

# Evaluation Proposal For Final Project

Samar Singh and Ioanna Fergadiotou

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>General</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Expression of discomfort with proposed mode of evaluation . . . . .	2
1.2	Our specific concerns . . . . .	2
1.3	Caveats and purposes . . . . .	2
<b>2</b>	<b>Proposed process</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1	Task . . . . .	3
2.2	Process . . . . .	3
<b>3</b>	<b>Suggested issues for debate</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1	Selection of active members . . . . .	3
3.2	Defining subcategories . . . . .	3
3.3	Critique of published scores . . . . .	3

# 1 General

This initiative was stimulated by Samar's critique of the proposed mode of evaluation of final projects as expressed in the thread "Superlative: Most Humorous Assignment" and by Ioanna's subsequent communication. We have been having a debate on this topic over the last few days and this document is the result of that debate. I do not know how to link to that debate in our notifications section and would welcome a way to do it.

We are of the view that the debate between us has lent clarity to our thinking and believe that a wider debate on this could be both a confidence building process and at the same time lead to a more acceptable method for evaluation of the final project.

## 1.1 Expression of discomfort with proposed mode of evaluation

There has been some expression of discomfort with the idea of voting, as has been put forward from what we can see on the various threads. We attempt to suggest a way that as a community of students we could address those concerns and some concerns more specific to us.

## 1.2 Our specific concerns

- Participation levels are low as a percentage of the total population. About 1300 of about 18,000 students replied to the recent questionnaire and about 500 have replied to the current one. In addition the number of new posts per day seem to be very small. Hence voting is likely to reflect the opinions of a small fraction of our peers.
- Team members are allowed to vote each other up and down. This is fine except when it comes to team projects where bigger teams would have an advantage.
- Defining the parameters of performance in the final project should be centered around the DNLE theme and the parameters defined in the Syllabus i.e. Creativity and originality of system design, educationally sound, engagement and interactivity, accessibility, scalability and sustainability.
- An education system is driven by the social context. How does someone from another culture understand a system unless this issue is specifically addressed?
- The 10-20 chosen projects should be spread around the different categories of education as we have to meet many needs e.g. K12, primary, Early Childhood, University etc. and there are several others that we chose from when we joined the course.

## 1.3 Caveats and purposes

We make no claims to having developed a perfect system. It would be nice to see this evolve from the "wisdom of the crowd" of our peers. We are attempting to present a structure which should be the subject of debate. At the end of that debate we would like Prof Kim and his team to refine a protocol and explain to us how the protocol evolved from the debate.

In general our approach is to create a rubric which should:

- serve as a guideline for our peers presenting their projects
- define the ways in which some areas are given precedence over others
- allow teams to generate arguments for a particular rubric cell.
- allow other teams to evaluate another team's project
- allow Prof Kim and his team to choose the projects that will be specially lauded and if they so wish, to explain their choice.

# 2 Proposed process

Wherever we feel strongly that an issue should be the subject of debate we indicate that with a link to Section 3. Our peers may also choose any other issue for debate including complete rejection of this process.

## 2.1 Task

Define a process for selection of projects to be showcased after final projects have been submitted so that the process is rational and free from bias to the extent possible.

## 2.2 Process

1. Prof. Kim's team will define the categories and the number of projects to be showcased in each category as they have the data about the number of teams in each category and the number of students in each category. Categories are defined by Prof Kim's team based on the type of Proposed Project or Topic Area cited by a team on joining.
2. Teams should decide which members participated actively in the team to become eligible to participate in the debate and voting process, henceforth called Active members. This (Section 3.1) could depend on assignment completed and/or the degree of communication with fellow team members. Active members will engage in the evaluation process. Failure to do this will mean that it is possible to recruit new members who join specifically for voting.
3. Within each assigned category students will debate (Section 3.2) subcategories required. These subcategories will form rows of the first column of the rubric table titled Criterion.
4. The table will have 3 other columns which define:
  - a) lowest level of consistency with criterion
  - b) medium level of consistency with criterion
  - c) highest level of consistency with criterion

Criterion	low level of consistency (score=1)	medium level of consistency (score=2)	high level of consistency(score=3)
Category 1: Creativity and originality of the system design			
Criterion 1: Not a modification of an existing idea	Rubric Statement	Rubric Statement	Rubric Statement
Criterion 2: Creative logic explained	Rubric Statement	Rubric Statement	Rubric Statement

5. Prof. Kim's team will finalize the rubric table for each category based on students' debates.
6. Teams will develop final projects in accordance with the rubric and submit them.
7. Active members of the teams who submitted a project will be involved in evaluation. Each Active team member will need to evaluate at least 5 projects in their category and 2 beyond their category, providing in each case a justification for the score for each criterion. Score will range from 1 to 3 for each sub-criterion as shown in the table above. Active team members will have their scores counted if this 7 project evaluation requirement is fulfilled.
8. Projects will be ranked in categories, according to the average score they got. This can be the subject of debate. (Section 3.3)
9. Prof Kim's team will select the projects in each category that will be featured.

## 3 Suggested issues for debate

### 3.1 Selection of active members

There could be a debate on how to select active members.

### 3.2 Defining subcategories

The existing categories from the syllabus can form the basis for criteria. Two criteria have been shown for illustration.

### 3.3 Critique of published scores

Where a score seems to be inappropriate it can be debated by Active members.