

STAT 021 S22 Final Project Peer Evaluation

Lizbeth Zarate-Hernandez

TOTAL POINTS

(not graded)

QUESTION 1

1 Evaluation A 5 / 5

QUESTION 2

2 Evaluation B

Your name: Lizbeth Zarate-Hernandez

Group scores: 71 total points

	Self	Tyrique Arthur	Joanne Miao	
Contributions & Attitude	4	4	4	
Cooperation with Others	4	4	4	
Focus, Commitments	4	4	4	
Team Role Fulfillment	4	4	4	
Ability to Communicate	4	4	4	
Accuracy	3	4	4	
Total points	23	24	24	

Notes and Comments for self:

I'm not going to talk too much about myself since there is a bias.

-My job was to take care that the codes that we were using were correct and relevant. I also work on background details such as checking whether r recognized categorical variables as factors. I took care of constantly knitting out of fear that something would happen to r-studio

-I was also a writer and talked with others about my interpretations with the final model we chose to present in the end and the conclusions derived from our findings.

-I read the Glassdoor report, so we can report accurate findings about our dataset. Also to be prepared if anyone had questions about our dataset since our situation was unique since we had a hypothetical data set.

-I gave myself a 3 in Accuracy because I did my work on time, but there was an error in one of my writings about our discussion and limitation section. With the help of others in my group, I was able to clarify my interpretation. Since I finished my work in time, I was able to correct my mistake before turning it in.

Notes and Comments for Tyrique Arthur:

-Tyrique had a positive attitude while working together and came to every meeting

- He routinely offered ideas to the group with respect to the methods we were applying to the dataset such as considering Cook's distance and other methods to measure influential points. But after discussing the possibilities, we rejected it because it wasn't applicable to our dataset. It was relevant to the main takeaway and conclusion.
- Tyrique along with Joanne did a lot of code for the tests of assumption while discussing with me if they were applicable and if the code were correct (for the first few days, r-studio didn't allow me to write in the share file because it wouldn't save my part since it wasn't in sync)
- He was focused on the work assigned to him at hand but was open to questions about other sections if we needed help or input.
- He fulfilled his part when writing his section and was not afraid to ask others for our opinion with how he was going about a certain topic.
- Also he never got irritated when someone in the group had questions about his work or the way he would phrase findings and conclusions(we were all careful with how we stated things since statistics is one of those subjects where you have to be careful if you are asserting an idea or findings).
- He didn't shy away from giving effective feedback respectfully that would help further our understanding of our analysis.
- He finished his work in time, so we all could go over the whole report and poster in search of any grammatical errors and incorrect statements.

Notes and Comments for Joanne Miao:

- Joanne was focused on time management while working together and came to every meeting
- Joanne, in my opinion, naturally took a leadership role because she would check with everyone whether everyone was available at certain times for meetings
- As the oldest one, with more experience with group projects, she had a timeline she wanted to stick to and communicated it to us
- Part of why we were able to pace and distribute our work was thanks to Joanne because she kept us focused until we reached our goal after every meeting.
- When there were disagreements, she would listen to both side and moderate the discussions if needed
- She would ask and/or provide practical feedback concerning interpretations and statements about our analysis.
- Would provide additional information if necessary such as noticing that exploratory variables are missing in our report and the possibility of introducing random sampling to meet critical assumptions.
- She was well organized with her work, so it wasn't hard to read through her notes and comments about the code and writing she did throughout the project.
- Joanne also would remind us of what other possible ways we could look at our results

Notes and Comments as a group:

I am happy and satisfied with my group. We worked diligently on this project in all aspects. There were times that we, as a group, felt that we weren't doing enough tests or applying more methods, but we realized that the purpose of this project was to use the appropriate

Your name: Lizbeth Zarate-Hernandez

Group scores: 71 total points

	Self	Tyrique Arthur	Joanne Miao	
Contributions & Attitude	4	4	4	
Cooperation with Others	4	4	4	
Focus, Commitments	4	4	4	
Team Role Fulfillment	4	4	4	
Ability to Communicate	4	4	4	
Accuracy	3	4	4	
Total points	23	24	24	

Notes and Comments for self:

I'm not going to talk too much about myself since there is a bias.

