

Name:

Marks:

Student no:

Technical component (45 marks)

Project Proposal assessment criteria	Level of achievement			
criteria	Outstanding (9)	Satisfactory (6)	Borderline (3)	Unsatisfactory (0)
Problem domain, and scope	Extensive, relevant and logically organized review, analysis, discussion of background material, both specific research and general theory. The proposal shows a clear mastery of the material in the topic area and ability to synthesize and abstract knowledge.	Acceptable coverage of background material, with both specific research and general theory, and shows basic understanding of the material in the topic area.	A limited coverage of background material, which perhaps does not cover both specific research and general theory. Flaws in the basic understanding of the material in the topic area are evident.	An extremely limited coverage of background material. A lack of understanding of the material in the topic area is clear. External work heavily used without academic merit.
Writing and presentation	Excellent logical structure, physical layout and appropriate attention to detail. The work is presented in an accurate, concise and coherent fashion. Scientific and technical style. No spelling mistakes or grammar errors. Appropriate referencing to a correctly formatted bibliography.	Acceptable structure and physical layout. Some inaccuracies or lack of detail in presentation of work. Neat, some spelling mistakes or grammar errors. Some errors in referencing or bibliography formatting. Appropriately acknowledges the work of others.	Structure and physical layout detract; many inaccuracies or considerable lack of detail in presentation of work. Numerous spelling mistakes or grammar errors. Several errors in referencing or bibliography formatting. Occasional failures to appropriately acknowledge the work of others.	Structure and physical layout very poor; presentation of work is inaccurate and incomplete. Numerous spelling mistakes or grammar errors. Several errors in referencing or bibliography formatting. Many failures to appropriately acknowledge the work of others.

Excellence, Innovation	The work is of the highest quality demonstrating best professional data science practice and showing substantial creativity and innovation.	The work is of average quality but with evidence of sound data science practice. A small amount of creativity and innovation is seen.	The work is of poor quality and without any significant evidence of sound data science practice. An insignificant amount of creativity and innovation is seen.	The standard of work demonstrates a complete lack of understanding of topic, and minimal effort invested. No creativity and innovation is seen.
Data Exploration	The proposal demonstrates a comprehensive descriptive statistical analysis and draws conclusions based on the obtained summary statistics and graphics. The work details and provides good explanations to the scientific approach the student is planning to undertake to solve the problem.	The proposal demonstrates a satisfactory descriptive statistical analysis and draws some conclusions based on the obtained summary statistics and graphics. The work details the scientific approach the student is planning to undertake to solve the problem.	The proposal demonstrates a limited descriptive statistical analysis. A very poor set of conclusions based on the obtained summary statistics and graphics is presented. The work does not detail the scientific approach the student is planning to undertake to solve the problem, or, proposes a clearly unreasonable approach.	The proposal fails to introduce a meaningful data exploration analysis, there are no conclusions obtained. The proposal does not detail the scientific approach the student is planning to undertake.
Understanding the available data sources and complying with ethics and privacy issues	The proposal shows an excellent understanding of relevant data sources, possible limitations, and the corresponding processing techniques. The work addresses the potential ethics and privacy issues.	The proposal shows a reasonable understanding of relevant data sources and the corresponding processing techniques. The work may fail to demonstrate the understanding of potential limitations of the available data. The proposal addresses the potential ethics and privacy issues.	The work shows some limited understanding of the available data sources. Limitation due to the available data are not addressed, and no details about the available processing techniques are provided. The proposal shows some basic understanding of the potential ethics and privacy issues.	The work demonstrates a complete lack of understanding of the available data sources and the corresponding processing techniques. The ethical aspect is not addressed.

Further comments:

Project Proposal assessment criteria	Level of achievement			
	Outstanding (1.5)	Satisfactory (1)	Borderline (0.5)	Unsatisfactory (0)
Genre: purpose	The opening succinctly establishes the purpose, and previews the contents of the document.	The opening contains unnecessary information that distracts from the document's purpose and contents.	Purpose and outline provided in the opening do not reflect the contents accurately.	Purpose of the document is unclear, or no outline has been provided for its contents.
structure	Document contains all structural elements in an appropriate order.	Some minor elements are missing or not presented in the right order.	Parts of the structure are mixed and hard to distinguish.	An essential part or parts of the structure are missing.
Register: audience	All expressions are appropriate to written communication, and carefully targeted at the audience.	Some expressions not adequately paraphrased or too casual, with a lack of sensitivity to the audience.	Many terms left unexplained, leaving some important points inaccessible to target readers.	Expressions sound overly casual and unprofessional with spoken colloquial expressions.
Discourse semantics: coherence	All topic sentences are clearly presented at the start of each segment, and followed through.	Some paragraphs contain multiple topic sentences, or the topic sentence is unnecessarily delayed.	Topic sentences are difficult to locate in some segments, or are not followed through.	Topic sentences are generally absent, causing the writing to meander aimlessly.
cohesion	All paragraphs are fully developed using appropriate lexical ties and known-new arrangement to link both sentences and paragraphs.	The development is generally clear, but some lexical ties have been left implicit, relying on readers to infer the relationship between ideas.	Lexical ties or known-new arrangements are significantly lacking, causing parts of the writing to appear disjointed.	Lexical ties are wrongly used or known-new arrangements are largely absent, rendering some ideas very difficult to follow.
positioning	Expressions generally sound objective but highly persuasive, and sources effectively positioned.	Expressions sound objective but lack persuasiveness, or sources cited are inadequately positioned.	Positioning contradicts the argument sometimes, or the sources cited are vague.	Positioning or sources are inappropriately used, causing the writing to sound subjective.
Lexicogrammar: sentence structure	All sentences are correct, start with important information, and are easy to understand.	Sentences contain noticeable grammatical errors, or are unnecessarily complicated.	Many sentences do not start with important information or contains significant errors.	Sentences are poorly phrased or are riddled with errors that render them difficult to read.
clear writing	Writing minimizes nominalization, vague terms and ineffective verbs.	Writing contains nominalization, vague terms or ineffective verbs.	Writing contains a substantial amount of ineffective words.	Writing is full of noun clusters, jargons, and ineffective verbs.
Graphology: spelling & punctuation	Writing is carefully proofread and completely free of errors.	Writing contains minor but noticeable careless errors.	Writing appears unprofessional with systematic errors.	Writing is riddled with errors, rendering it difficult to read.
formatting & referencing	Spacing, font size, script, etc. are professionally presented, with all references consistent & complete.	References are complete, but document presentation e.g. script, font size, or spacing, etc. is poor.	References are incomplete, inconsistent, or poorly presented.	Document is presented in a haphazard manner, or references are missing.

Further comments: