

| Weight: | Α | В | С | D | F |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| 40% | Excellent | Very good | Competent | Marginally Accepted | Unsatisfactory |
| Coursework Presentation and Structure (5%) | Excellent report presentation and academic writing style. The excellent organization makes the report very coherent and easily readable. All figures are plotted correctly with all required features: titles, axes labels and ticks, legends and the needed use of colours. No spelling, coding or mathematical errors spotted in the document. | Very good report presentation and structure ensuring clear flow and argument. Overall clear and well-written report. Most figures are plotted correctly with all required features: titles, axes labels and ticks, legends and the needed use of colours. Trivial spelling, coding or mathematical errors spotted in the document that will not affect the quality of the work. | Good report structure and easy to follow. Some sentences and/or paragraphs are difficult to interpret. Some figures are plotted correctly with all required features: titles, axes labels and ticks, legends and the needed use of colours. Minor spelling, coding or mathematical errors spotted in the document, which some might affect the quality of the work. | The report is fairly written but lacks clarity. Some weaknesses in the organization make it difficult to read. Most of the sentences and/or paragraphs are difficult to interpret. Few figures are plotted correctly with all required features: titles, axes labels and ticks, legends and the needed use of colours. Minor to major spelling, coding or mathematical errors spotted in the document that certainly affect the quality of the work. | Unsatisfactory report writing and organization. It lacks coherence, clarity, and fundamental material. None of the figures are plotted correctly with no use of the required features: titles, axes labels and ticks, legends and the needed use of colours. Major spelling, coding or mathematical errors spotted in the document. |
| Applied Approach & Technical Content (15%) | Correctly executes an appropriate sequence of quantitative data analysis methods that extract necessary insights from the dataset. The report is of excellent standard reflecting in-depth knowledge and understanding of the taught material, coursework objectives, and limitations of the dataset. It demonstrates independence and notable originality in tackling complex problems. | Correctly executes an appropriate sequence of quantitative data analysis methods that extract most of the insights from the dataset. The report of a good and systematic scope and standard, reflecting good knowledge of the taught material, coursework objectives, and limitations of the dataset. It demonstrates comprehensive skills in the techniques applied. | Appropriate chosen quantitative data analysis methods that extract appropriate insights from the dataset. The report demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the methods applied with some small gapes in their implementation. | Marginally accepted chosen quantitative data analysis methods as they extract the least possible insights from the dataset. The report demonstrates some knowledge of the techniques applied in the analysis with substantial weaknesses and gaps in some of their implementation. | No clear evidence of quantitative data analysis implementation. The report fails to demonstrate any knowledge of the techniques applied in the analysis with inability to recognize how to approach the problem. |
| Critical Analysis, Discussion and Conclusions (15%) | The report shows excellent ability to evaluate and analyse the results of the methods used. Excellent conclusion that summarises fully the work done and supported by evidence with all key points covered. | The report shows a very good evaluation of the methods used. Coherent and strong conclusion with all key points covered. | The report shows confidence in the analysis and makes sound conclusion covering most but not all key points. | The report provides evidence of the relevant analysis with satisfactory evaluation of the results. | Analysis, discussion, and conclusion are unsatisfactory. They lack coverage of the work key points and/or the results obtained from this work. |
| Quality of Code (5%) | The written code runs correctly and fully. The code is exceptionally well-written in a non-redundant, elegant, and well-structured manner. The overall coding style is of an excellent standard. Every line of code has its own full and simple explanatory comment associated with it. The code is fully understandable and can be easily build upon later on. | Most of the written code runs correctly. The code is clear, well-written, well-formatted. The overall coding style is of a good standard. Most of the lines are associated with well-explained comments. The code is mostly clear and understandable. | Most/part of the written code runs correctly. The code is reasonably well-written. There may be some errors in syntax or commands that could affect the quality of the work. The overall coding style is of a reasonable standard, but falls short of being good. Some lines are associated with reasonably explained comments. The code is partially clear but understandable to a certain extent. | The written code runs, but mostly incorrectly, or most of it does not run. The code is adequately or poorly written. There may be many errors in syntax or commands that affect the output of the code and quality of the work. Few lines are associated with poorly written, wordy, or badly formatted comments. The code is hardly understandable. | The written code does not execute or runs completely and/or incorrectly. code is poorly written and demonstrates a lack of knowledge of basic coding capabilities and syntax. There may be numerous errors in commands that significantly detract from the quality of the work. The overall coding style is sub-standard. Lack or no comments included in the code. The code cannot be understood. |