Assignment Evaluation

Course: BCSAI2023CSAI.2.M.B_C2_438658
Student: ACTUAL SCORING / FICTICIOUS STUDENT
Name of Assignment: Assignment 18.00
Date: 3/5/2024
Evaluator: José Manuel Rey
Date of evaluation: -----

Legend
[C] Conceptual
[T] Technical
[R]) Bake-off

NOTE: Rubrics structured as an orientative Checklist/Reference. **Not all sub-items have to be present.**
The actual grading may compensate/integrate weights among the same sub-group
▒▒ = compensated

	Factors	Weight	0% E	25% D	50% C	75% B	100% A	Value
	PRACTICE RECAP							
[C]	**Summary**	**6.0**						**3.8**
	Documentation clear and readable	25.0						6.3
	Aligned to objectives	25.0						12.5
	Structured deliverables, well organized and named	25.0						18.8
	Reproducible and adequate for review	25.0						25.0
	N/A	0.0						0.0
	N/A	0.0						0.0
[C]	**Dataset**	**6.0**						**3.6**
	Understanding of data	25.0						18.8
	Adequate EDA	13.0						13.0
	Completeness/Missing values/Systemic errors	13.0						0.0
	Analysis of data preparation and adequacy	13.0						3.3
	Analysis of sample sizes	13.0						6.5
	Well described and summarized	25.0						18.8
	N/A	0.0						0.0
	N/A	0.0						0.0
[C]	**Outline / Topics covered**	**12.0**						**7.1**
	Adequate coverage of ML principles	16.0						8.0
	Well structured and woven	11.0						8.3
	Relevant issues identified and addressed	11.0						11.0
	Completeness of work (4 requried models and tasks)	63.0						31.5
[T]	**Model Architecture**	**9.0**						**5.2**
	Explanation/Justification of arquitecture selection	40.0						20.0
	Diagrams / schematics of structure	20.0						15.0
	Explanation of hyperparameters	20.0						20.0
	Quantification/overall of parameters/complexity	10.0						0.0
	Benchmarking	10.0						2.5
[T]	**Technical Remarks**	**7.0**						**5.7**
	Identification of Libraries used	48.0						36.0
	Explanation of basic functionalities/capabilities used	32.0						32.0
	Analysis of opportunities for Hyper-param/AutoML	10.0						7.5
	Analysis of trade-off accuracy/interpretability	10.0						5.0
[T]	**Model Training**	**9.0**						**5.5**
	Well explained and justified	42.0						31.5
	Relevant issues identified and addressed	21.0						21.0
	Visual/graphic presentation of results	21.0						0.0
	Monitoring of bias/variance	17.0						8.5
[T]	**Model Evaluation [Metrics]**	**10.0**						**5.3**
	Relevant metrics used	25.0						18.8
	Training metrics + Performance metrics	17.0						17.0
	Hyper-tuning: Results well analyzed and explained	17.0						0.0
	Analysis of trade-offs	17.0						4.3
	Visual/graphic presentation of results	25.0						12.5
[C]	**Conclusion / Comparison of Models**	**8.0**						**4.4**
	Own critical assessment of issues/solutions	44.0						44.0
	Good general synopsis and functional observations	22.0						0.0
	Basic understanding of key concepts	22.0						5.5
	Basic understanding of procedural/technical info	11.0						5.5
[R]	**Ranked Performance (bake-off)**	**30.0**						**12.3**
	Ranking comparison against average solutions	33.0						33.0
	Performance metrics with "test" dataset	33.0						0.0
	Functional performance in real application	33.0						8.3
	N/A	0.0						0.0
[C]	**References & Sources**	**3.0**						**2.0**
	Clear/accurate/working links to sources, references or data	60.0						45.0
	Interrelated sources (functional, technical, operational...)	20.0						20.0
	Content relevant for analysis	20.0						0.0
	N/A	0.0						0.0
		100						**54.8**
	GRADING	***60***						***32.9***

Feedback for the student:
