



Assessment of Team and Group Work **Institutional Student Learning Outcome #2**

Report to the Campus
2012-13

Prepared by

The Executive Committee of the Assessment Commission

May 2013

Table of 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: direct assessment by faculty.....	4
Overall results for all teams: indirect assessment by students.....	5
Results by major: direct assessment by faculty.....	6
Results by major: indirect assessment by students.....	7
SPE 321 results: direct assessment by faculty.....	8
SPE 321 results: indirect assessment by students.....	9
Indirect assessment from the National Survey of Student Engagement.....	9
Assessment reporting.....	9
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
5: SPE 321 Faculty ratings of teams.....	8
6: SPE 321 student ratings of teams.....	9
Appendices	
A: Oregon Tech Team and Group Work Rubric.....	10
B: Faculty Reflections on Teamwork Assessment.....	12

Executive Summary

During the 2012-13 academic year, the Oregon Tech Assessment Commission conducted an institutional assessment of team and group work. The assessment was based on seven performance criteria:

Students will be able to:

1. Identify and achieve goal/purpose.
2. Assume roles and responsibilities as appropriate.
3. Communicate effectively.
4. Recognize and help reconcile disagreements among team/group members.
5. Share appropriately in work of team/group.
6. Develop strategies for effective action.
7. Adapt to differences in background and communication style of individual team/group members.

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 Oregon Tech Team and Group Work rubric. 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 used the same rubric to score 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 Oregon Tech. 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 Oregon Tech 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. Communicate effectively.
4. Recognize and help reconcile disagreements among team/group members.
5. Share appropriately in work of team/group.
6. Develop strategies for effective action.
7. Adapt to differences in background and communication style of individual team/group members.

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 Oregon Tech. 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.

Towards the end of each group's work together, the instructor asked each student to rate the group's performance, using the Oregon Tech Team and Group Work Rubric (Appendix A). This rubric contains the performance criteria listed above, was originally developed in 2009 and revised in 2012 by the Communication Department, and was formally adopted

for campus use by the Executive Committee of the Assessment Commission in February 2012.

The instructor also scored each group using the same rubric, then compiled all student ratings and completed a reflection. Faculty comments from this reflection are included in Appendix B.

Data collection

The Director of Assessment worked with the assessment coordinators and instructors to identify the appropriate courses, to provide electronic score sheets, 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 Oregon Tech 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 seven performance criteria listed on the rubric.
- Faculty scores for each of the seven performance criteria for each group assessed.
- Faculty comments on nature of the assessment and program results.

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: direct assessment by faculty

As described above, the faculty scored and commented on the performance of student teams using seven performance criteria. A broad sample of Oregon Tech programs participated in the assessment. There were 82 teams and 294 students involved. The percentage of teams demonstrating proficiency or high proficiency for each criterion is shown in Table 1.

Performance Criteria	% at Proficiency	% at High Proficiency	Total at Proficiency/ High Proficiency
1. Identify/achieve goal/purpose	45.1%	46.3%	91.4%
2. Assume roles/responsibilities	30.5%	51.2%	81.7%
3. Communicate effectively	32.9%	52.4%	85.3%
4. Reconcile disagreements	39.0%	51.2%	90.2%
5. Share work appropriately	30.5%	52.4%	82.9%
6. Develop strategies for effective action	39.0%	47.6%	86.6%
7. Cultural Adaptation	40.2%	53.7%	93.9%

Table 1. Faculty proficiency ratings, all teams

The Executive Committee of the Assessment Commission reviewed these overall results and found them to be acceptable. The committee concluded that the student teams met and exceeded expectations for all performance criteria. These high results are consistent with the findings from the 2009-10 assessment of teamwork. The committee also noted that:

- The areas of assuming roles/responsibilities and sharing work appropriately continue to have the lowest ratings, compared to the other criteria in the assessment. This is not unexpected since these criteria are typically the source of most student complaints about working in teams. The committee feels that this does not represent an area of concern given the results for both criteria are above 80%.
- Although the revised rubric seemed to clarify the differences between performance criteria, some faculty reported lack of understanding on the part of both students and faculty in the rating of “cultural adaptation.” This may point to an opportunity for focused professional development.
- Most faculty raters reported that the rubric did a good job of capturing their impression of the group(s) performance, though some admitted it was difficult to assess team dynamics when groups met outside of normal class time.
- Faculty reported a desire for resources in the areas of team coaching, peer review and feedback, and team building.

