

Communication Studies Program Assessment Report 2009-2010

I. Introduction of the Communication Studies Major Program

The Communication Studies program offers courses in a variety of communication contexts, including technical, rhetorical, interpersonal, group, and organizational communication. The program serves primarily Communication Studies majors, but also serves a group of students in other fields interested in communication-related course work to complement their chosen major.

II. Program Purpose, Mission Statement, and Objectives

Program Purpose, Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes

During fall 2009, Communication faculty reviewed the current program objectives and learning outcomes to provide feedback for change to the program. All of the most recent modifications to the program mission, educational objectives, and learning outcomes are included in the sections below. Although the student learning detailed in this report was assessed in a classroom setting, students had other opportunities to demonstrate their learning in Communication student clubs, honor societies, externships, and regional academic conferences.

Communication Studies Program Mission Statement

The Communication Studies Program prepares students for the challenges of a society which is informed, persuaded, entertained, and shaped by communication. Students develop and integrate knowledge, creativity, ethical practice, and skills related to communication. Students also examine and produce work in oral, written, and visual communication and practice skills in group and intercultural communication.

Program Education Objectives

After completion of the Communication Studies program, students should be able to:

1. Apply appropriate communication skills in their lives.
2. Demonstrate knowledge of communication theory and application in professional and academic endeavors.
3. Practice critical thinking to develop innovative and well-founded perspectives.
4. Build and maintain healthy and effective relationships.
5. Demonstrate appropriate and professional ethical behavior.

Expected Program Student Learning Outcomes

Students with a bachelor's degree in Communication Studies should be able to:

1. Demonstrate critical and innovative thinking.
2. Display competence in oral, written, and visual communication.
3. Apply communication theories.
4. Show an understanding of opportunities in the field of communication.
5. Use current technology related to the communication field.
6. Respond effectively to cultural communication differences.
7. Communicate ethically.
8. Exhibit productive group communication exchanges.

III. Three-Year Cycle for Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

The eight learning outcomes will be assessed, two or three each year, on a three-year cycle as demonstrated in Table 1.

Learning Outcomes	'09-'10	'10-'11	'11-'12	'12-'13	'13-'14	'14-'15
PSLO 1: Critical Thinking		•			•	
PSLO 2: Competence in Comm		•			•	
PLSO 3: Communication Theory		•			•	
PSLO 4: Opportunities in Field			•			•
PSLO 5: Use of Technology			•			•
PSLO 6: Cultural Communication			•			•
PSLO 7: Ethics	•			•		
PSLO 8: Group Communication	•			•		

Table 1. Communication Studies Assessment Cycle

IV. Summary of 2009-2010 Assessment Activities

The Communication Studies faculty conducted formal assessment of two student learning outcomes during 2009-2010. A summary mapping the PSLOs to the program curriculum map is found in the appendix of this document (See Appendix A).

Student Learning Outcome 7: Students with a bachelor's degree in Communication Studies should be able to communicate ethically.

Direct Assessment

This outcome was assessed in Communication 326: Communication Research during fall 2009 using an ethics assignment completed by 9 of 11 students enrolled in the course. Two Communication Studies faculty members reviewed the assignment using rubric criteria contained in Table 2 to measure student proficiency (See Appendix B for ethics assignment and complete rubric).

Performance Criteria	Assessment Method	Measurement Scale	Minimum Acceptable	Results
Ability to list, provide reason for importance, and apply an example of provision.	Questionnaire, rubric	1-4 scale	80% at 3 or 4	89%
Using code of ethics, describes ethical issues	Questionnaire, rubric	1-4 scale	80% at 3 or 4	100%
Describes parties involved and discusses their points of view	Questionnaire, rubric	1-4 scale	80% at 3 or 4	100%
Describes and analyzes possible/alternative approaches	Questionnaire, rubric	1-4 scale	80% at 3 or 4	89%
Chooses an approach and explains the benefits and risks	Questionnaire, rubric	1-4 scale	80% at 3 or 4	100%

Table 2 Faculty Assessment Results for SLO7 in COM 326 Fall 09

Areas of Competence

After analysis of the student responses, the reviewers found areas of strength in the following categories:

