Marking Criteria for the Individual Hands-on Assignment

Criteria & Weight	Fail (0% - 49%)	Pass (50% - 64%)	Credit (65%-74%)	Distinction (75%-84%)	High Distinction (85% - 100%)
Analysis of Structured Data (60 marks)	Rationale of the Choice of ML Algorithms ▪ Inadequate or no justification for the choice of ML algorithms. ▪ The chosen algorithms are not relevant to the business objective of GlobalStore. ▪ Limited or no explanation of the algorithms' suitability for the task.	Rationale of the Choice of ML Algorithms ▪ Basic justification provided for the choice of ML algorithms. ▪ Chosen algorithms are somewhat relevant to the business objective of GlobalStore. ▪ Basic explanation of the algorithms' suitability for the task.	Rationale of the Choice of ML Algorithms ▪ Clear justification for the choice of ML algorithms. ▪ Chosen algorithms are relevant and generally suitable for the business objective of GlobalStore. ▪ Good explanation of the algorithms' applicability to the task.	Rationale of the Choice of ML Algorithms ▪ Comprehensive justification for the choice of ML algorithms. ▪ Chosen algorithms are highly relevant and suitable for the business objective of GlobalStore. ▪ Strong explanation of the algorithms' strengths and limitations.	Rationale of the Choice of ML Algorithms ▪ Exceptional justification for the choice of ML algorithms. ▪ Chosen algorithms are the most appropriate for the business objective, with clear evidence of critical thinking. ▪ Deep explanation of the algorithms' theoretical and practical implications.
	Data Pre-processing and Selection of Key Features ▪ Inadequate or no data pre-processing conducted. ▪ Poor or no handling of missing values, outliers, duplicates, etc. ▪ No clear justification for the selection of features.	Data Pre-processing and Selection of Key Features ▪ Basic data pre-processing conducted. ▪ Somewhat adequate handling of missing values, outliers, duplicates, etc. ▪ Limited justification for the selection of features.	Data Pre-processing and Selection of Key Features ▪ Clear and appropriate data pre-processing conducted. ▪ Adequate handling of missing values, outliers, duplicates, etc. ▪ Justified selection of relevant features.	Data Pre-processing and Selection of Key Features ▪ Comprehensive data pre-processing conducted. ▪ Effective handling of missing values, outliers, duplicates, etc. ▪ Well-justified and relevant feature selection.	Data Pre-processing and Selection of Key Features ▪ Exceptional data pre-processing conducted. ▪ Excellent handling of all data quality issues. ▪ Excellent justification and well-supported feature selection.
	Training the TWO (2) ML Models ▪ No split of training and testing data	Training the TWO (2) ML Models ▪ Basic split of training and testing data	Training the TWO (2) ML Models ▪ Adequate split of training and testing data	Training the TWO (2) ML Models ▪ Good split of training and testing data	Training the TWO (2) ML Models ▪ Excellent split of training and testing data

