School of Computing and Information Systems, The University of Melbourne
COMP30027 Machine Learning, Semester 1 2022: Project 2 Report Marking Rubric

Method – 4 out of 16	Critical Analysis – 8 out of 16	Report Quality – 4 out of 16
100% • Insightful consideration of data representation, and its interaction with learner choice • Hyper-parameters identified and contrasted where necessary • Appropriate use of evaluation	100% • 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	100% • 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
80%-90% • Data representation mostly ignored or abstracted • Hyper-parameters identified but perhaps only weakly contrasted • Appropriate use of evaluation	80%-90% • 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	80%-90% • 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
70% • Data representation ignored, but appropriate for chosen methods • Hyper-parameters un-identified or not contrasted • Evaluation is logical and formal, but not appropriate	70% • 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	70% • 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 are too few or disconnected from the problem at hand

50%-60%	50%-60%	50%-60%
• Data representation not appropriate for chosen methods • Evaluation is illogical or informal • Methods are inadequate and prevent meaningful analysis	• 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	• 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
0-40% • Tasks are essentially incomplete or not attempted	**0-40%** • Argumentation is generally absent • Mostly data without corresponding analysis • Theoretical properties of methods are not in evidence	**0-40%** • 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 (80%-90%) and (50%-60%), 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 ((100%) and (70%) respectively).

For categories labelled (0-40%): 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.