ACTL3141/ACTL5104 Assignment Rubric, T1 2023

TASK/CRITERIA	Below Expectation (F)	Meets Expectation (PS-CR)	Exceeds Expectations (DN - HD)
Apply appropriate descriptive analysis of the data and provide a description of the characteristics of the dogs in the dataset **[10 marks]**	Does not apply appropriate methods to perform a descriptive analysis of the dog data, or applies them inaccurately Does not describe the profile of the dogs, or makes an ad hoc identification of this profile without reference to the results of the descriptive analysis	Applies some appropriate methods to explore the characteristic of the dogs in the data Describe the profile of the dogs making some references to the results of the descriptive analysis	Accurately applies appropriate methods to effectively explore the dog mortality data Provides an insightful description of the profile of the dogs which is clearly supported by the results of the descriptive analysis
Provide fitted model results, summary, and discussion using various survival analysis methods **[15 marks]**	Does not provide a summary and discussion of survival analysis results	Summarises and discusses model results using some appropriate survival analysis approaches	Provides a clear and comprehensive summary and discussion of the results using a variety of alternative survival analysis approaches
Apply appropriate logic to interpret and critique alternative survival analysis approaches, and uses their output to get insights on the impact of different covariates on mortality the mortality of companion dogs **[15 marks]**	Does not demonstrate adequate logical reasoning Does not identify the impact of the different covariates, or makes an ad hoc discussion of their impact on the mortality of companion dogs	Demonstrates some logical reasoning but may have some weaknesses or over-simplification Identifies the impact of the different covariates on the mortality of companion dogs, making some references to the modelling results	Accurately identifies and explains contextual issues, and demonstrates excellent problem-solving skills Clearly identifies the impact of the different covariates on the mortality of companion dogs which is clearly supported by the qualitative and quantitative analysis of the mortality data
Provide life tables for insured and uninsured dogs and uses the results to get insights on the lifespan of insured and uninsured dogs **[20 marks]**	Does not provide lifetables for insured and uninsured dogs Does not provide a summary and discussion of life table estimates Does not demonstrate adequate logical reasoning for the calculation of the life tables	Provides life tables for insured and uninsured dogs Summarises and discusses the life table estimates Demonstrates some logical reasoning for the construction of the life tables but may have some weaknesses or over-simplification Compares the life tables results with the results in Teng et al. (2022)	Provides life tables for insured and uninsured dogs that take into potentially important factors Provides a clear, comprehensive, and insightful summary and discussion of the life table estimates Accurately identifies and explains assumptions for the construction of the life table and demonstrates excellent problem-solving skills Provides a clear, comprehensive and insightful comparison of the life tables results with the results in Teng et al. (2022)
Identify & critically assess the potential problems of using only death data **[10 marks]**	Does not identify the potential problems of using only death data for the analysis Does not evaluate the possible impact of using only death data in the context of companion dog dataset	Identifies and discusses the potential problems of using only death data for the analysis Evaluate the possible impact of using only death data in the context of companion dog dataset but may have some weaknesses or over-simplification	Accurately identifies and discusses the potential problems of using only death data for the analysis Evaluate comprehensible the possible impact of using only death data in the context of companion dog dataset and discussed their implication for the analysis and interpretation of results

