FIT5149 S2 2020 Assignment 2 – Marking Rubric

Marking Rubric - Assignment 2 contributes 35% to your final unit mark

Indicating the level the student is work at*:	**0 column**	**(N) Fail**	**(P) Pass**	**(C) Credit**	**(D) Distinction**	**(HD) High Distinction**
This assessment meets **Unit Learning Outcomes** 1,2,3,4,5 1. Analyze data sets with a range of statistical, graphical and machine-learning tools; 2. Evaluate the limitations, appropriateness, and benefits of data analytics methods for given tasks; 3. Design solutions to real-world problems with data analysis techniques; 4. Assess the results of the analysis; 5. Communicate the results of an analysis for both specific and broad audiences.						
	Did not attempt	**Fail**	**Pass**	**Credit**	**Distinction**	**High Distinction**
Classification Accuracy (Computed with 100% Test Data)	Did not attempt the assessment	Accuracy score is lower than 0.37	Accuracy score is larger than or equal 0.37 and lower than 0.49	Accuracy score is larger than or equal to 0.49 and lower than 0.53	Accuracy score is larger than or equal to 0.53 and lower than 0.56	Accuracy score is larger than or equal to 0.56 The group has the highest score will receive full marks

15 marks	0	0 - 7.5	7.5 - 9	9 - 10.5	10.5 - 12	12 - 15
Classifier Model description	No attempt	No or limited discussion of the chosen models with an insufficient level of details about how they work.	Less than three of the chosen models are discussed and presented with some level of details about how they work but not in-depth.	All of the chosen models are discussed and presented with an appropriate level of details about how they work.	All of the chosen models are well justified and presented clearly with an appropriate level of details in-depth about how they work.	The chosen models are discussed and presented clearly with comprehensive details.
5 marks	0	0-2.5	2.5-3	3-3.5	3.5-4	4-5
Classifier development and evaluation	No attempt	No, or limited explanation of how the classifier was developed with no evidence and proper justification.	Limited explanation of how the classifier was developed with insufficient evidence and proper justification.	Some explanation of how the classifier was developed with some relevant supporting information. Demonstrates some understanding of the difference between the compared models.	A logical explanation of the classifier development process with supporting information. The discussion of experiments and the comparison is logical with an appropriate level of details.	Critically assess the accuracy of the models with comprehensive and comparative analysis. The discussion of experiments and the comparison is logical and solid with an appropriate level of details.

					Demonstrates a solid understanding of the difference between the compared models.	The experimental methodology is set correctly and logically lead to the development of the final model to be submitted Demonstrates a high level of understanding of the performance differences between the candidate classifiers and those caused by different settings.
10 marks	0	0-5	5-6	6-7	7-8	8-10
Code and Report Readability	No commenting of code	The R/Python code is incomplete and the code readability is poor. There is no clear structure in the report and the readability of the report is poor.	The R/Python code is complete but poorly structured and the code readability is poor with no or insufficient comments to explain how the code is intended to work.	The R/Python code is structured but the logic is not clear. Code readability is good with adequate comments to explain how the code is intended to work	The R/Python code is logically structured and easy to read. Comments clearly explain how the code is intended to work. However, there are some redundant or unnecessary code and/or comments.	The R/Python code is logically structured and easy to read. Concise but precise code comments clearly explain how the code is intended to work. The redundant or unnecessary code is excluded from the final

			The report is structured, but the readability of the report is poor.	The report is well structured, and the readability of the report is reasonable.	The report is well structured and the readability of the report is good.	submission. The README file is clear so that the submitted implementation can be easily set up. The report is well structured with proper sections and subsections; the readability of the report is good.
5 marks	0	0-2.5	2.5-3	3-3.5	3.5-4	4-5