

Assessment of Team and Group Work
Institutional Student Learning Outcome #2
Report to the Campus
2009-10

Prepared
By
The Executive Committee of the Assessment Commission

May 27, 2010

Contents

Executive Summary	1
Definition and performance criteria for team and group work	2
Description of assessment	2
Data collection	3
Data scoring	3
Data elements	3
Assessment results	3
Overall results for all teams: faculty	4
Overall results for all teams: students	5
Results by major: faculty	6
Results by major: students	7
Indirect assessment from Application to Graduate	7
Assessment reporting	7
Tables	
1: Faculty proficiency ratings, all teams	4
2: Student proficiency ratings, all teams	5
3: Faculty ratings of teams by major	6
4: Student ratings of teams by student major	7
Appendices	
A: OIT Team and Group Work Rubric	8
B: Faculty Reflection Form	10
C: Faculty Reflections on Teams	11

Executive Summary

During the 2009-10 academic year, the OIT Assessment Commission conducted an institutional assessment of team and group work. The assessment was based on six performance criteria:

Students will be able to:

1. Identify and achieve goal/purpose.
2. Assume roles and responsibilities as appropriate.
3. Interact appropriately with team/group members.
4. Recognize and help reconcile differences among team/group members.
5. Share appropriately in work of team/group.
6. Develop strategies for effective action.

The assessment was based on both faculty and student evaluations of team performance in required upper-division courses in the major and in SPE 321, Small Group and Team Communication. The assessment required a graded group project lasting over a period of time in the term, stable group membership, and a final product, such as a presentation, paper, or project. The students evaluated their teams using the OIT Team and Group Work rubric, both scoring and commenting on team performance. The faculty assessed team performance using a combination of factors—the student ratings of their teams, the quality of the team product, and their knowledge of what occurred in the teams. The faculty also used the same rubric, both scoring and commenting on team performance.

The institutional results indicated that student teams at the upper-division level demonstrated proficiency or high proficiency at a highly acceptable rate for all performance criteria, meeting and in most cases exceeding the Executive Committee's expectations. Similar results were demonstrated for student teams categorized by majors within OIT. Students, when asked to rate their team's performance, tended to rate their teams somewhat higher than the faculty did, but their overall results were similar to the faculty. In short, the assessment of teamwork at OIT demonstrated that this particular institutional learning outcome is a strength for the university.

Definition and performance criteria for team and group work

The Executive Committee of the Assessment Commission, in conjunction with the Communication Department, approved the following expectations and performance criteria for team and group work:

Most careers require that people work effectively in both teams and groups. Understanding the dynamics of team and group interactions is vital for success in many professions.

Expectation: Graduates should be able to accomplish group and team tasks, resolve conflict within groups and teams, while maintaining and building relationships within these groups. They should provide leadership and take different roles to enable groups to function effectively. These expectations may be met through specific coursework in group communication, through participation in group projects within courses, and through extracurricular activities related to the major.

Criteria for team assessment: Students will be able to

1. Identify and achieve goal/purpose.
2. Assume roles and responsibilities as appropriate.
3. Interact appropriately with team/group members.
4. Recognize and help reconcile differences among team/group members.
5. Share appropriately in work of team/group.
6. Develop strategies for effective action.

Description of assessment

The assessment included evaluation of student learning in both general education and program course work. General education assessment occurred in SPE 321, Small Group and Team Communication, a communication course required by most majors at OIT. Program assessment of team and group work occurred in selected courses that met the following criteria:

- The course was upper-division, required in the major, and taken after SPE 321 in the curriculum.
- The course included a group project lasting over a period of time during the term.
- The membership of each group in the course was stable during the term.
- Each group was expected to produce a product, such as a presentation, project or paper.
- In order to ensure student motivation in rating the group performance, the exercise counted in the students' grade for the course, with an appropriate weighting determined by the instructor.

Towards the end of each group's work together, the instructor asked each student to rate the group's performance, using the OIT Team and Group Work Rubric (Appendix A). This rubric contains the performance criteria listed above, was developed by the Communication Department, and was formally adopted for campus use by the Executive Committee of the Assessment Commission in February 2009.

The instructor then compiled all student ratings and examined them. Based on this student feedback, the instructor's own observations of the group, and the group's product, the instructor then completed a faculty reflection form (Appendix B) for each group. This form included faculty comments (Appendix C) and a proficiency score, based on the rubric, for each criterion.

Data collection

The Director of Assessment worked with the assessment coordinators and instructors to identify the appropriate courses, to provide electronic score sheets, to assist with class roster downloads of student IDs and names, and to compile all results for further analysis. The aggregated data for all courses were then submitted to the Director of Institutional Research for analysis.