Overall results for all teams: indirect assessment by 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. It should be noted that the results represent all students who completed ratings for each criteria. Fifteen percent of the students who participated in this assessment did not rate their team on the cultural adaptation criteria.

Performance Criteria	% at Proficiency	% at High Proficiency	Total at Proficiency/ High Proficiency
1. Identify/achieve goal/purpose	37.4%	59.5%	96.9%
2. Assume roles/responsibilities	34.0%	54.4%	88.4%
3. Communicate effectively	29.6%	62.2%	91.8%
4. Reconcile disagreements	24.8%	67.0%	91.8%
5. Share work appropriately	36.0%	49.3%	85.3%
6. Develop strategies for effective action	32.7%	59.5%	92.2%
7. Cultural Adaptation	25.0%	67.7%	92.7%

Table 2. Student proficiency ratings, all teams

The Executive Committee noted that students tended to rate team performance slightly higher than the faculty raters did. This is consistent with past finding using the same assessment process.

The committee felt that the rubric label “Cultural Adaptation” may not be a clear description of this criterion. The definition of proficiency at the various levels seems appropriate. The committee recommended the criteria be changed to simply “Adaptation.”

Results by major: direct assessment by 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. The percentage of teams performing at proficiency or high proficiency by major is shown in Table 3.

Performance Criteria	Arts & Sciences (9 teams)	Engineering (27 teams)	Health (41 teams)	Management (5 teams)
1. Identify/achieve goal/purpose	100%	81.4%	95.2%	100%
2. Assume roles/responsibilities	77.7%	66.6%	90.3%	100%
3. Communicate effectively	88.9%	74%	92.7%	80.0%
4. Reconcile disagreements	100%	85.2%	90.3%	100%
5. Share work appropriately	88.9%	66.6%	90.3%	100%
6. Develop strategies for effective action	100%	70.3%	97.5%	60%
7. Cultural Adaptation	100%	85.1%	97.5%	100%

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

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

- Not only were engineering teams rated lower in six of the seven criteria, but engineering faculty rated their teams lower in all criteria than the 2009-10 assessment. Most of the engineering teams assessed were involved in a yearlong senior project where faculty had a lot of opportunity to observe team dynamics and were heavily involved in the coaching of these teams. The committee would like to further explore the implications of the variability in the length and nature of the team projects used for this assessment.
- Some faculty members reported that by the time students are seniors in their program they know each other well and therefore the normal stages of group development do not occur. The committee acknowledged that it is difficult to recreate group work as it would appear in a professional setting, and it may be a limitation of this assessment.
- The results by major indicate that there may be a need for targeted program level actions, though none necessary at the institutional level.

Results by major: indirect assessment by 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. The percentage of students rating their teams at proficiency or high proficiency is shown in Table 4.

Performance Criteria	Arts & Sciences Student Ratings n=24	Engineering Student Ratings n=108	Health Student Ratings n=135	Management Student Ratings n=26
1. Identify/achieve goal/purpose	95.8%	96.3%	97.7%	100%
2. Assume roles/responsibilities	91.7%	82.4%	94.0%	88.4%
3. Communicate effectively	87.5%	87.0%	97.0%	96.1%
4. Reconcile disagreements	91.6%	85.3%	95.5%	100%
5. Share work appropriately	87.5%	73.4%	93.3%	92.3%
6. Develop strategies for effective action	91.7%	85.3%	96.3%	100%
7. Cultural Adaptation	95.8%	88.1%	95.5%	100%

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. Student ratings are consistently lower in assume roles and responsibilities, and share work appropriately.

