## School of Computing and Information Systems, The University of Melbourne COMP90049 Knowledge Technologies, Semester 2 2017: Project 2 Marking Rubric

• Test predictions submitted • One or more new attributes generated and discussed in the report  8 • Test predictions not submitted • One or more new attributes generated and discussed in the report  8 • Test predictions not submitted • One or more new attributes generated and discussed in the report  8 • Clearly identifies the knowledge gained about the task ported by evidence • Theoretical properties of methods are well-understood and linked to practical behaviour • Publishable with perhaps minor changes  8 • Clearly identifies the knowledge gained about the task community • Publishable with perhaps minor changes  8 • Clearly identifies the knowledge gained about the task community • Publishable with perhaps minor changes  8 • Clearly identifies the knowledge gained about the task community • Publishable with perhaps minor changes  8 • Clearly identifies the knowledge gained about the task community • Publishable with perhaps minor changes  8 • Clearly identifies the knowledge gained about the task community • Publishable with perhaps minor changes  8 • Clearly identifies the knowledge gained about the task community • Publishable with respect to the academic community • Publishable with perhaps minor changes  8 • Clearly identifies the knowledge gained about the task community • Publishable with respect to the academic community • Publishable with perhaps minor changes  8 • Clearly identifies the knowledge gained about the task community • Argumentation is logical and thoroughly supported by evidence • Theoretical properties of methods are well-understood and linked to practical behaviour • Permonstrates a moderate level of abstract thought • Attempts to situate with respect to the academic community. but perhaps not clearly • Adequately concise and meets word limits • Report structure is logical and formal, in line with the whole work fits together as a unit expect to the given problem • Adequately concise may be work fits together as a unit expect to the academic community. • References are suitably synthe	Method (15% weighting)	Critical Analysis (45% weighting)	Report Quality (25% weighting)
Argumentation is logical and incontrovertibly supported by evidence     Theoretical properties of methods are well-understood and linked to practical behaviour     Demonstrates a very high level of abstract thought     Admirably situated with respect to the academic community     Publishable with perhaps minor changes      Sor 9     Clearly identifies the knowledge gained about the task of the report structure is logical and formal, in line with typical standards in academic writing     Generally clear and casy-to-follow     References are suitably synthesised and chosen discriminately with respect to the given problem     Adequately concise and meets word limits      Sor 9     Clearly identifies the knowledge gained about the task of the report structure is logical and formal, in line with typical standards in academic writing     Generally clear and casy-to-follow     References are suitably synthesised and chosen discriminately with respect to the given problem     Adequately concise and meets word limits      Theoretical properties of methods are well-understood and linked to practical behaviour     Demonstrates a barract lovel of abstract thought and thoroughly supported by evidence     Theoretical properties of methods are well-understood and linked to practical behaviour     Demonstrates a barract level of abstract thought and the report, but only word unigrams      To Test predictions submitted     One or more attributes generated and discussed in the report, but only word unigrams      To Test predictions submitted     One or more attributes generated and discussed in the report, but only word unigrams      To Test predictions submitted     One or more attributes generated and discussed in the report, but only word unigrams      To Test predictions submitted     One or more attributes generated and discussed in the report, but only word unigrams      To Test predictions submitted     One or more attributes generated and discussed in the report, but only word unigrams      To Test predictions submi	10		
cussed in the report    Portical by evidence	• Test predictions submitted	• Clearly identifies the knowledge gained about the task	• Ideas and arguments are cohesive, where the compo-
Newtonian properties of methods are understood and linked to practical behaviour  Demonstrates a very high level of abstract thought Admirably situated with respect to the academic community Publishable with perhaps minor changes  8	O Company		