Data scoring

Both students and faculty used the OIT Team and Group Work Rubric to score each group's performance. The rubric includes performance descriptions and a four-point proficiency scale from "1" (no/limited proficiency) to "4" (high proficiency).

Data elements

The data elements collected in this assessment process included:

- Student ID (from course rosters)
- Student last and first name (from course rosters)
- Course Reference Number (CRN)
- Subject, course, and section number (e.g., BIO 102-01)
- Group identifier
- Student scores for each of the six performance criteria listed on the rubric.
- Faculty scores for each of the six performance criteria for each group assessed.
- Faculty comments on each of the six performance criteria listed on the rubric, for each group assessed.

In addition, the Director of Institutional Research linked the above data elements to the student's major.

Assessment results

The Executive Committee of the Assessment Commission reviewed the results of this assessment.

Overall results for all teams: faculty

As described above, the faculty scored and commented on the performance of student teams using six performance criteria. A broad sample of OIT programs participated in the assessment. There were 82 teams and 314 students involved. The percentage of teams demonstrating proficiency or high proficiency for each criterion is shown in Table 1, and the accompanying faculty comments are summarized in Appendix C.

Performance Criteria	% at Proficiency	% at High Proficiency	Total at Proficiency/ High Proficiency
1. Identify/achieve goal/purpose	34.1	54.9	89.0
2. Assume roles/responsibilities	51.2	37.8	89.0
3. Interacts appropriately	35.4	52.4	87.8
4. Reconciles differences	35.4	53.7	89.1
5. Shares work appropriately	39.0	43.9	82.9
6. Develops strategies for effective action	36.6	51.2	87.8

Table 1. Faculty proficiency ratings, all teams

The Executive Committee of the Assessment Commission reviewed these overall results and found them to be quite acceptable. The committee felt that the student teams met and exceeded expectations for all performance criteria. These high results were not a surprise to the members, considering the emphasis on team activity across the institution. The committee also noted that:

- Faculty tended to rate teams as proficient, rather than highly proficient, in the areas of assuming roles/responsibilities and sharing work appropriately, compared to the other criteria in the assessment. In other words, the two lowest high proficiency ratings were in these two areas. The committee noted that these two criteria are often the greatest challenge for student teams, as well as the source of most student complaints about working together.
- Although the rubric spells out the differences between performance criteria, the committee noted that faculty rated students similarly on “interacts appropriately” and “reconciles differences.” The committee suggested that the distinction between these two criteria may be subtle for some faculty raters.

Overall results for all teams: students

The students were also asked to rate their team's performance using the same performance criteria as the faculty. The percentage of students rating their team as proficient or highly proficient for each criterion is shown in Table 2.

Performance Criteria	% at Proficiency	% at High Proficiency	Total at Proficiency/ High Proficiency
1. Identify/achieve goal/purpose	35.0	60.2	95.2
2. Assume roles/responsibilities	43.9	44.9	88.8
3. Interacts appropriately	30.3	62.1	92.4
4. Reconciles differences	33.1	60.5	93.6
5. Shares work appropriately	39.5	49.4	88.9
6. Develops strategies for effective action	29.6	62.4	92.0

Table 2. Student proficiency ratings, all teams

The Executive Committee noted that although students tended to rate team performance slightly higher than the faculty did, the overall evaluations of faculty and students were very similar. The committee felt that these student ratings validated the faculty ratings and supported the idea that the faculty saw the teams accurately in this assessment.

Results by major: faculty

The faculty ratings of teams were also analyzed by major. Because of small sample sizes for each major, student teams were clustered into four categories of majors for this analysis—arts & sciences, engineering, health, and management. It should be noted, however, that there were no arts and sciences teams assessed. This occurred because there was either no appropriate course involving teamwork during the period of data collection, or the program does not emphasize teamwork. The percentage of teams performing at proficiency or high proficiency by major is shown in Table 3. This table also includes the mixed-major teams that were assessed in SPE 321, a general education course in small group and team communication.

Performance Criteria	Engineering (30 teams)	Health (37 teams)	Management (4 teams)	Mixed Majors in SPE 321 (11 teams)
1. Identify/achieve goal/purpose	90.0%	89.2%	100%	81.8%
2. Assume roles/responsibilities	90.0%	89.2%	100%	81.8%
3. Interacts appropriately	86.7%	91.9%	50.0%	90.9%
4. Reconciles differences	90.0%	89.2%	75.0%	90.9%
5. Shares work appropriately	83.3%	83.8%	75.0%	81.8%
6. Develops strategies for effective action	80.0%	94.6%	75.0%	90.9%

Table 3. Faculty ratings of teams by major, percentage at proficiency or high proficiency.

