FIT5212: Marking Rubric for Assessment 2

|                    | Modules  | Weight   | HD  | D  | С  | Р   | F   |
|--------------------|--|----------|---|--|--|---|---|
| Task 1<br>35 Marks | Recommend<br>er System<br>Performance<br>(Leaderboar<br>d) | 20 marks | Achieve 0.2 and above NDCG score in the whole test dataset.  The student with the highest score will get full marks.  Please include your name used in Kaggle in the final report submitted in Moodle.  | Achieve 0.15<br>and above<br>NDCG score in<br>the whole test<br>dataset.   | Achieve 0.1<br>and above<br>NDCG score in<br>the whole test<br>dataset.  | Achieve 0.05<br>and above<br>NDCG score in<br>the whole test<br>dataset.  | Achieve less than 0.03 NDCG score in the whole test dataset.  |
|                    | Methodology and result analysis in the report              | 15 marks | Different methods for recommende r systems are well compared and analyzed.  The report has demonstrate d a very good solution in a proper way. No error or only minor errors are found in the methodology. The methodology produces output with HD scores. The final solution to this challenge is well justified.  The report has proper sections and subsections (e.g. introduction, methodology, conclusion, | Different methods for recommender systems are reasonably compared and analyzed.  The report has demonstrated a reasonable solution and justification.  The report has proper sections and subsections (e.g. introduction, methodology, conclusion,). The methodology is explained fairly and the code is fairly commented. The report can be improved. | Different methods for recommender systems are fairly compared and analyzed.  The report has provided a fair solution and justification to the solution.  The report has some sectioning but it is not well organized. The explanation of the report is limited and the code is well commented. | Different methods for recommender systems are poorly compared and analyzed.  The report has provided a poor solution and justification to the solution.  The report has some sectioning but it is not well organized. The explanation of the report is poor and the code is well commented. | Different methods for recommender systems are badly analyzed.  The report has provided a bad solution and justification to the solution.  The report has poor/no sectioning and it is not well organized. The explanation of the report is poor and the code is poorly commented. |

|                    |                            |          | ). The methodology is explained properly and the code is well commented.   |   |  |  |   |
|--------------------|----------------------------|----------|--|---|--|--|---|
| Task 2<br>15 Marks | Node<br>Classificatio<br>n | 15 marks | Different methods for node classification are well analyzed.  The effects of using different information are shown in detail.  The student uses different information to evaluate the performance of node classification models and gives detailed explanations.  The student has made a convincing recommenda tion to the readers based on the observation in the analysis. | Different methods for node classification are reasonably analyzed.  The effects of using different information have been demonstrated. The student uses different information to evaluate the performance of node classification models and gives detailed explanations.  The student has made a reasonable recommendation to the readers based on the observation in the analysis. | Different methods for node classification are fairly analyzed.  The effects of using different information have been demonstrated. The student uses different information to evaluate the performance of node classification models and gives little explanation.  The student has made a recommendati on to the readers based on the observation in the analysis. | Different methods for node classification are pooly analyzed.  The effects of using different data reshaping methods have been demonstrated.  The student builds a simple node classification model without much consideration and explanation. The student then rushes to a recommendati on to the readers. | Different methods for node classification are badly analyzed.  The effects of using different graph information have not been demonstrated. The student builds a simple node classification model without any explanation.  The student then rushes to a recommendation to the readers. |

The total marks for this assessment are 50.