Rubric Detail

*A rubric lists grading criteria that instructors use to evaluate student work. Your instructor linked a rubric to this item and made it available to you. Select **Grid View** or **List View** to change the rubric's layout.*

Name: **CW1 feedback and mark split Level 11**

Exit

Grid View | List View

	Fail	Pass	Pass +	Pass ++	Excellent	Outstanding
1,2,3 Convserion to arff, randomisation and computational constraints	0 (0.00%) - 6.63 (6.63%) The problem is not well understood and not well described. The required conversions are either not completed or not presented properly. No software developed. No interesting properties in data are discussed.	6.8 (6.80%) - 8.33 (8.33%) The stated problem is not very well described. Some required conversions are completed, but the process is not convincingly presented. No software developed. No interesting properties in data are discussed.	8.5 (8.50%) - 10.03 (10.03%) All of the required conversions are completed, but the process is not clearly presented. The problem is reasonably described. No software developed. Some interesting properties of the data are noted, but not discussed in depth.	10.2 (10.20%) - 11.73 (11.73%) All of the required conversions are completed, and the process is clearly and convincingly described. The problem is reasonably described. In addition, either some reasonable piece of software is developed, or some interesting properties of data are discussed in some depth.	11.9 (11.90%) - 13.43 (13.43%) All of the required conversions are completed, and the process is presented clearly and convincingly. The problem is very well described and analysed. In addition, either first-class quality software is developed, or deep and thorough discussion of interesting properties of data.	13.6 (13.60%) - 17 (17.00%) All of the required conversions are completed and the process is presented clearly and convincingly. The problem is very well described and analysed. In addition, first-class quality

	Fail	Pass	Pass +	Pass ++	Excellent	Outstanding
						software is developed. In addition, deep and thorough discussion of interesting properties of data is given. The report shows real analytic depth and thorough research into the subject.
4. Classification: Performanance of the Nearest Neighbour Algorithm on the given data set	0 (0.00%) - 6.63 (6.63%) The problem is not well understood and not well described. Required experiments are either not	6.8 (6.80%) - 8.33 (8.33%) Some required experiments are completed, but they are not convincingly presented. The stated problem is not very well	8.5 (8.50%) - 10.03 (10.03%) Most required experiments are completed, but they are not convincingly presented in tables/graphs. The problem is	10.2 (10.20%) - 11.73 (11.73%) All of the required experiments are completed, and reasonably	11.9 (11.90%) - 13.43 (13.43%) All of the required experiments are completed, and presented logically and convincingly in tables/graphs. The problem is very well described and	13.6 (13.60%) - 17 (17.00%) All of the required experiments are completed and presented logically and convincingly in tables/graphs.

	completed or presented properly. No software developed. No interesting properties in algorithms and/or data are discussed.	described. No software developed. No interesting properties in algorithms and/or data are discussed.	reasonably described. No software developed. Some interesting properties of algorithms and/or data are discussed, but not to a great depth.	presented in tables/graphs. The problem is reasonably described. In addition, either some reasonable piece of software is developed, or some interesting properties of data and/or algorithms are noted.	analysed. In addition, either first-class quality software is developed, or deep and thorough discussion of interesting properties of data and algorithms is given.	The problem is outstanding described and analysed. In addition, first-class quality software is developed. In addition, deep and thorough discussion of interesting properties of data and algorithms is given. The report shows real analytic depth and thorough research into the subject.
	Fail	Pass	Pass +	Pass ++	Excellent	Outstanding
5. Deeper analysis: search for important attributes by correlation for each class	0 (0.00%) - 6.63 (6.63%) The problem is not well understood and not well described. Required experiments are either not	6.8 (6.80%) - 8.33 (8.33%) Some required experiments are completed, but they are not convincingly presented. The stated problem is not very well	8.5 (8.50%) - 10.03 (10.03%) Most required experiments are completed, but they are not convincingly presented in tables/graphs. The problem is	10.2 (10.20%) - 11.73 (11.73%) All of the required experiments are completed, and reasonably presented in tables/graphs. The problem is reasonably	11.9 (11.90%) - 13.43 (13.43%) All of the required experiments are completed, and presented logically and convincingly in	13.6 (13.60%) - 17 (17.00%) All of the required experiments are completed and presented logically and convincingly in tables/graphs.