The Executive Committee felt these results were also quite acceptable and that they were similar to the overall results discussed above. In addition, the committee noted that:

- The Management data should be viewed with caution due to the small number of teams assessed as compared with engineering and health majors. The committee identified the need for broader data collection in the management area for future assessments—perhaps identifying a greater selection of courses in the management majors or collecting data over a greater period of time—to ensure that assessment in management programs is comparable to the other groups of majors included in the assessment.
- The SPE 321 results were somewhat lower than those for engineering and health for criteria 1, 2, and 6. The committee felt there could be several reasons for this. The criteria for selecting an appropriate upper-division program course for this assessment specified that the course was to occur after SPE 321 in the program’s curriculum. Therefore, the student teams in the programs had already taken SPE 321, while the student teams in SPE 321 were currently engaged in learning small group and team concepts. The SPE 321 teams also included students with mixed majors who may have had differing interests in the team’s product or less familiarity with fellow team members than did the program teams.

Results by major: students

The student ratings of teams were also analyzed by the major of the student offering the rating. Again, because of small sample sizes, students were clustered into four categories of majors for this analysis—arts& sciences, engineering, health, and management. In this case, arts & sciences students were involved through their participation in SPE 321, a course that includes a mixture of students from different majors. The percentage of students rating their teams at proficiency or high proficiency is shown in Table 4.

Performance Criteria	Engineering Student Ratings n=120	Health Student Ratings n=161	Management Student Ratings n=15	Arts & Sciences Student Ratings n=18
1. Identify/achieve goal/purpose	91.7%	97.5%	100%	94.4%
2. Assume roles/responsibilities	82.5%	93.8%	100%	77.8%
3. Interacts appropriately	86.7%	95.7%	93.3%	100%
4. Reconciles differences	90.0%	95.6%	100%	94.4%
5. Shares work appropriately	82.5%	93.8%	100%	77.8%
6. Develops strategies for effective action	83.3%	98.2%	100%	88.8%

Table 4. Student ratings of teams by student major, percentage at proficiency or high proficiency.

The Executive Committee noted that, again, students tended to rate their teams slightly higher than the faculty did, but the results were similar. The committee also noted the small sample sizes for management and arts & sciences students and felt that these results should be viewed with caution.

Indirect assessment from Application to Graduate

As an additional indirect measure, the Executive Committee collected data from graduating seniors on their level of learning on the institutional student learning outcomes (ISLOs), which includes an item on teamwork. On a scale of 5 (1 being “none” and 5 being “exceptional”), graduating seniors rated their level of learning in teamwork at 4.1, or “substantial.” These results indicate a high level of agreement among graduating seniors and the faculty that they are able to demonstrate proficiency in teamwork. The data for the Petition to Graduate ISLO Survey are included in the Assessment Office records of this study, for future reference.

Assessment Reporting

The Director of Assessment, along with the Executive Committee of the Assessment Commission, will report the results of this assessment to the campus by email to the faculty list serve, by posting the final report on the assessment web site, and by a convocation presentation to the faculty. The Assessment Office will retain the final report and documentation of this assessment indefinitely.

Appendix A

OIT Team and Group Work Rubric, p. 1

Performance Criteria	No/Limited Proficiency (1)	Some Proficiency (2)	Proficiency (3)	High Proficiency (4)
Identify and Achieve Goal/purpose	Clear goals are not formulated or documented; thus all members don't accept or understand the purpose/task of the group. Group does not achieve goal.	Individuals share some goals but a common purpose may be lacking. Priorities may be unrealistic and documentation may be incomplete. Group may not achieve goal.	Group shares common goals and purpose. Some priorities may be unrealistic or undocumented. Group achieves goal.	When appropriate, realistic, prioritized and measurable goals are agreed upon and documented and all team members share the common objectives/purpose. Team achieves goal.
Assume Roles and Responsibilities	Members do not fulfill roles and responsibilities. Leadership roles are not defined and/or shared. Members are not self-motivated and assignments are not completed on time. Many members miss meetings	Some members may not fulfill roles and responsibilities. Leadership roles are not clearly defined and/or effectively shared. Some members are not motivated and some assignments are not completed in a timely manner. Meetings rarely include most members.	Members often fulfill roles and responsibilities. Leadership roles are generally defined and/or shared. Generally, members are motivated and complete assignments in a timely manner. Many members attend most meetings.	Members consistently and effectively fulfill roles and responsibilities. Leadership roles are clearly defined and/or shared. Members move team toward the goal by giving and seeking information or opinions, and assessing ideas and arguments critically. Members are all self-motivated and complete assignments on time. Most members attend all meetings.
Interact Appropriately	Members do not communicate openly and respectfully. Members do not listen to each other. Communication patterns foster a negative climate that undermines teamwork and contributes to a lack of trust and low morale. Humor used is not appropriate.	Members may not consistently communicate openly and respectfully. Members may not listen to each other. Humor used may not be appropriate at times.	Members usually communicate openly and respectfully. Members often listen to most ideas. Members usually support and encourage each other. Humor used is generally appropriate.	Members always communicate openly and respectfully. Members listen to each other's ideas. Members support and encourage each other. Communication patterns foster a positive climate that motivates the team and builds cohesion and trust. Humor used is always appropriate and motivating.

