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Definitions

Teamwork (SJC), “Students will consider different points of view and work interdependently to achieve a shared purpose or goal.”

Teamwork (THECB), “to include the ability to consider different points of view and to work effectively with others to support a shared purpose or goal.”

General Issues & Discussion

- **Setting a standard for our graduates and core complete students.** The question addressed through this assessment process is, “Are we, as an institution, effective in educating our students to attain the general education outcomes?” That question focuses on students that graduate (with an AA, AS, or AAT) or complete the core. As we assess, we should not make allowances (e.g. assess more easily) for students we believe may be earlier in their college career; we acknowledge that the technology does not yet support ideal sampling methods (work sampled only from recent graduates), and we consider that limitation when analyzing the results. Our standard for and expectations of our graduates and core complete students should be applied consistently.

- **Grading Perspective.** The levels of the rubric do not correspond to a particular grade (e.g. Level 4 does not equate to an “A”) or to a particular level of academic experience (freshman, sophomore etc.). More importantly, we are not assessing student work for the purpose of assigning a grade; the purpose is to identify their relative level of teamwork to evaluate how well San Jacinto College is helping student attain that skill. Thus, if a student only performs at a Level 1 even though they are addressing the assignment extremely well, it is still a Level 1 of performance.

- **Frame analytic (criterion-by-criterion) assessment within a holistic assessment framework.** Once all criterion have been evaluated, consider the student’s performance more holistically. Is the student’s work representative of work you would be confident as labeling “successful teamwork” by a San Jacinto College graduate or core complete student? Alternatively, is the student’s work representative of work you believe should *not* be labeled as “successful teamwork” by a San Jacinto College graduate or core complete student? Use your answers to those questions to consider your criterion-by-criterion assessment

- **Generalize behaviors (reading holistically).** It is valid to consider the examples given within the criteria or within the institutional interpretation to be a general description of that level of teamwork rather than the only valid examples of that skill level. The work presented by the student may represent a comparable level of skill. In other words, given another opportunity to complete the assignment, would a student performing as they are given their response to the assignment perhaps exhibit the specific examples offered by the rubric or institutional interpretation?

- **Explicit Examples.** This rubric seeks to observe explicit examples of behaviors relevant to teamwork skills. For that to happen, we rely on students to provide those examples. If a student focuses entirely on the end product for the team project, only provides declarative statements without examples, or does not answer a question, a lower assessment on the rubric may be appropriate: a “1” or a “0” on the rubric.

- **Negative Examples.** A student providing negative examples of how they did not perform well against the question/rubric is indicative of outcome attainment. For example, a student understands teamwork if they are able to say, *I could have done a better job of facilitating the contributions of others by inviting them to describe their ideas more. Specifically, I missed an opportunity in our third meeting to ask Dana more about her idea; she had mentioned it, and I thought it was a good idea, but when no one else asked about it, I just let it go. I should have asked her to share more and better supported her idea.*

- **Peer Assessment.** Peer assessments are not the activity we intend to assess; if a student document only includes peer assessment and no self-assessment, the usability should be a “1” because it’s not the element of the common assignment expected in the sample. However, a peer evaluation may still be assessable if the student wrote enough and there is evidence in their assessment of peers that they have adequate understanding of the teamwork criteria. Assess the explicit examples about the student or their peers – positive or negative – against the criteria.
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• **Team Dynamic.** The rubric assesses the individual’s role in, contributions to, and understanding of the team and not the team dynamic. It is possible for a student to describe a poor team dynamic while still individually possessing, demonstrating, and describing good teamwork skills.

• **Process rather than Product.** The rubric focuses on the process of teamwork rather than the end product or result of that teamwork. When assessing student work, the discipline specific assignment the team completed should only be considered as context for understanding student response to the teamwork reflection questions, as needed. The quality of the team’s or the student’s work on the project itself is beyond the scope of the rubric.

**Institutional Interpretation of Criteria**

**Contributes to Team Meetings**

• When working in a team meeting, successful students make suggestions and contribute ideas that help the team move forward on the group’s work. Unsuccessful students do not offer ideas or suggestions that contribute substantively to the group's work.

• This criterion focuses specifically on the student’s contributions to team meetings and the communication within those meetings; it does not reference or consider the actual work a student may do as part of the project.

**Facilitates the Contribution of Team Members**

• Successful students interact with team members by clarifying or asking questions about ideas, views, or suggestions of other team members. Unsuccessful students only participate reactively by taking turn speaking and listening to others.

• The different levels of this criterion may need to be interpreted more conceptually as describing a general level of behavior that could include examples students provide but that are not listed on the rubric. See Generalize Behaviors above.

**Individual Contributions Outside of Meetings [to Team Work]**

• Successful students contribute meaningfully to the quality of the group's work; they add overall value to the team. Unsuccessful students meet minimal expectations and deadlines, but do not contribute beyond their assigned responsibilities.

• This criterion focuses on the work a student does toward the completion of the project; this is independent of their contributions to team meetings as described above. The use of the phrase “outside of meetings” serves to make that distinction. It does not mean that the student’s work must be done – spatially, chronologically, and geographically – at a time other than when the team is meeting. A more accurate wording of the criterion may be, “Individual Contributions to Completion of Project Tasks.”

**Fosters Constructive Team Climate**

• Successful students treat team members respectfully with constructive communication and a positive attitude; they provide assistance and encouragement to team members. Unsuccessful students do not positively engage team members and may contribute to a negative team environment.

• The different levels of this criterion may be interpreted more conceptually; not all of the behaviors are easily observed or likely to be described by the student (e.g. non-verbal communication). See Generalize Behaviors above.