• Admirably situated with respect to the academic community • Publishable with perhaps minor changes  8 or 9 • Clearly identifies the knowledge gained about the task • One or more new attributes generated and discussed in the report  • Test predictions submitted • One or more attributes generated and discussed in the report, but only word unigrams  7 • Test predictions submitted • One or more attributes generated and discussed in the report, but only word unigrams  7 • Attempts to situate with respect to the academic community, but perhaps not clearly  • Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear • Argumentation is logical, but evidence is lacking in some areas • Theoretical properties of methods are understood, but not clearly linked to practical behaviour • Demonstrates a moderate level of abstract thought • Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear • Argumentation is logical, but evidence is lacking in some areas • Theoretical properties of methods are understood, but not clearly linked to practical behaviour • Demonstrates abstract thought, but extended analysis not always clear or successful	-		• Report structure is logical and formal, in line with typical standards in academic writing
8 • Test predictions not submitted • One or more new attributes generated and discussed in the report  • Clearly identifies the knowledge gained about the task of the academic community, but perhaps not clearly • Demonstrates a moderate level of abstract thought of the report, but only word unigrams  7 • Test predictions submitted • One or more attributes generated and discussed in the report, but only word unigrams  7 • Test predictions submitted • One or more attributes generated and discussed in the report, but only word unigrams  7 • Test predictions submitted • One or more attributes generated and discussed in the report, but only word unigrams  7 • Test predictions submitted • One or more attributes generated and discussed in the report, but only word unigrams  7 • Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear • Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear • Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear • Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear • Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear • Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear • Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task or chosen indiscriminately • Adequately concise and meets word limits • Report structure is logical and formal, with small disvergences from typical academic standards • Generally clear, with small disruptions in flow • References are suitably synthesised, but are too few or chosen indiscriminately • Adequately concise and meets word limits • Report structure is logical and formal, with small disruptions in flow • References are suitably synthesised, but are too few or chosen indiscriminately • Adequately concise and arguments are coherent, and generally the work fits together as a unit • Report structure is logical, but work fits together as a unit • Report structure is logical, but work fits together as a unit		• Demonstrates a very high level of abstract thought	• Generally clear and easy-to-follow
8 8 or 9  • Test predictions not submitted • One or more new attributes generated and discussed in the report  • Theoretical properties of methods are well-understood and linked to practical behaviour • Demonstrates a moderate level of abstract thought • Attempts to situate with respect to the academic community, but perhaps not clearly  • Test predictions submitted • One or more attributes generated and discussed in the report, but only word unigrams  7  • Test predictions submitted • One or more attributes generated and discussed in the report, but only word unigrams  7  • Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear • Argumentation is logical, but evidence is lacking in some areas • Theoretical properties of methods are understood, but not clearly linked to practical behaviour • Demonstrates a moderate level of abstract thought to task, but vague or unclear • Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear • Argumentation is logical, but evidence is lacking in some areas • Theoretical properties of methods are understood, but not clearly linked to practical behaviour • Demonstrates a bastract thought, but extended analysis not always clear or successful			• References are suitably synthesised and chosen dis- criminately with respect to the given problem
<ul> <li>Test predictions not submitted</li> <li>One or more new attributes generated and discussed in the report</li> <li>Theoretical properties of methods are well-understood and linked to practical behaviour</li> <li>Demonstrates a moderate level of abstract thought</li> <li>Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear</li> <li>Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear</li> <li>Agumentation is logical and thoroughly supported by evidence</li> <li>Theoretical properties of methods are well-understood and linked to practical behaviour</li> <li>Attempts to situate with respect to the academic community, but perhaps not clearly</li> <li>Adequately concise and meets word limits</li> <li>Adequately concise and meets word limits</li> <li>Adequately concise and arguments are coherent, and generally the work fits together as a unit</li> <li>Report structure is logical and formal, with small disvergences from typical academic standards</li> <li>Generally clear, with small disvergences are unitably synthesised, but are too few or chosen