OIT Team and Group Work Rubric, p. 2

Performance Criteria	No/Limited Proficiency (1)	Some Proficiency (2)	Proficiency (3)	High Proficiency (4)
Reconcile Differences	Members do not welcome disagreement. Difference often results in voting. Decision processes increase ego involvement. Subgroups are present.	Few members welcome disagreement. Difference often results in voting. Decision processes reduce ego involvement. Some members respect and accept disagreement and work to account for differences. Subgroups may be present.	Many members welcome disagreement and use difference to improve decisions. Decision processes reduce ego involvement. Most members respect and accept disagreement and work to account for differences. Subgroups rarely present.	All members welcome disagreement and use difference to improve decisions. Decision processes reduce ego involvement. All members respect and accept disagreement and employ effective conflict resolution skills. Subgroups absent.
Share Appropriately	Contributions are unequal. Certain members dominate discussions, decision making, and work. Some members may not contribute at all. Individuals work on separate sections of the work product, but have no coordinating effort to tie parts together.	Contributions are unequal although all members contribute something to discussions, decision making and work. Coordination is sporadic so that the final work product is of uneven quality.	Many members contribute to discussions, decision-making and work. Individuals focus on separate sections of the work product, but have a coordinator who ties the disparate parts together (they rely on the sum of each individual's work)	All members contribute significantly to discussions, decision making and work. The work product is a collective effort; team members have both individual and mutual accountability for the successful completion of the work product.
Develop Strategies for Effective Action	Members seldom use decision making processes to decide on action. Individuals often make decisions for the group. The group does not share common norms and expectations for outcomes. Group fails to reach consensus on most decisions. Group does not produce plans for action.	Members sometimes use decision making processes to decide on action. Some of the members of the group do not share norms and expectations for outcomes. Group sometimes fails to reach consensus. Plans for action are informal and often arbitrarily assigned.	Members usually use effective decision making processes to decide on action. Most of the group shares norms and expectations for outcomes. Group reaches consensus on most decisions and produces plans for action.	Members use effective decision making processes to decide on action. Group shares a clear set of norms and expectations for outcomes. Group reaches consensus on decisions and produces detailed plans for action.

Appendix B
Faculty Reflection on Team and Group Work
Assessment of Institutional Student Learning Outcome (ISLO) #2

Date:

Instructor:

Course and section number:

Group Identifier (group 1, group 2, etc.):

How long did the group work together?

Did you prescribe the goal(s) for the group, or did they create them?

What were the students required to produce (presentation, paper, project, etc.)?

Please reflect on the student learning you have observed with the team or group that you are assessing. The performance criteria for the ISLO are listed below. What are the strengths and weaknesses that you see, either from direct observation, student products, or from student ratings and comments?

Performance Criteria	Comments	Score (using rubric)
1. Identify and achieve goal/purpose.		
2. Assume roles and responsibilities as appropriate.		
3. Team/group members interact appropriately.		
4. Recognize and help reconcile differences among team/group members.		
5. Team/group members share work appropriately.		
6. Develop strategies for effective action.		

Appendix C

Faculty Reflections on Teams Performance Criterion on Identify and achieve goal/purpose

- Project was very good
- Project was good.
- Still getting started with process
- Know each other well and have similar interest which helped group identify goals quickly.
- Some take assignment more seriously than others, which influences goal attainment.
- Have goals, but need to take more time together to execute goals.
- Team achieves goal each time
- Met goals second half of qtr
- Lacking common purpose
- This group achieved the purpose of the project which was to research and present data on the uses of PET bone imaging and compare to conventional imaging procedures.
- This group achieved the purpose of the project which was to research and present data on the uses of PET for CNS tumors and compare with conventional imaging like CT and MRI.
- This group achieved the purposes of the project which was to research and present data on the uses of PET for cardiac imaging and compare with conventional MPI imaging currently done in Nuclear Medicine.
- This group achieved the purpose of the project which was to research and present data on the uses of PET for thyroid imaging and compared to current I131 imaging for thyroid carcinoma.
- Goals were identified last term. Group is on track to achieve goals.
- Lots of brainstorming w/ one student rising as facilitator and organizer of goals.
- The team identified common goals, objectives, & target populations—some very promising situations became not as positive. The team is continuing to pursue other populations.
- Project goals & objectives already established, may be lack of ownership by all since they didn't create the goals & objectives.
- This group was very successful at identifying & achieving the purpose of this project.
- They floundered at first, trying to do an impossible project for OIT-PDX to support.
- Floundered at first pursuing overambitious projects. Then settled down.
- An incredible project. I thought undoable, but then I discovered that they were both master mechanics & employed as such.
- This team is mostly volunteers, not enrolled in the class, but it is not an employer project.
- High task performance
- Considering the interdisciplinary involvement that was needed, I was pleasantly surprised.
- Slow at first then picked up speed.
- The goal of building a functional unit at the end of the quarter was realistic but due to lack of planning and adherence to scheduling and improper prioritization, modules were not integrated on time.
- Did not achieve goal on time. Trouble rests with poor identification of goal and schedule documentation was not complete.
- The team proposed, planned, scheduled well. When problems arose, the goal-driven attitude, knowledge and diligence clearly drove essential work to overcome all difficulties.
- They exceeded expectations
- Required extra assistance w/ keeping the group focused on project goals and final products.
- This group identified project goals and stayed on task.
- Group clearly identified goals and worked efficiently to complete them.
- Group was very focused.

