Projects: mid-semester evaluation

Karën Fort and Fanny Ducel

karen.fort@univ-lorraine.fr / https://members.loria.fr/KFort

Evaluation criteria

- quality of the presentation + demo
- project itself:
  - organization
  - documentation
  - tests
  - quality of the code
  - etc (other criteria can be taken into account, depending on the project)

You will evaluate each other: peer evaluation

▶ each group shares their GitLab with their evaluator group:

You will evaluate each other: peer evaluation

▶ each group shares their GitLab with their evaluator group:
  ▶ to avoid conflicts of interest, the match is done by the teacher

---

[1]karen.fort@univ-lorraine.fr and fanny.ducel@inria.fr

You will evaluate each other: peer evaluation

- each group shares their GitLab with their evaluator group:
  - to avoid conflicts of interest, the match is done by the teacher
- the evaluator group produces **a short document (PDF)** summarizing their evaluation, according to the criteria mentioned in class, and with **actionable, helpful, benevolent** comments to help improve their project until the defense

---

[1]karen.fort@univ-lorraine.fr and fanny.ducel@inria.fr

You will evaluate each other: peer evaluation

- each group shares their GitLab with their evaluator group:
  - to avoid conflicts of interest, the match is done by the teacher
- the evaluator group produces **a short document (PDF)** summarizing their evaluation, according to the criteria mentioned in class, and with **actionable, helpful, benevolent** comments to help improve their project until the defense
  - use your critical thinking skills, and try to think about what you can teach the other group and what you can learn from their work

---

[1]karen.fort@univ-lorraine.fr and fanny.ducel@inria.fr

You will evaluate each other: peer evaluation

- each group shares their GitLab with their evaluator group:
  - to avoid conflicts of interest, the match is done by the teacher
- the evaluator group produces **a short document (PDF)** summarizing their evaluation, according to the criteria mentioned in class, and with **actionable, helpful, benevolent** comments to help improve their project until the defense
  - use your critical thinking skills, and try to think about what you can teach the other group and what you can learn from their work
- the evaluation document should be sent by email to **both teachers**[1] and **to the evaluated group** at the **end of the session** (3h to evaluate)

---

[1] karen.fort@univ-lorraine.fr and fanny.ducel@inria.fr

You will evaluate each other: peer evaluation

▶ each group shares their GitLab with their evaluator group:
  ▶ to avoid conflicts of interest, the match is done by the teacher
▶ the evaluator group produces **a short document (PDF)** summarizing their evaluation, according to the criteria mentioned in class, and with **actionable, helpful, benevolent** comments to help improve their project until the defense
  ▶ use your critical thinking skills, and try to think about what you can teach the other group and what you can learn from their work
▶ the evaluation document should be sent by email to **both teachers**[1] and **to the evaluated group** at the **end of the session** (3h to evaluate)
▶ only the **evaluator** group will be graded, but:

---

[1]karen.fort@univ-lorraine.fr and fanny.ducel@inria.fr

You will evaluate each other: peer evaluation

- each group shares their GitLab with their evaluator group:
  - to avoid conflicts of interest, the match is done by the teacher
- the evaluator group produces **a short document (PDF)** summarizing their evaluation, according to the criteria mentioned in class, and with **actionable, helpful, benevolent** comments to help improve their project until the defense
  - use your critical thinking skills, and try to think about what you can teach the other group and what you can learn from their work
- the evaluation document should be sent by email to **both teachers**[1] and **to the evaluated group** at the **end of the session** (3h to evaluate)
- only the **evaluator** group will be graded, but:
- the evaluation will serve as a basis for our final grading

---

[1]karen.fort@univ-lorraine.fr and fanny.ducel@inria.fr

Mapping

- **Malayalam** – Binesh, Elise, Camille evaluate **Speech biomarkers**
- **Disability biases** – Loic, Arthur, Joely, Florian evaluate **Inclusive French**
- **XNLi** – Lucie, Ivo, Anastazija, Dadjat evaluate **Disability biases**
- **Inclusive French** – Samba, Benjamin, Maiwenn, Léa C. evaluate **Corpus 14**
- **Corpus 14** – Pierre, Emma, Thomas, Léa B. evaluate **Analysis of city council meeting minutes**
- **Speech biomarkers** – Van goa, Seyed, Gao, Muhamad evaluate **Language learning**
- **LGBTQ Biases in romance stories** – Ibrahim, Melvin, Léo, Shayan evaluate **XNLi**
- **Language learning** – Emile, Emeric, Zhara, Murad evaluate **LLM style**
- **LLM style** – Olga, Stéphanie, Céline, Joe evaluate **LGBTQ Biases in romance stories**
- **Analysis of city council meeting minutes** – Jad, Austin, Sana, Ke evaluate **Malayalam**