UKRI Centre for Doctoral Training in
Speech and Language Technologies
and their Applications

COM61004: Introduction to Collaborative Research Practice for SLT
Mark Sheet

Student Name	Aaron Fletcher
Student Registration	230116573
Cohort	5
Academic Year	2023/24
Marker's Name	Rob Gaizauskas, Thomas Hain, Supervisor, Session Facilitators
Overall Mark	84%

e-Portfolio contents

Mini-Project *Group report and conference presentation* *A log of personal contributions/activity organised on a chronological basis, i.e. a brief weekly summary of activity and their individual contributions* *Group work weighted 80%; individual work weighted 20%*	
Mark (max 45%)	32
Comments	You have clearly been thoroughly engaged with and have made a very significant contribution to the project. You have been involved in most aspects of the project including data generation, scoping and defining research questions, implementing the models you have chosen to adopt and writing, project report and project management.

Your work log was at an appropriate level of detail, but could have distinguished more clearly between activities the team as a whole were engaged in and your specific contributions. In some places it was not possible to work out what you meant -- e.g. p. 8 "Relocation to subset task to intent classification." -- perhaps a proof reading at the end might have helped -- and in a number of cases activities appear, such as intent classification, and then disappear (i.e. do not make it into your final system) without further discussion. Presumably at some point a decision was made not to include intent classification in the final NLP system architecture, but there is no record in the work log of this, resulting in a slight sense of incoherence for the reader. The dates for your final few entries are somewhat mixed up (week 21 is w/c 25/2/2023, then week 22 is 18/2/2023, followed by weeks 23-24 which are also 18/2/2023 -- not just an ordering issue, but presumably these should all end with 24 not 23). |

UKRI Centre for Doctoral Training in
Speech and Language Technologies
and their Applications

	=== ● Very detailed record including the hours ● Most of the work here seems to be in meetings - and data generation ? If you count the hours of work against hours of meetings - do you think this is a fair reflection ? ● First work on methods seem to be as late as week 9
Journal Club *Each student will be expected to provide:* ● *their commentary bullets about each paper* ● *brief write-up of outcomes of the discussion from each session They should indicate if they were the discussion chair* ● *A copy of the slides used at each session for which they were the presenter.*	
Mark (max 20%)	18.7
Comments from session facilitators	Presentation(s) ● Very good presentation. I think they really got the main / most important part of this paper. It is a dense paper, so getting the main idea is not an easy task. Slides were good (minor comments, like lack of slide numbers, but that is fine). Nice link to the mini-project. Engagement ● Detailed slide deck and very active participation in discussion. Aaron was charing the discussion and did this very well. ● Good, curious, reads stackexchange, not afraid to criticise and ask questions. ● Nice insightful comments about paper ● Great presentation ● Good ● Very active engagement and good bullet points ● Raised critical points and was very active in the discussion. ● Overall good questions, engaged during the session ● Good points, but more on criticising the style of the paper. However, his argumentation was actually good. ● Good ● Good addition to what has been said prior, brings NLP perspective on speech representations
Meta-MOOC *Each student will be expected to provide:* ● *List of the topics they have worked on (including links to the relevant Meta-MOOC platform pages),* ● *For each topic, a brief description of their individual contributions to each topic they have been involved with.*	
Mark (max 25%)	25

UKRI Centre for Doctoral Training in
Speech and Language Technologies
and their Applications

Comments from session facilitators	Presented the substantial changes made. Nice presentation given by all students in the group with contributions clearly described. Detailed explanation of changes made including a nice detailed summary
Technical training sessions (self-directed learning) *Each student will be expected to provide:* ● *A list of all training courses undertaken with evidence of completion and duration,* ● *Reflection on lessons learned in the context of the student's cohort work and research project.* ● *A review of where the learned skills have been applied by the student, with evidence.*	
Mark (max 10%)	8.3
Comments	Sensible set of courses taken. Very thorough narrative descriptive of the course contents and useful reflection on the quality of the courses. There could have been more on where the learned skills have been/will be applied in your work. Missing evidence for participation in/completion of the University of Sheffield courses. === ● Good to see computing training ● Great to see quite extensive training ! ● Very detailed reporting !