	completed or presented properly. No software developed. No interesting properties in algorithms and/or data are discussed.	described. No software developed. No interesting properties in algorithms and/or data are discussed.	reasonably described. No software developed. Some interesting properties of algorithms and/or data are discussed, but not to a great depth.	described. In addition, either some reasonable piece of software is developed, or some interesting properties of data and/or algorithms are noted.	tables/graphs. The problem is very well described and analysed. In addition, either first-class quality software is developed, or deep and thorough discussion of interesting properties of data and algorithms is given.	The problem is outstanding described and analysed. In addition, first-class quality software is developed. In addition, deep and thorough discussion of interesting properties of data and algorithms is given. The report shows real analytic depth and thorough research into the subject. Research papers/webpages are cited and used in an interesting way.
Fail	**Pass**	**Pass**	**Pass**	**Excellent**	**Outstanding**	
6. Improving the classification using the selected attributes from 5	0 (0.00%) - 6.24 (6.24%) The problem is not well understood and not well described. Required experiments are either not	6.4 (6.40%) - 7.84 (7.84%) Some required experiments are completed, but they are not convincingly presented. The stated problem is not very well	8 (8.00%) - 9.44 (9.44%) Most required experiments are completed, but they are not convincingly presented in tables/graphs. The problem is	9.6 (9.60%) - 11.04 (11.04%) All of the required experiments are completed, and reasonably presented in tables/graphs. The problem is reasonably	11.2 (11.20%) - 12.64 (12.64%) All of the required experiments are completed, and presented logically and convincingly in	12.8 (12.80%) - 16 (16.00%) All of the required experiments are completed and presented logically and convincingly in tables/graphs.

	completed or presented properly. No software developed. No interesting properties in algorithms and/or data are discussed.	described. No software developed. No interesting properties in algorithms and/or data are discussed.	reasonably described. No software developed. Some interesting properties of algorithms and/or data are discussed, but not to a great depth.	described. In addition, either some reasonable piece of software is developed, or some interesting properties of data and/or algorithms are noted.	tables/graphs. The problem is very well described and analysed. In addition, either first-class quality software is developed, or deep and thorough discussion of interesting properties of data and algorithms is given.	described and analysed. In addition, first-class quality software is developed. In addition, deep and thorough discussion of interesting properties of data and algorithms is given. The report shows real analytic depth and thorough research into the subject.
7. Conclusions	0 (0.00%) - 6.63 (6.63%) The problem is not well understood and not well described. No technical analysis is given. Some	6.8 (6.80%) - 8.33 (8.33%) Some technical analysis is given. Some web resources and research papers are cited but the text shows little	8.5 (8.50%) - 10.03 (10.03%) Good technical analysis is given answering several questions. Some research papers/websites are mentioned	10.2 (10.20%) - 11.73 (11.73%) Solid technical analysis is given answering many of the questions raised. Some research papers/websites are mentioned but	11.9 (11.90%) - 13.43 (13.43%) Deep techncial analysis is given answering all of the questions raised. Deep and thorough discussion is	13.6 (13.60%) - 17 (17.00%) Deep techncial analysis is given answering all of the questions given. Relevant additional experiments are performed, and

	Fail Few research papers are cited but the text shows little evidence of real understanding. No experiments have been run to support the conclusions.	**Pass** Some experiments that have been run in earlier sections are refered to in support of the conclusions.	**Pass +** Experiments that have been run in earlier sections are clearly refered to in support of the conclusions. No additional experiments have been done.	**Pass ++** Experiments that have been run in earlier sections are clearly refered to in support of the conclusions. No additional experiments have been done.	**Excellent** given. Relevant additional experiments are performed, or relevant additional questions are explored in depth. Research papers/webpages are cited and used in an interesting way.	**Outstanding** questions are explored in depth. Research papers/webpages are cited. The report shows real analytic depth and thorough research into the subject.
8. Research Question	0 (0.00%) - 0 (0.00%) The problem is not well understood and not well described. Experiments are missing, not completed or	6.4 (6.40%) - 7.84 (7.84%) Experimental results are given for at least one other value and compared. Weak explanation of	8 (8.00%) - 9.44 (9.44%) Experimental results are given for at least two other relevant values and compared. A good explanation is	9.6 (9.60%) - 11.04 (11.04%) Experimental results are given for at least two other relevant values and compared. Solid explanation of the different results.	11.2 (11.20%) - 12.64 (12.64%) Deep techncial analysis is given. Experimental results are given for an appropriate range of other	12.8 (12.80%) - 16 (16.00%) Deep techncial analysis is given. Relevant additional experiments are performed on this and other datasets. The

not presented properly. Weak explanation of the different results. No evidence of research into the question. No relevant websites or research papers are cited.	the different results. Some textbooks, web resources and research papers are cited but the text shows little evidence of real understanding.	given for the different results. The choice of experimetnal values is explained and justified. Some textbooks and web resources are mentioned but only briefly.	The choice of experimetnal values is explained and justified. Relevant textbooks, and research reports are cited and used.	relevant values and compared. Solid explanation of the different results. The choice of experimetnal values is explained and justified. Relevant textbooks, and research reports are cited and used.	choice of experimetnal and settings is explained and justified. Research papers/webpages are cited. The report shows real analytic depth and thorough research into the subject.
Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Excellent	Outstanding

The rubric total value of 73.56 has been overridden with a value of 74.00 out of 100.

Name:**CW1 feedback and mark split Level 11**

Exit