# COMP30018 Knowledge Technologies, Semester 2 2016  *(postponed)*

## Project 1 Marking Rubric

*Handwritten marks at top: 2.5 · 3 · 45 · 14.5*

| Critical Analysis (Maximum 6 marks) **6** | Creativity (Maximum 2 marks) **2** | Soundness (Maximum 4 marks) **4** | Report Quality (Maximum 3 marks) **2.5 / 3** |
|---|---|---|---|
| **6 marks** — Theory effectively connected to practical observations (examples); superior analysis; knowledge clearly indicated and suitably situated with respect to data; insightful conclusions | **2 marks** — Demonstrated creativity in methods or data analysis (vis-à-vis project specifications) | **4 marks** — Engages with all technical tasks; reasonable evaluation attempt; overall logical strategy | **3 marks** — Roughly meets length guidelines; suitable use of citations; sensible structure and clarity |
| **5 marks** — Theory mostly connected to practical observations (examples); rich analysis; knowledge clearly indicated but oblique or weak; logical conclusions | **1 mark** — A basic submission; straightforward application of method to data | **3 marks** — Some logical flaws; or weak/unconvincing evaluation | **2 marks** — Flouts length guidelines; or noticeable issues with structure and/or clarity; or poor referencing |
| **4 marks** — Theory weakly connected to practice; fair analysis but deficient in some respect; knowledge not clearly indicated or flawed; weak conclusions | **0 marks** — Methods presented but no analysis | **2 marks** — Crucial logical flaws; some important task or tasks absent from the report; problems detract from other aspects of submission | **1 mark** — The report is unstructured and inaccessible; the reader cannot discern what has been done |
| **3 marks** — Theory tangentially connected to practice; analysis attempted but generally inadequate; knowledge poor or absent; poor or illogical conclusions | | **1 mark** — Illogical strategy; and/or core components not attempted | |
| **2 marks** — Theory completely disconnected to practice; analysis poor; knowledge absent; absent conclusions | | | |
| **1 mark** — Analytical gaps and flaws do not permit meaningful conclusions | | | |

**Comments:**

- Generally solid report with sensible observations
- It would have been nice to see more examples, especially of good approximate matches
- Seems overly long