Marking rubric for labsheet 3

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