

Criteria		High distinction (100% to 80%)	Distinction (70% to 79% of available mark)	Credit (60% to 69% of available mark)	Pass (50% to 59% of available mark)	Fail (<50% of available mark)
		Implementation				
<b>Task 1 Implementation [5 marks] (4 + 1)</b>	<b>Basic Text Pre-processing</b>	<p>All required basic text pre-processing steps are performed correctly without any error.</p> <p>Included all required output files.</p> <p>Meets all filename and output format requirements.</p>	<p>All required basic text pre-processing steps are performed correctly, with one or two minor errors.</p> <p>Included all required output files.</p> <p>Meets all filename and output format requirements.</p>	<p>Most required basic text pre-processing steps are performed correctly, with one or two minor errors. One or two steps are missing, or not done properly.</p> <p>Included all required output files.</p> <p>Meets most filename and output format requirements.</p>	<p>Some required basic text pre-processing steps are performed correctly, with some minor errors. Some steps are missing, or not done properly.</p> <p>Included most required output.</p> <p>Some output files do not meet the naming or format requirements.</p>	<p>Few to none text pre-processing steps are performed, or many of them have major errors.</p> <p>Included minimum or no required output file.</p> <p>Many output files do not meet the format requirements.</p>
<b>Task 2 Implementation [7 marks] (5 + 2)</b>	<b>Generating Feature Representations</b>	<p>All required document feature representations are generated properly.</p> <p>The methods used are justifiable, proper and effective.</p> <p>The output count vector meets all the format requirements.</p>	<p>All required document feature representations are generated properly.</p> <p>The methods used are mostly correct and justifiable.</p> <p>The output count vector meets all the format requirements.</p>	<p>Most required document feature representations are generated.</p> <p>Most methods used are correct and justifiable, some are questionable and/or without a not clear purpose.</p> <p>The output count vector meets most of the format requirements.</p>	<p>At least half of the required document feature representations are generated.</p> <p>Some methods used are correct and justifiable, many are questionable and/or without a not clear purpose.</p> <p>The output count vector meets most of the format requirements.</p>	<p>Few to none of the required document feature representations are generated.</p> <p>The methods used are not correct nor effective.</p> <p>The output count vector fails to meet most of the format requirements.</p>

<b>Task 3 Implementation</b> <b>[8 marks]</b> <b>(6 + 2)</b>	<b>Clothing Review Classification</b>	<p>The nature of all tasks has been properly investigated and discussed before building machine learning models.</p> <p>All required models are built properly.</p> <p>All research questions are answered correctly supported by comprehensive experiments and robust evaluations.</p>	<p>The nature of each task has been properly investigated and discussed before building machine learning models.</p> <p>Most required models are built properly.</p> <p>Most research questions are answered correctly supported by comprehensive experiments and robust evaluations.</p>	<p>The nature of most tasks has been properly investigated and discussed before building machine learning models.</p> <p>Many required models are built properly.</p> <p>Most research questions are answered correctly supported by complete experiments and evaluations.</p>	<p>Some required models are built properly. Many models are built without initial investigations on the nature of the tasks.</p> <p>Some research questions are answered correctly supported by experiments and evaluations. Some evaluations are incomplete or without robust comparisons.</p>	<p>Few to none models are built correctly. There is no initial investigation on the nature of the tasks.</p> <p>Few to none research questions are answered, or most of the research questions are answered incorrectly or without experiments or evaluations.</p>
	<b>Notebook Presentation</b>					
<b>Notebook Presentation</b> <b>(1+2+2)</b>	<b>Notebook Presentation  Code Commenting</b>	<p>Commenting provides clear explanations of how the code is intended to work.</p> <p>It also provides clear instructions and insights to why the code has been written as it has.</p> <p>Commenting is thorough, and concise.</p> <p>Comments provided would be helpful to other data scientists.</p>	<p>Commenting provides useful insights into how the code is intended to work.</p> <p>It also provides good instructions as to why the code has been written as it has.</p> <p>Commenting has been provided in most cases and is generally concise.</p> <p>Most comments provided would be helpful to other data scientists.</p>	<p>Commenting provides some explanation as to how the code is intended to work.</p> <p>It also provides adequate instructions as to why the code has been written as it has.</p> <p>Commenting has been provided in most cases.</p> <p>Most comments provided would be helpful to other data scientists with some corrections or additions made.</p>	<p>Commenting provides some explanation as to how the code is intended to work, but is at times unclear.</p> <p>Some instruction is provided, but should have provided more details.</p> <p>Commenting has been provided in some of the expected cases.</p> <p>Comments provided have some usefulness to other data scientists, but require corrections or additions to be made.</p>	<p>Code commenting does not provide a clear explanation of the code.</p> <p>There is a lack of instructions as to why the code has been written as it has.</p> <p>Commenting is minimal OR not provided at all.</p>

	<b>Notebook Presentation   Notebook Content</b>	<p>The jupyter notebook provides comprehensive justifications and discussions on the methods/approaches chosen, results, analysis and findings.</p> <p>Effective use of markdown, with clear sectioning, highlight, styling, etc.</p> <p>The jupyter notebook is absolutely clear, concise, exceptionally well organized, has clear logic flow and very easy to follow.</p>	<p>The jupyter notebook provides most of the justifications and discussions on the methods/approaches chosen, results, analysis and findings.</p> <p>Effective use of markdown, with clear sectioning, highlight, styling, etc.</p> <p>The jupyter notebook is mostly clear and concise. It is in general well organized, shows some logic flow, and fairly easy to read.</p>	<p>The jupyter notebook provides many justifications and discussions on the methods/approaches chosen, results, analysis and findings.</p> <p>The jupyter notebook contains some irrelevant information. It is mis-leading in some places. It is readable by someone who knows what it is supposed to be doing. However, it requires improvement on the presented logic flow.</p>	<p>The jupyter notebook provides some justifications and discussion on the methods/approaches chosen, results, analysis and findings.</p> <p>The jupyter notebook contains lots of irrelevant information. It is mis-leading in lots of places. It is not well organised and there is no clear logic flow.</p>	<p>The jupyter notebook provides minimal justification and discussion on the methods/approaches chosen, results, analysis and findings.</p> <p>The jupyter notebook contains lots of irrelevant information. It is poorly organized, very messy, and is not readable.</p>
	<p><b>Note:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rubric for Notebook Presentation (including code commenting and notebook content) is common across Task 1, 2 and 3.</li> <li>- Students can refer to the activities in modules as examples for the level of details that they should include in their jupyter notebook.</li> </ul>					