Assignment 2 Marking Rubric

	Weight	HD+	HD	DI	CR	PA	PA-	NN
Approach	**60%**	Outstanding across the course.	The approach is an excellent and extremely thorough investigation of the chosen ML problem. It explored multiple algorithms and techniques for solving the problem (when required). It goes beyond using the tools provided in class. There are no gaps in what the investigation has considered. The approach makes careful consideration of the unique aspects of the chosen ML problem. Has completed the advanced challenges mentioned in the specification (excellent).	The approach is a good and reasonably thorough investigation of the chosen ML problem. It is mostly limited to the techniques and algorithms discussed in class. There are small gaps between in the investigation in what could have been explored. The approach considers, but not fully, the unique aspects of the chosen ML problem. Has completed the advanced challenges mentioned in the specification (satisfactory).	The approach is sufficient, but not a thorough investigation of the chosen ML problem. It is limited to the techniques and algorithms discussed in class, such as a pure reproduction of lab code. There are gaps in the investigation and alternative algorithms or techniques are better than the ones in the approach. The approach has a limited consideration of the unique aspects of the chosen ML problem.	The approach is a minimally sufficient investigation of the chosen ML problem. It only examines the bare minimum requirements of suitable techniques and algorithms. There are many gaps in the investigation and there are algorithms or techniques are are clearly more suited to the chosen ML problem. The approach has limited or minimal consideration of the unique aspects of the chosen ML problem.	Poor, superficial, or incomplete approach that does not meet the minimum requirements for PA.	Not Completed
.			The choices in the investigation are highly justified and have an excellent explanation. The reader is left with no questions.	The choices in the investigation are justified and have a good explanation. The reader is left with minor questions.	The choices in the investigation have sufficient justification, however, there are unexplained choices and the reader is left with important open questions.	The choices in the investigation have the bare minimal justification. The reader is left with important unanswered questions that are not considered.	Does not justifies the approach. Does not explain the approach.	
			The design of the approach includes excellent choice of training data selection, pre-processing, model training, parameter tuning, and evaluation.	The design of the approach includes all necessary steps including the choice of training data selection, pre-processing, model training, parameter tuning, and evaluation.	The design of the approach includes most of the necessary steps such as the choice of training data selection, pre-processing, model training, parameter tuning, and evaluation.	The design of the approach includes most of the necessary steps such as the choice of training data selection, pre-processing, model training, parameter tuning, and evaluation.	The design of the approach is missing significant steps such as the choice of training data selection, pre-processing, model training, parameter tuning, and evaluation.	
Ultimate Judgement & Evaluation (Independent Evaluation)	**20%**	Outstanding across the course.	Ultimate Judgement is established and exceptionally justified	Ultimate Judgement is established and suitably justified	Ultimate Judgement is established, but there are unexplained choices, or the justification is hard to follow	An Ultimate Judgement is made by not justified	An Ultimate Judgement is not made.	Not Completed
			Evaluation of the Ultimate Judgement is exceptional and clearly demonstrated (or proves) the viability of the trained model in real-world practice,	Evaluation of the Ultimate Judgement is sound and suitably explained, however, the reader may not be fully convinced and have minor questions.	An sufficient attempt at evaluating the Ultimate Judgement is made.	The Ultimate Judgement is not evaluated or the evaluation is incomplete and insufficient		
			The evaluation is independent.	The evaluation is independent.	The evaluation is independent.	The evaluation is not independent.		
Report Presentation	**20%**	Outstanding across the course.	Report is easy to read and flows well. It is structured well, leading the reader to fully understand the rationale for the final approach taken.	Report is reasonably easy to read and flows relatively well. It is structured reasonably well, leading the reader to reasonably understand the rationale for the final approach taken.	Report can be followed but does not flows well in places. It is adequately structured, but reader may find it difficult to understand the rationale of selected approach.	Report is difficult to follow and doesn't flows well. Readers find it difficult to understand the rationale of the selected approach.	Incomplete or error ridden report.	Not Completed
			Approaches are excellently described. Tables, figures and other visualisation are tailored to the descriptions and justifications made in the report's text.	Approaches are described well, Tables, figures and other visualisation are easy to read and to interpret, but may not be highly relevant or appropriately tailored to the descriptions and justifications in the report's text.	Approaches are described in sufficient detail, but aspects may be incomplete. Tables, figures and other visualisation are sufficient but are difficult to interpret.	Approaches are described to a minimal standard. Tables, figures and other visualisation are provided to a care minimum amount.		