

School of Computing and Information Systems, The University of Melbourne  
COMP30027 Machine Learning, Semester 1 2022: Project 2 Report Marking Rubric

Method – 4 out of 14	Critical Analysis – 7 out of 14	Report Quality – 3 out of 14
<p style="text-align: center;">100%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insightful consideration of data representation, and its interaction with learner choice</li> <li>Hyper-parameters identified and contrasted where necessary</li> <li>Appropriate use of evaluation</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">100%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Argumentation is logical and incontrovertibly supported by evidence</li> <li>Theoretical properties of methods are well understood and linked to practical observations</li> <li>Demonstrates a very high level of abstract thought</li> <li>Thorough results analysis and laudable error analysis</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">100%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ideas and arguments are cohesive, where the components of the report clearly indicate how they relate to the whole</li> <li>Report structure is logical and formal, in line with typical standards in academic writing</li> <li>Generally clear and easy-to-follow</li> <li>References are suitably synthesized and chosen discriminately with respect to the given problem</li> <li>Adequately concise and meets word limits</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;">80%-90%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data representation mostly ignored or abstracted</li> <li>Hyper-parameters identified but perhaps only weakly contrasted</li> <li>Appropriate use of evaluation</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">80%-90%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Argumentation is logical and thoroughly supported by evidence</li> <li>Theoretical properties of methods are well understood and linked to practical observations</li> <li>Demonstrates a moderate level of abstract thought</li> <li>Thorough results analysis, and fair attempt at error analysis</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">80%-90%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 divergences from typical academic standards</li> <li>Generally clear, with small disruptions in flow</li> <li>References are suitably synthesised, but are too few or chosen indiscriminately</li> <li>Adequately concise and meets word limits</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;">70%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data representation ignored, but appropriate for chosen methods</li> <li>Hyper-parameters un-identified or not contrasted</li> <li>Evaluation is logical and formal, but not appropriate</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">70%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 observations</li> <li>Demonstrates abstract thought, but extended analysis not always clear or successful</li> <li>Only minimal error analysis attempted</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">70%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 are too few or disconnected from the problem at hand</li> </ul>

<p>50%-60%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data representation not appropriate for chosen methods</li> <li>• Evaluation is illogical or informal</li> <li>• Methods are inadequate and prevent meaningful analysis</li> </ul>	<p>50%-60%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Argumentation is illogical in places, and evidence is inadequate or contradictory</li> <li>• Theoretical properties of methods are not in evidence</li> <li>• No signs of abstract thought and/or analysis</li> </ul>	<p>50%-60%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ideas and arguments are notably incoherent • Report structure is flawed</li> <li>• Some unclear sections which detract from the overall work</li> <li>• References are disconnected or absent</li> <li>• Possibly way off the word limits</li> </ul>
<p>0-40%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tasks are essentially incomplete or not attempted</li> </ul>	<p>0-40%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Argumentation is generally absent</li> <li>• Mostly data without corresponding analysis</li> <li>• Theoretical properties of methods are not in evidence</li> </ul>	<p>0-40%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 (80%-90%) and (50%-60%), 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 ((100%) and (70%) respectively).

For categories labelled (0-40%): unsatisfactory (N) grades depend on the number of factors in which the submission failed to meet the required standards. More details are given in the brief comments from the marker.