SPE 321 Results: direct assessment by faculty

The Executive Committee also reviewed the results of the teamwork assessments conducted in several sections of SPE 321 Small Group and Team Communication (a general education course) Winter Term 2013. The faculty ratings of the 13 mixed-major teams are reported in Table 5.

Performance Criteria	% at Proficiency	% at High Proficiency	Total at Proficiency/ High Proficiency
1. Identify/achieve goal/purpose	15.4%	61.5%	76.9%
2. Assume roles/responsibilities	61.5%	38.5%	100%
3. Communicate effectively	23.1%	69.2%	92.3%
4. Reconcile disagreements	53.8%	46.2%	100%
5. Share work appropriately	23.1%	53.8%	76.9%
6. Develop strategies for effective action	23.1%	61.5%	84.6%
7. Cultural Adaptation	12.5%	87.5%	100%

Table 5. SPE 321 faculty proficiency ratings of teams

The committee observed that these ratings though lower are in alignment with the assessment of teams in program courses. This is expected due to the fact that ratings are by content experts. It should be noted that only eight of the groups were rated for cultural adaptation due to the fact that some SPE 321 faculty used the old rubric for this assessment. Groups were rated below expected levels of performance in their ability to achieve their goal/purpose and share work appropriately. The communication faculty will review these results and document any recommendations in the 2012-13 Communication General Education Assessment Report.

SPE 321 Results: indirect assessment by students

Thirty-four students from the SPE 321 groups rated the performance of their team. Cultural adaptation was not rated, due to the fact that students were provided the old rubric for this assessment. The percentage of students rating their teams at proficiency or high proficiency is shown in Table 6.

Performance Criteria	% at Proficiency	% at High Proficiency	Total at Proficiency/High Proficiency
1. Identify/achieve goal/purpose	35.3%	58.8%	94.1%
2. Assume roles/responsibilities	73.5%	17.6%	91.2%
3. Communicate effectively	41.2%	55.9%	97.1%
4. Reconcile disagreements	32.4%	61.8%	94.1%
5. Share work appropriately	52.9%	41.2%	94.1%
6. Develop strategies for effective action	41.2%	47.1%	88.2%
7. Cultural Adaptation	--	--	--

Table 6. SPE 321 student ratings of teams

As with the other groups, the SPE 321 students rated their group performance higher than faculty.

Indirect assessment from the National Survey of Student Engagement

As an additional indirect measure, the Executive Committee reviewed results from the 2012 National Survey of Student Engagement. Eighty-two percent of senior students reported that their experience at Oregon Tech contributed quite a bit or very much to their ability to work effectively with others, a mean of 3.22 on a 4 point scale (1=very little, 2=some, 3=quite a bit, and 4=very much). These results support the findings from the teamwork assessment conducted within the institution.

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

Name:		Course/Section:		Date:	
OIT Team and Group Work Rubric, p. 1 of 2					
Performance Criteria	No/Limited Proficiency (1)	Some Proficiency (2)	Proficiency (3)	High Proficiency (4)	Score:
1. 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.	
2. 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.	
3. Communicate Effectively	Members do not communicate openly and respectfully. Members do not listen to each other. Communication patterns undermine teamwork	Members may not consistently communicate openly and respectfully. Members may not listen to each other.	Members usually communicate openly and respectfully. Members often listen to most ideas. Members usually support and encourage each other.	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.	

OIT Team and Group Work Rubric, p. 2 of 2

Performance Criteria	No/Limited Proficiency (1)	Some Proficiency (2)	Proficiency (3)	High Proficiency (4)	Score:
4. Reconcile Disagreement	Members do not welcome disagreement. Difference often results in voting. Subgroups are present.	Few members welcome disagreement. Difference often results in voting. 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. 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. All members respect and accept disagreement and employ effective conflict resolution skills. Subgroups absent.	
5. 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.	
6. 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.	
7. Cultural Adaptation	Members do not recognize differences in background or communication style.	Members may recognize, but do not adapt to differences in background and communication style	Members usually recognize and adapt to differences in background and communication style.	Members always recognize and adapt to differences in background and communication style.	

