RMIT Classification: Trusted

	Weight	Elements	HD+	HD	DI	CR	PA	PA-	NN
Approach	**50%**	**1) Data exploration leading to well informed approach.** **2) Identifying an adequate evaluation framework that is tailored to the problem.** **3) Identified the state-of-the-art DL techniques relevant to the problem.** **4) Well justified network architecture and objective.** **5) Hyper parameters selection strategy.** **6) Approach satisfy all the requirements and restrictions.**	Outstanding across the course.	Goes beyond applying standard NN for classification, regression (used advanced concepts). The approach is an excellent and extremely thorough investigation of the chosen ML problem. All elements adequately analysed.	Goes beyond applying standard NN for classification, regression (used advanced concepts). The approach is a good and reasonably thorough investigation of the chosen ML problem. There are small gaps between in the investigation in what could have been explored.	The approach is sufficient, but not a thorough investigation of the chosen ML problem. There are gaps in the investigation and alternative algorithms or techniques are better than the ones in the approach. The approach has a limited consideration of the unique aspects of the chosen ML problem.	The approach is a minimally sufficient investigation of the chosen ML problem. It only examines the bare minimum requirements of suitable techniques and algorithms. There are many gaps in the investigation and there are algorithms or techniques are clearly more suited to the chosen ML problem.	Poor, superficial, or incomplete approach that does not meet the minimum requirements for PA.	Not Completed
Ultimate Judgment & Analysis	**30%**	**1) Analysis of the model and the outputs using suitable methods.** **2) Make a clear ultimate Judgment.** **3) Rational behind the ultimate model is clear and considers all the aspects.** **4) Conduct evaluations with independent test data.** **5) Limitations of the model identified.**	Outstanding across the course.	Ultimate Judgement is established and exceptionally justified Evaluation of the Ultimate Judgement is exceptional and clearly demonstrated the viability of the trained model in real-world practice and limitations. Used independent data when exercising the ultimate judgment.	Ultimate Judgement is established and suitably justified Evaluation of the Ultimate Judgement is sound and suitably explained, however, the reader may not be fully convinced and have minor questions. Used independent data when exercising the ultimate judgment.	Ultimate Judgement is established, but there are unexplained choices, or the justification is hard to follow. An sufficient attempt at evaluating the Ultimate Judgement is made.	An Ultimate Judgement is made by not justified.	An Ultimate Judgement is not made.	Not Complete
Report & Code	**20%**	**1) Code is well documented and easy to understand.** **2) Code does not contain errors.** **3) Code contain evidence of all investigations mentioned in report.** **4) Code is optimal and shows good programming practices.** **1) Report Well structured and easy to read.** **2) Reader can fully understand the rationale for the approach taken**	Outstanding across the course.	Code is exceptional and satisfy all the elements. Report is easy to read and flows well. It is structured well, leading the reader to fully understand the rationale for the final approach taken.	Code is styled and organised reasonably. Commenting could be improved. Report is reasonably easy to read and flows relatively well. It is structured reasonably well, leading the reader to reasonably understand the rationale for the final approach taken.	Code is styled and organised reasonably. Commenting could be improved. Few minor errors. Report can be followed but does not flows well in places. It is adequately structured, but reader may find it difficult to understand the rationale of selected approach.	Code is styled and organised poorly, not following general good programming practices. Commenting is rare. Implementation has minor issues but works. Report is difficult to follow and doesn't flows well. Readers find it difficult to understand the rationale of the selected approach.	Code is styled and organised poorly, not following general good programming practices. Contain major errors. Incomplete or error ridden report.	Not Complete