1. All students (100%) demonstrated proficiency in using the National Communication Association **code of ethics to describe ethical issues** within a research context.
2. All students (100%) demonstrated proficiency in **describing parties** that should be involved in the ethical situation. They were proficient in **discussing viewpoints** of the parties involved in the given scenario.
3. All students (100%) were proficient in **describing the risks and benefits of chosen approaches** from the given scenario.
4. Most students (89%) demonstrated proficiency in **describing and analyzing alternatives**. They were able to describe and analyze at least two alternatives and the effects of the alternatives on the parties involved.
5. Most students (89%) demonstrated proficiency in listing **important provisions** from the National Communication Association code of ethics and being able to explain why the provisions were important. They also demonstrated proficiency in applying examples to the provisions.

Areas of Improvement:

1. One students (representing 11% of students assessed) did not demonstrate proficiency in the area of **describing and analyzing alternatives**.
2. In the provisions segment of the assessment, one student (representing 11% of students assessed) was not able to do one of the following: identify three important provisions from the National Communication Association code of ethics, explain why the provisions were important, or demonstrate proficiency in applying examples to the provisions.

Other Area of Consideration

1. The number of students participating in the course used for this assessment was relatively small, so the number of participants was only nine, representing approximately 15% of the population of students in the Communication Studies program.
2. More than one code of ethics exists for students in Communication Studies. This assessment only considered the National Communication Association code of ethics related to research.

Plans for Improvement:

Although the results of this assessment did not indicate that any of the performance criteria fell below expected proficiency, the following actions should be considered:

1. Place increased emphasis on **understanding and analyzing alternatives** for ethical versus unethical behavior by adding an ethics component to one sophomore, junior, and senior level course in the major.
2. **Increase the exposure** students have to appropriate discipline codes of ethics by having students consider a variety of communication ethical codes, including but

not limited to the National Communication Association (NCA), the Society of Professional Journalists (SPJ), the Public Relations Society of America (PRSA), the International Association of Business Communicators (IABC), and the Society for Technical Communication (STC).

3. In order to increase the number of Communication Majors assessed, COM 255: Communication Ethics should be used as part of the Communication Studies ethics assessment when re-administered in three years.

Student Learning Outcome 8: Students with a bachelor’s degree in Communication Studies should be able to exhibit productive group communication exchanges.

Direct Assessment

This outcome was assessed in the Communication 407: Rhetoric of Disaster course during spring 2010. Ten of 14 students in the course (gathered into four teams) were asked to review their teams using the OIT Team and Group Work rubric. Two Communication Studies faculty members then considered student responses and rated student group proficiency (not individual proficiency) using the same rubric followed by the students (See Appendix C for complete rubric). Table three summarizes the faculty assessment of the students.

Performance Criteria	Assessment Method	Measurement Scale	Minimum Acceptable	Results
Identify and achieve goal/purpose	Questionnaire, rubric	1-4 scale	80% at 3 or 4	100%
Assume Roles and Responsibilities	Questionnaire, rubric	1-4 scale	80% at 3 or 4	100%
Interact Appropriately	Questionnaire, rubric	1-4 scale	80% at 3 or 4	100%
Reconcile Differences	Questionnaire, rubric	1-4 scale	80% at 3 or 4	50%
Share Appropriately	Questionnaire, rubric	1-4 scale	80% at 3 or 4	75%
Develop Strategies for Effective Action	Questionnaire, rubric	1-4 scale	80% at 3 or 4	100%

Table 3. Faculty Assessment Results for SLO 8 in COM 407 Spring 10.

Areas of Competence

After faculty analysis of group and team work, the reviewers found areas of strength in the following categories:

1. All student groups (100%) **shared common goals** and worked toward achieving the goals.
2. All student groups (100%) **assumed appropriate roles** within their groups and were motivated to complete group work.
3. All student groups (100%) **interacted appropriately** by communicating openly and respectfully with one another, resulting in a positive group climate.
4. All student groups (100%) **developed strategies for effective action**, meaning they used effective decision making processes to arrive at group consensus.

