

This is a rough marking guide to provide an indication how each report section will be assessed. There are 10 criteria as follows. Each section is weighted differently. For example a HD grade for the EDA section is worth much more than a HD grade for the bibliography.

	HD	DI	CR	P	F
Title and abstract	Title is appropriate to the task. Executive summary is concise, effective and summarises key findings well. Keywords are well selected.	Title is appropriate to the task. Executive summary is concise and summarises key findings well. Keywords are well selected.	Title is written. Executive summary is written. Some keywords have been written.	NA	NA
Problem identification	A sufficient number of problems have been identified, all of which are interesting and complex.				
Data preprocessing	Data preprocessing is done well, with minimal errors. Choices as to how missing values and other steps necessary to clean the data were justified and explained clearly.				
Exploratory data analysis	Exploratory data analysis conducted is extremely holistic of material covered in the course and even shows signs of extension outside the scope of the course. Insightful information is extracted from each plot and a large variety of plots is created in order to gain the most				

	information. Many plots also utilise good use of graphics and the exploration into possible variables that could be created based off discovered insights has been discussed, ready for the next section.				
Further preprocessing	Final variables for an initial model are selected based on rigorous analysis and evidence from the previous EDA section. The explanations are clear and understandable. Variable creation has been well justified, and thoughts as to how they could help with predictive value is insightful and well thought out.	Final variables for an initial model are selected based on good analysis and evidence from the previous EDA section. Variable creation has been justified, and thoughts as to how they could help with predictive value is well thought out.	Final variables for an initial model are selected based on moderate analysis and evidence from the previous EDA section. Variable creation has been justified, and thoughts as to how they could help with predictive value is stated.		
Modelling	An initial linear model was trained and was used to predict property values for the test dataset.	NA	An initial linear model was trained was used to predict property values for the test dataset, with some errors.	NA	No linear model was trained.
Evaluation	At least two models have been trained and the later ones have clearly been improved upon with deep thought and analysis of the	Two models have been trained and the second has clearly been improved upon with deep thought and	Two models have been trained. The second has been improved but the changes in the	One model has been trained. No improvements have been made.	No models were trained.

	<p>data. Likings of the chosen model have clearly been addressed and adhered to. Changes in modelling have been justified with solid EDA evidence. The two models are compared with RMSE metrics effectively and the plot of residuals is done effectively. The residuals are commented upon. Cut off value is suitable.</p>	<p>analysis of the data. Likings of the model have been addressed but not in too much detail. Changes in modelling has been justified with evidence. The two models are compared with RMSE metrics effectively and the plot of residuals is done effectively. Cut off value is not suitable.</p>	<p>modelling process regarding which variables were used has not been touched on in enough detail. No mention of RMSE. Cut off value is not suitable.</p>		
<p>Recommendations and final conclusions</p>	<p>Final conclusions are drawn well and concisely. An insightful final section has been completed that touches on challenging and new ideas. It is clear a number of techniques have been implemented and have been analysed. RMSE is commented on well and the link back to how certain variables may have affected the metric are stated. Concepts and ideas beyond the scope of the course has been touched upon, or referenced. Improvements are thoughtful.</p>	<p>Final conclusions are drawn nicely. A final section has been completed that touches on new and challenging ideas. RMSE is commented upon but not in a lot of detail. The link back to certain variables is good. Improvements are thoughtful but some could be explained further.</p>	<p>Final conclusions are drawn.</p>	<p>Final conclusions are drawn poorly and there is a lack of effort.</p>	<p>Final conclusions are not drawn.</p>
<p>References</p>	<p>References of any style are appropriately formatted</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>References appropriately used,</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>Referencing with many errors. In</p>

	and cited properly. In text referencing is correctly used.		with errors. In text references are used with errors.		text referencing mostly incorrect.
Grammar and punctuation, concision, and flow	Report is exceptionally written, with no grammatical errors. Length is appropriate and as concise as possible. The report flows well.	Report is very well written, with some grammatical errors. Length is somewhat appropriate. The report flows.	Report is well written, with some grammatical errors. Length is only just appropriate. The report mostly flows.	Report is not well written. There are errors everywhere. Length is not suitable for the task. The report does not flow.	The report is an error.