Identify & critically assess ethical issues, implications in business decision making. **Identify social / cultural dimensions and implications of business context and practices** **[10 marks]**	Does not use ethical frameworks / principles to analyse issues, e.g.: Does not identify relevant ethical frameworks Does not identify the main stakeholders or accurately explain the impacts on them Does not identify key social / cultural issues or implications in a business context, or Makes an ad hoc identification without reference to relevant theory /frameworks	Identifies appropriate ethical frameworks / principles and applies them analytically to business decisions. Identifies relevant stakeholders. Provides reasonable analysis of implications of decisions on stakeholders Identifies some key social /cultural issues and implications in a business context but may not adequately explain these using appropriate theory and frameworks.	Uses appropriate ethical frameworks in a thorough, critical analysis of issues. Identifies the key stakeholders and provides insightful, broadly based assessment of implications on them of business decisions Identifies and explains key social / cultural issues and implications in a business situation, using appropriate theory and frameworks.
Propose recommendations to address ethical considerations **[5 marks]**	Does not propose feasible recommendations to address the issues.	Proposes reasonable recommendations to address issues. Provides sound justification for recommendations, based on analysis and relevant ethical frameworks / principles.	Provides appealing recommendations that convincingly address identified issues. Implications of recommendations are well considered, and alternative responses if appropriate are assessed well.
COMMUNICATION CRITERIA	**Below Expectation (F)**	**Meets Expectation (PS-CR)**	**Exceeds Expectations (DN - HD)**
Communicates clearly and concisely **[5 Marks]**	• Does not express (or explain where necessary) aim, ideas and information clearly and precisely in language appropriate for the intended audience, purpose and context (using own words as much as possible). • Uses inaccurate expression/grammar which often makes meaning unclear. Technical details not sufficiently presented and/or explained.	• Generally, but not consistently, expresses (and explains where necessary) aim, ideas and information clearly and precisely in language appropriate for the intended audience, purpose and context (using own words as much as possible). • Uses generally accurate expression/grammar but meaning occasionally needs to be clearer. Technical details generally presented and explained clearly.	• Consistently expresses (and explains where necessary) aim, ideas, arguments and information clearly, precisely and concisely in language appropriate for the intended audience, context and purpose (using own words). • Uses fluent, accurate expression/grammar (or with negligible errors which do not interfere with clarity). Technical details presented and explained clearly.

Structures text logically and coherently
[5 Marks]
	• Inappropriate split of information in the main body vs appendix as requested in task; and/or bad/insufficient cross reference as appropriate
	• Does not present main argument, ideas and information logically or structure text coherently to achieve aim, e.g.:
	  – Text has an unclear focus and possibly irrelevant or repetitive material; ideas are not sequentially or logically developed
	
	Text is not structured to effectively achieve aim (e.g., inadequate introduction and/or conclusion; paragraphs not developed or linked)
		• Overall adequate split of information in the main body vs appendix as requested in task, with cross references as appropriate.
		• Generally, presents main argument, ideas and information logically and structures text coherently to achieve aim e.g.:
		  – Text has a generally clear focus, with little or no irrelevant material; ideas are generally developed sequentially and logically, but this could be more consistent
		Text has an adequate structure (e.g. introduction and conclusion; paragraphs generally well- developed and linked, although text could be more cohesive)
			• Clear and well thought out split of information in the main body vs appendix as requested in task, with cross references as appropriate.
			• Presents all ideas /arguments/information logically and persuasively, and structures text coherently and effectively to achieve aim:
			  – Text has a clear focus, with no irrelevant or repetitive material, and a logical development and sequence of main ideas and supporting material
			Text has a clear, coherent structure, (e.g. introduction clearly defines aim/argument; paragraphs are well-developed, clearly linked and progress the argument; clear conclusion follows from discussion and reinforces key points)

Presents text professionally **[5 Marks]**	• Does not present document at a professional standard, e.g.	• Presents document at a professional standard, e.g.:	• Presents document very professionally, e.g.:

	– Little evidence of editing (frequent spelling/ punctuation errors) – Does not accurately use appropriate format (e.g. report) or follow requirements – Style and presentation are not appropriate for the specific business/academic context	– Some evidence of editing (only minor spelling/punctuation errors) – Uses appropriate format (e.g. report) and follows formatting requirements Style and presentation are appropriate and sufficiently formal for the specific business/academic context	– Evidence of thorough editing (e.g., no/negligible spelling /punctuation errors) – Accurately and effectively uses appropriate format (e.g. report) and meets requirements – Style and presentation are highly appropriate for the specific business/academic context