Areas of Improvement

1. Half of the student groups (50%) did not demonstrate effective **reconciliation of differences**. Some groups ineffectively dealt with differences of work process and scheduling.
2. One group (representing 25% of all groups assessed) showed an inability to **share appropriately**, meaning that group member contributions were unequal and group coordination was sporadic.

Other Areas of Consideration

1. In most cases the groups performed exceptionally; however, it should be recognized that an entire group can seem ineffective based upon the actions of one group member.
2. One of the groups assessed had only one member respond to the assessment.
3. Percentages are based on the evaluation of four groups. Given the small sample size, ineffectiveness could be magnified.
4. Assessment was performed relatively early in the quarter (week 7).

Plans for Improvement:

1. During fall 2010, determine courses in the major where the importance of **reconciling group differences** and **appropriate sharing** can be reemphasized and practiced.
2. Assessment of group communication should be done later in the quarter after students have had longer to interact with their groups (week 10).
3. Group communication will be reassessed during 2010-2011.

Indirect Assessment: As mentioned above, ten of 14 students in the COM 407: Rhetoric of Disaster course used the rubric to measure the proficiency of their group members in the area of group communication (see Appendix C for rubric). The results of this assessment are summarized in Table 4.

Performance Criteria	Assessment Method	Measurement Scale	Minimum Acceptable	Results
Identify and achieve goal/purpose	Questionnaire, rubric	1-4 scale	80% at 3 or 4	100%
Assume Roles and Responsibilities	Questionnaire, rubric	1-4 scale	80% at 3 or 4	90%
Interact Appropriately	Questionnaire, rubric	1-4 scale	80% at 3 or 4	100%
Reconcile Differences	Questionnaire, rubric	1-4 scale	80% at 3 or 4	100%
Share Appropriately	Questionnaire, rubric	1-4 scale	80% at 3 or 4	90%
Develop Strategies for Effective Action	Questionnaire, rubric	1-4 scale	80% at 3 or 4	100%

Table 4. Student Assessment Results for SLO 8 in COM 407 in Spring 10.

Areas of Competence

After student analysis of group and team work, the reviewer found areas of strength in the following categories:

1. All students (100%) perceived that members of their group **shared common goals** and worked toward achieving goals.
2. All students (100%) perceived that members of their group **interacted appropriately** by communicating openly and respectfully with one another, resulting in a positive group climate.
3. All students (100%) perceived that members of their group worked effectively to **reconcile differences** by welcoming disagreement and respecting each other despite disagreement.
4. All students (100%) perceived that members of their group **developed strategies for effective action**, meaning they used effective decision making processes to arrive, in most cases, at group consensus.

Areas of Improvement

1. One student (representing 10% of students assessed) perceived that students in his or her group did not **assume appropriate roles** within the group and as a result were not as motivated to complete group work.
2. One student (representing 10% of students assessed) perceived that students in his or her group showed an inability to **share appropriately**, meaning that group member contributions were unequal and group coordination was sporadic.

Other Areas of Consideration

1. Student assessment was the same as faculty assessment in the areas of shared common goals, appropriate interaction, and developing strategies for interaction, but differed in the areas of assuming appropriate roles and reconciliation of differences.
2. Not all students from all groups were assessed because some were not in class the day of the assessment which could have influenced the indirect assessment of this outcome.

Plans for Improvement

1. Because all indirectly assessed categories were at or above the minimum expected level, there is no need for improvement at this time.
2. Despite the indirect assessment suggesting no improvements need to be made at this time, indirect assessment will be conducted in conjunction with direct assessment during 2010-2011.

Additional Assessment

During spring 2010, assessment in support of OIT's institutional learning outcome of professionalism was conducted with a university provided list of seven Communication Studies students who had applied for graduation for spring 2010. Two faculty members from the Communication Studies program assessed each student on the list using standards of professionalism created for the institutional assessment. The assessment demonstrated that 86% of graduating seniors in Communication Studies demonstrate professionalism through timeliness, attitude toward feedback, attitude toward tasks,

punctuality, attendance, academic integrity, interpersonal skills, following policies and procedures, work ethic, and appearance.