indiscriminately</li> <li>Adequately concise and meets word limits</li> <li>Ideas and arguments are coherent, and generally the work fits together as a unit</li> <li>Report structure is logical and formal, with small disvergences from typical academic standards</li> <li>Actempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear</li> <li>Adequately concise and meets word limits</li> <li>Ideas and arguments are coherent, and generally the work fits together as a unit</li> <li>Report structure is logical, but or chosen indiscriminately</li> <li>Adequately concise and meets word limits</li> <li>Ideas and arguments are coherent, and generally the work fits together as a unit</li> <li>Report structure is logical and formal, with small disruptions in flow or chosen indiscriminately</li> <li>Adequately concise and arguments are coherent or chosen indiscriminately</li> <li>Ideas and arguments are coherent</li></ul>		Publishable with perhaps minor changes	• Adequately concise and meets word limits
<ul> <li>One or more new attributes generated and discussed in the report</li> <li>Theoretical properties of methods are well-understood and linked to practical behaviour</li> <li>Demonstrates a moderate level of abstract thought</li> <li>Attempts to situate with respect to the academic community, but perhaps not clearly</li> <li>Test predictions submitted</li> <li>One or more attributes generated and discussed in the report, but only word unigrams</li> <li>Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear</li> <li>Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear</li> <li>Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear</li> <li>Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear</li> <li>Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear</li> <li>Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear</li> <li>Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear</li> <li>Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear</li> <li>Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear</li> <li>Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear</li> <li>Action the report, but only word unigrams</li> <li>Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear</li> <li>Action the report structure is logical, but possibly informal or out-of-line with academic standards</li> <li>Some unclear sections that do not detract from the overall work</li> <li>Report structure is logical, but possibly informal or out-of-line with academic standards</li> <li>Some unclear sections that do not detract from the overall work</li> <li>Report structure is logical, but evidence is lacking in some areas</li> <li>Some unclear sections that do not detract from the overall work</li> <li>References are present, but terse or disconnected from the pr</li></ul>	8	8 or 9	8 or 9
by evidence Theoretical properties of methods are well-understood and linked to practical behaviour Demonstrates a moderate level of abstract thought Attempts to situate with respect to the academic community, but perhaps not clearly  To the predictions submitted One or more attributes generated and discussed in the report, but only word unigrams  Theoretical properties of methods are well-understood and linked to practical behaviour  Attempts to situate with respect to the academic community, but perhaps not clearly  To the predictions submitted  Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear  Argumentation is logical, but evidence is lacking in some areas  Theoretical properties of methods are understood, but not clearly linked to practical behaviour  Demonstrates abstract thought, but extended analysis not always clear or successful  Report structure is logical and formal, with small divergences from typical academic standards  References are suitably synthesised, but are too few or chosen indiscriminately  Adequately concise and meets word limits  I lideas and arguments are mostly coherent, but do not come together in a unified way  Report structure is logical and formal, with small divergences from typical academic standards  References are suitably synthesised, but are too few or chosen indiscriminately  Adequately concise and meets word limits  To lideas and arguments are mostly coherent, but do not come together in a unified way  Report structure is logical, but possibly informal or out-of-line with academic standards  References are pushed to practical behaviour  Report structure is logical and formal, with small divergences from typical academic standards  I deferences are suitably synthesised, but are too few or chosen indiscriminately  I dea and arguments are mostly coherent, but do not come together in a unified way  Report structure is logical, but or chosen indiscriminately  I dea and arguments are mostly coherent, but do not come together in a unified way  Report	One or more new attributes generated and dis-	Argumentation is logical and thoroughly supported	• Ideas and arguments are coherent, and generally the work fits together as a unit
