## 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 |