Appendix B
Faculty Reflections on Teamwork Assessment

Program	Length of group work	Product	Usefulness of rubric
Dental Hygiene	3 terms	Project with portfolio	Pretty good
Strengths/Weaknesses			
The timing of this assessment in relation to a particular group assignment is interesting. The level of group functioning seems to be directly proportional to the level of proficiency demonstrated in the assignment submissions.			
Desired Resources			
It would be great to have some team building exercises/techniques during spring term. That is when these teams are being formed for the four terms of the course series. I understand that the communications department conducted activities like this in the past.			

Program	Length of group work	Product	Usefulness of rubric
Radiologic Science	8 weeks	Paper & presentation	Perfect
Strengths/Weaknesses			
It was anticipated that some of the groups would not work well together; however, they were able to set aside differences and work together toward a common goal, demonstrating professionalism. Only one group did not work together cohesively which resulted in missed deadlines and missed requirements. Overall student performance exceeded faculty expectations.			
Desired Resources			
None			

Program	Length of group work	Product	Usefulness of rubric
CET (hardware)	3 terms	Working system prototype	Good
Strengths/Weaknesses			
This year students had very little problems. One group had problems with only one team member. Overall, students worked well together, divided up tasks. However, no real leaders emerged.			
Desired Resources			
A colloquium speaker came and did a great job of speaking about real world project teams and real world team problems. I would like to see this continue in the future.			

Program	Length of group work	Product	Usefulness of rubric
ECHO	5 weeks	Paper and PPT	Good
Strengths/Weaknesses			
The strengths of both groups are the final projects (gorgeous power points). They were outstanding. The weakness is minor in both groups and it is more formatting citations and references.			
Desired Resources			
None			

Program	Length of group work	Product	Usefulness of rubric
Management	6 weeks	Case study analysis	Worked well, though only minor difference between 3 & 4
Strengths/Weaknesses			
<p>As seniors that know each other well, these groups worked together very well. Overall the groups were highly organized and motivated and the product produced was of high quality. I am sure that the groups split up the tasks and worked on their own quite a bit. Regardless, they were able to take the pieces and coordinate them into a well-constructed final product. Conflict and disagreements were non-existent for this exercise.</p> <p>For this activity, the students worked on a real-world project related to OIT and their degree. Students had great buy-in and quite a bit of knowledge regarding the topic which helped with motivation levels. Ideally, I wanted to have students repeat the case study analysis process individually to assess individual student proficiency, however, so much time was spent on the group project that there was little time (and no motivation) to repeat the same process with a business of their choosing. In the future I would want to rethink these two assignments so as to not lose the opportunity for individual assessment.</p>			
Desired Resources			

Program	Length of group work	Product	Usefulness of rubric
MMET	2011-12 school year	Design and manufacture a functioning product	Ok
Strengths/Weaknesses			
<p>Strengths: teams did learn to pull together and achieve their goals, learning was part of the process. Weakness: Students need additional knowledge and skills associated with project management prior to senior year. Students lack cultural awareness and communication training (gender communication) to be effective in diverse teams.</p>			
Desired Resources			
Expert in the specialized field to work with each project team as co-advisor. An industry advisor would be idea, but two faculty advisors would be helpful.			

