Criteria	weight	Failed (0)	Passed (50)	Good (70)	Excellent (100)
			Danie ande de la la		Basic code was there and the
			Basic code was there but	Basic code was there and the	code ran without problems. Some suitable visualization
Project 1 (a)			order to run. Some basic	code ran without problems.	code was written and well
		Not		The code was a bit messy and	commented. Explanation was
Data cleaning, visualization, and		attempted or		not explained well. Some limited explanation was given	clear and easy to understand. Feature scaling was correctly
feature scaling	7.00%	incomplete	not done or not explained.	about feature scaling.	implemented and/or explained.
			Basic code was there but		·
			needed some modification in		Basic code was there and ran
			order to run. The code was inefficient. Some	Basic code was there and ran	okay and not too slow. The code was efficient.
		Not		okay. Some classification	Classification accuracy, F1
Project 1 (b)		attempted	provided. There was no (or	results were provided and	score, and confusion matrix
SVM Classifier	17.00%	or incomplete	minimal) explanation on what was done.	results was given.	results on the test set were provided and explained well.
SVIII Classifier	17.0070	mcomplete	Basic code was there but	lesuits was given.	provided and explained well.
			needed some modification in		Basic code was there and ran
			order to run. The code was	Basis and a second as	okay and not too slow. The
Project 1 (c)		Not		Basic code was there and ran okay. Some classification	code was efficient. Classification accuracy, F1
5,000 = (0)		attempted	provided. There was no (or	results were provided and	score, and confusion matrix
Logistic Regression	12.000/	or	minimal) explanation on what		results on the test set were
classifier	13.00%	incomplete	was done. Basic code was there but	results was given.	provided and explained well.
			needed some modification in		Basic code was there and ran
			order to run. The code was		okay and not too slow. The
Dualact 1 (d)		Not		Basic code was there and ran okay. Some classification	code was efficient. Classification accuracy, F1
Project 1 (d)		Not attempted		results were provided and	score, and confusion matrix
Stochastic Gradient		or	minimal) explanation on what		results on the test set were
Descent classifier	13.00%	incomplete	was done.	results was given.	provided and explained well.
			Basic code was there but needed some modification in		Basic code was there and ran
			order to run. The code was		okay and not too slow. The
				Basic code was there and ran	code was efficient.
Project 1 (e)		Not attempted		okay. Some classification results were provided and	Classification accuracy, F1 score, and confusion matrix
Voting classifier		or	minimal) explanation on what		results on the test set were
	13.00%	incomplete	was done.	results was given.	provided and explained well.
Project 1 (f)		Not			Good comparison and good conclusion. Overall
Conclusions and		attempted	Incomplete conclusion.		presentation was excellent
overall		or	Overall presentation could be		with good use of Markdown
presentation	4.00%	•	improved.	conclusion is given.	cell(s).
Project 2 (a)		Not attempted	Data cleaning code needed some modification to run.	Data cleaning code was there and ran okay. There was some	Data cleaning code was there and ran well. Good explanation
		or .	Code very messy and there	explanation about the data	was given in the markdown
Data cleaning	7.00%	incomplete	was a lack of explanation.	cleaning done in the code.	cell(s).
				Data normalization code ran okay and some explanation	Data normalization code ran well and good explanation was
				was given alongside the code;	given alongside the code; or
		Nint		or some explanation was given	
Project 2 (b)		Not attempted		why data normalization was not performed. (this could be	why data normalization was not performed. (this could be
		or		given through some	given through some
Data normalization	3.00%	incomplete	not performed.	experimental codes)	experimental codes)
				Two random forest classifiers	Two random forest classifiers
Project 2 (c)		Not		of different hyperparameters	of different hyperparameters were implemented; code ran
		attempted		were implemented; code was a	okay and was neatly
Two random forest classifiers	20.00%	or		bit messy or insufficient	presented. Good explanation
Ciassillers	20.00%	incomplete Not	crashed part-way through.	explanation was given.	was supplied along the way. Good comparison. Overall
Project 2 (d)		attempted	Incomplete comparison.		presentation was excellent
	2 225	or	Overall presentation could be	·	with good use of Markdown
Comparison	3.00%	incomplete	improved.	presentation was okay.	cell(s).