Rubrics for TDS2101 Project Part B

| REPORT (8) | Content – all required components (5) Items #1-#5 of the Project Guidelines Part B | 1 point per component 0.5 point per component 0 point per component | The component is clearly described and explained. Written elaboration is easily understood The component is answered in a brief manner, lack of clarity is evidential although it is possible to make up what is explained. Component is not available, or it is impossible to ascertain if the component has been provided. |
|------------|---|---|--|
| | Organization (1) including Item #6 of the Project Guidelines Part B | 1 point | Organization is decent and acceptable. There is evidence of effort to arrange them according to the flow appropriate for a data science pipeline. Visualizations are added wherever appropriate throughout the data science pipeline steps. |
| | | 0.5 point 0 point | Organization is not done properly or haphazardly put together OR Organization is fine, but no visualizations were provided when necessary. No clear structure in place |
| | Language (1) | 1 point 0.5 point 0 point | Written English is clear and free from grammatical and typo errors Written English is acceptable, with some errors Language contains many errors and it is almost difficult to make sense of what is being explained. (This has consequences on other sections of the marking scheme) |
| | References (1) | 1 point 0.5 point 0 point | References are available, and properly formatted. Reference style is not important, as long it is consistently applied. References are available, but there seems to be some inconsistencies in how it is formatted. |

| | | | No references provided. |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---|
| DS PROCESS COMPONENTS (3) | DS pipeline components (3) : Questions, Data Collection, Data | 0.5 points per component | DS pipeline component as listed, is performed and documented clearly, as visible from both the report and the code implementation |
| | Pre-processing, EDA, Data mining/data modelling, Data visualization | 0.25 points per component | DS pipeline component as listed, is inconsistently performed and/or documented. Appears to be missing from either the report or the code implementation. |
| | | 0 point per component | DS pipeline component was not attempted. |
| PIPELINE SOLUTIONS (8) | Description and implementation of solution (5) | 1 point per component | All of the following are performed and implemented in the solution: Understanding data source and its properties (1) Examining quality of data and cleaning (1) EDA (1) Data mining or predictive modelling (1) Data visualizations (1) |
| | | 0.5 point per component | Implementation has minor errors or slightly buggy (still able to produce some sort of output that is reasonable) |
| | | 0 point per component | Did not implement the component or the implementation is erroneous. |
| | Analysis and assessment of chosen solutions (2) | 2 points | There is clear justification of why: Choice of data used (0.5) Choice of cleaning methods employed (1) Choice of data mining/data modelling algorithms used (0.5) |
| | | Partial (50%) points per component | Justification is provided but it is not very precise or sufficiently clear to substantiate the choices made. |
| | | No points per | No justifications were provided, or the justifications provided do not |

| | | component | make sense. |
|------------------|---|------------------|--|
| | Challenges encountered and future proposals (1) corresponds to Item #7 of the Project Guidelines Part B | 1 point | Item #7 in the Project Guidelines Part B is addressed in the report (does not need to be in the Notebook) |
| | | 0.5 point | Either the challenges encountered or the future proposals were missing from the report. |
| | | 0 point | None of the two items were addressed in the report. |
| PRESENTATION (8) | Clarity of Presentation (3) | 3 points | The message is absolutely clear. The presentation is crystal clear in both the delivery and the visuals. |
| | | 2 points 1 point | Can make up most of what is presented. Delivery can be better. Choice of visuals can be better. |
| | | 0 point | Hardly able to make up most of what is presented. Delivery or visuals can be improved a lot more. |
| | | | Very difficult to comprehend what was being presented. Both the delivery and visuals are poorly presented. |
| | Content (2) | 2 points | Content (referring to the slides) prepared is clear and storytelling is sufficiently appealing to the audience. |
| | | 1 point | Content is reasonably clear although the choices of some content and visuals used were not very appealing and could be confusing. |
| | | 0 point | Content was poorly constructed. The presentation does not appear to be properly put together. Major mistakes and issues are seen in the presented content. |
| | Flow (1) | 1 point | The presentation was done with a good, planned flow. Easy to figure out how the entire picture from start to end. |

| | | | T |
|--|---------|-----------|---|
| | | 0.5 point | The presentation was decent and although there were hiccups throughout, but the outline of what was presented is still reasonable. |
| | | 0 point | Flow of presentation is messy and in a big disarray. The points were all over the place and disorganized. |
| | Q&A (2) | 2 points | All questions posed during presentation were fielded and reasonable and acceptable answers were given. |
| | | 1 point | The answers to the questions posed were less desirable, partially correct to some extent. The students appear to understand what was being asked. |
| | | 0.5 point | The students attempted to answer the questions the best they could although the answers were not reasonable. |
| | | 0 point | The questions posed were not answered or the students appear clueless over what was being asked. |