|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

ANL488 BUSINESS ANALYTICS APPLIED PROJECT

**Project Oral Presentation – Grading Form**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name of Student: | Chen Guo Hao, Alvin | PI: | N1981071 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Name of Marker: | Munish Kumar | PI: | M2090099 |
| (Supervisor) |  |  |  |
| Project Title: | Comparison of SARIMA and LSTM models in forecasting solar irradiance | | |

Each oral presentation will be graded by the supervisor and a second marker, whose marks will be weighted by 60% and 40% respectively. The supervisor and second marker’s grade should be sent (by email) to the Programme Executive and the ANL488 Course Coordinator the day after the end of all the candidates’ presentations. The indicated grades by each marker should be given out of 100 as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Course Learning**  **Outcomes** | **S/N** | **Component** | **Maximum**  **Marks** | **Score** |
| Apply appropriate business analytics techniques to the business analytics problem, including conducting business understanding, data understanding, data preparation, modeling, evaluation and deployment. | 1. | **Preparation** includes   1. quality and organization of the slides and/or any speaking notes, 2. the amount of information contained in each slide (e.g. explanation and discussion rather than mere “cut-and-paste” output), and the effort put into appearing as professional as possible. | 35 | 30 |
| Debate the effectiveness of the proposed business analytics solution. | 2. | The **quality of the actual delivery** depends on   1. the confidence and flow of the delivery (including eye contact, posture, and vocalization), 2. the candidate’s ability to provide a good understanding of the problem within the time limit (so exceeding the time limit by too much should incur a penalty), and   the candidate’s ability to understand, interpret and respond to queries. | 35 | 25 |
| Defend project results to peers and supervisors. | 3. | **Effectiveness** refers to:   1. the overall strength of the candidate’s arguments, and 2. the strength and clarity of the oral presentation in explaining what has been achieved by the project. | 30 | 25 |
|  |  | **TOTAL** | 100 | 80 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments**  *The marker is at liberty to make brief comments that can improve the project.*  Alvin was very thoroughly prepared, but for some reason (could be nerves), he rushed through the presentation, the only positive of this being it left him with plenty of time for Q&A. During his Q&A, he was very clear on what the business impact was and what the ultimate goal of the analytics project was. He answered confidently and someone on control of his subject matter; I do not think any question we asked was difficult for him to respond to. I am actually quite happy with his presentation overall  My main comment on how he can improve the work is (short term) is to perhaps incorporate some uncertainty modelling. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Signature: |  | Date: | 20/9/2022 |

**Notes for markers of Project Oral Presentation:**

**Variability Chart for Score**





Note to all markers of ANL488:

1. The overall mean mark is 71 for both the Oral and Final Report. We should aim for a mean of 65 with the exceptional students scoring around 75.
2. For those students who have not done enough work for either the oral or the final report, you can ask them to extend for another semester.