School of Computing and Information Systems, The University of Melbourne
COMP90049 Knowledge Technologies, Semester 2 2019: Project 2 **Report** Marking Rubric

Method (15% weighting)	Critical Analysis (40% weighting)	Report Quality (15% weighting)
10 • System design is admirably clear and unquestionably structured to provide testable hypotheses which will provide knowledge for the given problem	**10** • Clearly identifies the knowledge gained about the task • 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	**10** • Ideas and arguments are cohesive, where the components of the report clearly indicate how they relate to the whole • Report structure is logical and formal, in line with typical standards in academic writing • Generally clear and easy-to-follow • References are suitably synthesised and chosen discriminately with respect to the given problem • Adequately concise and meets word limits
8 • Utilises relevant methodological strategies which are connected to logical hypotheses • System design is clear and reproducible, but some minor ideas are overlooked • Evaluation is systematic and logical	**8 or 9** • Clearly identifies the knowledge gained about the task • Argumentation is logical and thoroughly supported 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	**8 or 9** • Ideas and arguments are coherent, and generally the work fits together as a unit • Report structure is logical and formal, with small divergences 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
7 • Utilises relevant methodological strategies which are connected to plausible hypotheses • Description of system design is missing some important idea, making the design questionable or dubious • Evaluation is logical but not systematic	**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 abstract thought, but extended analysis not always clear or successful • Little connection to the academic community	**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 • Perhaps small divergences from the word limits

Method (15% weighting)	Critical Analysis (40% weighting)	Report Quality (25% weighting)
5 or 6 • Utilises methodological strategies, but disconnected from corresponding hypotheses, or fundamentally limit the prospect of gaining knowledge • Description of system design lacks several crucial methodological components • Evaluation is attempted but illogical	**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	**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
0 to 4 • Methodological strategies are incomplete or absent	**0 to 4** • No indication of knowledge gained about the task • Argumentation is generally absent • Mostly data without corresponding analysis • Theoretical properties of methods are not in evidence • No connection to the academic community	**0 to 4** • Ideas and arguments are missing or impossible to follow • Report has no structure or references • Not a formal report, even at a stretch

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.