# 1. Suitability of Objective, Problem, and Data Selection (10 marks)

| Criteria | Poor | Needs Improvement | Satisfactory | Good | Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Clarity of Objective (5 marks) | 0-1 The objective is unclear, vague, and not evidently connected to a business problem or data, it can't be achieve by predictive modelling. | >1-2 The objective is identified but not clearly articulated or well-aligned with the business problem and data, and it might be achieved by predictive modelling. | >2-3 The objective is clear, with a basic alignment to the business problem and data context, and it can be partly achieved by predictive modelling. | >3-4 The objective is detailed, well-articulated, and effectively aligns with the business problem and data, and it can be achieved completely by predictive modelling. | 5 The objective is exceptionally clear, focused, and perfectly aligned with the data and the business problem, and predictive modelling can achieve it completely and effectively. |
| Relevance of Problem and Data Appropriateness (5 marks) | 0-1 The business problem is not identified or is poorly connected to the objective and data. The data selected is unsuitable, with no clear connection to the business problem or objective. | >1-2 The business problem is mentioned but lacks a clear link to the objective and data, with minimal relevance shown. The data selected has a weak connection to the business problem and objective, with minimal suitability shown. | >2-3 The business problem is relevant, and a basic connection between the objective and data is established. Predictive modelling is shown to be a possible solution. The data selected is appropriate, with a basic level of suitability and relevance to the | >3-4 The business problem is well-defined, relevant, and shows a good connection to the objective and data. Predictive modelling is shown to be an effective solution. The data selected is highly suitable and has a clear relevance and strong justification for the | 5 The business problem is clearly presented, demonstrating a deep understanding of its complexities and nuances. Predictive modelling is shown to be an essential and highly effective solution. The data's characteristics are comprehensively summarised to |

| | | | business problem and objective. | business problem and objective. | explain how they will support achieving the objective, and any limitations are addressed proactively. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

## 2. Data Preprocessing Knowledge and Application (30 marks)

| Criteria | Poor | Needs Improvement | Satisfactory | Good | Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Technique Application (15 marks) | 0-3 Preprocessing techniques are inappropriately used or completely omitted, showing no understanding. | >3-6 Preprocessing techniques are applied but with limited understanding and effectiveness. | >6-9 Preprocessing techniques are applied correctly with a basic level of understanding. | >9-12 Preprocessing techniques are applied effectively, showing good understanding and purpose. | >12-15 Preprocessing techniques are applied expertly with an excellent understanding and justification, demonstrating mastery. |
| Data Integrity (15 marks) | 0-3 Data integrity is not considered, leading to potential compromises in data quality. | >3-6 Data integrity is partially considered, but methods used are inadequate or incorrectly applied. | >6-9 Data integrity is maintained with appropriate methods, though the application could be improved. | >9-12 Data integrity is effectively maintained with methods that are correctly applied and show good understanding. | >12-15 The approach to ensuring data integrity is exemplary, showcasing a thorough understanding of best practices. Clear |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | evidence is provided that data quality has been enhanced without compromising its authenticity or the integrity of the analysis. |

## 3. Predictive Modelling Knowledge and Application (35 marks)

| Criteria | Poor | Needs Improvement | Satisfactory | Good | Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Modelling and hyperparameters Selection (20 marks) | 0-4 The model and hyperparameter selection are haphazard, and there is no understanding or rationale for the choices. | >4-8 The model and hyperparameter selection show some thought but lack a clear rationale and understanding of the options. | >8-12 The model and hyperparameter selection are appropriate, with a basic rationale for the choices. | >12-16 The model and hyperparameter selection are well thought out, with a clear rationale and a good understanding of the model's hyperparameter strengths, weaknesses and limitations. | >16-20 The selection of models and hyperparameters is done with exceptional insight, reflecting a deep understanding of the task. The rationale for the chosen model(s) and hyperparameters is compelling, demonstrating a sophisticated analysis of their strengths and limitations in the context of the specific business problem. |

| Technical Proficiency (15 marks) | 0-3 Technical skills are lacking, and there are numerous errors in model development and parameter tuning. | >3-6 Technical skills are developing but insufficiently, leading to suboptimal model development and tuning. | >6-9 Technical skills are adequate, resulting in a satisfactory model development and tuning. | >9-12 Technical skills are well-honed, leading to a well-developed and tuned model. | >12-15 Exhibits outstanding technical proficiency with a nuanced and expert model development and tuning approach. The application of techniques and methodologies indicates a high level of competence and innovation. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

## 4. Insightfulness of Analysis and Recommendations (10 marks)

| Criteria | Poor | Needs Improvement | Satisfactory | Good | Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Analytical Depth (5 marks) | 0-1 The analysis is superficial, offering no valuable insights or relevant recommendations. | >1-2 The analysis provides limited insights, and recommendations are generic or not actionable. | >2-3 The analysis is adequately insightful, with generally relevant and actionable recommendations. | >3-4 The insightful analysis offers well-reasoned recommendations that show good potential for business impact. | >4-5 The analysis demonstrates exceptional depth, with unique insights that offer clear added value. Recommendations are not only actionable but also demonstrate |

| | | | | | foresight and strategic thinking. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Business Relevance (5 marks) | 0-1 Analysis and recommendations are irrelevant to the business context or problem. | >1-2 Some relevance to the business context is noted, but recommendations lack impact and feasibility. | >2-3 Analysis and recommendations are relevant to the business context with a satisfactory level of impact and feasibility. | >3-4 Analysis and recommendations are strongly relevant to the business context and offer good potential for impact and implementation. | >4-5 The opinions and suggestions show a profound understanding of the business context. They are highly practical, well-justified, and likely to result in significant business improvement. |

## 5. Report Structure and Organisation (15 marks)

| Criteria | Poor | Needs Improvement | Satisfactory | Good | Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Logical Flow (5 marks) | 0-1 The report is disorganised with no logical progression, making it difficult to understand. | >1-2 The report shows an attempt at organisation but lacks a clear and logical progression. | >2-3 The report has a logical flow that aids in understanding but could be more intuitive and cohesive. | >3-4 The report is well-organized, with a logical and intuitive flow that facilitates a good understanding of the content. | >4-5 The report showcases an exemplary structure with a seamless flow that enhances the reader's understanding. Transitions between sections are smooth, guiding the reader |

| | | | | | effortlessly through the narrative. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Comprehensiveness (5 marks) | 0-1 The report is incomplete, missing key sections or critical information. | >1-2 The report includes most sections but lacks depth and detail in several areas. | >2-3 The report is complete, with all sections present and adequately addressed. | >3-4 The report is detailed and informative, covering all necessary sections with additional insights. | >4-5 Every section is complete and provides in-depth information that reveals a high level of understanding and analysis. The content goes beyond the basics to provide insightful perspectives on the project. |
| Formatting and Presentation (5 marks) | 0-1 The report ignores formatting guidelines, with an unprofessional and disorganised presentation. | >1-2 The report follows some formatting guidelines but lacks consistency and professionalism in presentation. | >2-3 The report adheres to most formatting guidelines and presents information in an organised manner. | >3-4 The report is consistent with formatting guidelines and presents information clearly and professionally. | >4-5 The report presentation is of outstanding quality, meticulously adhering to formatting guidelines. It employs professional visual and textual elements to convey information effectively and engagingly. |