- Group would drift off task but come back together before the project deadline.
- These group members ultimately knew what they had to produce and had that final goal in mind. The group did not define the goal beyond the initial request for proposal nor did it create a framework to measure its success in order to succeed at a higher level.
- Well defined project goals and scope of work
- Some initial struggles in goal- and deadline-setting were significantly eased by implementation of a scheduling system for the group.
- I found that the students struggled initially with identifying a strategy to meet the prescribed goals. Eventually the team managed to achieve all required goals.
- The team is good identifying goals, but setting priorities is rather lacking. At the beginning of the project documentation was considered not important.
- Beautiful power point, very in-depth
- The students understood the goal of the assignment and met it.
- The students had clear goals and met them.
- The outcome of the project was of very high caliber which gave the appearance of quality group interaction. The actual group score was 3.6. Students apparently had forgotten teamwork skills from BUS class.
- The actual group score was 4.0. Students began by setting a time line, but had issues regarding team leadership with some students shared what they would and wouldn't do. The actual presentation demonstrated a lack of preparation and practice, but did have informative content.
- Some presenters were prepared, others seemed lost. Time management was not applied. Presentation suggestive of lack of practice. A single voice was not identified. Goals were unclear to some members. Student assessment of this criteria was 3.6 suggesting lack of clarity of the rubric or denial.
- The overall group worked well together. One team member failed to effectively participate throughout the project, and did not attend class the day of the scheduled presentation. However, the goal of the project was achieved
- 100% of team members participated equally and effectively. The presentation was very professional. Team members added special techniques that made the audience feel part of the presentation.

Performance Criterion on Assume Roles and Responsibilities

- One student assumed a lot of the burden.
- Satisfactory, although students did not assume variable roles.
- Some members want roles they shouldn't have. Others leave early to they can't fulfill a role.
- Developing roles but letting past roles dictate the level of responsibility.
- Roles and responsibilities are emerging.
- Some roles and responsibilities established, but much of this is ongoing.
- All members fulfill roles
- Most members fulfill roles
- Some not motivated/didn't fulfill responsibilities
- Second half qtr most fulfill roles
- All members appeared to have participated in this project equally and each shared equally in the presentation of the project
- All members appeared to have participated in this research and putting this project together equally, however two members dominated most of the presentation of the data.
- All members appeared to have equally participated in this research and putting this project together as well as presenting the data.
- Roles and responsibilities appear to be shared equally.
- All members assumed different roles that seemed to suit their individual strengths.
- There are some team members who are more actively involved than others.
- Some more willing to step up than others.