• Theoretical properties of methods are well-understood and linked to practical behaviour • Demonstrates a moderate level of abstract thought • Attempts to situate with respect to the academic community, but perhaps not clearly  7 • Test predictions submitted • One or more attributes generated and discussed in the report, but only word unigrams cussed in the report, but only word unigrams • Theoretical properties of methods are well-understood, but not clearly inked to practical behaviour • Demonstrates abstract thought, but extended analysis not always clear or successful  • Theoretical properties of methods are well-understood, but academic standards • Generally clear, with small disruptions in flow • References are suitably synthesised, but are too few or chosen indiscriminately • Adequately concise and meets word limits  • Ideas and arguments are mostly coherent, but do not come together in a unified way • Report structure is logical, but possibly informal or out-of-line with academic standards • Generally clear, with small disruptions in flow • References are suitably synthesised, but are too few or chosen indiscriminately • Adequately concise and meets word limits  • Ideas and arguments are mostly coherent, but do not come together in a unified way • Report structure is logical, but possibly informal or out-of-line with academic standards • Some unclear sections that do not detract from the overall work			
understood and linked to practical behaviour  Demonstrates a moderate level of abstract thought  Attempts to situate with respect to the academic community, but perhaps not clearly  Test predictions submitted One or more attributes generated and discussed in the report, but only word unigrams  Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear  Argumentation is logical, but evidence is lacking in some areas  Theoretical properties of methods are understood, but not clearly linked to practical behaviour  Demonstrates abstract thought, but extended analysis not always clear or successful  Generally clear, with small disruptions in flow  References are suitably synthesised, but are too few or chosen indiscriminately  Adequately concise and meets word limits  Adequately concise and meets word limits  Adequately concise and meets word limits  Flows  References are suitably synthesised, but are too few or chosen indiscriminately  Adequately concise and meets word limits  Flows  References are suitably synthesised, but are too few or chosen indiscriminately  Adequately concise and meets word limits  Flows  References are mostly coherent, but do not come together in a unified way  Report structure is logical, but possibly informal or out-of-line with academic standards  Some unclear sections that do not detract from the overall work  References are present, but terse or disconnected from the problem at hand		• Theoretical properties of methods are well-	,
<ul> <li>Attempts to situate with respect to the academic community, but perhaps not clearly</li> <li>Test predictions submitted</li> <li>One or more attributes generated and discussed in the report, but only word unigrams</li> <li>Argumentation is logical, but evidence is lacking in some areas</li> <li>Theoretical properties of methods are understood, but not clearly linked to practical behaviour</li> <li>Demonstrates abstract thought, but extended analysis not always clear or successful</li> <li>Attempts to situate with respect to the academic commodities</li> <li>Adequately concise and meets word limits</li> <li>Ideas and arguments are mostly coherent, but do not come together in a unified way</li> <li>Report structure is logical, but possibly informal or out-of-line with academic standards</li> <li>Some unclear sections that do not detract from the overall work</li> <li>References are present, but terse or disconnected from the problem at hand</li> </ul>			• Generally clear, with small disruptions in flow
Attempts to situate with respect to the academic community, but perhaps not clearly  7  • Test predictions submitted • One or more attributes generated and discussed in the report, but only word unigrams  • Attempts to situate with respect to the academic community, but perhaps not clearly  7  • Attempts to situate with respect to the academic community. But perhaps not clearly  • Adequately concise and meets word limits  • Ideas and arguments are mostly coherent, but do not come together in a unified way  • Report structure is logical, but possibly informal or out-of-line with academic standards  • Some unclear sections that do not detract from the overall work  • References are present, but terse or disconnected from the problem at hand		• Demonstrates a moderate level of abstract thought	• References are suitably synthesised, but are too few
7  • Test predictions submitted • One or more attributes generated and discussed in the report, but only word unigrams • Argumentation is logical, but evidence is lacking in some areas • Theoretical properties of methods are understood, but not clearly linked to practical behaviour • Demonstrates abstract thought, but extended analysis not always clear or successful  7  • Ideas and arguments are mostly coherent, but do not come together in a unified way • Report structure is logical, but possibly informal or out-of-line with academic standards • Some unclear sections that do not detract from the overall work • References are present, but terse or disconnected from the problem at hand			· ·
