Template for the presentation

## 1. Introduction

* **Problem Statement and RQ:** Briefly describe the societal or research issue you aim to address with this project. Why is this important to study? Clearly state the research question you have chosen. Use your work from Assignment 1 to inform this part of the presentation.

2. Data Collection and Description

* **Method Used and Dataset Overview:** Explain the data collection method selected (e.g., plug-ins, data donation, scraping, APIs). Describe the rationale for choosing this method based on your research question and the intended analysis. Provide a description of the dataset you acquired, including the number of data points, the type of data (e.g., text, metadata), and any key characteristics. You may use figures or tables to illustrate this if necessary. Use your work from Assignment 1 to inform this part of the presentation.

3. Data Labeling

* **AI model:** Explain the AI model used to label the data, including the original sample used to train the model and how their definition of the label aligns with your research question.

4. Discussion on Ethical and Privacy challenges

* **Ethical principles:** Discuss the alignment of your research project with ethical principles
* **Privacy regulations:** Explain the steps taken to ensure GDPR and other regulations are fullfill.
* **PRIDE ethical form:** Fill in this form, showing your reflection and considerations on the data you use and the implications for participants. The PRIDE form itself should not be part of the presentation, but it is part of the grade (see rubric below), and it needs to be handed in together with the presentation slides **the day before** the final presentations.

5. Discussion on Errors and Biases

* **Measurement Errors:** Explore any issues related to how the data was measured (e.g., ambiguous text, incorrect data labels). How might these impact your ability to answer the research question?
* **Representation Errors:** Discuss representation errors, such as biases in the dataset that might make it less representative of the broader population or phenomenon you are studying.
* **Fairness:** Discuss what errors may be present in the data that may create differences between subpopulations.
* **Correcting for errors:** Explain what steps could be done to correct for errors and biases

6. Conclusion

* Provide a final reflection on the answer to the research question and how different errors may affect the results.

References: Include any sources referenced in your report (e.g., literature, tools, methods).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade:** | **Less than 5.5**  **Unsatisfactory:** | **Between 6 and 7.5**  **Satisfactory to good** | **Between 8 and 10**  **Good to Excellent** | **Weight** | **Grade** |
| Part A: Process | | | | | |
| **Preparation of the feedback meeting & amount of work done, based on the update presentation and general impression of the meeting.** | The amount of work done was less than would have been expected on the basis of the amount of ECTS.  The update slides are messy and do not show who worked on what. The slides do not show any of the considerations made. | The amount of work done was what would have been expected on the basis of the amount of ECTS.  The update slides are clear and convey who worked on what parts of the assignment. Some of the considerations made in the assignment are presented. | The amount of work done was more than would have been expected on the basis of the amount of ECTS.  The updates slides cover all topics that should be present in the assignment so far. It becomes clear who worked on what parts of the assignment. For all parts of the assignment considerations are given.  The student prepared points to discuss in the meeting. | 0.2 |  |
| **Active participation in the feedback moments** | The student did not participate in the feedback moments. | The student participated actively. | The student participated actively and showed a deep understanding of the project.  The student is proactive in bringing up the points and questions that they want to discuss. | 0.1 |  |
| Part B: Quality of the report or presentation | | | | | |
| **Problem definition and data collection**  (assessed from the presentation) | The purpose or the research question is still not clearly articulated. | Effectively formulates a clear description of the research question and clearly argues its relevance. New data is not collected. | Effectively formulates a clear description of the research question and clearly argues its relevance. New data is collected if it was mentioned in the feedback. | 0.10 |  |
| **Data labeling**  (assessed from the presentation) | The data was not labeled, or labeled in a way that did not match the RQ. | The data is labeled correctly, matching the RQ. | The data is labeled correctly and effectively contributes to answering the RQ. | 0.15 |  |
| **Discussion of ethical and privacy challenges**  (assessed from the presentation and the PRIDE form) | No discussion of the alignment of the project with ethical and privacy principles, or the discussion is clearly incorrect.  The PRIDE form is missing | The discussion of the alignment of the project with ethical and legal principles is mostly correct. No or few steps have been done to ensure ethical and privacy principles are respected.  The PRIDE form is filled in, and most fields show good effort and reflection. | The discussion of the alignment of the project with ethical principles is correct and steps have been done to ensure ethical and privacy principles are respected.  The PRIDE form is filled in completely. All fields show good considerations and reflections on the use of participant data. The fields show good understanding of the different ethical principles. | 0.20 |  |
| **Discussion of errors**  (assessed from the presentation) | The discussion of errors is often inaccurate or incomplete; presents little if any analysis or interpretation; conclusions or recommendations are often not well supported, inaccurate, and/or inconsistent, and are presented in a vague or rudimentary manner; reflection/discussion is missing or lacks depth. | The discussion of errors is generally correct, outlines conclusions, potential consequences for the analysis and recommendations on how to expand the study that are logical and consistent with the analysis and evidence. | The discussion of errors is generally correct. Conclusions, potential consequences of errors for the analysis and recommendations on how to expand the study are insightful, coherent, well supported, logically consistent. | 0.20 |  |
| **Q&A** | Questions are not answered correctly | Questions are answered mostly correctly | The answers to the questions show a deep understanding of the weaknesses and strengths of their methods. | 0.05 |  |
| **General comments** |  | | | | |
| **Overall grade** |  | | | | |