- I observed roles & responsibilities evenly distributed.
- Once settled down to a reasonable project, they became an exemplary group.
- Some team members consistently not present to assume roles
- Good communication, no strong leaders emerged, shared responsibilities
- One member did not fully participate, all others assumed roles
- Generally shared roles, some reluctant members
- Some confusion, but no hostility.
- Total partnership observed
- Leadership was not overall effective. Although motivation in all members was not problematic, the large amount of work did not equate to total success. Individual modules did accomplish 70% of proposed functionality.
- Team members assumed roles in accordance with plan. Motivation was not lacking but not exemplary either. Some procrastination was observed. Leader needs to push even more.
- Good leaders, efficient responsibilities and accountabilities up and down chain of command. This group far above others.
- Very relaxed and cooperative group.
- Group had trouble getting equal participation from all members.
- Members were good about dividing leadership roles. All members attended meetings I observed.
- Due to different schedules outside of class & some students being heavily involved in extracurricular activities, some members felt they had more responsibility.
- Group members all performed tasks as assigned and produced quality work.
- Members were present at all required meetings & moved forward under general consensus rather than strong leadership.
- Students found this to be difficult, but they are improving in this as the project moves forward.
- The roles within this group, while defined, were not embraced or necessarily nurtured. The individual members succeeded best when their tasks were defined and they could simply follow through. Defining those tasks and assigning responsibilities was more difficult.
- Developed a workable organizational chart for their team
- Group was well-led, with significant improvements occurring after first group dynamics meeting; discipline leaders stepped forward as necessary to maintain progress; group members were generally timely with their submittals, and worked to keep the rest of the group on schedule if their submittals were delayed.
- This was a work-in-progress, this group had some major difficulties in assuming responsibilities and this led to some discord. The problems were eventually solved.
- Collaboration was good and each member took responsibility.
- They each assumed roles and took responsibility.
- The group worked together well and drove to meet one another even though it was an online class.
- The group assessment was 3.1 suggesting that the group believed they met proficiency. Group members met with me independently with concerns related to member responsibility. The issues were eventually resolved. The group worked well during the presentation with equal presenting times and good use of time management.
- Group assessment was 3. The group was randomly selected. This presented with a problem for this group. The "natural" leaders repelled. The "queen of the hill" eventually wrote the paper and the "queen of the other kingdom" became withdrawn; not her natural demeanor.
- Students commented that they had difficulty scheduling meeting times. Communication was diminished. The majority of this group's membership was comprised of the younger, more irresponsible students. The group was randomly selected. Skills regarding role assignments-personal strengths were not considered. The goal was achieved, but did not meet with expected levels of performance.
- This group had scheduled meetings, assigned duties and followed through with all requirements, with the exception of one team member. The other's compensated for this deficit and met their timelines, and final objective
- The majority of the group used effective time management. One student got wordy which resulted in exceeding the time requirement.

Performance Criterion on Interact Appropriately

- Good communication an open to new ideas.
- Seem to respect each other.
- Members communicate appropriately both face to face and from distance.
- Respectful to each other as they maintain lines of communication.
- Open & effective communication
- Last few weeks good open communication
- Not always open communication
- The team members all interacted appropriately as far as I could assess.
- I have not heard of any dissension.
- Only heard complaint once. All members took part in meetings & were present.
- For the most part this is true. There is a member who is not as positive & sometimes affects overall climate.
- While meeting with me, team members interacted appropriately.
- Team choose to work on own then collaborate after. D___ tended to float on group. Little effort to include T___
- Respectful interaction, overcame age differences and communicated well.
- More could be done to encourage and/or listen to input from all members.
- G___ very little communication w/ group, little effort by group to include
- Very good
- Never a problem
- Team members got along and tried to work for common good. Interaction was essential and without conflict even when project did not meet complete success and was not on schedule.
- Members do not show outward hostility, however, leader was frustrated consistently. Yet he dealt with frustration professionally.
- I did not notice any serious problems with interactions. Perhaps interactions were required only at the interfacing period so little of it were noted.
- Very well.
- Group members always interacted very well together. This was part of problem indicated in note below (non-completion or project due to social event all involved in)
- Members worked well together in all class settings and no problems were reported from field work.
- Members all worked well together w/ some friction relating to 2 above.
- On points of contention, two of the strongest group members would argue points intensely but resolution was always found without instructor involvement.
- Always interacted well together.
- While the members of this group actually interacted quite well, there were occasional outbursts, miscommunications, and poor choices of humor. I think their maturity improved during this course considerably as they worked through these issues.
- Group sometimes made it difficult for the selected team leader
- Initial disagreements over communication styles were quickly addressed after/during first group dynamics meeting; some group members adapted to initial challenges by withdrawing from full vocal communication interaction (rather be quite than criticized)
- Despite some major clashes of personality, the group members found a way to interact with civility.
- Great
- Each member had good interaction.
- Good interaction.
- The group assessment was 3.1. During the creation of the project, the team members had individual and clique issues. Comments by members stated that they used conflict resolution skills resulting in attitude corrections. The presentation was organized. No attitude conflicts were apparent during the presentation.

- At presentation: Half of the group was truly unprepared; read scripts; got confused with their slides; used poor body language and a tone of voice that projected confrontation. No obvious team practice, poor time management use; poor communication.
- The five effective team members encouraged the remaining member and accepted delays in the content submitted by this member. Presentation met with time management, all members presented equally with the exception of the one member who was charged with sharing the information from the absent member who failed to notify any anyone.
- The team presented themselves as a cohesive group. They were prepared and organized. The initial presenter introduced the following presenter.

