Evaluator Name: **Antoinette Pinder-Darling**

Project being evaluated: **Group 3 Statistics Reference**
http://statisticsreference.wikispaces.com/ (Web Address)

Instructions: The next part is a self-reflection of the group project. Use the rubric on project #2 to answer questions 1&2:

1. Grade the project for the "general" category on the rubric. (Assign your point value between 0 & 10). Explain your rational as you see fit.

The website contains at least five (5) pages that provide detailed descriptive and inferential statistics as required from the assessment rubric provided in project 2. The statistics researched by Group 3 team members included: the measures of central tendencies, measures of variability, p-value, Pearson correlation coefficient and z-test. Three inferential statistics were present, as well as two descriptive. Each member recorded at least one video; but one member's section was incomplete.

The font style for the wiki was inconsistent; there were variations in font type and size for at least four of pages of the wiki site. The first page, the video page, the page containing the measures of dispersion, spread or variability and the list of references used at the end and for some of the pages. The videos were also inconsistent. Varied data was used for each statistic reported. A *point* was *deducted* for the variations in font style and size. Apart from this being a statistics course, we are also technology students and the rules of quality web-design should still be applicable for this project.

The link to the wiki was posted late on Blackboard. The due date was April 20th and it was posted on April 21st. A *point* was *deducted* for the late posting.

I can only assume that each member submitted a log, as this could not be determined from the wiki.

Point value awarded: **8**

2. Grade the project for the "components" category on the rubric. (Assign your point value between 0 & 15). Explain your rational as you see fit.

The website contains at least five (5) pages that provided detailed information on descriptive as well inferential statistics. For the p-value section of the wiki page, there was a minor grammar mistake. Instead of "if rejected" the text should read "is rejected".

While the voice-over for the video recording was very clear, the volume at a balanced pitch, and the content provided was appropriate; it was difficult viewing the information contained in the p-value demonstration video. Including a video on the limitations of p-value to the wiki page was informative, but it would have been more appropriate if the researcher had added some of the content included in the other video posted to the one she recorded as it was rather brief (under 3 minutes). Points were deducted for grammatical errors as well as there was not a recorded video explaining p-value demonstrated by the researcher. A video used for that inferential statistic was actually done by someone other than the researcher. Using another person's video in the site showed a lack of planning; therefore, a *point* was *deducted*.

The concepts were excellently defined and explained on the site, but were not reinforced in the recording; the focus was only the calculations. Reminding the reader of conceptual definitions would have been a plus for the p-value video. This researcher's video for the calculation was not as attractively done as was for the other videos. Additionally, the p-value write-up did not follow appropriate APA style.

The water-mark in the Pearson video was very distracting; however, the voice over was very clear and was easy listening. Minimal mistakes were made by the researcher in the recorded video. The write-up for this inferential statistic did not follow appropriate APA and a *half-point* was deducted for this section.

The z-test video was excellent and explained very clearly; the video was simple, yet attractive. However, the APA reference page for the z-test document write-up did not follow appropriate 6th edition rules. A *half-point* was deducted for this. The book titles were not italicized and the second lines not appropriately indented. Group 3 had a section just for videos—this I thought was rather unique. While viewing the videos, I didn't have to jump around the pages trying to figure out which one I did not listen too.

The videos for measures of central tendency and variability were very thorough and the voice over used a clear and consistent pitch and tone. The write-up followed appropriate APA format.

Points awarded: **12**

3. Explain any comments, concerns, or issues that you experienced with this project. (This can be as detailed as you would like).

There are two overall comments that I would like to make about this project. I liked that this group provided extra materials for the researcher that they felt adequately explained concepts if further explanations were needed; however, this wiki was not properly edited and this could be the direct result that time was not built into the planning to address it.

My other concern with the project is that strict attention was not given to ensuring that appropriate APA (6th edition rules) was followed. This project had many APA inconsistencies.