Assessment marking criteria

Components	Initial data exploration Data analysis and visualisation Summary of what was found Written communication in appropriate academic language.
Excellent (85 – 100)	 An outstanding analysis showing creativity and outstanding levels of thoughtfulness. This would include aspects such as: Correctly identifying and justifying types of attributes. Correctly finding, explaining and justifying useful summary statistics for the attribute. More than three analysis questions are answered correctly. Visualisations are correct, clear, and appealing. Thorough discussion of the result. Insightful concise summary written with careful thought towards the audience. Language use is error free and the report extremely well presented and organised.
Very good (75 – 84)	 A superior analysis demonstrating solid understanding of the three components. This would include aspects such as: Correctly identifying and justifying types of attributes. Correctly finding and explaining summary statistics for the attribute. More than three analysis questions are answered correctly. Visualisations are done correctly and clearly. Some discussion of the result. Excellent summary written with some thought towards the audience. Language use is mostly error free and the report well-presented and organised.
Good (65 – 74)	A good analysis demonstrating reasonable understanding of the three components. This would include aspects such as:

	 Mostly correctly identifying types of attributes. Some justifications may be missing. Mostly correct finding and explaining summary statistics for the attribute. Less than three analysis questions are answered correctly. Visualisations are done correctly and clearly. Not much discussion of the result. Reasonable summary but not much thought about the audience. Language use is mostly acceptable with some areas of improvement needed with respect to the presentation or organisation.
Satisfactory (50 – 64)	 A brief but just satisfactory analysis of the three components. This would include aspects such as: Mostly correct identification of types of attributes. Not much in the way of justification. Mostly correct summary statistics for the attribute but not well explained. Less than two analysis questions are answered correctly. Visualisations are not clear or incorrect. Not much discussion of the result. Summary mostly just says what exploration was done, not the results or meaning. Little to no thought of the audience. Language use may be vague with many aspects needing improvement.
Unsatisfactory (<50)	Not demonstrating the level required for a satisfactory result.