

School of Computing and Information Systems, The University of Melbourne
COMP30027 Machine Learning, Semester 1 2020: Project 2 Report Marking Rubric

Method – 3 out of 12 (25% weighting)	Critical Analysis – 6 out of 12 (50% weighting)	Report Quality – 3 out of 12 (25% weighting)
10 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Insightful consideration of data representation, and its interaction with learner choice •Hyper-parameters identified and contrasted where necessary •Appropriate use of evaluation 	10 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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 •Report structure is logical and formal, in line with typical standards in academic writing •Generally clear and easy-to-follow •References are suitably synthesized and chosen discriminately with respect to the given problem •Adequately concise and meets word limits
8 or 9 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Data representation mostly ignored or abstracted •Hyper-parameters identified but perhaps only weakly contrasted •Appropriate use of evaluation 	8 or 9 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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 •References are suitably synthesised, but are too few or chosen indiscriminately •Adequately concise and meets word limits
7 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Data representation ignored, but appropriate for chosen methods •Hyper-parameters un-identified or not contrasted •Evaluation is logical and formal, but not appropriate 	7 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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 •Report structure is logical, but possibly informal or out- of-line with academic standards •Some unclear sections that do not detract from the overall work •References are present, but terse or disconnected from the problem at hand •Perhaps small divergences from the word limits

School of Computing and Information Systems, The University of Melbourne
COMP30027 Machine Learning, Semester 1 2020: Project 2 Report Marking Rubric

Method – 3 out of 12 (25% weighting)	Critical Analysis – 6 out of 12 (50% weighting)	Report Quality – 3 out of 12 (25% 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"> •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"> •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 •Report has no structure or references •Not a formal report, even at a stretch

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. More details are given in the brief comments from the marker.