	Criteria	High distinction (100% to 80%)	Distinction (70% to 79% of available mark)	Credit (60% to 69% of available mark)	Pass (50% to 59% of available mark)	Fail (<50% of available mark)
	Implementation					
Task 1 Implementation	**Data Parsing**	Data is parsed correctly. The attribute names meet all of the specifications.	Data parsing is mostly correct, there is a minor error. The attribute names meet all of the specifications.	Data parsing is generally ok, but a few steps are not appropriate, leading to a few small data errors. A few attribute names do not meet the specifications.	Data parsing is generally ok, but some steps are not appropriate, leading to some data errors. Some attribute names do not meet the specifications.	Data is not parsed correctly. Most attribute names fail to meet the specifications.
Task 2 Implementation	**Data Cleansing | Data Problem Identification**	All data quality issues are properly identified.	Most data quality issues are properly identified.	Many data quality issues are properly identified.	Some data quality issues are identified.	Few to none data quality issues are identified.
	Data Cleansing | Data Problem Fixing	All data quality issues are resolved. The methods used are justifiable, proper and effective. The final output meets all of the specifications.	Most data quality issues are resolved. The methods used are justifiable, proper and effective. The final output meets all of the specifications.	Many data quality issues are resolved. Most methods used are justifiable, proper and effective. The final output meets most of the specifications.	Some data quality issues are resolved. Some methods used are proper and effective. The final output meets some of the specifications.	Few to none data quality issues have been resolved. The methods used are not correct nor effective. The final output fails to meet most of the specifications.
	Data Cleansing | errorlist	All data quality issues, as well as the way the quality issues are fixed (including justification if decided not to fix),	Most data quality issues, as well as the way the quality issues are fixed (including justification if decided	Many data quality issues, as well as the way the quality issues are fixed (including justification if decided	Some data quality issues, as well as the way the quality issues are fixed (including justification if decided	Few to none data quality issues, as well as the way the quality issues are fixed (including justification

		are both properly recorded in the errorlist.	not to fix), are both properly recorded in the errorlist.	not to fix), are both properly recorded in the errorlist.	not to fix), are both properly recorded in the errorlist.	if decided not to fix), are both properly recorded in the errorlist.
Task 3 Implementation	**Data Integration | Schema-Level Integration**	All schema-level conflicts are properly resolved. Data is merged properly.	Most schema-level conflicts are properly resolved. Data is mostly merged properly. There is a minor error.	Many schema-level conflicts are properly resolved. Data is mostly merged properly, there are some minor errors.	Some schema-level conflicts are properly resolved. Data is merged together, but there are some major errors.	Few to none schema-level conflicts are resolved. Data is not merged properly.
	Data Integration | Data Level Integration	All data-level conflicts are properly resolved.	Most data-level conflicts are properly resolved	Many data-level conflicts are properly resolved.	Some data-level conflicts are properly resolved.	Few to none data-level conflicts are properly resolved.
	Notebook Presentation					
Notebook Presentation	**Notebook Presentation| Code Commenting**	Commenting provides clear explanations of how the code is intended to work. It also provides clear instructions and insights to why the code has been written as it has. Commenting is thorough, and concise. Comments provided would be helpful to other data scientists.	Commenting provides useful insights into how the code is intended to work. It also provides good instructions as to why the code has been written as it has. Commenting has been provided in most cases and is generally concise. Most comments provided would be helpful to other data scientists.	Commenting provides some explanation as to how the code is intended to work. It also provides adequate instructions as to why the code has been written as it has. Commenting has been provided in most cases. Most comments provided would be helpful to other data scientists with some corrections or additions made.	Commenting provides some explanation as to how the code is intended to work, but is at times unclear. Some instruction is provided, but should have provided more details. Commenting has been provided in some of the expected cases. Comments provided have some usefulness to other data scientists, but require corrections or additions to be made.	Code commenting does not provide a clear explanation of the code. There is a lack of instructions as to why the code has been written as it has. Commenting is minimal OR not provided at all.

	Notebook Presentation | Notebook Content	The jupyter notebook provides comprehensive justifications and discussions on the methods/approaches chosen, results, analysis and findings. Effective use of markdown, with clear sectioning, highlight, styling, etc. The jupyter notebook is absolutely clear, concise, exceptionally well organized, has clear logic flow and very easy to follow.	The jupyter notebook provides most of the justifications and discussions on the methods/approaches chosen, results, analysis and findings. Effective use of markdown, with clear sectioning, highlight, styling, etc. The jupyter notebook is mostly clear and concise. It is in general well organized, shows some logic flow, and fairly easy to read.	The jupyter notebook provides many justifications and discussions on the methods/approaches chosen, results, analysis and findings. The jupyter notebook contains some irrelevant information. It is mis-leading in some places. It is readable by someone who knows what it is supposed to be doing. However, it requires improvement on the presented logic flow.	The jupyter notebook provides some justifications and discussion on the methods/approaches chosen, results, analysis and findings. The jupyter notebook contains lots of irrelevant information. It is mis-leading in lots of places. It is not well organised and there is no clear logic flow.	The jupyter notebook provides minimal justification and discussion on the methods/approaches chosen, results, analysis and findings. The jupyter notebook contains lots of irrelevant information. It is poorly organized, very messy, and is not readable.
	Note: - Rubric for Notebook Presentation (including code commenting and notebook content) is common across Task 1, 2 and 3. - Student can refer to the activities in modules as examples for the level of details that they should include in their jupyter notebook.					