**Responds to Conflicts**

• Successful students should actively engage and work positively to move the group beyond conflict of any sort to continue making progress on the task at hand. Unsuccessful students passively observe conflict with the team, allow it to be resolved by others, and/or simply accept the resolution proposed by others.

• This criterion may require reading more laterally across the entire student document; students may not clearly identify conflicts, problems, or issues they encountered, so they may describe situations in other areas of their response (other than to question 5) that are relevant.

• This criterion focuses on how a student reacts to a conflict, problem, or issue; to perform well does not suggest a particular method or approach to the problem, and it does not require, necessarily, that the issue be resolved entirely (e.g. students may negotiate to a certain extent before agreeing to disagree). In fact, it may be an inherent part of the resolution process that not all individuals will be entirely satisfied with the outcome.
Teamwork VALUE Rubric
for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can by shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

Teamwork is behaviors under the control of individual team members (effort they put into team tasks, their manner of interacting with others on team, and the quantity and quality of contributions they make to team discussions.)

Framing Language

Students participate on many different teams, in many different settings. For example, a given student may work on separate teams to complete a lab assignment, give an oral presentation, or complete a community service project. Furthermore, the people the student works with are likely to be different in each of these different teams. As a result, it is assumed that a work sample or collection of work that demonstrates a student's teamwork skills could include a diverse range of inputs. This rubric is designed to function across all of these different settings.

Two characteristics define the ways in which this rubric is to be used. First, the rubric is meant to assess the teamwork of an individual student, not the team as a whole. Therefore, it is possible for a student to receive high ratings, even if the team as a whole is rather flawed. Similarly, a student could receive low ratings, even if the team as a whole works fairly well. Second, this rubric is designed to measure the quality of a process, rather than the quality of an end product. As a result, work samples or collections of work will need to include some evidence of the individual's interactions within the team. The final product of the team's work (e.g., a written lab report) is insufficient, as it does not provide insight into the functioning of the team.

It is recommended that work samples or collections of work for this outcome come from one (or more) of the following three sources: (1) students’ own reflections about their contribution to a team's functioning; (2) evaluation or feedback from fellow team members about students' contribution to the team's functioning; or (3) the evaluation of an outside observer regarding students' contributions to a team's functioning. These three sources differ considerably in the resource demands they place on an institution. It is recommended that institutions using this rubric consider carefully the resources they are able to allocate to the assessment of teamwork and choose a means of compiling work samples or collections of work that best suits their priorities, needs, and abilities.
**Teamwork VALUE Rubric**

**Outcome:** Students will consider different points of view and work interdependently to achieve a shared purpose or goal.

*Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet Level 1 of performance.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Usability of Sample</strong></td>
<td>No issues encountered.</td>
<td>There was a disconnect between the rubric and the assignment, e.g. student may or may not have performed well, but the assignment did not ask the student to perform in a manner expected by the rubric.</td>
<td>The student responded in a manner that interfered with reliable assessment of this outcome, e.g. student wrote much less than assignment required; or, poor writing skills interfere with assessing a non-writing outcome.</td>
<td>The assignment was not the common assignment expected for the course, e.g. entirely different assignment, excessively modified common assignment, mistaken alignment, or presented as not part of regular course grade.</td>
<td>This document was not accessible or not assessable: wrong file format, unable to open the file, illegible/unreadable, unexpected teamwork, or instance of plagiarism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Levels for this criterion are separate and distinct categories – not a scale.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contributes to Team Meetings</strong></td>
<td>Helps the team move forward by articulating the benefits of alternative ideas or proposals.</td>
<td>Offers alternative solutions or courses of action that build on the ideas of others.</td>
<td>Offers new suggestions to advance the work of the group.</td>
<td>Shares ideas but does not advance the work of the group.</td>
<td>Does not meet “Level 1” standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members</strong></td>
<td>Facilitates the contributions of team members by building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others and inviting those not participating to engage.</td>
<td>Facilitates the contributions of team members by building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others</td>
<td>Facilitates the contributions of team members by restating the views of other team members and/or asking questions for clarification.</td>
<td>Participates as a team member by taking turns and listening to others without interrupting.</td>
<td>Does not meet “Level 1” standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Contributions Outside of Team Meetings</strong></td>
<td>Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough, comprehensive, and advances the project. Helps other team members complete their assigned tasks to a similar level of excellence.</td>
<td>Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough, comprehensive, and advances the project.</td>
<td>Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished advances the project.</td>
<td>Completes all assigned tasks by deadline.</td>
<td>Does not meet “Level 1” standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fosters Constructive Team Climate</strong></td>
<td>Supports a constructive team climate by: (a) treating team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication; (b) using positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work; (c) motivating teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team’s ability to accomplish it; and (d) providing assistance and/or encouragement to team members.</td>
<td>Supports a constructive team climate by exhibiting three of the four behaviors noted in Level 4.</td>
<td>Supports a constructive team climate by exhibiting two of the four behaviors noted in Level 4.</td>
<td>Supports a constructive team climate by doing any one of the four behaviors noted in Level 4.</td>
<td>Does not meet “Level 1” standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responds to Conflict</strong></td>
<td>Addresses conflict directly and constructively, helps to manage/resolve it in a way that strengthens overall team cohesiveness and future effectiveness.</td>
<td>Identifies and acknowledges conflict and stays engaged until it is resolved.</td>
<td>Redirects focus away from conflict, toward common ground and toward the task at hand.</td>
<td>Passively accepts alternate viewpoints/ideas/opinions.</td>
<td>Does not meet “Level 1” standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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