Marking rubric for labsheet 3

Criteria	weight	Failed (0)	Passed (50)	Good (70)	Excellent (100)
Project 1 (a) **Data visualisation and cleaning**	5.00%	Not attempted or incomplete	Basic code was there but needed some modification in order to run. Some basic visualisation code was written but no explanation was provided.	Basic code was there and the code ran without problems. Some basic visualisation code was written. The code was a bit messy and not explained well.	Basic code was there and the code ran without problems. Some suitable visualisation code was written and well commented. A function is provided for data cleaning. Explanation was clear and easy to understand.
Project 1 (b) **DT Classifier (raw)**	16.00%	Not attempted or incomplete	Basic code was there but needed some modification in order to run. Some classification results were given.	Basic code was there and ran okay. Grid search was done but not explained well. Some classification results were provided and some explanation about the results was given.	Basic code was there and ran okay and not too slow. Grid search was done with good explanation. The code was efficient. F1 score and confusion matrix on 3-fold cross validation were provided and explained well.
Project 1 (c) **DT classifier (scaled)**	16.00%	Not attempted or incomplete	Basic code was there but needed some modification in order to run. The code was inefficient. Feature scaling was not done correctly. Grid search was not done or incomplete. Some classification results were provided. There was no (or minimal) explanation on what was done.	Basic code was there and ran okay. Feature scaling was done but not entirely correct. Grid search was done but not explained well. Some classification results were provided and some explanation about the results was given.	Basic code was there and ran okay and not too slow. Feature scaling was done correctly and explained well. Grid search was done and explained. The code was efficient. F1 score and confusion matrix on 3-fold cross validation were provided and explained well.
Project 1 (d) **Outputs and comparison**	3.00%	Not attempted or incomplete	The confusion matrices and F1 score from the previous parts were iterated.	A brief comparison stating the difference between the confusion matrices and F1 score was given.	Comparison was done in great detail. A couple of classes in the two confusion matrices were looked at and compared individually. .
Project 2 (a) **Data loading, visualisation, and data preparation**	5.00%	Not attempted or incomplete	Data loading code needed some modification to run. Code was very messy and there was a lack of explanation.	Data loading code was there and ran okay. There was some visualisation about the data but not well explained. There was code written for data preparation.	Data loading code was there and ran well. Good visualisation was given and explained well. A function was used to prepare the data for the next part of the project.
Project 2 (b) **DT Regressor (raw)**	16.00%	Not attempted or incomplete	Grid search on 3 of the 4 listed hyperparameters was attempted but not working well. Code was quite messy.	Grid search on 3 of the 4 listed hyperparameters was done. Code ran okay. The best parameters were shown. The MSE was reported.	Grid search on 3 of the 4 listed hyperparameters was done. Code ran well and was modularised. The best parameters were shown. The MSE was reported. Good explanation.
Project 2 (c) **DT Regressor (scaled)**	16.00%	Not attempted or incomplete	Feature scaling was not entirely correct. Grid search on 3 of the 4 listed hyperparameters was attempted but not working well. The MSE was reported.	Feature scaling was done correctly. Grid search on 3 of the 4 listed hyperparameters was done. Code ran okay. The best parameters were shown. The MSE was reported.	Feature scaling was done correctly. Grid search on 3 of the 4 listed hyperparameters was done. Code ran well and was modularised. The best parameters were shown. The MSE was reported. Good explanation.
Project 2 (d) **SVR**	16.00%	Not attempted or incomplete	Feature scaling was not entirely correct. Grid search on 3 of the 4 listed hyperparameters was attempted but not working well. The MSE was reported.	Grid search on 3 of the 4 listed hyperparameters was done. Code ran okay. The best parameters were shown. The MSE was reported.	Grid search on 3 of the 4 listed hyperparameters was done. Code ran well and was modularised. The best parameters were shown. The MSE was reported. Good explanation.
Project 2 (e) **Comparison, output figure**	7.00%	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). A figure illustrating the prediction results from the 3 regressors was included with code and good explanation.