Assessment 2: Report – Marking guide

**Assessment criteria/grading rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CRITERIA** | **A: Excellent**  **(>80%)** | **B: Very good**  **(70–79%)** | **C: Good**  **(60–69%)** | **D: Acceptable**  **(50–59%)** | **N: Unacceptable**  **(<50%)** |
| **Describe the two models, experiment settings and compare the results for task 1.**  **(25 marks)** | Comprehensive description of the two models with the model figure presented, comprehensive description of the task 1 experiment settings and comprehensive comparison of the results with in-depth discussion.  **(21–25 marks)** | Accurate description of the two models with the model figure presented, accurate description of the task 1 experiment settings and accurate comparison of the results with some discussion.  **(18–20 marks)** | Clear description of the two models with the model figure presented, clear description of the task 1 experiment settings and clear comparison of the results.  **(15–17 marks)** | Satisfactory description of the two models without the model figure presented, satisfactory description of task 1 experiment settings and satisfactory comparison of the results.  **(12.5–14 marks)** | Inadequate description of the two models without model figure presented, inadequate description of task 1 experiment settings and inadequate comparison of the results.  **(<12.5 marks)** |
| **Describe the two models, experiment settings and compare the results for task 2.**  **(25 marks)** | Comprehensive description of the two models with the model figure presented, comprehensive description of the task 2 experiment settings and excellent comparison of the results with in-depth discussion.  **(21–25 marks)** | Accurate description of the two models with the model figure presented, accurate description of the task 2 experiment settings and accurate comparison of the results with some discussion.  **(18–20 marks)** | Clear description of the two models with the model figure presented, clear description of the task 2 experiment settings and clear comparison of the results.  **(15–17 marks)** | Satisfactory description of the two models without the model figure presented, satisfactory description of the task 2 experiment settings and satisfactory comparison of the results.  **(12.5–14 marks)** | Inadequate description of the two models without the model figure presented, inadequate description of the task 2 experiment settings and inadequate comparison of the results.  **(<12.5 marks)** |
| **Describe the two optimisers or learning rates, experiment settings and compare the results for task 3.**  **(35 marks)** | Comprehensive description of the two optimisers or learning rates, comprehensive description of the task 3 experiment settings and very good comparison of the results with in-depth discussion.  Quality comparison of all three tasks’ results with in-depth discussion and ranking of models presented.  **(29–35 marks)** | Accurate description of the two optimisers or learning rates, accurate description of the task 3 experiment settings and accurate comparison of the results with some discussion.  Logical comparison of all three tasks’ results with some discussion and ranking of models presented.  **(25–28 marks)** | Clear description of the two optimisers or learning rates, clear description of the task 3 experiment settings and good comparison of the results.  Appropriate comparison of all three tasks’ results and ranking of models presented.  **(21–24 marks)** | Satisfactory description of the two optimisers or learning rates, satisfactory description of task 3 experiment settings and fair comparison of the results.  Adequate comparison of all three tasks’ results and no ranking of models presented.  **(17.5–20 marks)** | Inadequate description of the two optimisers or learning rates, inadequate description of the task 3 experiment settings and inadequate comparison of the results.  Inadequate comparison of all three tasks’ results and no ranking of models presented.  **(<17.5 marks)** |
| **Demonstrate correct code quality (report only).**  **(10 marks)** | Exceptionally appropriate, clear and concise responses.  The packages, functions, algorithms and standards are implemented correctly.  **(8–10 marks)** | Highly appropriate, clear and concise response.  The packages, functions, algorithms and standards are implemented.  **(7 marks)** | Generally appropriate and concise response.  The packages, functions, algorithms and standards are implemented.  **(6 marks)** | Appropriate and clear response.  The packages, functions, algorithms and standards are identified but not implemented correctly.  **(5 marks)** | Inadequate response with lack of clarity and concision.  The packages, functions, algorithms and standards are not implemented correctly.  **(<5 marks)** |
| **Research extensively and demonstrate depth of thinking; produce a well-structured report.**  **(5 marks)** | The report demonstrated evidence of extensive research effort and a depth of thinking.  The report demonstrated excellent knowledge of the subject content by integrating major and minor data analysis concepts.  Structure of the report is clear and easy to follow.  **(4–5 marks)** | The report demonstrated evidence of good research effort and a depth of thinking.  The report demonstrated good knowledge of the subject content by integrating major data analysis concepts.  Structure of the report is clear and easy to follow.  **(3.5 marks)** | The report demonstrated evidence of limited research effort.  The report demonstrated limited knowledge of the major data analysis concepts.  Structure of the report is clear and easy to follow.  **(3 marks)** | The report demonstrated evidence of minimal research effort.  The report demonstrated a little knowledge of the major data analysis concepts.  Structure of the report is difficult to follow.  **(2.5 marks)** | The report did not demonstrate enough knowledge of the data analysis concepts, evidence of the research effort or depth of thinking.  Report is poorly written without any structure and with frequent errors.  **(<2.5 marks)** |