

STUDENT

Christine Woods

GRADE 62%

Task 1

OLTP v. DW The layer model is a bit too low-level for the audience. Better to describe this in terms of the OLTP manages transactions while the DW is optimised for data analysis. Basic ideas are there although the presentation needs more focus.	10	5
DW Architecture Figure 3 (what happened to figure 2?) does show the source systems and data marts, although it also needs to show the ETL process and use the term 'data mart'. Good description of ETL process, although this does go into too much detail with figure 4. The structure of this section is a little strange – it reads as if the bulletpoint benefits are due to ETL, not due to the move to a DW. It would be better to show a diagram with the source systems, ETL process, DW, data marts and BI applications and to talk about the movement of RR data from the source systems through to the BI systems.	20	12
Data Marts Data marts give each department a local copy of the sections of the DW that they need to see. This allows them to run analysis queries on their data without having to run them on the central DW. The fact that they only see the data that they need improves the system security. The list of data marts is good, and links well to the RR case study. Again, the basics are here but needs more focus.	10	6
Normalised v. Dimensional Figure 5 would be better in section 1. Basics are there but more detail is needed. Mentioning information governance is good, but has too much detail and would be better in section 2.	10	5
TOTAL	50	28

Task 2

Source Systems You didn't need to build a DB of the existing systems, just list them.	5	3
Star Schema The basic structure with two fact tables is good. Showing the conformed dimensions in a different colour to the unconfirmed ones is a good idea. You need to justify your design decisions, particularly the decision to link the continuity track to a dimension rather than a fact (which makes your schema a snowflake rather than a star). You've also got secondary IDs in other dimensions, which is a problem. Master data is good. Aggregate data should have one table per fact. Metadata is okay, but we'd normally have more than one table, at least one for conformed dimensions and another for unconfirmed dimensions.	25	14
Data Marts Good identification of the two main data marts. You could put the tables for each data mart into the table with the requirements.	10	7
ETL Excellent ETL with justifications and build/update sequence.	10	10
TOTAL	50	34

General comments:

Don't put the introduction before the table of contents. Only the abstract comes before the ToC. If you've got diagrams and graphics then remember to include a table of figures as well. Make sure that all figures are readable; black on purple is not a good idea.