Criteria & Weight	Fail (0% - 49%)	Pass (50% - 64%)	Credit (65%-74%)	Distinction (75%-84%)	High Distinction (85% - 100%)
	▪ Inadequate or incorrect explanation of the model training process. ▪ Limited understanding of the steps involved. ▪ No Python or R code included.	▪ Basic explanation of the model training process. ▪ Basic understanding of the steps involved. ▪ Basic code provided. ▪ Python or R code included, with extensive errors.	▪ Clear explanation of the model training process. ▪ Good understanding of the steps involved. ▪ Correct and functional code provided. ▪ Python or R code included, with some errors.	▪ Comprehensive explanation of the model training process. ▪ Strong understanding of the steps involved. ▪ Well-documented and functional code provided. ▪ Good Python or R code included without errors.	▪ Exceptional explanation of the model training process with critical insights. ▪ Deep understanding of the training steps and their implications. ▪ Highly efficient and well-documented code provided. ▪ Excellent Python or R code included without errors.
	Testing and Evaluating the TWO (2) ML Models ▪ Inadequate or incorrect explanation of the model testing process. ▪ Limited or no evaluation of model performance. ▪ Limited or no comparison of the models' performance ▪ Wrong or no selection of the best performing model ▪ No Python or R code included.	Testing and Evaluating the TWO (2) ML Models ▪ Basic explanation of the model testing process. ▪ Basic evaluation of model performance. ▪ Basic comparison of the models' performance ▪ The best performing model is selected but lacks justification ▪ Python or R code included, with extensive errors.	Testing and Evaluating the TWO (2) ML Models ▪ Clear explanation of the model testing process. ▪ Good evaluation of model performance. ▪ Good comparison of the models' performance ▪ The best performing model is selected with limited justification ▪ Python or R code included, with some errors.	Testing and Evaluating the TWO (2) ML Models ▪ Comprehensive explanation of the model testing process. ▪ Excellent evaluation of model performance. ▪ Excellent comparison of the models' performance ▪ The best performing model is selected with good justification ▪ Good Python or R code included without errors.	Testing and Evaluating the TWO (2) ML Models ▪ Outstanding explanation of the model testing process with critical insights. ▪ Outstanding evaluation of model performance. ▪ Outstanding comparison of the models' performance ▪ The best performing model is selected with excellent justification ▪ Excellent Python or R code included without errors.
	Discuss the Findings of Your Analysis and Derive Actionable Insights ▪ Inadequate or incorrect discussion of findings.	Discuss the Findings of Your Analysis and Derive Actionable Insights ▪ Basic discussion of findings with no plausible explanations.	Discuss the Findings of Your Analysis and Derive Actionable Insights ▪ Clear discussion of findings with good explanations.	Discuss the Findings of Your Analysis and Derive Actionable Insights ▪ Comprehensive discussion of findings	Discuss the Findings of Your Analysis and Derive Actionable Insights ▪ Exceptional discussion of findings with excellent plausible explanations.

Criteria & Weight	Fail (0% - 49%)	Pass (50% - 64%)	Credit (65%-74%)	Distinction (75%-84%)	High Distinction (85% - 100%)
	▪ Limited or no actionable insights. ▪ No clear recommendations provided.	▪ Basic actionable insights. ▪ Some recommendations provided.	▪ Relevant actionable insights. ▪ Well-supported recommendations provided.	with strong plausible explanations. ▪ Highly relevant actionable insights. ▪ Strong, well-supported recommendations.	▪ Highly relevant and impactful actionable insights. ▪ Insightful and highly effective recommendations.
Analysis of Unstructured Data **(40 marks)**	Rationale of the Choice of ML Algorithm ▪ Inadequate or no justification for the choice of the ML algorithm. ▪ The chosen algorithm is not relevant to the business objective. ▪ Limited or no understanding of the algorithm's suitability for the task.	Rationale of the Choice of ML Algorithm ▪ Basic justification provided for the choice of the ML algorithm. ▪ The chosen algorithm is somewhat relevant to the business objective. ▪ Basic understanding of the algorithm's suitability for the task.	Rationale of the Choice of ML Algorithm ▪ Clear justification for the choice of the ML algorithm. ▪ The chosen algorithm is relevant and generally suitable for the business objective. ▪ Good understanding of the algorithm's applicability to the task.	Rationale of the Choice of ML Algorithm ▪ Comprehensive justification for the choice of the ML algorithm. ▪ The chosen algorithm is highly relevant and suitable for the business objective. ▪ Strong understanding of the algorithm's strengths and limitations.	Rationale of the Choice of ML Algorithm ▪ Exceptional justification for the choice of the ML algorithm. ▪ The chosen algorithm is the most appropriate for the business objective, with clear evidence of critical thinking. ▪ Deep understanding of the algorithm's theoretical and practical implications.
	Data Transformation (Feature Extraction) and Selection of Model Parameters ▪ Inadequate or incorrect feature extraction methods. ▪ Poor selection or justification of model parameters. ▪ No clear discussion of the findings.	Data Transformation (Feature Extraction) and Selection of Model Parameters ▪ Basic feature extraction methods implemented with limited justifications. ▪ Somewhat adequate selection of model parameters with limited justification. ▪ Basic discussion of the findings.	Data Transformation (Feature Extraction) and Selection of Model Parameters ▪ Appropriate feature extraction methods with good justifications. ▪ Adequate selection and justification of model parameters. ▪ Good discussion of the findings.	Data Transformation (Feature Extraction) and Selection of Model Parameters ▪ Comprehensive feature extraction methods with strong justifications. ▪ Well-chosen and justified model parameters. ▪ Strong discussion of the findings.	Data Transformation (Feature Extraction) and Selection of Model Parameters ▪ Exceptional feature extraction methods with excellent justifications. ▪ Insightful and well-supported selection of model parameters. ▪ Highly detailed and insightful discussion of the findings.

