Group Project Marking Rubric

Assessment Element	Weight	Outstanding (80-100)	Excellent (70-79)	Good (60-69)	Acceptable (50-59)	Fail (Weak Work) (40-49)	Fail (Poor Work) (35-39)	Fail (Very Poor) (1-34)	Fail (No Content) (0)
Exploratory Data Analysis (EDA)	20%	Insightful and comprehensive EDA with exceptional detail, correct insights, and highly effective visuals. Identifies key features, trends, and biases.	Detailed EDA with mostly correct insights, effective visuals, and identification of key features.	Sound EDA with relevant insights, minor gaps in analysis. Effective visuals.	Basic EDA with limited insights and visuals. Limited identification of trends.	Weak EDA with superficial insights, lacking detail or depth.	Poor EDA with significant errors, minimal insights, or incomplete analysis.	Minimal EDA with errors; largely incomplete, little insight or value.	No EDA provided
Data Preparation for ML	20%	Excellent preprocessing, advanced feature engineering, thoroughly addresses missing data and bias.	Good preprocessing, mostly relevant feature engineering, addresses most issues effectively.	Satisfactory preprocessing and feature engineering; minor issues unaddressed.	Basic data preparation; minimal feature engineering, basic handling of missing values.	Weak data preparation; does not fully handle missing values, minimal features.	Poor data preparation; inadequate handling, errors in approach.	Minimal data preparation, limited or incorrect methods, substantial gaps.	No data preparation provided
ML Model Development	20%	Well-chosen models with thorough evaluation; excellent understanding of tuning & trade-offs, highly accurate predictions.	Appropriate models, clear evaluation, understanding of tuning & metrics, generally accurate.	Satisfactory model choice, some tuning, reasonably good evaluation metrics.	Basic model selection; limited metric evaluation, lacks tuning or optimization.	Weak model choice, lacking tuning or significant issues in evaluation.	Poor model choice, limited or incorrect metric evaluation.	Minimal model development, inappropriate model choice, significant gaps.	No model development provided
Ethical Analysis	20%	In-depth, critical 800-word analysis;	Comprehensive, well-structured analysis;	Adequate analysis identifying most	Basic ethical discussion, limited	Weak analysis; superficial with limited	Poor ethical analysis; lacks critical	Minimal or misguided ethical analysis,	No ethical analysis provided

		expertly identifies biases, fairness, trade-offs, real-world impact.	identifies main biases, trade-offs, and implications.	ethical issues; may lack depth in some areas.	identification of issues or biases.	exploration of ethical implications.	insight, fails to address main issues.	missing main concepts.	
Jupyter Notebook & Executive Summary	20%	Exceptionally clear, well-structured notebook; code is thoroughly documented, and summary is insightful and accessible.	Structured and clear notebook; good documentation and a clear, effective summary.	Functional notebook, adequate documentation; summary covers main points.	Limited documentation; summary lacks depth or clarity.	Weak documentation; notebook lacks coherence or detailed explanation.	Poorly documented notebook; significant gaps in summary or structure.	Minimal notebook; lacks clarity, structure, and documentation.	No notebook or summary provided

The **total mark** for this project will be calculated as the **average of the scores** achieved across the five assessment components, each weighted at **20%** of the final mark.