

**COM61003: Introduction to Responsible SLT Leadership**  
**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	68%

**e-Portfolio contents**

<b>Ethical research practice</b> <i>Preliminary analysis of potential ethical issues in their proposed research topic. Participation and completion of FCE6100</i>	
Mark (max 25%)	12.5
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FCE6100 completed</li> </ul> <p>Nothing submitted here aside from evidence of participation and completion of FCE6100. I.e. no preliminary analysis of potential ethical issues in your proposed research topic, as requested.</p> <p>===</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where is the rest ? Oh, some if it is in different place. Still not very detailed and quite generic. I would voice reservations to call this tRL 1 research. What is the point of these tables ?</li> <li>FCE6100 completed</li> </ul>
<b>Responsible Research and Innovation</b> <i>Short (max 1 page) summaries of RRI guest lectures. Participation and completion of ORBIT RRI training</i>	
Mark (max 15%)	14.3
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ORBIT RRI training course completed with excellent feedback from instructors.</li> </ul> <p>Good set of talks chosen to attend/summarise. Good set of summaries</p>

	<p>produced and I particularly liked your effort to conclude each summary by stating the important take-aways for you from the talk. In general I recommend starting with an objective summary of the content of a speaker's presentation followed by an evaluation of what they've said and how they've presented it. I.e. start with a summarisation of the content of the presentation -- (1) the problem addressed (2) the work carried out to address the problem or arguments/approaches advanced in relation to solving the problem (3) the major results/conclusion(s)/take-away point(s). Then follow this with a summarisation of your critical concerns/observations regarding (1) the content and (2) the presentation style. By and large you do this, but in summary 1 you launch into problems with the presentation and then get on to the content of the talk. Also for most of the talks you don't raise any critical points or questions about the content of the work. Were you convinced by the speaker's claims? Was the argument clear at all points?</p> <p>===</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed notes but I would recommend that you give them more structure, in terms of content, presentation style, and key lessons from each. It is partly there, but often distributed.</li> <li>• ORBIT RRI training course completed with excellent feedback from instructors</li> </ul>
<b>Leadership skills (Personal Development Project)</b> <i>Preliminary plan for what needs to be done to realise the project and how it will be carried out over the following 3 years</i>	
Mark (max 30%)	19.5
Comments	<p>Good idea, well-motivated and with clearly identified goals and target communities. However I am concerned about the scope/ambition of the project, which seems almost certainly too broad for a PDP. Remember that in years 2, 3 and 4 the PDP is meant to take just 30 hours per *year* of your time. I can confidently predict that you will <b>not</b> be able to fit content development and multimodal delivery ("Videos, Podcasts, In-Person"), website development and dissemination through "attendance at roundtable discussions, conferences, and events", and creating "an outreach consulting project for healthcare and NLP technologies within SLT" within this time envelope. You need to assess and limit your scope to an achievable subset of these activities.</p> <p>Re: activities and timings, very well specified via the Gantt chart you have provided. However it would be nice to see person-hour estimates (not just durations) for these activities. If you were to do this I think you'd rapidly see that the whole programme you are proposing will consume significantly more time than you have available.</p>

	<p>Re: feasibility and risk, you have usefully identified and discussed mitigations for a number of key threats. Re: time-scale, which I see as the largest threat, your discussion is not entirely clear. You say : "This has attempted to improve through the reduction of scores," where "This" here seems to refer to competing interests for your time during this period. Not clear what is meant by "reduction of scores" unless it's "fiddling the figures in the risk assessment", which does not seem a wise idea. I think you'll need more than an "iterative development process" and a Gantt chart plus periodic reassessment. You'll need to start by limiting your scope to, or at least prioritising, a subset of the possible activities you have identified so that you can focus on them.</p> <p>Re: RRI analysis, you have not provided one. Though their utility for projects like this which are not technology research or development but rather education, is debatable it is still useful to think about the AREA4P headings and consider, who will be impacted, what negative as well as positive outcomes there might be and who else, aside from you and your direct audience, might be engaged in the process you proposing in order to improve it.</p> <p>You have discussed impact assessment and this is sensible. When you get to writing your final PDP report in year 4 you will want to be able to say something evidence-based about how successful your project was.</p> <p>===</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great job to produce a separate document.</li> <li>• The title and aim seem far far to ambitious and it is very hard to understand how this can be achieved. Please pick a very specific area !</li> <li>• Unfortunately this ambition also falls seemingly into the trap to not engage with users, but to produce material and then to disseminate. Especially for adaption this has failed many times. Producing a website that nobody wants to use is pointless. How are you going to engage with real users ?</li> </ul> <p>Please pick a specific area and identify specific people to work with - and it will be great.</p>
<b>Commercial Exploitation</b> <i>Short (max 1 page) summaries of external partners guest lectures</i>	
Mark (max 15%)	11.5
Comments	<p><i>Talbot et al Talk:</i> Generally good overview with useful comment from yourself on the content and value of different parts of the presentation. Somewhat confusing when you say "This led very well into the two case studies that were presented next. " and then go on to discuss three case studies.</p>

