- Identification and description of key challenge(s) or problem(s) to be addressed   10%
    - 0-2 Very short, with no attempt to provide context for challenge/problem
    - 3-5 Has included references and some rationale, but rationale for why challenge/problem is important or interesting is unclear
    - 5-7 Evidence of reading and rationale for challenge/problem but the structure isn't very clear and appears disjointed. OR it is well written, but shows no evidence of clear rationale for questions
    - 8-10 Clearly written, well structured, with evidence of relevant reading and rationale for challenge/problem is clear, flows well

- Introduction to the dataset   10%
    - 0-2 Very short, with no attempt to include any relevant references (if appropriate)
    - 3-5 Has included references and some rationale, but rationale is for dataset is unclear
    - 5-7 Evidence of reading and rationale for choice of dataset but the structure isn't very clear and appears disjointed. OR it is well written, but shows no evidence of clear rationale
    - 8-10 Clearly written, well structured, with evidence of relevant reading and rationale, flows well

- The challenge(s)/problem(s) is (are) to be addressed using the following
    - Summary statistics (including figures) for data being analysed   20%
        - 0-5 Has graphs or tables, but without any accompanying written explanation. OR has some writing, but no tables or graphs.
        - 6-10 Does not appear to have understood the results. No graphs, or graphs are in the wrong place (e.g. in an appendix). Only short or inaccurate explanations supplied. Has included irrelevant graphs, or has included the raw data in the results section.
        - 11-15 figures/tables labelled incorrectly. Does show some understanding, and has presented the information in a logical format. No clear explanation for the choice of visualisations or analysis.
        - 16-20 Logical and clear presentation of relevant descriptive analysis. Clear, well labelled figures and tables, with a clear accompanying written description of what they show, in the context of the analysis to be completed

    - Description, rationale, application and findings from one unsupervised   20%
      analysis method
        - 0-5 Has implemented a solution but without any accompanying written explanation. OR has some writing, but no evidence of implementation in the code
        - 6-10 Has implemented something but does not appear to have understood the results. No results or results are in the wrong place (e.g. in an appendix). Only Short or inaccurate explanations supplied. No rationale for method chosen
        - 11-15 Does show some understanding of implementation and results, and has presented the information in a logical format. No clear explanation for choice of method.
        - 16-20 Logical and clear presentation of results. Clear, well labelled figures and tables, with a clear accompanying written description of what they show, in the context of the analysis to be completed. Good justification of methods and metrics

- Description, rationale, application and findings from one supervised 20%
  analysis method
  - 0-5 Has implemented a solution but without any accompanying written explanation. OR has some writing, but no evidence of implementation in the code
  - 6-10 Has implemented something but does not appear to have understood the results. No results or results are in the wrong place (e.g. in an appendix). Only short or inaccurate explanations supplied. No rationale for method chosen
  - 11-15 Does show some understanding of implementation and results, and has presented the information in a logical format. No clear explanation for choice of method.
  - 16-20 Logical and clear presentation of results. Clear, well labelled figures and tables, with a clear accompanying written description of what they show, in the context of the analysis to be completed. Good justification of methods and metrics

- Reflection on methods used for analysis 10%
  - 0-2 Short with no attempt to critically reflect on methods used
  - 3-5 Poor structure, shows little understanding of lessons learnt and how things could be done differently
  - 5-7 Poor structure, but contains the essential elements. OR the structure is good, but elements are missing.
  - 8-10 Intelligent evaluation of the strengths, weaknesses and limitations of the analysis that was performed, and sensible suggestions for possible improvements and extensions to it. Well organised and clearly written

- Structure presentation, and proper citation of references 10%
  - 0-2 Report is not easy to read or follow, no appropriate referencing
  - 3-5 Poor structure, elements missing, can be followed, referencing not appropriate
  - 5-7 Contains the essential elements, can be followed, referencing not appropriate
  - 8-10 Well written, easy to follow and understand, good referencing (including legends and captions on figures)