumptions.
- **Needs Significant Revision:** Solutions fail to demonstrate basic functionality or understanding of Big Data tools. Code is unstructured, undocumented, and assumptions are not addressed.
- **Needs Substantial Work:** Solutions are missing or entirely incorrect. Code is absent or non-functional, with no attempt to address assumptions.

Criterion 2: Explanation of Implementation and Results (25%)

- **Outstanding:** Clear, concise, and comprehensive explanation of the

implementation, with strong justification for methods used. Results are accurately stated and well-connected to the implementation.

- **Excellent:** Clear and thorough explanation of the implementation and results, with good justification for methods. Minor gaps in detail.
- **Very Good:** Explanation is clear but not as detailed. Justification for methods is provided but lacks depth in some areas.
- **Good:** Explanation is adequate but lacks clarity or detail in parts. Results are stated but not always well-connected to the implementation.
- **Satisfactory:** Explanation is basic and lacks depth. Justification for methods is minimal or absent. Results are stated but may not be clearly connected to the implementation.
- **Needs Improvement:** Explanation is unclear, incomplete, or contains errors. Justification is weak, and results are not well-connected to the implementation.
- **Needs Significant Revision:** Explanation is mostly missing or incorrect. Justification for methods is absent, and results are unclear or incorrect.
- **Needs Substantial Work:** Explanation is absent. Results are missing or unrelated to the implementation.

Criterion 3: Collaboration, Group Cohesion, and Critical Reflection (20%)

- **Outstanding:** Clear evidence of excellent collaboration, with balanced contributions from all members. Insightful, well-balanced reflections from all group members, clearly highlighting contributions, challenges, and key learnings. Suggestions for future improvements are thoughtful and practical. The recording demonstrates a cohesive, well-coordinated group effort.
- **Excellent:** Strong evidence of collaboration, with most members contributing equally. Reflections are meaningful, with clear identification of contributions and learnings. Suggestions for improvements are practical but less comprehensive. The recording reflects good group cohesion.
- **Very Good:** Evidence of collaboration, though contributions may be slightly unbalanced. Reflections are meaningful, but contributions or learnings may not

be well-detailed. Suggestions for improvement are included but basic. Group effort is evident but could be more cohesive.

- **Good:** Collaboration is present but uneven, with one or more members contributing significantly more. Reflections are present but may lack depth or clarity. Contributions and learnings are addressed but not consistently detailed across the group. Some signs of group effort are lacking.
- **Satisfactory:** Limited collaboration, with significant imbalances in contributions. Reflections are basic, with minimal detail or insight into contributions or learnings. Suggestions for improvement are vague or absent. The recording lacks cohesion or demonstrates coordination issues.
- **Needs Improvement:** Minimal collaboration, with clear dominance by one or two members. Reflections are unclear or lack meaningful content. Contributions and learnings are poorly addressed or missing. The group effort is disjointed or unclear.
- **Needs Significant Revision:** Very little collaboration is evident. Reflections are missing for some group members or are superficial. No meaningful discussion of contributions, challenges, or learnings. The group effort appears fragmented or uncoordinated.
- **Needs Substantial Work:** No collaboration is evident. Reflections are absent or entirely unrelated to the task. The recording reflects an individual effort rather than a group task.

Criterion 4: Presentation of Submission (10%)

- **Outstanding:** Submission is professional and adheres to all guidelines. Screen recording is clear, within time limits, and well-structured. Supporting materials are organised and complete.
- **Excellent:** Submission is professional and mostly adheres to guidelines. Screen recording is clear and within time limits, with minor organisational issues.
- **Very Good:** Submission meets guidelines but may have minor issues with structure or clarity in the recording or supporting materials.

- **Good:** Submission meets most guidelines but has noticeable issues with clarity, structure, or organisation.
- **Satisfactory:** Submission meets basic requirements but lacks polish or clarity. Recording or supporting materials are incomplete or poorly organised.
- **Needs Improvement:** Submission is incomplete or poorly organised. Recording lacks clarity or does not adhere to guidelines.
- **Needs Significant Revision:** Submission is largely incomplete or fails to meet key guidelines. Recording is unclear or disorganised.
- **Needs Substantial Work:** Submission is absent or entirely non-compliant with guidelines. Recording is missing or unusable.