D5 Evidenced Peer Assessment (F21DG)

Frankland, Matthew
H00241997/mf48

December 24, 2020

1 Peer Assessment Results

Name of Student providing marks: Matthew Frankland

	Farhan Hafiz	George Hughes	Sabina Jędrzejczyk	Ross Moir	Ridwan Mukhtar	Mark Schmieg	Nicolas Sparagano	Cailean Welsh	Totals
D1	80	110	100	100	110	100	100	100	800
D2	80	120	120	100	80	100	120	80	800
D3	90	140	100	110	80	90	110	80	800
Total	83	123	107	103	90	97	110	87	

2 Evidence for Peer Assessment

All who worked on the Design & Code (F21DG) project were excellent collaborators and I have not given anyone a mark below 80/100 (the higher end of the score range). I gave extra marks to those who worked extra hard on a deliverable.

2.1 Ability at searching for information and evaluating usefulness of information

All sources were referenced from academic papers or official technical documentation. The relevant subgroup evaluated a reference's usefulness versus the marking specification, and whether it would convey any key concept. I marked Farhan Hafiz down for the quantity of references he found versus personal opinion. These comments are justified by the series of meeting recordings that are found on Teams, particularly weeks 1-7.

2.2 Ability to generate/brainstorm ideas and concepts in group and to rationally evaluate/develop them in the context of other group members' ideas

Everyone contributed a range of different ideas that were developed by the group as a whole. Brainstorming sessions were help collaboratively, where the merits; disadvantages and usefulness of an idea were discussed. If a majority liked an idea, the group collectively got behind that idea.

2.3 Ability to apply sound design, implementation and integration methodologies to develop project software

All subgroups applied an agile methodology during development. I would give extra credit to Sabina Jędrzejczyk and Nicolas Sparagano for their leading roll in D2, and D3. They lead their respective subgroups in calculating metrics and creating a clear user interface that was easy to use. Both systems were easy to integrate with the serialised Topic Models that my subgroup created. These comments are justified by the code base for metric generation (D2 Task-2), the code base for displaying topic models (D2 Task-3) and the group's GitLab commit history for D2.

2.4 Ability to apply sound methodologies and methods to critical assessment of the project deliverable

Work was always checked, at least twice, by the writer, once by the subgroup and at least once by the group as a whole. This methodology applied to reports, as well as code, and was a solid foundation for direct; critical feedback. With such feedback, our group were able to keep our code and reports to high level, as demonstrated by our assessment results for our reports.

2.5 Attendance & Communication

Every member attended all group meetings, apart from a single justified absence, and this can be proven through meeting minutes and recordings. Ridwan Mukhtar and Cailean Welsh's mark tend towards 80 because, along with myself, they were undertaking an Industrial Placement and could not spend as much time on the project. Some variance is given if a special effort was made on a particular deliverable.

Communication was excellent. Meetings often started with what had been achieved or action steps from the last meeting. Everyone contributed constructive questions or suggestions which would lead the group into the purpose of a given meeting. Everyone was comfortable with contacting others in the group midweek to ask for help if they, or their subgroup, needed it. I would like to give George Hughes extra credit for being the best at presenting our work and answering followup questions. He was also able to communicate the mathematical principles behind Topic Modelling to the rest of the group in an easy to understand manner. These comments are justified by the series of student meeting recordings that are held of Teams and on the report presentations.

2.6 Rate each person's contribution to project documentation and written reports

Most work was done collaboratively, with a given report split into sections for each group member to work on. Code was worked on, using different branches, in the same manner as the reports, before being merged back to trunk. I initially did not like using GitLab commit history as evidence because commit messages are branch specific, or, for collaborative work, only one person would commit. As a group, we put the names of those who worked on code on a commit message. Overleaf was used while the group worked on the final reports. Justification for everyone's contributions can be found in the meeting records of the two weeks leading up to the 3rd/4th and the 23rd/24th November - the submission dates.

I would give each person's contribution an equal weight in regard to documentation and report writing. Once our individual sections were complete, we would all get together and read the merged document to make sure it flowed well.