

Assessment marking criteria

Components	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explore data 2. Preprocess dataset 3. Describe understanding of the data 4. Summary of what was found <p>Written communication in appropriate academic language.</p>
Excellent (85 – 100)	<p>An outstanding analysis showing creativity and outstanding levels of thoughtfulness. This would include aspects such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correctly identifying and justifying types of attributes. • Correctly and imaginatively finding, explaining and justifying useful summary statistics for the attributes with appropriate and meaningful visualisations. • A thorough exploration of the dataset identifying and characterising outliers and clusters of data points and potentially attributes. Identification, description and justification of interesting attributes. Description of the meaning of the exploration. • Correct, well explained and justified preprocessing carried out. • Insightful concise summary written with careful thought towards the audience. • Language use is error free and the report extremely well presented and organised.
Very good (75 – 84)	<p>A superior analysis demonstrating solid understanding of the four components. This would include aspects such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correctly identifying and justifying types of attributes. • Correctly finding and explaining summary statistics for the attributes with appropriate visualisations. • A mostly thorough exploration of the dataset identifying and characterising outliers and clusters of data points. Identification and description of interesting attributes. Some description of the meaning of the exploration. • Correct and justified preprocessing carried out. • Excellent summary written with some thought towards the audience. • Language use is mostly error free and the report well-presented and organised.
Good (65 – 74)	<p>A good analysis demonstrating reasonable understanding of the four components. This would include aspects such as:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mostly correctly identifying types of attributes. Some justifications may be missing. • Mostly correct finding and explaining summary statistics for the attributes. Visualisations may be missing or inappropriate. • Some exploration of the dataset but not at an outstanding level. Some identification and/or characterization of outliers and clusters. Possible identification and/or description of interesting attributes. Not much description of the meaning of the exploration. • Mostly correct preprocessing, but not well explained or justified. • Reasonable summary but not much thought about the audience. • Language use is mostly acceptable with some areas of improvement needed with respect to the presentation or organisation.
Satisfactory (50 – 64)	<p>A brief but just satisfactory analysis of the components. This would include aspects such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mostly correct identification of types of attributes. Not much in the way of justification. • Mostly correct summary statistics for the attributes but not well explained. Not much in the way of visualisations. • A bit of exploration, but not really coming to terms with multiple attributes taken together. Poor identification and/or characterization of outliers and clusters. Not much if any description of the meaning of the exploration. • Mostly correct preprocessing, but no explanation or justification. • Summary mostly just says what exploration was done, not the results or meaning. Little to no thought of the audience. • Language use may be vague with many aspects needing improvement.
Unsatisfactory (<50)	<p>Not demonstrating the level required for a satisfactory result.</p>