

BENVGSC6: Data Science for Spatial Systems – Coursework Mark Scheme

We use the marking scheme set out by the University London College.

	A+ (80-100%)	A (70-79%)	B (60-69%)	C (50-59%)	Fail (near pass) (40-49%)	Fail (1-39%)
Analysis context and research questions (15%)	<p>The report focuses on analysis and interpretation of the dataset chosen. Each component of analysis, visualisation, database structure is detailed in the context of the overall project. The report overall conveys, excellently, the rationale of the methodology undertaken and the visualisations created compliments the story behind the data analysis extremely well. The project's background references are framed extensively to wider projects/academic literature, far beyond that on the prescribed reading list. The research question is very</p>	<p>The report focuses on the analysis. The wider context of the work is clearly defined and how the work places in the wider context of research. The report conveys the story behind the analysis well and the dataset chosen compliments the story and analysis undertaken.</p> <p>The project's background references are framed well to wider projects/academic literature, with few to no inaccurate bibliography or citations.</p> <p>The research question is well thought out.</p>	<p>The report focuses on analysis of data and as a piece of individual work is well defined. The report fails to clearly detail how this fits into the wider context. The story behind the analysis is present but some flaws in execution of the analysis distract from the overall narrative of the submission.</p> <p>The project's background references are framed broadly to wider projects/academic literature. There may be some inaccuracies bibliography or citations.</p> <p>The research question is adequate and reflects some critical thinking of the topic.</p>	<p>The report shows a basic understanding of analysis and the data set chosen is limited in analytical scope. The story of the analysis is broken and the work raises more questions of the data then the work answers. The work satisfies the techniques that were taught during lectures but the wrong analytical techniques have been applied to the dataset.</p> <p>The project's background references are framed but may be limited to the prescribed reading list/datasets. There may be obvious inaccuracies bibliography or citations.</p> <p>A fair research question is proposed but is not interesting.</p>	<p>The report shows a basic understanding of analysis, but the data set chosen is unsuitable for analysis. The story of the analysis is broken and incoherent. The work raises more questions of the data then the work answers. The report details the wrong techniques to analyse the data and provides no insight to the data being analysed.</p> <p>Very little background research is evident beyond use of the datasets. Bibliography may be incomplete or inconsistent and citations poor.</p> <p>A research question is proposed but needs substantial improvements.</p>	<p>A poor attempt at the problem using an unsuitable dataset. The story behind the analysis is not present and the report has been rushed and thrown together haphazardly.</p> <p>There is no evidence of wider background research at all.</p> <p>No research questions.</p>

	interesting and insightful.					
Data collection handling, and presentation (15%)	A detailed description of the data is present. Data has been extensively treated and justified in preparation for analysis. There is a table that describes the variables selected for analysis so that the readers can easily understand the variables used for analysis.	A detailed description of the data is present. Data has been extensively treated and justified in preparation for analysis. There is a table that describes the variables selected for analysis.	A detailed description of the data is present. Data has been treated and justified in preparation for analysis. There are no obvious errors in variable selection.	A detailed description of the data is present, including data provider, country, and URL (if the URL exists). Data has been treated in preparation for analysis. There are obvious errors in variable selection, for example, including identification columns for analysis, or incorrectly treating categorical variable as numerical ones.	There is some description of the dataset but essential information is missing, such as provider, country, or URL (if the URL exists). Data is incomplete and is not compatible for data analysis. The data is unstructured and no obvious work has been carried out on the dataset.	No data source has been identified or collected, or data source incomplete and unavailable.
Correctness, depth and scope of data analysis (35%)	The work shows extensive knowledge of the topic chosen and an in-depth understanding of the links between the problem, data and method(s) employed to solve it. Shows considerable insight into any shortcomings of the analysis and demonstrates critical reflection on the finished product.	The work shows good knowledge of the topic chosen and a clear appreciation of the links between the problem, data and method(s) employed to solve it. Critical appraisal of the finished product is thoughtful and relevant. No errors in the notebook.	The work shows good knowledge of the chosen topic although there may be some minor issues with the choice of data and/or methods at the lower end of the scale. At the upper end of the scale, matching data and/or method to the problem is sound. Some evidence of critical reflection is displayed. Some minor errors in the code.	The work shows adequate knowledge of the chosen topic but choice of data and/or methods could have been better. Critical reflection may be poor, or lacking entirely at the lower end of the scale. There are a few errors in the code but they don't impact the presentation of the work.	The work shows poor knowledge of the chosen topic and the choice of data and/or methods is illogical. Critical reflection is an alien concept. There are existing errors in the code which prevent the code from executing, or the results of coding are largely different from the discussion in the text.	The work shows that methods taught were not understood at all.
Visualisation (10%)	Figures used to convey the visualisation of data analysed are of	Figures used to convey the visualisation of data analysed are excellent; they are	Figures used to convey the visualisation of data analysed are overall good and well	Figures used to convey the visualisation of data analysed are adequate but errors	Figures used to convey the visualisation of data analysed are poor and do not aid	Figures used to convey the visualisation of data

	publishable quality; they are clear, well labelled and convey the intended information expertly.	clear, well labelled and wholly appropriate. Visuals complement the report and display an understanding of the methodology executed within the report	chosen, but at the lower end of the scale may contain minor errors. Visuals are lacking in clarity.	detract from their usefulness. Visuals are lacking in context. The graphics may not be referenced within the document.	understanding in any way. The graphics are not referenced within the document and are out of order/place.	analysed are bad or missing entirely.
Quality of writing (15%)	The final piece of work is presented to a professional standard. Exceptionally well written; stylish with no errors in spelling, punctuation or grammar. The piece of work is clearly and logically structured and enjoyable to read.	The final piece of work is presented very well and would only require minor editing. Very well written with virtually no errors in spelling, punctuation or grammar. The piece of work is clearly and logically structured and flows well.	A good, well written piece of work with few errors in spelling, punctuation or grammar. The work shows structure and is clearly presented. The work may require the odd edit.	The final piece of work may lack polish and would need attention. A more-or-less competent piece of work but may contain some errors in spelling, punctuation or grammar. The may lack structure and presentation could be improved.	The final piece is poorly presented and would need serious editing. A more-or-less weak piece of work containing a number of errors in spelling, punctuation or grammar. The piece may lack any kind of structure.	The final piece is very badly presented. Only a complete re-write would bring it up to standard. A poor piece of work. Written English is bad, with numerous errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
Creativity of analytical work (10%)	The work is outstandingly creative and approaches the problem within a clear and analytical mind set. The execution of the analysis is also excellent and shows meticulous planning and understand to the problem being addresses	The work is creative in the execution and shows that the student has though thoroughly about the problem being tackled. At each stage the narrative is inferred by the analysis of the previous stage and the analysis has been planned from the outset.	The work is creative in nature, both in the execution and the thought process is apparent within the narrative. The execution is sound and the student has demonstrated understanding to the analytical process.	The works shows some creativity which is satisfactory, but some flaws in the execution or assertions are made within the work.	The work shows little to no creativity but falls short in the execution and understanding.	The work shows no creativity or relevance in research questions or methods, and there are major problems in the execution.