INF283 | Introduction to Machine Learning
Project 2 Grading Rubric
Checked by: Adnan Niazi & Håkon Tjeldnes
Date: 05-Nov-2018

Student's name: Sindre
Points obtained by the student: 16 **/17 (max)**
(This is the number of points that counts towards the final grade)

Has the student passed the project: Yes
(You need at least 8.5 points to pass the project)

Is this the student's second attempt at this project: ☐ **Yes**

N.B.: Students who have failed the project on the first attempt have a chance to resubmit an improved version of their work. Resubmitted projects will be assessed using the same rubric as the original submission. To pass the project on the second attempt, the student should score at least 11 points on the rubric. However, all projects that pass on the second attempt will count only 8.5 points towards the final grade.

SUMMARY

Total points obtained in the project: 16

Grading criteria	Points obtained	Max. points
Project implementation	5.00	**05**
Model selection and evaluation	4.00	**04**
Quality of the report	5.50	**06**
Quality/documentation of the code	1.50	**02**
Penalties	0.00	**00**
Bonus for extraordinary work	0.00	**02**

Note: If a student obtains more than 17 points in the project because of the bonus, (s)he will still only get a maximum of 17 points. The bonus is there to compensate the student if (s)he has done an extraordinary job, but has suffered deduction in points in some part of the project due to some minor mistake.

Project Implementation (5.00 /5 points)

Has the student tried at least three different classifiers for this task?	Yes (2 points) ✔	Tried only 2 (1 points)	Tried only 1 (0.5 points)	No (0 points)
Are the candidate classifiers reasonable for this task?	Yes (1 points) ✔	Most of them are, but not all (0.75 point)	No (0 points)	
Has the student tried different values of the hyperparameters to choose the best model?	Yes, perfect! (0.5 points) ✔	Yes, but there is some mistake in it (0.25 points)	Didn't do it at all (0 points)	
Are the hyperparameter values reasonable?	Yes, perfect! (0.5 points) ✔	Mostly, but there is some mistake in it (0.25 points)	No (0 points)	
Do the approach and design choices make sense?	Yes, perfect! (0.5 points) ✔	Mostly, but there are some things that don't make sense (0.25 points)	No (0 points)	
Are the results high quality?	Yes (0.5 points) ✔	Somewhat (0.25 points)	No (0 points)	
Comments (if any) by the graders:				

Model selection and evaluation (4.00 /4 points)

Has the student used a model selection procedure such as validation data, cross-validation, bootstrap?	Yes, perfect! (2 point) ✔	Mostly, but there is some mistake in it (1points)	Didn't do it at all (0 points)	
Has the models selection procedure been used correctly?	Yes, perfect! (1 point) ✔	Mostly, but there is some mistake in it (0.75 points)	No (0.5 points)	Didn't do it at all (0 points)
Has the student properly evaluated the performance of the final classifier for example on unseen test data chosen randomly etc.?	Yes, perfect! (1 point) ✔	Mostly, but there is some minor mistake in it (0.75 points)	Done, but incorrectly (0.5 points)	Didn't do it at all (0 points)
Comments (if any) by the graders:				

Quality of the report (5.50/6 points)

Is the report thorough enough?	Yes, perfect! (2 points) ✔	Almost there! (1.5 points)	There is much room for improvement (0.75 points)	Not thorough at all (0 points)
Is there an executive summary of the project?	Yes, perfect! (1 points) ✔	A bit lacking (0.5 points)	Didn't do it at all (0 points)	
Are the preprocessing steps described?	Yes, perfect! (0.5 points) ✔	Mostly, but not all/some minor mistake (0.25 points)	Didn't do it at all (0 points)	
Are the approach and design choices justified well?	Yes, perfect! (0.5 points) ✔	Mostly, but not all/some minor mistake (0.25 points)	Didn't do it at all (0 points)	
Is the chosen performance measure justified?	Yes, perfect! (0.5 points) ✔	Somewhat (0.25 points)	Didn't do it at all (0 points)	
Is there an description of the final classifier?	Yes, perfect! (0.5 points) ✔	Somewhat (0.25 points)	Didn't do it at all (0 points)	
Are development ideas reported?	Yes, perfect! (0.5 points) ✔	Mostly, but not all/some minor mistake (0.25 points)	Didn't do it at all (0 points)	
Are the results described well (quality of plots etc.)?	Yes, perfect! (0.5 points)	Mostly, but not all (0.25 points)	Didn't do it at all (0 points) ✔	
Comments (if any) by the graders:				

Quality/documentation of the code (1.50 /2 points)

Has the student documented the classes, functions, and methods properly?	Yes, perfect! (0.5 point)	Yes, but some classes/functions/methods are lacking proper documentation (0.25 points)	Didn't do it at all (0 points) ✔
Has the student used a consistent code style?	Yes, perfect! (0.5 points) ✔	Yes, but there is room for some improvement (0.25 points)	No (0 points)
Are the results reproducible?	Yes, perfect! (1 point) ✔	Somewhat (0.5 points)	No (0 points)
Comments (if any) by the graders:			

Penalties (0.00 /0 points)

Student has failed to follow delivery instructions?	Yes, but only partially (-0.25 points)	Yes, completely (-0.5 points)
Has the student submitted late?	Yes, 1 day late (-4 points)	Yes, 2 days late (-8 points)
Comments (if any) by the graders:		

Bonus for extraordinary work (0.00 /2 points)

Has the student done something extraordinary and deserves a bonus?	(2 points)	(1.5 points)	(1 points)
Comments (if any) by the graders:			