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

ANL488 BUSINESS ANALYTICS APPLIED PROJECT

**Project Oral Presentation – Grading Form**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name of Student: | Krystal Chee Jia Qi | PI: | B1981108 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Name of Marker: | Munish Kumar | PI: | M2090099 |
| (2nd Marker) |  |  |  |
| Project Title: | Sentiment Analysis of Tweets on Electric Car-sharing Service, BlueSG | | |

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 | 25 |
| 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 | 20 |
|  |  | **TOTAL** | 100 | 70 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments**  *The marker is at liberty to make brief comments that can improve the project.*  Krystal gave a very clear presentation and her slides were immaculate; very clear, clean and engaging. I think the conclusions drawn from her study were also very good.  I however think that she was not as well prepared at answering questions related to the some of her choice of algorithm and was not very meticulous in looking at the results from her code. While she did derive some results, I noticed that the results were potentially mislabelled spelling disaster for the overall conclusion of the work.  She can mitigate this by looking into uncertainty or perhaps noting what the chances are of there being mislabels in the work (aside from a confusion matrix which is perhaps not the way to go here). I do however think she has sufficient work to complete her thesis. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Signature: |  | Date: | 21/09/22 |

**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.