	<p><i>Klaas Molapisi Talk:</i> Found this summary somewhat abstract. What is "a point of value"? Not clear in places whether you are talking about a company's own values or the values of the customers whose needs they are trying to meet. Further examples would have helped more. What did you think of this talk? -- you don't provide any comment on either the content of the talk or the manner of presentation.</p> <p>3 other talk summaries also included but these were also submitted under the RRI Talk series (where they fit more appropriately), so are ignored here.</p> <p>===</p> <p>Quite extensive reports - of good comments and care in writing. Same comment as above applies, some structure will help making them consistent and more useful for you later ... Takeaways are good in principle</p>
<p><b>Written and Oral Presentation Skills</b>  <i>Attendance at the regular CDT / SpandH / NLP seminar series and prepare a short (max 1 page) summary of each session including a comment on presentation (strengths &amp; weaknesses). Presentation of their research topic as part of the main seminar series, CDT conference, or similar.</i></p>	
Mark (max 15%)	10.5
Comments	<p><i>Summaries/Analysis of Presentation Quality:</i></p> <p>Impressive effort (9 summaries) which demonstrates your commitment to attending seminars and writing up summaries (good practice). Overall, summaries are good and reflect not just the content of the talks but your critical engagement with what the speaker is saying. In the summaries of the speech talks (the last 3 as presented in the portfolio) your summaries degenerate in places into somewhat incoherent/apparently hastily made lists of points in a telegraphic style (e.g. page 2 of summary of seminar 7 -- this is too long for a summary -- and the 10 point list in the middle of the summary of seminar 8).</p> <p>You were asked for each speaker to include an "analysis of presentation quality (strengths &amp; weaknesses)". In some cases (e.g. seminars 4, 7, 8) you did not do this, while in others this analysis is pretty cursory (e.g. seminar 5 "Overall, the presentation style was excellent, if a little rushed, due to the amount of time allotted." or seminar 9 "The lecture was presented in a great and informative way, with high interactivity.").</p> <p>NB: Re: seminar 7 you say "We have around 700 languages of the word; " -- I presume you mean "world" here not "word"; but note this number should be *7000* not 700.</p>

*Your Presentation:*

The poster was prepared at a very early stage of your research so its primary purpose has to be seen not as presenting results of a scientific study but as communicating and motivating the area you intend to research. As such I feel the poster takes too long (reading left to right, top down) to get to this and misses a trick to graphically present the key idea. Starting with a definition of key terms is how lawyers start dull contract documents and is not how to grab an audience. Essentially your area is search with a twist -- huge sea of documents from which you need to find not one but ALL the relevant documents -- high precision and high recall are both needed in a setting where the search space is exploding (I know there is more to systematic reviews but this crude view is enough for now). There are various ways you could graphically communicate this idea/process at the top of the slide which would let you address the first questions someone has in looking at a poster: "What is this research about/what is the problem being addressed/why should I care?". As it is the reader has to plough through too much text, prime themselves with key definitions (not that clear -- what is TAR an acronym for?) and before they can get an idea what your research is about.

Also would be better if you explicitly articulated, e.g. in a numbered or bulleted list, your initial formulation of your research questions.

Finally, not clear to me how active learning fits in this process -- what is being labelled and what is being learned? Again this could be conveyed graphically in the context of a picture/diagram of the TAR process.

===

As for reports, see above - keep up the good work !

Your own poster has far too many words, and looks really technical. This is not the standard we have here. One could have discussed key technology, and possible approaches even at that stage. Nobody stands in front of a poster and wants to read a paper.