

School of Computing and Information Systems, The University of Melbourne
COMP90049 Introduction to Machine Learning, Semester 1 2020: Project 1 Report Marking Rubric

| Method (25% weighting) | Critical Analysis (50% weighting) | Report Quality (25% weighting) |
|--|---|---|
| 10 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> System design is admirably clear and unquestionably structured to provide testable hypotheses which will provide knowledge for the given problem | 10 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly identifies the knowledge gained about the task Argumentation is logical and incontrovertibly supported by evidence Theoretical properties of methods are well-understood and linked to practical observations Demonstrates a very high level of abstract thought Thorough results analysis and laudable error analysis | 10 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ideas and arguments are cohesive, where the components of the report clearly indicate how they relate to the whole Argument structure is logical and formal, in line with typical standards in academic writing Generally clear and easy-to-follow Adequately concise and meets word limits ($\pm 10\%$) |
| 8 or 9 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> System design is clear and reproducible, but some minor ideas are overlooked Appropriate use of evaluation | 8 or 9 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly identifies the knowledge gained about the task Argumentation is logical and thoroughly supported by evidence Theoretical properties of methods are well-understood and linked to practical observations Demonstrates a moderate level of abstract thought Thorough results analysis, and fair attempt at error analysis | 8 or 9 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ideas and arguments are coherent, and generally the work fits together as a unit Report structure is logical and formal, with small divergences from typical academic standards Generally clear, with small disruptions in flow Adequately concise and meets word limits ($\pm 10\%$) |
| 7 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of system design is missing some important idea, making the design questionable or dubious Parameters un-identified or not contrasted Evaluation is logical but not systematic | 7 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear Argumentation is logical, but evidence is lacking in some areas Theoretical properties of methods are understood, but not clearly linked to practical observations Demonstrates abstract thought, but extended analysis not always clear or successful Only minimal error analysis attempted | 7 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ideas and arguments are mostly coherent, but do not come together in a unified way Argument structure is logical, but possibly informal or out-of-line with academic standards Some unclear sections that do not detract from the overall work Perhaps small divergences from the word limits |

School of Computing and Information Systems, The University of Melbourne
COMP90049 Introduction to Machine Learning, Semester 1 2020: Project 1 Marking Rubric

| Method (20% weighting) | Critical Analysis (50% weighting) | Report Quality (30% weighting) |
|--|--|---|
| 5 or 6 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Data representation not appropriate for chosen methods• Evaluation is illogical or informal• Methods are inadequate and prevent meaningful analysis | 5 or 6 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Knowledge gained about the task is fundamentally flawed or lacking• Argumentation is illogical in places, and evidence is inadequate or contradictory• Theoretical properties of methods are not in evidence• No signs of abstract thought and/or analysis | 5 or 6 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ideas and arguments are notably incoherent• Report structure is flawed• Some unclear sections which detract from the overall work• References are disconnected or absent• Possibly way off the word limits |
| 0 to 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tasks are essentially incomplete or not attempted | 0 to 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No indication of knowledge gained about the task• Argumentation is generally absent• Mostly data without corresponding analysis• Theoretical properties of methods are not in evidence | 0 to 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ideas and arguments are missing or impossible to follow• Completely unstructured argumentation |

Notes:

For categories labelled (8 or 9) and (5 or 6), it is at the marker's discretion to determine how well the report meets the standards of an H1 or P respectively. An alternative interpretation: the higher of the two marks indicates that the submission was close to, but not meriting, the category above ((10) and (7) respectively).

For categories labelled (0 to 4): unsatisfactory (N) grades depend on the number of factors in which the submission failed to meet the required standards.

Brief comments from the marker are annotated on the submission.