V. Summary of Student Learning

Student Learning Outcome 7: Students with a bachelor's degree in Communication Studies should be able to communicate ethically.

Strengths: All students (100%) met the minimum criteria standard in the following areas: using a code of ethics to describe ethical issues, describing parties that should be involved in the ethical situation, discussing viewpoints of the parties involved in an ethical scenario, and describing the risks and benefits of chosen approaches from an ethical scenario. Also, most students (89%) met the minimum criteria for describing and analyzing alternatives and recognizing important provisions from a code of ethics.

Weaknesses: One student (representing 11% of students assessed) did not demonstrate proficiency in the area of describing and analyzing alternatives and was not able to identify three important provisions from a code of ethics, explain why the provisions were important, or demonstrate proficiency in applying examples to the provisions.

Plans for Improvement: During 2010-2011, Faculty of the Communication Studies program will discuss adding an ethics component to one sophomore, junior, and senior level course in the major. They will also review the variety of codes of ethics to be considered by students in the Communication Studies program.

Student Learning Outcome 8: Students with a bachelor's degree in Communication Studies should be able to exhibit productive group communication exchanges.

Strengths: Both direct and indirect assessment demonstrated that students met the minimum competency criteria in the areas of sharing common goals, interacting appropriately, and developing strategies for interaction. Likewise, indirect assessment suggested that students perceived that their groups met minimum competency criteria in the areas of reconciling differences and sharing effectively.

Weaknesses: The direct assessment suggested a need for greater emphasis in the areas of reconciling differences and sharing effectively.

Plans for Improvement: During fall 2010, courses in the major where the categories of importance of reconciling group differences and appropriate sharing can be reemphasized and practiced will be determined. Group communication will be reassessed both directly and indirectly during week ten of the fall 2010 quarter.

VI. Changes as a Result of Assessment

As a result of assessment findings in 2008-2009, the following occurred during 2009-2010 in order to close the assessment loop:

1. During spring 2010 faculty advisors discussed career opportunities with advisees to better inform the students about career options in communication.

2. Faculty discussed baseline expectations for student technology competence during fall 2009.

Appendix A

PSLO Summary Map

SLO 7: Students with a bachelor’s degree in Communication Studies should be able to communicate ethically.

Courses that are shaded below indicate that the SLO above is taught in the course, students demonstrate skills or knowledge in the SLO, and/or students receive feedback on their performance on the SLO.

I = Introduced
 R = Reinforced
 E=Emphasized

Communication Courses	Fall	Winter	Spring
COM 104: Intro to Comm	IE		
COM 105: Intro to Comm Theory		IE	
COM 106: Intro to Comm Research			IE
COM 115: Intro to Mass Comm	IE		
COM 205: Intercultural Comm	IE	IE	IE
COM 207: Graphic Design	IE	IE	
COM 215: Creativity in Comm		R	
COM 225: Interpersonal Comm	R	R	R
COM 226: Nonverbal Comm		R	
COM 237: Intro to Visual Comm			IE
COM 248: Digital Media Prod			R
COM 255: Comm Ethics			E
COM 256: Public Relations	R		
COM 276: Democracy and Media		R	
COM 301: Rhetorical Theory		R	
COM 326: Comm Research	E		
COM 345: Org Comm I		R	
COM 346: Health Comm			R
COM 347: Negotiation and Conflict	R	R	R
COM 348: Facilitation			R
COM 365: Electronic Comm and Soc			E
COM 401: Civil Engineering Project I			
COM 402: Civil Engineering Project II			
COM 407: Seminar			R
COM 420: Externship	E	E	E
COM 421: Senior Project I	E		
COM 422: Senior Project II		E	
COM 423: Senior Project III			E
COM 425: Mediation		R	
COM 426: Mediation Practicum			E
COM 445: Org Comm II			R
COM 446: Leadership and Comm		R	
JOUR 211: Pub/Student Newspaper	R	R	R

