Background Information

Before you complete Part 2, make sure you have familiarized yourself with the [Part 1 information](https://uwli.courses.wisconsin.edu/d2l/common/dialogs/quickLink/quickLink.d2l?ou=3938075&type=content&rcode=UWS1-10942375).

Suggestions for Success

The following are some suggestions for the presentation and report that can help you achieve a good score.

Your **presentation** should:

* provide a concise summary of the final project, including: the business problem, your data cleaning approach, forecasting models used, comparison of the forecasting models, your recommendations for Fargo Health, and lessons learned.
* be organized in a logical sequence.
* thoughtfully use graphics to explain and reinforce the content.
* be free of misspellings and grammatical errors.
* have clear voice narration to explain the content. You can find information on how to add narration to PowerPoint from [Microsoft Office Support](https://support.office.com/en-us/article/Record-a-slide-show-with-narration-ink-and-slide-timings-3dc85001-efab-4f8a-94bf-afdc5b7c1f0b) .

Your **report** should:

* be written in and saved as a Microsoft Word file.
* be formatted with 12-point Times New Roman font.
* be single spaced.
* not exceed 10 pages.
* address **all** questions as stated in the case study (pages 4-5) **and** address the ethics question described in the Part 1 instructions.
* include citations for references, if any.
* thoughtfully use graphics to explain and reinforce the content.
* be free of misspellings and grammatical errors.
* include your approach to data cleaning. Include necessary plots to show data quality issues and your approach to fixing them.
* include your comparison of the forecasting models used.
* include all R files. Your R programs should work, be free of syntax errors, and use comments to explain what the code is accomplishing.
* include the cleaned dataset, submitted as a separate Excel file.

**PART 2** Grading Criteria

| **Criteria** | **Excellent** | **Strong** | **Competent** | **Needs Improvement** | **Needs Substantial Revision** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Missing value imputation, data cleaning and forecasting analysis are rigorous. Explains the choice of variables identified for analysis. Explains the analysis output / statistical findings. R code file is well commented for easy understanding. | 20 points | 17.5 points | 15 points | 12.5 points | 10 points |
| The recommended action plan is specifically tailored with reference to the client organization, i.e. Fargo Health Group. | 20 points | 17.5 points | 15 points | 12.5 points | 10 points |
| Explains the choice of the required tools and methodologies deployed (e.g., methods and tools used for missing value imputation, forecasting etc.). Compares and contrasts various missing value & forecasting methods (e.g., compares two or more missing value imputation methods and provides justification for selecting one over the other). | 20 points | 17.5 points | 15 points | 12.5 points | 10 points |
| Identifies and analyzes social, legal, and ethical issues associated with the recommendations provided. | 20 points | 17.5 points | 15 points | 12.5 points | 10 points |
| The report and the presentation are effective and coherent and tailored to assist organizational decision making. | 20 points | 17.5 points | 15 points | 12.5 points | 10 points |
| **Overall Score** | **A 90 or more** | **B 80-89** | **C 70-79** | **D 60-69** | **F 0-59** |

**PART 2** Submitting Your Work

Create a zip file that includes your:

* 10-minute narrated PowerPoint presentation.
* Deliverable Report written in Microsoft Word.
* complete R script for the time series models.
* final, cleaned dataset in Microsoft Excel format.

Name this file:

**FinalProjectPart02\_DS700\_*YourLastName*.zip**  
**EXAMPLE** FinalProjectPart02\_DS700\_Peterson.zip

Submit your work to the following dropbox:

## Rubric Name: Individual Final Project Rubric: Part 2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **Criteria** | **Excellent** | **Strong** | **Competent** | **Needs Improvement** | **Needs Substantial Revision** | | Need Assessment. Missing value imputation, data cleaning & forecasting analysis are rigorous. Explain the choice of variables identified for analysis. Explain the analysis output / statistical findings. R code file is well commented for easy understanding. | 20 points | 17.5 points | 15 points | 12.5 points | 10 points | | Frame Task. The recommended action plan is specifically tailored with reference to the client organization i.e. Fargo Health Group. | 20 points | 17.5 points | 15 points | 12.5 points | 10 points | | Tools. Explain choice of required tools and methodologies used (e.g., for missing value imputation, forecasting etc.). Compare & contrasts various missing value & forecasting methods (e.g., compare 2+ missing value imputation methods & justify one.). | 20 points | 17.5 points | 15 points | 12.5 points | 10 points | | Ethics. Identify and analyze social, legal, and ethical issues associated with the recommendations provided. | 20 points | 17.5 points | 15 points | 12.5 points | 10 points | | Report & Presentation. The report and the presentation are effective and coherent and tailored to assist organizational decision making. | 20 points | 17.5 points | 15 points | 12.5 points | 10 points | | **Overall Score** | **A 90 or more** | **B 80 or more** | **C 70 or more** | **D 60 or more** | **F 0 or more** | |