ame	CW1 feedba	ck and mark split				
escription						
ubric Detail						
	Levels of Achieve	ement				
Criteria	Fail	Pass	Pass +	Pass ++	Excellent	Outstanding
1,2,3 Convserion to	0.00 to 39.00 %	40.00 to 49.00 %	50.00 to 59.00 %	60.00 to 69.00 %	70.00 to 79.00 %	80.00 to 100.00 %
arff, randomisation and computational constraints Weight 20.00%	The problem is not well understood and not well described. The required conversions are either not completed or not presented properly. No software developed. No interesting properties in data are discussed.	The stated problem is not very well described. Some required conversions are completed, but the process is not convincingly presented. No software developed. No interesting properties in data are discussed.	All of the required conversions are completed, but the process is not clearly presented. The problem is reasonably described. No software developed. Some interesting properties of the data are noted, but not discussed in depth.	All of the required conversions are completed, and the process is clearly and convincingly described. The problem is reasonably described in addition, either some reasonable piece of software is developed, or some interesting properties of data are discussed in some depth.	All of the required conversions are completed, and the process is presented clearly and convincingly. The problem is very well described and analysed. In addition, either first-class quality software is developed, or deep and thorough discussion of interesting properties of data.	All of the required conversions are completed and the process is presented clear and convincing! The problem is very well described and analysed. In addition, first-class quality software is developed. In addition, deep and thorough discussion of interesting properties of data is given. The report shows reanalytic depth and thorough research into the subject.
4. Classification: Performanance of the Nearest Neighbour Algorithm on the given data set Weight 20.00%	0.00 to 39.00 % The problem is not well understood and not well described. Required experiments are either not completed or not presented properly. No software developed. No interesting properties in algorithms and/or data are discussed.	40.00 to 49.00 % Some required experiments are completed, but they are not convincingly presented. The stated problem is not very well described. No software developed. No interesting properties in algorithms and/or data are discussed.	50.00 to 59.00 % Most required experiments are completed, but they are not convincingly presented in tables/graphs. The problem is reasonably described. No software developed. Some interesting properties of algorithms and/or data are discussed, but not to a great depth.	60.00 to 69.00 % All of the required experiments are completed, and reasonably presented in tables/graphs. The problem is reasonably described. In addition, either some reasonable piece of software is developed, or some interesting properties of data and/or algorithms are noted.	All of the required experiments are completed, and presented logically and convincingly in tables/graphs. The problem is very well described and analysed. In addition, either first-class quality software is developed, or deep and thorough discussion of interesting properties of data and algorithms is given.	80.00 to 100.00 % All of the required experiments ar completed and presented logically and convincingly in tables/graphs. The problem is very well described and analysed. In addition, first-class quality software is developed. In addition, deep and thorough discussion of interesting properties of data and algorithms is given. The reposhows real analytic depth and thorough research into the
5. Deeper analysis: search for important	0.00 to 39.00 % The problem is not well	40.00 to 49.00 % Some required	50.00 to 59.00 % Most required	60.00 to 69.00 % All of the	70.00 to 79.00 % All of the required	80.00 to 100.00 % All of the

