## Program assessment instrument: Direct measure #1: Project description and rubric

050.3: AS in Computer information science Annual program object assessment

## Project Briefing

*Conflicting views on Wikipedia*

To the computer world, Wikipedia represents the gold standard of collaborative internet projects: even as the 6th most visited website on the planet, Wikipedia is managed by only a handful of paid, full-time staff. Virtually the entire bulk of the work of building the encyclopedia is carried out by volunteers.

A vast majority of students in CIT-115 at West Hills (FA18), however, report that their English and/or social science teachers either dismiss the network of community-curated information as inaccurate or villainize the use of it as tantamount to academic dishonesty.

The net impact of the messaging from non-technical teachers is a sense among students that Wikipedia is an untrustworthy research tool to be shunned.

## Assignment specifications

Gather and report data which compares the **validity** and **comprehensiveness** of of 3 Wikipedia articles to 3 non-Wikipedia sources (which are encyclopedia-like but non-academic).

Design a spreadsheet-based tool to store your data and aggregate your findings into a digestible output, such as a graph or summary figure.

Compose two well-thought-out paragraphs to paste into text boxes inside your spreadsheet:

Paragraph 1: A declaration of the purpose of your study, including your **central research question.**

Paragraph 2: **Summarizes your findings**. Include specific reference to the results of the data you collected. This should read a lot like an academic abstract.

When finished, share the results of your study with a person not in this class—preferably somebody who has some pre-existing opinion about Wikipedia’s validity and or/ comprehensiveness. Prepare to discuss the results of your sharing with the class.

## Project notes

* As validity measures, include at least the following metrics, plus 2 of your own:
  + A count of total sources cited in each article
  + The number of cited sources which contain a working link to the actual source
  + An assessment on a scale of your design of the reliability of each of the cited sources
* For comprehensiveness, include at least the following metrics, plus two of your own:
  + Number of words
  + Number of sections/headers in the article
  + Presence of any curation notices on the article, such as Wikipedia’s “Stub” declaration that means the topic is under-covered
  + A sentence written by the reviewing providing a subjective assessment of relevance to the chosen field of study
* Choose your three wikipedia articles strategically: based on a topic interesting to you, locate articles which relate to central ideas in that field. If you choose an obscure article, finding comparison articles on the Net can be difficult.
* For comparison articles, our goal is to find ones that are trying to accomplish a goal similar to Wikipedia, which is to assemble a set of sources and a summary of key concepts centered around a single idea.
  + Do not compare a wikipedia article to an academic journal article because academic journals are non-community curated and intended for an entirely different purpose than an encyclopedia
* Summarize your findings by averaging measures across your wikipedia articles and separately about your non-wikipedia articles.
* When sharing your project, consider including questions like these:
  + What is your current opinion about Wikipedia as an information source on the Web?
  + Who or what has influenced your views of Wikipedia?
  + Does my study seem to be designed well?
  + In what ways has reviewing this study impacted your view of Wikipedia?

## Assessment rubric

Proficiency on this task is defined as scoring a 2 or greater in all but one criterion.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Advanced (3)** | **Proficient (2)** | **Basic / Needs development (1)** | **Incomplete (0)** |
| ***Measure the validity and comprehensiveness of the articles using the given metrics and ones of your own design*** | All assigned metrics were developed into scoring scales and student-designed metrics were creative and thoughtful | Assigned metrics were used but student-designed metrics were ill-thought out | Only some of the assigned metrics were used, their scales undeveloped. Student did not create their own metrics. | Metrics were not used to assess the articles. |
| ***Design a spreadsheet data schema to capture and summarize your data*** | Spreadsheet is thoughtfully structured to present information neatly and aid in the aggregation of results. Formatting enhances readability | Spreadsheet organizes all necessary information.  Formatting was not adjusted to enhance the readability | Spreadsheet fails to logically organize the gathered information.  Formatting may distract from the comprehension of the data. | Data was not organized in a spreadsheet. |
| ***Use the spreadsheet tools to summarize and display your findings*** | Analysis functions included average() and at least one other metric, such as a count or variability.  Formula pasting was used. | Averages() were correctly calculated across metrics. Formula pasting was not used.  No additional tools were used. | Analysis functions were used but were implemented incorrectly .  No additional tools were used. | Analysis functions were not used. |
| ***Write a two-paragraph report on your research: one describing the purpose and the second describing your findings*** | The stated research question captures both the spirit of the project and reveals thought by the writer.  Report of findings is comprehensive and includes both data an interpretation of that data. | Research question is stated clearly but not elaborated upon.  Report of findings consists of a direct statement of summary statistics and does not elaborate. | Research question is muddled or incorrect.  Report of findings does not include evidence. | Report is incomplete or not present. |
| ***Share your project with somebody else and report on your conversation*** | Thorough questions were asked during the project sharing and reported to the class orally or in written form | Moderately thoughtful questions were asked during sharing, and those results were reported to the class | Superficial questions were asked and the results were not shared in a meaningful way with the class | Project not shared |