**Assessment Rubric**

Name(s): Sit Yie Sian, Teng Kai Deng, Leong Sheng Mou Programme: RDS2 Group: G2 Date: 24/04/2023

**Project Part A – Shortlist promising models (40%) – CLO3**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Item** | **Criteria** | | | **Final Marks** |
| **Poor** | **Accomplished** | **Good** |
| 1 | Problem statement (10) | No or very little discussion on existing problem and the project The proposed project already exists, or with very minor change. No discussion or very little of introduction given to the related system or technology.  0-4 | Little discussion on existing problem and introduction of proposed project. Minor ideas are modified from existing system(s). Introduction to the related system is given, but no evaluation provided.  5-7 | Good discussion and evaluation of existing problem and the proposed project. Ideas modified from existing system, with some creative ideas are added. Good discussion and evaluation of the related system.  8-10 |  |
| 2 | Programming (20) | The end product fails with many logic errors, many actions lacked exception handling. Solutions are over-simplified. Programming skill needs improvement.  Evaluation steps of different models are not automated.  0-7 | Major parts are logical, but some steps to complete a specific job may be tedious or unnecessarily complicated. Program algorithm demonstrates acceptable level of complexity. The student is qualified to be a programmer  Some evaluation steps are automated.  8-15 | Correct and logical flow, exceptions are handled well. Demonstrates appropriate or high level of complex algorithms and programming skills.  Almost all evaluation steps are automated.  16-20 |  |
| 3 | Degree of completion  (10) | Too much still remain to be done. Basic  requirements are not fulfilled.  The end product produces enormous errors, faults or incorrect results.  Limited performance metrics are used.  0-4 | All required features present in the interface  within the required scope, but some are simplified. Or one or two features are missing. The system is able to run with minor errors.  More than 5 performance metrics are shown.  5-7 | All required features present in the interface  within or beyond the required scope.  No bugs apparent during demonstration.  More than 8 performance metrics are shown.  8-10 |  |
| Sum of Score | | | | |  |

**Appendix 2**

**Project Part B – Fine-tune the system (40%) – CLO3**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Item** | **Criteria** | | | **Final Marks** |
| **Poor** | **Accomplished** | **Good** |
| 1 | Model Optimization  (12) | The model is not optimized.  Default setting is used without any adjustments.  0-4 | The model is optimized based on performance metrics.  Different parameters are regularized to optimize the model.  Ensemble classifier is not attempted.  5-8 | The model is optimized based on performance metrics.  Different parameters are regularized to optimize the model  Ensemble classifier is evaluated.  9-12 |  |
| 2 | system implementation  (13) | The end product is produced with different  system design or approach, which is not related to the initial proposal.  0-4 | The end product conforms to most of the  system design, but some are different from the specification.  5-9 | The end product fully conforms to the  proposed system design.  10-13 |  |
| 3 | Results  (Performance measurement) (10) | Analytical methods were missing  or inappropriately aligned with data and research design. Results were confusing.  0-4 | The analytical methods were  identified. Results were presented. All were related to the research question and design. Sufficient metric or measurement is applied.  5-7 | Analytical methods and results  presentation were sufficient, specific, clear, structured and appropriate based on the research questions and research design. Extra metric or measurement is applied.  8-10 |  |
| 4 | Organization  (5) | The structure of the paper was  weak. Transition was weak and difficult to understand.  0-2 | A workable structure was  presented for presenting ideas. Transition was smooth and clear.  3-4 | Structure was intuitive and sufficiently  inclusive of important information of the research. Transition from one to another was smooth and organized.  5 |  |
| Sum of Score | | | | |  |

**Presentation (20%) – CLO2**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Item** | **Criteria** | | | **Final Marks** |
| **Poor** | **Accomplished** | **Good** |
| 1 | Output (10) | Inadequate information/outputs needed are  generated.  Most of the information/outputs generated are less accurate.  Results visualization is overly cluttered or the design seems inappropriate for the problem area.  Lack of information that is  useful for the user  0-4 | Adequate information/outputs needed are  generated.  The information/output generated are accurate, but some with errors.  Pleasant looking, clean, well-organized results visualization  The information displayed is helpful for the user, but some details are  omitted.  5-7 | All the necessary information/outputs are  generated.  All or most of the information/outputs generated are accurate. Minor errors can be ignored.  The results are visually pleasing and appealing.  Great use of colors, fonts, graphics and layout.  The information displayed is helpful to the users and complete with necessary details.  8-10 |  |
| 2 | Presentation  (10) | The presentation was unclear.  Results were presented without justifications and reasons.  Results were not supported with ML concepts and theories.  0-4 | The presentation is well organized for the most part, but more clarity with transitions is needed.  Answers to the research question and system performances supported ML concepts and theories.  5-7 | The presentation was concise and straight to the point.  The results were presented and illustrated in easily interpretable graphs or charts.  The research question and system performance were answered and identified.  8-10 |  |
| Sum of Score | | | | |  |