1 of 3

Levels of Achievement Excellent Criteria Fail Pass Pass + Pass ++ Outstanding understood are completed, completed, but experiments are experiments are completed, and correlation for presented completed and and not well but they are they are not completed, and each class described. convincingly reasonably logically and presented not Weight Required convincingly presented in presented in convincingly in logically and 20.00% experiments presented. The tables/graphs. tables/graphs. tables/graphs. convincingly in are either not The problem is The problem is The problem is tables/graphs. stated problem is not reasonably The problem is completed or reasonably very well not presented very well described. No described. In described and very well properly. No described. No software addition, either analysed. In described and analysed. In software software developed. some addition, either developed. No developed. No Some reasonable first-class quality addition, firstclass quality interesting interesting interesting piece of software is properties in properties in properties of software is developed, or software is algorithms algorithms algorithms developed, or deep and developed. In and/or data thorough and/or data and/or data are addition, deep some are discussed. are discussed. discussed, but interesting discussion of and thorough interesting not to a great properties of discussion of depth. data and/or properties of interesting algorithms are data and properties of algorithms is noted. data and algorithms is given. given. The report shows real analytic depth and thorough research into the subject. Research papers/webpages are cited and used in an interesting way. 6. Improving 0.00 to 39.00 40.00 to 49.00 50.00 to 59.00 60.00 to 69.00 70.00 to 79.00 % 80.00 to 100.00 the All of the classification All of the All of the The problem is Some required Most required required using the not well experiments experiments are required experiments are required selected understood are completed, completed, but experiments are completed, and experiments are attributes and not well but they are they are not completed, and presented completed and from 5 described. not convincingly reasonably logically and presented Weight Required convincingly presented in presented in convincingly in logically and 20.00% experiments presented. The tables/graphs. tables/graphs. tables/graphs. convincingly in are either not The problem is The problem is The problem is tables/graphs. stated very well completed or problem is not reasonably reasonably The problem is not presented very well described. No described. In described and very well described. No addition, either analysed. In described and properly. No software software software developed. some addition, either analysed. In developed. No developed. No Some reasonable first-class quality addition, firstinteresting interesting interesting piece of software is class quality properties of properties in properties in software is developed, or software is algorithms algorithms developed, or developed. In algorithms deep and and/or data and/or data and/or data are some thorough addition, deep are discussed. are discussed. discussed, but interesting discussion of and thorough not to a great properties of interesting discussion of depth. data and/or properties of interesting algorithms are data and properties of noted. algorithms is data and given. algorithms is given. The report shows real analytic depth and thorough research into the subject. 7. Conclusions 0.00 to 39.00 40.00 to 49.00 50.00 to 59.00 60.00 to 69.00 70.00 to 79.00 % 80.00 to 100.00 Weight Deep techncial 20.00% The problem is Some technical Good technical Solid technical analysis is given Deep techncial analysis is not well analysis is given analysis is given answering all of analysis is given understood given. Some answering answering the questions answering all of and not well web resources several many of the raised. Deep and the questions described. No and research questions. questions thorough given. Relevant technical papers are Some research raised. Some discussion is additional

2 of 3 14/09/2018, 17:30

papers/websites

research

cited but the

analysis is

given. Relevant

experiments are

given. Some web resources and research	text shows little evidence	are mentioned but only briefly.	papers/websites	additional	performed, an
papers are cited but the text shows little evidence of real understanding. No experiments have been run to support the conclusions.	of real understanding. Some experiments that have been run in earlier sections are refered to in support of the conclusions.	Experiments that have been run in earlier sections are clearly refered to in support of the conclusions. No additional experiments have been done.	but only briefly. The experiments that have been run in earlier sections are clearly refered to in support of the conclusions. No additional experiments have been done.	experiments are performed, or relevant additional questions are explored in depth. Research papers/webpages are cited and used in an interesting way.	relevant additional questions are explored in depth. Researc papers/webpa, are cited. The report shows r analytic depth and thorough research into t subject.
	cited but the text shows little evidence of real understanding. No experiments have been run to support the	cited but the text shows little evidence of real understanding. No experiments have been run to support the some experiments support of the text shows been run to support the	cited but the text shows experiments sections are little evidence of real run in earlier sections are understanding. No refered to in support of the experiments support of the have been run to support the run in earlier sections are the conclusions. No additional experiments have been run to support the run in earlier sections are the conclusions. No additional experiments have been done.	cited but the text shows experiments that have been of real understanding. No refered to in support of experiments support of the experiments support of the experiments to support the conclusions. It is a some of the text shows experiments sections are that have been run in earlier to in support of the experiments support of the conclusions. The conclusions of the conclusions of the conclusions. The conclusions of the experiments that have been to that have been tha	cited but the text shows experiments sections are little evidence of real understanding. No refered to in experiments support of the experiments support of the experiments have been run to support the conclusions. In the text shows experiments sections are that have been run in earlier to in support of the experiments have been run to support the conclusions. In the text shows experiments sections are that have been run in earlier sections are the conclusions. In the that have been run in earlier sections are the conclusions. In that have been run in earlier sections are experiments to in support of the experiments that have been run in earlier sections are sections are that have been run in earlier sections are sections are that have been run in earlier sections are sections are that have been run in earlier sections are sections are the conclusions. In the that have been run in earlier sections are sections are the conclusions. In that have been run in earlier sections are sections are the conclusions. In that have been run in earlier sections are sections are sections are the conclusions. In that have been run in earlier sections are sections are sections are the conclusions. In that have been run in earlier sections are sections a

3 of 3