STAT 021 S22 Final Project Peer Evaluation

Christopher Meng

TOTAL POINTS

(not graded)

QUESTION 1

1 Evaluation A **5 / 5**

QUESTION 2

2 Evaluation B

Your name: Christopher Meng (he/him)

Group scores: Overall, I think everyone did exceptionally, and it was definitely one of the more positive group project experiences that I had. Despite our busy and often conflicting schedules, it didn't feel hard to get people to meet on a relatively consistent basis, and everyone got everything done by the deadlines that we set for ourselves. The differences between 3 and 4 are fairly trivial, and I would personally give everyone in this group a very good grade. The reason I didn't give anybody a 4 for "Focus, Commitments" was because my interpretation of "almost always focused on the task" means that we're working on the project almost 100% of the time when we're together. Sometimes, we would naturally have side conversations while we were waiting for someone to come back or situate themselves, or someone would respond or read time-sensitive messages; I think that's very normal and not necessarily a bad thing.

	Christopher	**Jess**	**Shikha**	**Xinxin**
Contributions & Attitude	4	4	4	4
Cooperation with Others	4	4	4	4
Focus, Commitments	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
Team Role Fulfillment	3.5	4	3.5	4
Ability to Communicate	4	4	4	3.5
Accuracy	4	3.5	3.5	4
Total points	23	23	22.5	23

Notes and Comments for Jess:

To me, Jess was the "leader" of the group in the conventionally-defined way. I felt like she took the most initiative in organizing meetings, starting discussions, and asking pertinent logistical questions. I think Jess' work style is more to get a draft done and revise later. She gave her thoughts and feedback on others' work, and I likewise did with her work. So, we worked together well in that way, but that was the reason why I gave a 3.5 for "Accuracy" as I often saw her thoughts as she was working through them. However, she really cleans up her work well when she goes through revisions; I was particularly impressed with her role in transforming our poster to its final form. (In terms of team dynamics, Jess and I often worked as a pair as we live in the same hall, and Shikha and Xinxin often worked together as I believe they have another class together.) Overall, I think Jess was the first one to take charge and move our group along as she really wanted to do well on this project, but I'm also confident that someone else in our group would have done that role too if she hadn't.

Notes and Comments for Shikha:

I felt like Shikha was very dependable, and we could count on her to get her parts done. She is more of a quieter personality from what I know of her, so she didn't usually assume the conventional "leadership" position. However, she set very clear boundaries on what she could do, when she could get things done, and when she could meet, which I appreciated. She was very cooperative and focused on the tasks at hand. I didn't give her a 4 for accuracy because there was one part of her write-up that people thought didn't really answer the prompts and didn't flow as well as it could have been? However, Shikha stated early on something to the effect that writing was not her preference, and I also keep in mind that, to the best of my knowledge, Shikha and Xinxin are both international students? As someone trained in writing center pedagogy, I look more for meaning/ideas than the exact form or style of writing, and I thought she discussed her section carefully. Overall, I wish I got to know Shikha a bit better, and I appreciate her attention to detail and that she was very easy to work with.

Notes and Comments for Xinxin:

Xinxin took charge of setting up the initial Excel file and combining data from different sources so that we could have information for each predictor for all states (and D.C.). I see her as a very independent worker who is able to take initiative and also ask questions when she doesn't understand something. There was one time when I felt some murmurs of potential frustration in the group when she made a decision about the data without consulting the rest of us, but I personally didn't mind and appreciated how she got things done. I also appreciate how her ideas help guide our discussions in new directions, or she always helps put a fresh perspective on questions we have or concepts that we are trying to clarify. Overall, I also enjoyed working with Xinxin, and I greatly respect her thoughtfulness that she puts into her work and especially how she was able to communicate effectively asychronously (something that I want to work on doing better in terms of concision and leaving behind my notes/thoughts!).

Self-Reflection:

I had the most prior stats and R experience in the group, so I ended up taking the lead on several of the coding parts of the project such as the assessment (with and without DC), cross-validation, and data visualization, while collaborating with Jess. (Shikha and Xinxin worked on the main part of model selection.) Having also presented academic posters and written a paper for stats class before, I provided a poster template and big-picture support in the write-up and the poster, in terms of content/ideas and what to include and not include. I wasn't able to attend one of the meetings because that was the weekend that I found out about my grandmother's passing, but otherwise, I've generally been very responsive to the group and completing my roles on time and in detail. I was a bit worried about navigating group dynamics based on prior experiences, but I'm overall very pleased with my role in the group and how we all worked together.