SPE 111: Public Speaking	IE	IE	IE
SPE 314: Argumentation	R		
SPE 321: Small Group Comm	IE	IE	IE
WRI 115: Intro to Writing	IE	IE	IE
WRI 121: English Composition	IE	IE	IE
WRI 122: English Composition	IE	IE	IE
WRI 123: English Composition	IE	IE	IE
WRI 214: Business Correspond	R		
WRI 227: Technical Writing	IE	IE	IE
WRI 327: Advanced Tech Writing	E	E	E
WRI 350: Documentation Dev		R	R
WRI 410: Proposal and Grant	R		
WRI 415: Technical Editing		R	
WRI 420: Document Design			R

SLO 8: Students with a bachelor’s degree in Communication Studies should be able to exhibit productive group communication exchanges.

Courses that are shaded below indicate that the SLO above is taught in the course, students demonstrate skills or knowledge in the SLO, and/or students receive feedback on their performance on the SLO.

I = Introduced
 R = Reinforced
 E=Emphasized

Communication Courses	Fall	Winter	Spring
COM 104: Intro to Comm			
COM 105: Intro to Comm Theory			
COM 106: Intro to Comm Research			
COM 115: Intro to Mass Comm			
COM 205: Intercultural Comm	IE	IE	IE
COM 207: Graphic Design			
COM 215: Creativity in Comm			
COM 225: Interpersonal Comm			
COM 226: Nonverbal Comm		R	
COM 237: Intro to Visual Comm			
COM 248: Digital Media Prod			
COM 255: Comm Ethics			R
COM 256: Public Relations	R		
COM 276: Democracy and Media		R	
COM 301: Rhetorical Theory		R	
COM 326: Comm Research			
COM 345: Org Comm I			
COM 346: Health Comm			
COM 347: Negotiation and Conflict	R	R	R
COM 348: Facilitation			R
COM 365: Electronic Comm and Soc			R
COM 401: Civil Engineering Project I			
COM 402: Civil Engineering Project II			
COM 407: Seminar			R
COM 420: Externship			
COM 421: Senior Project I			
COM 422: Senior Project II			
COM 423: Senior Project III			
COM 425: Mediation		R	
COM 426: Mediation Practicum			R
COM 445: Org Comm II			R
COM 446: Leadership and Comm			R
JOUR 211: Pub/Student Newspaper	R	R	R

SPE 111: Public Speaking			
SPE 314: Argumentation			
SPE 321: Small Group Comm	IE	IE	IE
WRI 115: Intro to Writing			
WRI 121: English Composition			
WRI 122: English Composition			
WRI 123: English Composition			
WRI 214: Business Correspond			
WRI 227: Technical Writing			
WRI 327: Advanced Tech Writing			
WRI 350: Documentation Dev			
WRI 410: Proposal and Grant			
WRI 415: Technical Editing			
WRI 420: Document Design			

Appendix B
Ethics Assessment

The National Communication Association Guidelines for ethics in Research

Communication research takes many forms, but there are ethical principles that apply to a communication researcher, no matter what form of research is utilized. The ethics of social scientific research has received attention from other scholarly societies, because those studies rely most heavily on the interaction between researcher and person(s) being researched. Of the published guidelines, those of the American Psychological Association's (APA) are the most comprehensive. Communication researchers working in the social science tradition are urged to consult the APA guidelines for specific advice concerning the ethical conduct of social scientific research. Some principles specific to communication researchers need to be articulated, however.

In terms of integrity, ethical communication researchers should employ recognized standards of research practice, conducting research that they have been properly trained to do, and avoiding procedures for which they have not been adequately prepared. If in doubt about any ethical matter, they seek advice before proceeding. Their primary goal is to avoid harm to others – whether direct emotional or physical harm or harm to the reputations of those being researched.

The value of confidentiality demands that the identity of those being researched be kept confidential except in cases where the research is carried out on public figures or publicly available material. Criticism of another's language, ideas, or logic is a legitimate part of scholarly research, but ethical researchers avoid ad hominem attacks. Avoiding personal attack does not mean that critics or reviewers refrain from commenting directly and honestly on the work of others, however.