-My job was to take care that the codes that we were using were correct and relevant. I also work on background details such as checking whether r recognized categorical variables as factors. I took care of constantly knitting out of fear that something would happen to r-studio

-I was also a writer and talked with others about my interpretations with the final model we chose to present in the end and the conclusions derived from our findings.

-I read the Glassdoor report, so we can report accurate findings about our dataset. Also to be prepared if anyone had questions about our dataset since our situation was unique since we had a hypothetical data set.

-I gave myself a 3 in Accuracy because I did my work on time, but there was an error in one of my writings about our discussion and limitation section. With the help of others in my group, I was able to clarify my interpretation. Since I finished my work in time, I was able to correct my mistake before turning it in.

Notes and Comments for Tyrique Arthur:

-Tyrique had a positive attitude while working together and came to every meeting

- He routinely offered ideas to the group with respect to the methods we were applying to the dataset such as considering Cook's distance and other methods to measure influential points. But after discussing the possibilities, we rejected it because it wasn't applicable to our dataset. It was relevant to the main takeaway and conclusion.
- Tyrique along with Joanne did a lot of code for the tests of assumption while discussing with me if they were applicable and if the code were correct (for the first few days, r-studio didn't allow me to write in the share file because it wouldn't save my part since it wasn't in sync)
- He was focused on the work assigned to him at hand but was open to questions about other sections if we needed help or input.
- He fulfilled his part when writing his section and was not afraid to ask others for our opinion with how he was going about a certain topic.
- Also he never got irritated when someone in the group had questions about his work or the way he would phrase findings and conclusions(we were all careful with how we stated things since statistics is one of those subjects where you have to be careful if you are asserting an idea or findings).
- He didn't shy away from giving effective feedback respectfully that would help further our understanding of our analysis.
- He finished his work in time, so we all could go over the whole report and poster in search of any grammatical errors and incorrect statements.

Notes and Comments for Joanne Miao:

- Joanne was focused on time management while working together and came to every meeting
- Joanne, in my opinion, naturally took a leadership role because she would check with everyone whether everyone was available at certain times for meetings
- As the oldest one, with more experience with group projects, she had a timeline she wanted to stick to and communicated it to us
- Part of why we were able to pace and distribute our work was thanks to Joanne because she kept us focused until we reached our goal after every meeting.
- When there were disagreements, she would listen to both side and moderate the discussions if needed
- She would ask and/or provide practical feedback concerning interpretations and statements about our analysis.
- Would provide additional information if necessary such as noticing that exploratory variables are missing in our report and the possibility of introducing random sampling to meet critical assumptions.
- She was well organized with her work, so it wasn't hard to read through her notes and comments about the code and writing she did throughout the project.
- Joanne also would remind us of what other possible ways we could look at our results

Notes and Comments as a group:

I am happy and satisfied with my group. We worked diligently on this project in all aspects. There were times that we, as a group, felt that we weren't doing enough tests or applying more methods, but we realized that the purpose of this project was to use the appropriate

statistical techniques to address our question and think of how our findings can be interpreted beyond this project. In our case it was about the ethics revolving around the transparency of companies' methods used to derive a conclusion about their self reported wage gap assessment and the history revolving around women in workplaces that are predominantly men led.

We spent so much time on this project. Sometimes we would stay up (from 7pm) until 11 or 12 on most nights after getting feedback on our proposal until the day of the presentation. At some point, it felt like we were studying for the final exam since we were considering all correct and relevant options we had yet to consider and think deeper about our analysis and of our data. After making all our models and checking our conditions, we as a group discussed how we wanted to proceed by choosing a top model and sticking to it. Also, along the way, we deliberated possible questions that people could ask us based on our presentation. As a group we try to keep others in check by asking questions whether our statements are correct or not. This system worked because we would ask respectfully if someone's work required additional information to understand and offered helpful insights when needed. We would usually reach our daily target after every meeting and discuss as a group the changes and findings that could change our course of action for the next day's meeting. We work more as a group, in the same room rather than everyone doing their things at separate times. It was important to us that our work was consistent with each others' work and findings.

2 Evaluation B