<ul> <li>Test predictions submitted</li> <li>One or more attributes generated and discussed in the report, but only word unigrams</li> <li>Argumentation is logical, but evidence is lacking in some areas</li> <li>Theoretical properties of methods are understood, but not clearly linked to practical behaviour</li> <li>Demonstrates abstract thought, but extended analysis not always clear or successful</li> <li>Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear</li> <li>Report structure is logical, but possibly informal or out-of-line with academic standards</li> <li>Some unclear sections that do not detract from the overall work</li> <li>References are present, but terse or disconnected from the problem at hand</li> </ul>		community, but perhaps not clearly	• Adequately concise and meets word limits
<ul> <li>One or more attributes generated and discussed in the report, but only word unigrams</li> <li>Argumentation is logical, but evidence is lacking in some areas</li> <li>Theoretical properties of methods are understood, but not clearly linked to practical behaviour</li> <li>Demonstrates abstract thought, but extended analysis not always clear or successful</li> <li>Come together in a unified way</li> <li>Report structure is logical, but possibly informal or out-of-line with academic standards</li> <li>Some unclear sections that do not detract from the overall work</li> <li>References are present, but terse or disconnected from the problem at hand</li> </ul>	7	7	7
<ul> <li>Argumentation is logical, but evidence is lacking in some areas</li> <li>Theoretical properties of methods are understood, but not clearly linked to practical behaviour</li> <li>Demonstrates abstract thought, but extended analysis not always clear or successful</li> <li>Report structure is logical, but possibly informal or out-of-line with academic standards</li> <li>Some unclear sections that do not detract from the overall work</li> <li>References are present, but terse or disconnected from the problem at hand</li> </ul>	• One or more attributes generated and dis-		• Ideas and arguments are mostly coherent, but do not come together in a unified way
<ul> <li>but not clearly linked to practical behaviour</li> <li>Demonstrates abstract thought, but extended analysis not always clear or successful</li> <li>overall work</li> <li>References are present, but terse or disconnected from the problem at hand</li> </ul>			<ul> <li>Report structure is logical, but possibly informal or out-of-line with academic standards</li> </ul>
sis not always clear or successful the problem at hand			• Some unclear sections that do not detract from the overall work
			• References are present, but terse or disconnected from the problem at hand
• Little connection to the academic community • Perhaps small divergences from the word limits		• Little connection to the academic community	• Perhaps small divergences from the word limits

## School of Computing and Information Systems, The University of Melbourne COMP90049 Knowledge Technologies, Semester 2 2017: Project 1 Marking Rubric

Method (15% weighting)  6 • Test predictions not submitted • One or more attributes generated and discussed in the report, but only word unigrams	Critical Analysis (45% weighting) 5 or 6  • Knowledge gained about the task is fundamentally flawed or lacking  • Argumentation is illogical in places, and evidence is inadequate or contradictory  • Theoretical properties of methods are not in evidence  • No signs of abstract thought and/or analysis  • No connection to the academic community	Report Quality (25% weighting)  5 or 6  Ideas and arguments are notably incoherent Report structure is flawed Some unclear sections which detract from the overall work References are disconnected or absent Possibly way off the word limits
<ul> <li>Test predictions submitted</li> <li>No attributes generated and discussed in the report</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>0 to 4</li> <li>No indication of knowledge gained about the task</li> <li>Argumentation is generally absent</li> <li>Mostly data without corresponding analysis</li> <li>Theoretical properties of methods are not in evidence</li> <li>No connection to the academic community</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>0 to 4</li> <li>Ideas and arguments are missing or impossible to follow</li> <li>Report has no structure or references</li> <li>Not a formal report, even at a stretch</li> </ul>

## Notes:

For categories labelled (8 or 9) and (5 or 6), it is at the marker's discretion to determine how well the report meets the standards of an H1 or P respectively. An alternative interpretation: the higher of the two marks indicates that the submission was close to, but not meriting, the category above ((10) and (7) respectively). For categories labelled (0 to 4): unsatisfactory (N) grades depend on the number of factors in which the submission failed to meet the required standards. Brief comments from the marker are annotated on the submission in Turnitin.