Professional responsibility requires that ethical communication researchers know and comply with the legal and institutional guidelines covering their work. They do not use the work of others as their own, plagiarizing others' ideas or language or appropriating the work of others for which one serves as a reviewer.

Responsibility to others entails honesty and openness. Thus, the ethical communication researcher:

- Obtains informed consent to conduct the research, where appropriate to do so.
- Avoids deception as part of the research process, unless the use of deception has been approved in advance by an appropriate review body.
- Provides adequate citations in research reports to support theoretical claims and to justify research procedures.
- Discloses results of the research, regardless of whether those results support the researcher's expectations or hypotheses.
- Does not falsify data or publish misleading results.
- Reports all financial support for the research and any financial relationship that the researcher has with the persons or entities being researched, so that readers may judge the potential influence of financial support on the research results.

Likewise, the value of personal responsibility mandates that:

- Communication researchers will not accept research funding for projects that are likely to create a conflict of interest or where the funder controls any of the research design or procedures. If funding is accepted, communication researchers honor their commitments to finish the work on schedule.
- Communication researchers who work with human subjects honor their commitments to their subjects. Those who work with communities honor their commitments to the communities they research.
- Communication researchers share credit appropriately and recognize the contributions of others to the finished work. They decide before research is conducted how authorship will be determined and the order of authorship. They also decide through mutual consultation whether authors should be added or deleted from the finished product.

Ethics Homework Assignment

For this assignment, please use the National Communication Association research code of ethics.

List three provisions in the professional ethics code that you think are very important. For each provision, explain why you have selected it as important. Give an example of how this provision might be applied in a professional situation.

Expected answer: Informed consent, deception, doing no harm

1. Please read the ethics scenario described below and answer the questions which follow it. The attached rubric (performance chart) will be used to evaluate your proficiency on this assignment.

You are interested in studying the effects of dress and perception on communication. You have an opportunity to study people's reactions to communication in a grocery store. You could perform an experiment where you allow people to observe you shoplifting. You would have two treatment conditions. In the first you would be dressed in dirty and torn clothes that are not seasonally appropriate. In the second condition you would be dressed in business attire. Another researcher would be dressed in the uniform of the store and would observe reactions and be available for people to report the shoplifting. You would compare the rate of shoplifting reports and analyze the reactions of the people in the store. This study would have the advantage of observing people in a natural setting and of observing real reactions, making it potentially very valid and generalizable. Is it ethical? Why or why not? Justify your answer using the NCA code of ethics.

OIT Ethics Rubric

Performance Criteria	Limited or No Proficiency (1)	Some Proficiency (2)	Proficiency (3)	High Proficiency (4)	Score
1. Using code of ethics, describes ethical issue(s)	Has a vague idea of what the issue is and is uncertain how the code of ethics applies.	Describes the issue(s) using concepts from code of ethics, but important elements may be missing or misunderstood.	Describes the issue(s) using basic concepts from code of ethics.	Describes the issue(s) in detail, demonstrating full understanding of relevant code of ethics provisions and how they relate to the issue(s).	
2. Describes parties involved and discusses their points of view.	Is unsure who should be involved in the issue and/or does not reflect on their viewpoints.	Describes some of the parties and their viewpoints, but important elements are missing or misunderstood.	Describes who should be involved in the issue(s) and discusses the viewpoints of the parties at a basic level.	Describes who should be involved in the issue(s) and thoroughly discusses their viewpoints.	
3. Describes and analyzes possible/ alternative approaches	Is unable to describe or analyze alternatives or consider the effect on parties involved.	Describes and analyzes only one alternative and its effect on parties involved, but important elements are missing or misunderstood.	Describes and analyzes at least two alternatives and their effects on parties involved.	Describes and analyzes a number of alternative approaches and thoroughly considers the interests and concerns of all parties involved.	
4. Chooses an approach and explains the benefits and risks.	Has difficulty choosing an approach or stating benefits and risks.	Chooses an approach and explains benefits and risks, but important elements are missing or misunderstood.	Chooses an approach and explains basic benefits and risks.	Chooses an approach and thoughtfully and thoroughly explains benefits and risks.	

Appendix C

Small Group and Team Rubric

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.