Data Science – Final Project

Final Project - Presentation Marking Criteria

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Introduction** |  |
| 1. Was the introduction engaging and timely? | Topics to be covered were briefly discussed. Techniques were used to engage audience early e.g. asking questions |
| 1. Were the presentation contents clearly defined? | Main questions posed by the presenter are briefly defined and followed. |
| 1. Was it clear when the introduction had ended? | Introduction was wrapped up before starting the main body of the presentation. |
| **Professional Practise** |  |
| 1. Was the presentation clearly articulated? | No long pauses or overuse of bridging terms like errrrm or ‘filler’ words. |
| 1. Were the audience engaged? | The presenter asked questions or gave the audience activities to do |
| 1. Was the presenter confident in their explorations and interpretations? | The delivery of the presentation supports confidence in their results. |
| **Structure** |  |
| 1. Did the content follow a logical sequence? | Content was organised so that the topic was introduced slowly. More difficult aspects of topic discussed towards end. Flow. |
| 1. Were the presentation materials relevant and well-designed? | Slides were not cluttered and contained brief sentences that the presenter used as a prompt. Clear screenshots. Flow. |
| 1. Was the core content clear and timely? | Content was well explained and easy to follow. Content was delivered in the timescale allowed and did not overrun. |
| **Content**  **Technologies Used** |  |
| 1. Did the presenter show evidence of using more than 1 application? | Did they use more than 1 of the following: HDFS, HIVE, PIG, SPARK, and R? |
| 1. Were legible code samples provided during the presentation? | Readable, commented, demonstrable, working? |
| 1. Did the presenter justify the use of specific technologies? | Did the presenter specifically know why they used a type of technology? (Hive/HDFS for consistency, Spark for speed and accuracy). |
| 1. Were the appropriate technologies used to answer specific questions? | Did the presenter understand why a certain technology should be used over another? |
| **Content**  **Evidence of Coding** |  |
| 1. Did code conform to professional practices? | Naming conventions, Commented, Alignment? |
| 1. Did the presenter demonstrate code samples during the presentation? | Yes/ Yes when prompted? or No |
| 1. Did the code samples work? | Some code won’t rerun exactly as there are inbuilt mechanisms against duplication. Otherwise code that performs analysis should run. |
| 1. Was the code written at appropriate depth of knowledge for the specific tasks? | Was the code written efficient, or longwinded? |
| **Content**  **Visualisations** |  |
| 1. Did the presenter take time to go through the supportive visualisations? Ensuring audience comprehension? | Did the presenter show knowledge and clearly convey their interpretation of the graphs to the audience? |
| 1. Were the visualisations clear and readable? | Did the presenter take action to ensure that the graphs were legible? |
| 1. Did the visualisations provide support to the Presenters arguments? | Were the visualisations produced relevant to and supportive of the presenters point? |
| 1. Were the visualisations presented informative? | Did the visualisations provide sufficient, relevant detail in a clean format to be easily understood? |
| 1. Did the presenter take time to customise the visualisations? | Colours, labels, legends, Titles, Axis Range, Overlays, Multi-plot, and Trend lines etc.? |
| **Content**  **Interpretations and Insights** |  |
| 1. Did the presenter demonstrate depth of data exploration? | Did the presenter demonstrate knowledge of the datasets? Understood terms, meanings and relations? |
| 1. Were the presenter’s explanations clear and understandable? | Did the presenter take time to ensure that the explanations were logical and easily drawn from supporting evidence? |
| 1. Was there evidence of data manipulation by the presenter? | Did the presenter perform any feature engineering/ calculated columns on the data? |
| 1. Was there a need identified for data cleansing processes? | Did the presenter have to deal with nulls? Record deletion or imputation? |
| **Content**  **Investigative Approach** |  |
| 1. Throughout the presentation did the presenter ATSQ? | Did the presenter refer back to the starting questions posed in the introduction? Were these answered? |
| 1. Did the presenter consistently follow an investigative approach? | Did the presenter make use of the 5 whys approach through the presentation? |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| 1. Was the conclusion clear and timely? | Topics covered were briefly discussed again. Conclusion was not too long. |
| 1. Did the conclusion leave you with a message? | Audience given something to think about after presentation e.g. links to websites which give more detail on the topic covered. |
| **Q & A** |  |
| 1. Did the presenter field questions well? | Questions at the end of the presentation were answered fully and confidently. |
| 1. Was the presenter able to justify their approach, methods and reasoning? | Did the presenter understand their work? Are they able to defend it, explain in further detail or in simpler terms? |