Performance Criterion on Reconcile Differences

-
- They managed without consulting the instructor
- Some disagreements, but have worked through them. Some subgroups exist.
- Have disagreements, but they don't cause a lot of conflict.
- Worked well together to figure out a topic for assignment.
- Seem to have few disagreements with each other to this point.
- Some open & effective conflict resolution second half of qtr
- Last few weeks good open communication
- Sub-groups present
- Eff conflict res 2nd half qtr
- I saw no differences, nor was I aware of any differences within the group that needed to be resolved or needed to be resolved and weren't.
- This group appears to function cohesively.
- Did not see any.
- No issues of conflict were displayed.
- I did not observe the group welcoming disagreement, rather it was avoided.
- When I am with the group they work well together. I suspect when I am not there, they may be more likely to have differences.
- While meeting w/ me team members did not demonstrate any differences.
- Now have become a working group
- One is doing most of the work because the other got diverted by his employer to do testing on the toyota gas pedal.
- Seemed to compromise rather than support answers
- No problems apparent.
- Team members work together to solve differences looking for support from resources
- No attempt to discuss when some members disagreed
- I saw very few internal differences. However, the group did need to reconcile with other groups involved in the project from other depts.
- I saw no differences. However, they did fail to attract others from outside the department to participate, which was a mild disappointment.
- No outward hostility, disagreement were noted. Some subgroup thinking between two against leader was noted.
- There were differences throughout project cycle. Leader is commended for overcoming and managing knowledge/ability differences of members.
- Little differences were noted since the goals were achieved. All actions and comments were constructive when differences in opinion exist.
- Opinions were expressed and dealt with appropriately.
- Group did not appear to have any conflict despite problems indicated in item 2.
- Group was able to handle minor differences easily.
- Members worked well together reconciling differences.

- Group had formulation of subgroups around two strong leaders.
- No group conflicts were observed.
- Voting was not necessary to make decisions within the group and subgroups did not form to isolate any other members of the team. Differences and unique ideas were generally welcomed.
- Group had some difficulty with conflict resolution
- Group worked internally to improve their recognition and handling of differences; group universally reports on effective problem solving/problem reduction atmosphere in their meetings.
- There was no problem recognizing the differences! The reconciliation took several weeks.
- Worked together very well all quarter.
- This group worked more independently on the project.
- Mutual cooperation.
- The group assessment was 3.1. The project began with disagreement and control issues. Within time, the group worked through their issues and presented with a united front. This was a good learning experience for this particular group.
- Recognizing difference was well demonstrated; however, reconciliation was not a strong point. The primary leader took charge in order to earn the points for the term. The leader was willing to do the brunt of the project to maintain her GPA. The others let her.
- Recognition of differences was perceived, but remained unresolved by most members. The students who were most interested in maintaining high GPA took charge and created the project. The slackers stayed in their comfort zone...let someone else do the work.
- During presentation the group found themselves in a difficult situation...an AWOL member. They met prior to their scheduled presentation to determine a course of successful action.
- Students made no comments regarding any differences. They followed the guidelines set forth in their business perquisite course and behaved as peers. Interestingly, the majority of this group consisted of the “more experienced” students. All accepted responsibility.

Performance Criterion on Sharing Work Appropriately

- There was variability in contributions.
- Some members don't share work evenly and don't always get the information to others.
- Members working together well and sharing appropriately.
- Getting together to share can be challenge.
- They share with each other effectively.
- Good fair sharing of work
- Last few weeks good open comm and sharing work
- Contrib unequal
- Second half qtr good distr work
- All team members appeared to share the work equally during the presentation.
- All team members helped in presenting the data, but two members dominated most of the presentation of the data.
- All team members shared equally in presenting the data.
- It appears that tasks are shared between group members.
- K-leader and early organizer for assessment (surveys); T-resources for donated supplies & or lessons & dates; J-budget & table top; A-minutes, writing up assignments.
- Some take on more responsibility than others.
- The main problem w/ this group is that one person takes on most of the work according to her timeline. Others then just step aside & are not as involved.
- From what the group shared with me during meetings, it seemed that work was evenly distributed.
- Half the people seem to be doing twice the work
- Each took their own exam 1st then shared answers