Your name: Christopher Meng (he/him)

Group scores: Overall, I think everyone did exceptionally, and it was definitely one of the more positive group project experiences that I had. Despite our busy and often conflicting schedules, it didn't feel hard to get people to meet on a relatively consistent basis, and everyone got everything done by the deadlines that we set for ourselves. The differences between 3 and 4 are fairly trivial, and I would personally give everyone in this group a very good grade. The reason I didn't give anybody a 4 for "Focus, Commitments" was because my interpretation of "almost always focused on the task" means that we're working on the project almost 100% of the time when we're together. Sometimes, we would naturally have side conversations while we were waiting for someone to come back or situate themselves, or someone would respond or read time-sensitive messages; I think that's very normal and not necessarily a bad thing.

	Christopher	Jess	Shikha	Xinxin
Contributions & Attitude	4	4	4	4
Cooperation with Others	4	4	4	4
Focus, Commitments	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
Team Role Fulfillment	3.5	4	3.5	4
Ability to Communicate	4	4	4	3.5
Accuracy	4	3.5	3.5	4
Total points	23	23	22.5	23

Notes and Comments for Jess:

To me, Jess was the "leader" of the group in the conventionally-defined way. I felt like she took the most initiative in organizing meetings, starting discussions, and asking pertinent logistical questions. I think Jess' work style is more to get a draft done and revise later. She gave her thoughts and feedback on others' work, and I likewise did with her work. So, we worked together well in that way, but that was the reason why I gave a 3.5 for "Accuracy" as I often saw her thoughts as she was working through them. However, she really cleans up her work well when she goes through revisions; I was particularly impressed with her role in transforming our poster to its final form. (In terms of team dynamics, Jess and I often worked as a pair as we live in the same hall, and Shikha and Xinxin often worked together as I believe they have another class together.) Overall, I think Jess was the first one to take charge and move our group along as she really wanted to do well on this project, but I'm also confident that someone else in our group would have done that role too if she hadn't.

Notes and Comments for Shikha:

I felt like Shikha was very dependable, and we could count on her to get her parts done. She is more of a quieter personality from what I know of her, so she didn't usually assume the conventional "leadership" position. However, she set very clear boundaries on what she could do, when she could get things done, and when she could meet, which I appreciated. She was very cooperative and focused on the tasks at hand. I didn't give her a 4 for accuracy because there was one part of her write-up that people thought didn't really answer the prompts and didn't flow as well as it could have been? However, Shikha stated early on something to the effect that writing was not her preference, and I also keep in mind that, to the best of my knowledge, Shikha and Xinxin are both international students? As someone trained in writing center pedagogy, I look more for meaning/ideas than the exact form or style of writing, and I thought she discussed her section carefully. Overall, I wish I got to know Shikha a bit better, and I appreciate her attention to detail and that she was very easy to work with.

Notes and Comments for Xinxin:

Xinxin took charge of setting up the initial Excel file and combining data from different sources so that we could have information for each predictor for all states (and D.C.). I see her as a very independent worker who is able to take initiative and also ask questions when she doesn't understand something. There was one time when I felt some murmurs of potential frustration in the group when she made a decision about the data without consulting the rest of us, but I personally didn't mind and appreciated how she got things done. I also appreciate how her ideas help guide our discussions in new directions, or she always helps put a fresh perspective on questions we have or concepts that we are trying to clarify. Overall, I also enjoyed working with Xinxin, and I greatly respect her thoughtfulness that she puts into her work and especially how she was able to communicate effectively asychronously (something that I want to work on doing better in terms of concision and leaving behind my notes/thoughts!).

Self-Reflection:

I had the most prior stats and R experience in the group, so I ended up taking the lead on several of the coding parts of the project such as the assessment (with and without DC), cross-validation, and data visualization, while collaborating with Jess. (Shikha and Xinxin worked on the main part of model selection.) Having also presented academic posters and written a paper for stats class before, I provided a poster template and big-picture support in the write-up and the poster, in terms of content/ideas and what to include and not include. I wasn't able to attend one of the meetings because that was the weekend that I found out about my grandmother's passing, but otherwise, I've generally been very responsive to the group and completing my roles on time and in detail. I was a bit worried about navigating group dynamics based on prior experiences, but I'm overall very pleased with my role in the group and how we all worked together.