

COMP30027 Machine Learning

Project 2 Marking Sheet

Version 1.0 (April 23, 2017)

Innovation (Maximum = 5 marks)	Critical Analysis (Maximum = 5 marks)	Report Clarity (Maximum = 2.5 marks)	Report Structure (Maximum = 2.5 marks)
5 marks High level of innovation/creativity; careful thought through and attention given to overall solution and evaluation.	5 marks Rich contribution in results analysis; advantages/disadvantages of various methods clear, and theory connected to observations; insightful error analysis	2.5 marks Very clear and accessible description of all that has been done, including motivations, methods and resources.	2.5 marks Logical structure throughout, all key references present and formatted correctly, exemplary formatting conformant with the style sheet.
3.5 marks Significant innovation/creativity beyond what is discussed in lectures/in the discussion forum; reasonable thought and attention given to overall solution and evaluation.	3.5 marks Competent results analysis; some understanding of the advantages/disadvantages of various methods, and competent theoretical justifications; some error analysis	1.5 marks Clear description for the most part, with some minor deficiencies/loose ends.	1.5 marks Generally logical structure, with a small number of missing key references and/or minor formatting inconsistencies/divergences from the style sheet.
2.5 marks Applies a representative selection of methods discussed in lectures/in the discussion forum, but very little beyond this.	2.5 marks Some contribution, but missing analysis of weak points or alternatives; slight disconnect between theoretical properties of methods and observations; minimal error analysis	1 mark Generally clear description, but there are notable gaps and/or unclear sections.	1 mark Basic structure is sound but with noticeable flaws, significant numbers of missing references and/or major formatting inconsistencies/divergences from the style sheet.
1.5 marks Applies only the basic methods discussed in lectures/in the discussion forum, and shows almost no signs of independent thought.	1.5 marks Marginal contribution; minimal identification of critical methodological behaviour; flaws in analysis/discussion of observations	0.5 marks The report is unclear on the whole and the reader has to work hard to discern what has been done.	0.5 marks Overall structure is unsound with major gaps in references and major divergences from the style sheet.
0.5 marks Applies only the absolute baseline (or worse) methods, and shows absolutely no sign of independent thought.	0.5 marks No contribution; no identification of critical methodological behaviour; no analysis/discussion of observations	0.25 marks The report is completely inaccessible.	0.25 marks The report completely lacks structure, omits all key references and/or completely ignores the style sheet.