Program	Length of group work	Product	Usefulness of rubric
DMS	8 weeks	20 min video	Excellent
Strengths/Weaknesses			
<p>Strengths-A majority of the teams were able to work well and accomplished goals and established responsibilities.</p> <p>Weakness-One group did not function well together thus project was suboptimal. The one team was unable to reconcile differences.</p>			
Desired Resources			

Program	Length of group work	Product	Usefulness of rubric
Respiratory Care	7 weeks	Presentation	
Strengths/Weaknesses			
<p>The groups were functional with very few complaints and they produced an acceptable end product. The students were given very specific instructions for not only what the product was to be but what their roles and responsibilities in the group consisted of. I believe that a combination of the good intentions of the students and the excellent directions and structure provided to them helped to assure functional groups. The nature of the assignment was such that the students would learn significant information if they finished the assignment together. I do feel that in most assignments where groups of two or more students are involved they often do not provide sufficient oversight and rigor in peer review of each other's work. Often if a role is given to another student, students have a tendency to take an inadequate amount of responsibility for assuring the quality of their fellow student's work.</p>			
Desired Resources			
<p>In my experience the greatest need is for the production of documents and guidelines that help to improve the quality of peer review and feedback. This is particularly the case when it comes to the quality of literature review and coming to well supported conclusions based upon those literature reviews.</p>			

Program	Length of group work	Product	Usefulness of rubric
Vascular	1 term	Design a lab	Fairly well
Strengths/Weaknesses			
<p>I think the students were given a very large task with multiple components. All groups were required to select a group leader who could help guide the group with time management, due dates, meeting times and dates, etc. This went very well. Each group did a great job in selecting a leader who actually has that skill, rather than picking one just so that individual did not have to play that role. For the most part the groups communicated well within their groups which was observed during in-class group projects and tasks. I had them report on their out of class meetings with minutes that reported what occurred and had them also report on how each team member interacted from their own perspective. This was a very valuable thing to do. I think they all put together great proposals and overall projects, with a lot of maturity and creativity. Some team members were much more visibly nervous during the presentation portion than others. Each member had to present their section of the project for their group. They need more work in oral presenting. Also some of the directions for the group projects were not followed to the letter in a couple cases but nothing that misdirected the final outcomes. The students actually had lower scored observations than I did of their abilities.</p>			
Desired Resources			
n/a			

Program	Length of group work	Product	Usefulness of rubric
GIS	3 weeks	A map	Worked well
Strengths/Weaknesses			
<p>Student strengths include the ability to work well with each other, share ideas, and work together to formulate viable conclusions. Student weaknesses included difficulties in scheduling, some personality conflicts that interfered with group effectiveness, and some scheduling issues.</p>			
Desired Resources			
No additional resources required.			

Program	Length of group work	Product	Usefulness of rubric
Surveying	9 weeks	Collect data and produce design drawings	Good, though did not capture the effort some groups had to put out to make the team work.
Strengths/Weaknesses			
<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Students are interested in and motivated to complete assigned tasks -Students want to work in their teams and do not act "put-upon" to work as a team. - Students are more often willing to put out extra effort for team projects than they would normally do on their own. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students have difficulty coordinating tasks for individual completion. Often, they would take on tasks as a team that would be more appropriately divided and assigned as individual tasks. - Some students rely too heavily on the skills and energy of their fellow team members to complete tasks and do not participate as fully as they would if the project was an individual task. 			
Desired Resources			
I believe that the resources that are currently available to both faculty and students are excellent at Oregon Tech. It is not a question of the availability of resources, but of applying them in the classroom.			

Program	Length of group work	Product	Usefulness of rubric
MET-Wilsonville		Report / presentation	Difficult to assess since they often met outside of class.
Strengths/Weaknesses			
<p>Students appeared to divide up work and assign responsibilities without conflict.</p> <p>Students had difficulty keeping the project small enough to be manageable. At first, they were excited and had all kinds of ideas, but as time progressed, they realized maybe too late that they could not meet all of their original goals. Many students had time conflicts that made them late or not show up at all, which was disruptive for those that did show up.</p>			
Desired Resources			

Program	Length of group work	Product	Usefulness of rubric
Nuclear Medicine	4 weeks	PPT and presentation	Pretty well, though lack of clarity on "cultural adaptation"
Strengths/Weaknesses			
All of the groups did really well in producing a PPT presentation that lasted no more than 15 minutes and was between 20-30 slides. Most of the groups presented their material really well within these constraints. One group did not work together as well as the others, but only in a minor way.			
Desired Resources			
None			