- All members gave input when working through exam questions, providing back up resources
- K___ participation low, some dominate personalities
- Divided up chapters but didn't seem to ask for individual input.
- Quite well
- Never a problem.
- Due to nature of the project, each of the three members is required to work on a separate module. When all modules are completed, the group interfaces them.
- Individuals were scheduled separate modules. Not all modules were completed when it came time for integration. Some members had to help others to complete their part of the work. This is to be expected.
- The workload was shared. Some took on more responsibility and contribute more than others. No complaints occurred on the differences of workload since the team members wanted to succeed.
- Division of work was mutually agreed upon.
- Project items that were supposed to include all members often included only a few. Group members tried harder to balance schedules than to insure equal participation.
- All members were present for all work.
- Workload was not evenly distributed.
- Despite episodes of internal conflict, all members did share equally in the work.
- Team members seemed to share work well.
- While there may have been some issues with how work was shared, the collaborative nature of the final product was very impressive.
- Shared work but more capable students devoted more time and energy into final product
- Not all group members are providing equal effort to the project, but all group members are participating and providing some level of effort; effort discrepancy has been masked by some of the higher-achieving/more motivated group members who have assumed any slack.
- There was some unevenness in the share of workload carried by this group and it will be reflected in their grade.
- Great sharing and collaboration.
- This group divided up the project and did their individual sections. The final project looked disjointed and separate.
- Divided it up equally and worked on the final presentation together.
- The product and presentations were of high caliber. If the issues hadn't been shared with me over the course of the project, I wouldn't have suspected issues. I agree with the group assessment of 4.
- One student took ownership of the project. Differences were unresolved and eventually the group presented portions of the project with the assumed leader presenting 1/3 of the project and the remaining 5 people 2/3. Presentation essence was "let's get this over with."
- This group was disconnected, lacked cohesion, due to some members' regard for the importance of teamwork. The presentation went overtime due to the failure to practice and team members whose participation was limited prior to the in-class assignment and lack of commitment. The students who took the project seriously saved the other team members
- The effective team members demonstrated excellent evidence of this. They avoided making commentary regarding the absent member and proceeded as professionals.
- Yes. Each member, with exception of one, gave equal presentation times, was well prepared and took the project seriously.

Performance Criterion on Developing Strategies for Effective Action

- They completed the project in the appropriate amount of time.
- Work well together to accomplish strategies but classes seem to get in the way at times.
- Use the opinions of others to develop group strategies and actions.
- Need more time with project to develop appropriate strategies.
- Hard to find time to develop group at significant level.

- Good strategies
- Yes
- Individual made decisions, not common norms
- Yes
- The members appeared to have made effective decisions that led to a presentation that contained the content required and also led to a well thought out presentation that was presented equally among the members of the group.
- The group is working well together toward implementation next term.
- Surveys, WIC, teen moms at KU, mommy and baby museum, physician training
- Good skills displayed.
- Strategies were already established, so this was not difficult.
- Group failed to reach consensus at times, but moved on.
- Group worked together to come to consensus and gave appropriate back up.
- Work together to find solutions and make sure there is agreement
- Little communication
- Good enough for this stage in their development.
- Good but I would have liked them to reach these strategies quicker.
- The problem rests with members having trouble with finishing modules. Since the module is assigned not to teams of 2 or more, when problems caused delays, effective action as a team did not come about to compensate.
- Although strategies were developed at onset of the project, difficulties were encountered. Half of the members were unable to change strategies to cope with developing problems. Other members eventually assisted but the solutions did not come in time to ensure that the project fulfills all specifications of original proposal.
- Again the original proposal and plan were well strategized. When trouble arose, team members eventually come to consensus on solutions.
- Everyone was involved and worked to achieve end.
- Group worked on a "whomever available" model vs a thought out action plan.
- Members did not seem to have an action plan. They simply met & worked & achieved project goals.
- Despite pressures from outside schedules, members developed effective plans and got the work done.
- More project planning may have helped reduce some of the group conflict.
- Seemed to have no clear overall strategy, but performed individual tasks well to create decent finished products.
- This group was fairly good at working together to develop strategies for action. Their interactions led to synergistic ideas and they delegated tasks well. The extroverted nature of most of the members meant that they all put forth ideas and responded with constructive criticism.
- Team did adjust schedule and resources when necessary
- Group may be one of the most agreeable senior design teams I've known; they excel at reaching decisions that everyone in the group can support sufficiently to maintain progress.
- Ultimately the group succeeded in meeting their objective.
- Met this with flying colors.
- They came up with a good final project.
- Yes, broke down the power point into sections but gave it a feeling that they worked together the entire way through.
- The group worked through their issues and reached consensus. The group assessment of 3.8 is accurate. Once the project got underway and the roles were truly clarified, the students were successful.
- Total lack of effective decision making skills. This group either failed to take the prerequisite business course at OIT or "crammed and dumped" the material. Students provided minimal response to instructor's suggestions for improvement.
- Overall, this was a dysfunctional group. I have doubts regarding the effectiveness of patient care and finishing assigned tasks for half of this team's membership in their senior/externship year. The group kept their problems to themselves prior to presentation. Instruction assessment was met without response from 83% of the group. Only

one student sought input regarding how to improve this situation. Once addressed she stated that these were skills covered in the prerequisite business class and skills that, obviously, were not applied in this project.

- Team worked effectively and professionally. They appeared to use the skills covered in their business course as well as project management tools.
- This group gave an excellent presentation. Effective decision making was evident in their paper and especially in the presentation. They maintained a “single voice.”