Assessment Rubric

This rubric will be used to mark your assignment. You are advised to use it to supplement your understanding of what is expected for the assignment and to direct your effort towards the most rewarding parts of the work. Your assignment will be marked out of 100, and marks will be scaled back to contribute to the defined weighting for assessment of the course.

Review Criteria	Max Mark	Exemplary	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Unsatisfactory
Overall holistic evaluation of the report	10	9-10 Highly original and very interesting. Excellent, detailed and relevant discussion that develops and enhances the reader's understanding of the topic. Very clear key message and closely associated conclusion.	7-8 Interesting with some originality. Relevant discussion of sufficient detail to allow the reader to develop a clear understanding of the topic. Identifiable key message and related conclusion.	6 Interesting but lacking originality. Although mostly relevant, discussion sometimes lacks sufficient detail to allow the reader to develop a consistent understanding of the topic. Apparent key message and associated conclusion.	5 Not very interesting or original. Discussion is not always relevant nor sufficiently detailed to enable the reader to develop an understanding of the topic. Difficult to be certain what the key message is and how the conclusion relates to it	0-4 Boring and mundane. Discussion lacks detail, is mostly irrelevant and doesn't help the reader to develop an understanding of the topic. No discernible key message or conclusion.
Communication, Structure and Presentation	10	8-10 Exemplary use of language enhancing the quality of the submission. Very well ordered with logical and clear structure supported by appropriate headings and sub headings. All use of others' ideas and materials acknowledged. References are all included and are formatted	7 Very good use of language. Well-ordered and logical. Headings and sub-headings help to clarify text. All use of others' ideas and material is acknowledged. All references are included, though some minor inconsistency of in-text citation or formatting.	6 Reasonable but needs some revision. Mostly well-ordered and logical, most supported by headings and sub-headings All use of others' ideas and material is acknowledged. Some references are missing and occasional inconsistencies of in-text citation and formatting.	5 Poor, needs significant revision. Order is not always logical and is sometimes confusing. Headings are largely those suggested by the assignment specification and the questions posed. All use of other's ideas and material is acknowledged, though sometimes	0-4 Very difficult to understand. Order is confusing and not always logical. Headings and sub-headings do little to help clarify the text Not all use of other's ideas and material is acknowledged. Missing in-text citations, i.e. plagiarism. References in the bibliography not used in the

Review Criteria	Max Mark	Exemplary	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Unsatisfactory
		consistently and appropriately. Diagrams and/or images are ideally suited to the points where they are used.	Diagrams and/or images are used effectively.	Diagrams and/or images improve readability.	inconsistently. Missing references and inconsistent in-text citation and formatting. Diagrams and/or images are not well selected.	text. Poorly and inconsistently formatted. Diagrams and/or images detract from the key messages.
Problem Description	10	9-10 Goals are clear, challenging, and suitable for the data used. Wider context of goals is discussed (e.g. expected impact or importance). The problem description provides context for the data mining that is connected and used in the rest of the work.	7-8 Problem description is clear and suitable for the data used. The problem description provides context for the data mining that is connected and used in the rest of the work.	6 The problem description provides adequate context for the mining work although some key elements could be expanded to support richer analytical work.	5 Problem description is barely adequate for the purpose. Problem description does not connect tightly with the work performed.	0-4 Key elements of the problem description are missing or insufficiently explained.
Data Description	10	9-10 Source, attributes, population, quality assessment and basic statistical summary provided. Description demonstrates deep understanding of the data.	7-8 Source, attributes, population, quality, and basic statistical summary provided.	12-13 Source, attributes, population, quality, and basic statistical summary provided. Data description should be clearer.	10-11 Most of the required information provided and correct.	0-4 Required information not provided and/or incorrect or misleading, demonstrating lack of engagement with the data.
Method description	30	24-30 At least 2 course methods applied. R, Rattle and other tools have been properly	21-23 At least 2 course methods applied. R, Rattle and other tools have been properly	18-20 At least 2 course methods applied. R, Rattle and other tools have been properly	15-17 At least 2 course methods applied. Not always clear what software tools were used.	0-14 Less than 2 course methods applied. Not clear what software tools were used

Review Criteria	Max Mark	Exemplary	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Unsatisfactory
26 (handwritten)		identified and used appropriately. Reproduction of major results is possible from description of methods. Data pre-processing is well-suited to the methods used and the mining goals, with justification (or no-pre-processing, with convincing justification). Careful parameter setting and tuning explained and justified by experimentation or theory or both. Justification for methods chosen demonstrates careful attention to the applicability and limitations of the methods to the problem goals.	identified and used appropriately. Reproduction of major results is possible from description of methods. Extensive, directed, experimentation with data preprocessing or tuning parameters explained. Justification for methods chosen is clear and linked to problem goals.	identified and used appropriately. Reproduction of major results is possible from description of methods. Some experimentation with data preprocessing or tuning parameters evident. Justification for methods chosen is clear.	Unclear that reproduction of results is possible from description of methods. Experimentation with data pre-processing or tuning parameters barely evident, suggesting a simplistic approach to the problem. Weak justification for methods chosen.	Methods not described in adequate detail for reproduction. Justification for methods chosen absent or unconvincing.
Results **18** (handwritten)	20	17-20 Outstandingly useful and potentially actionable results found. Results are clearly interpreted for domain expert.	14-16 Results presented are well selected for significance to the mining goals. Results are interpreted for domain expert. Results are well supported by selected quality measures	12-13 Major results are clearly presented, with quality measures present but overall interpretation for domain experts could be sharper.	10-11 Results are clearly presented, with typical quality measures present.	0-9 Scant attention to evaluation appropriate to the methods used.

(handwritten annotation): but missed significance of High, Low effect on Close

Review Criteria	Max Mark	Exemplary	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Unsatisfactory
		Results supported by well-selected quality measures, explained in terms of impact for domain expert.	that are explained for domain expert.			
Conclusion and further work	10	9-10 Thoughtful analysis of how results could be applied, including identifying challenges. Ideas for further work are creative, relevant and exciting, and tied to application context.	7-8 Analysis of potential application of results ties to problem goals and recognises the application context. Ideas for further work are significant and realistic.	6 Statement of how results could be applied to the domain is realistic in the context of the problem goals. Ideas for further work are present but could be better tied to the problem and application domain.	5 Statement of how results could be applied to the domain is given. Possible further work identified.	0-4 Missing analysis of application or extension.

10

89