BENG0095 Group Assignment
Assessment Form (2020/21)

**UCL** ENGINEERING
Change the world

**Group Name:**                                            **Module Code**        BENG0095

| General Comments: | | |
|---|---|---|
| **1. Methodology** | | **Mark (%)** |
| The methodology is as simple as could be or is missing entirely.  The wrong type of algorithm may have been used and demonstrates a lack of understanding of the problem. | The methodology is novel and draws in extra information in an intelligent way.  The description of the methodology displays a keen understanding of the problem. | |
| **2. Evaluation Strategy** | | |
| The evaluation strategy is either missing or inappropriate.  Errors in the strategy have gone unnoticed leading to a biased model. | Excellent evaluation strategy that covers all the bases and is well justified. | |
| **3. Presentation of Results** | | |
| No attempt has been made to present and discuss the results.  They are difficult to understand and no attempt has been made to interpret them. | The results are well interpreted revealing insights into the data and the approach.  Excellent use of statistics, tables, and graphs. | |
| **4. Interest of Approach** | | |
| No interest or novelty.  The approach is simply a like for like copy of an existing solution. | A novel approach that demonstrates an excellent grasp of the problem. | |
| **5. Format, structure, references, and clarity of writing/code** | | |
| The submission was in the wrong format or large parts were missing.  No references and the writing and code quality are poor. | Superbly laid out notebook with clear logical steps.  The notebook runs and the code and surrounding text are well written and easy to understand.  The references show an impressive level of background reading. | |
| **Overall Mark** | | |

**Marking Descriptors (Underline corresponding descriptor)**

UCL ENGINEERING
Change the world

| Range | Descriptor |
|---|---|
| 90-100%<br>Exceptional | • Methodology is of publishable quality. Developed new approaches to tackle the problem<br>• Evaluation is constructed in such a way as to remove any positive bias. Parameters have been correctly set and an appropriate re-sampling method has been used and justified. Goes well beyond what was expected<br>• Results are clearly presented and go into exceptional detail. There is brilliant use of tables and graphs and the surrounding text is excellently written and shows real insight into both the data and the approach<br>• The approach is completely novel and draws in extra data in an interesting and novel way<br>• There are no flaws in the spelling, the references show a good range of background reading, and the writing and code is of publishable quality |
| 80-89%<br>Outstanding | • A methodology that shows novelty and is clearly described. Multiple data sources are used and the model brings together multiple innovative strands<br>• The evaluation strategy compliments the methodology and is logically explained and justified. All relevant parameters have been estimated<br>• Results are excellently displayed with appropriate visualisations and reporting used. The surrounding text shows an excellent level of critical understanding<br>• There is novelty and innovation in the approach. Impressive use of outside information<br>• Very few flaws in the writing, layout, references (of which there are a good amount), and code |
| 70-79%<br>Excellent | • An impressive methodology that uses multiple sources of information. The reason for using them is well justified and advanced methods have been used<br>• Excellent evaluation strategy with all of the basics well covered<br>• Results are clearly presented and some attempt at interpreting the results have been made<br>• The approach is interesting and the reasons justifying the approach are well made<br>• Very good write-up with very few mistakes. Code is generally well commented and there are some references displaying background reading |
| 60-69%<br>Good | • A nice methodology is presented and an engineered data source has been used. The use of engineered information is appropriate and well justified<br>• The evaluation strategy is logical and well reported but might contain some errors<br>• Results are all present but perhaps not formatted in the optimal way (i.e. tables and graphs not properly used)<br>• The use of extra data or modification of the core model has displayed novelty and interest<br>• Well written with good code and structure. Some references. |
| 50-59%<br>Satisfactory | • The methodology is appropriate but poorly described. No engineered data sources have been used<br>• An evaluation strategy has been employed but there are flaws in the estimation of parameters<br>• The results are generally well presented but some key information is missing<br>• There is some novelty to the approach but it is little more than training a standard classifier<br>• Write-up is generally OK but there are a few spelling errors. Some references, adequate code and comments |
| 40-49%<br>Passable | • A methodology is presented but it does nothing more than train on the raw features in the training set<br>• The methodology is evaluated but no appropriate re-sampling methods are used or there are errors in the approach<br>• Results are poorly presented with key information missing<br>• There is no novelty to the approach<br>• Some flaws in the write-up with parts missing, no references, or poorly written documentation and code |
| 20-39%<br>Unsatisfactory<br>(Clear fail) | • An attempt at a methodology has been made but it does not work<br>• No real attempt at an evaluation strategy or there are major flaws in the approach<br>• Results have not been properly presented or there are major errors/omissions<br>• No novelty to the approach<br>• Poorly written documentation and code. No references |
| 0-20%<br>Hopeless<br>(Unacceptable fail) | • Methodology is missing<br>• Evaluation strategy is missing<br>• Results are missing<br>• The approach has been copied from another source without reference<br>• Seriously flawed write-up with little to no documentation, little to no code, or submitted in the wrong format. |