Criteria & Weight	Fail (0% - 49%)	Pass (50% - 64%)	Credit (65%-74%)	Distinction (75%-84%)	High Distinction (85% - 100%)
	Implementation of the ML Model ▪ Inadequate or incorrect explanation of the model implementation. ▪ Limited understanding of the implementation steps. ▪ No Python or R code included.	Implementation of the ML Model ▪ Basic explanation of the model implementation. ▪ Basic understanding of the implementation steps. ▪ Python or R code included, with extensive errors.	Implementation of the ML Model ▪ Clear explanation of the model implementation. ▪ Good understanding of the implementation steps. ▪ Python or R code included, with some errors.	Implementation of the ML Model ▪ Comprehensive explanation of the model implementation. ▪ Strong understanding of the implementation steps. ▪ Good Python or R code included without errors.	Implementation of the ML Model ▪ Exceptional explanation of the model implementation. ▪ Deep understanding of the implementation steps. ▪ Excellent Python or R code included without errors.
	Discuss the Key Findings of Your Analysis and Derive Actionable Insights ▪ Inadequate or incorrect discussion of findings. ▪ Limited or no actionable insights. ▪ No clear recommendations provided.	Discuss the Key Findings of Your Analysis and Derive Actionable Insights ▪ Basic discussion of findings with no plausible explanations. ▪ Basic actionable insights. ▪ Some recommendations provided.	Discuss the Key Findings of Your Analysis and Derive Actionable Insights ▪ Clear discussion of findings with good explanations. ▪ Relevant actionable insights. ▪ Well-supported recommendations provided.	Discuss the Key Findings of Your Analysis and Derive Actionable Insights ▪ Comprehensive discussion of findings with strong plausible explanations. ▪ Highly relevant actionable insights. ▪ Strong, well-supported recommendations.	Discuss the Key Findings of Your Analysis and Derive Actionable Insights ▪ Exceptional discussion of findings with excellent plausible explanations. ▪ Highly relevant and impactful actionable insights. ▪ Insightful and highly effective recommendations.
Please consider Writing and Structure of Report	▪ Your writing is not professional in tone and has major spelling and grammatical errors. ▪ Your written expression does not indicate a logic/flow between each section of the report.	▪ Some attempt has been made to use a professional tone and presentation in your writing, but there are some spelling and grammatical errors. ▪ You have endeavoured to provide logic/flow between each section of the report.	▪ Your writing is mostly professional in tone and presentation, but occasional spelling and/or grammatical errors exist. ▪ Your written expression indicates the logic/flow between each section of the report.	▪ Your writing is professional in tone and presentation, with a few very minor spellings and/or grammatical errors. ▪ Your written expression strongly indicates the logic/flow between each section of the report.	▪ Your writing is professional in tone and presented outstandingly with no spelling or grammatical errors. ▪ Your written expression provides a strong and coherent indication of the logic/flow between each section, enabling key

▪ Poor or unclear structure. ▪ Your sources have not been referenced, and/or there are excessive errors in referencing in the report. ▪ The word limit has not been adhered to. ▪ No executive summary is provided.	▪ Attempt to a good structure but lack coherent flow between sections. ▪ Some sources are referenced throughout the report, but there are errors in your referencing of sources. ▪ An executive summary is provided but missing key aspects of the report.	▪ Good structure with organised headings. ▪ Most sources are referenced throughout the report, with only minor errors in referencing. ▪ An executive summary is provided and covers essential aspects of the report.	▪ Good structure with organised headings and coherent follow between sections. ▪ All sources are referenced throughout the report with only minor errors in referencing. ▪ An executive summary is provided and covers essential aspects of the report using non-jargon language.	arguments to develop fully. ▪ Good structure with organised headings and coherent follow between sections. ▪ All sources are referenced throughout the report, and the seeds are used very well, with no significant errors in referencing. ▪ A concise executive summary is provided and covers essential aspects of the report using jargon-free language.