**Grading methods for Group Work**

Ask students to assess their own contribution to the team.

Have students evaluate their own teamwork skills and their contributions to the group’s process using a self-assessment of the process skills you are emphasizing. These process skills may include, among others, respectfully listening to and considering opposing views or a minority opinion, effectively managing conflict around differences in ideas or approaches, keeping the group on track both during and between meetings, promptness in meeting deadlines, and appropriate distribution of research, analysis, and writing.

## Hold individuals accountable.

To motivate individual students and discourage the free-rider phenomenon, it is important to assess individual contributions and understanding as well as group products and processes. In addition to evaluating the work of the group as a whole, ask individual students to demonstrate their learning. This can be accomplished through independent write-ups, weekly journal entries, content quizzes, or other types of individual assignments.

## Ask students to evaluate their group’s dynamics and the contributions of their teammates.

Gauge what various group members have contributed to the group (e.g., effort, participation, cooperativeness, accessibility, communication skills) by asking team members to complete an evaluation form for group processes. This is not a foolproof strategy (students may feel social pressure to cover for one another). However, when combined with other factors promoting individual accountability, it can provide you with important information about the dynamics within groups and the contributions of individual members. If you are gathering feedback from external clients – for example, in the context of public reviews of students’ performances or creations – this feedback can also be incorporated into your assessment of group work. Feedback from external clients can address product (e.g., “Does it work?”, “Is it an effective design?”) or process (e.g., the group’s ability to communicate effectively, respond appropriately, or meet deadlines) and can be incorporated formally or informally into the group grade.

## Instructor Assessment of Group Product

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Assessment Option | Advantages | Disadvantages |
| Shared Group Grade The group submits one product and all group members receive the same grade, regardless of individual contribution. | * encourages group work - groups sink or swim together * decreases likelihood of plagiarism (more likely with individual products from group work) * relatively straightforward method | * individual contributions are not necessarily reflected in the marks * stronger students may be unfairly disadvantaged by weaker ones and vice versa |
| Group Average Grade Individual submissions (allocated tasks or individual reports) are scored individually. The group members each receive the average of these individual scores. | * may provide motivation for students to focus on both individual and group work and thereby develop in both areas | * may be perceived as unfair by students * stronger students may be unfairly disadvantaged by weaker ones and vice versa |
| Individual Grade - Allocated task Each student completes an allocated task that contributes to the final group product and gets the marks for that task | * a relatively objective way of ensuring individual participation * may provide additional motivation to students * potential to reward outstanding performance | * difficult to find tasks that are exactly equal in size/complexity * does not encourage the group process/collaboration * dependencies between tasks may slow progress of some |
| Individual Grade - Individual report Each student writes and submits an individual report based on the group's work on the task/project | * ensures individual effort * perceived as fair by students | * precise manner in which individual reports should differ often very unclear to students * likelihood of unintentional plagiarism increased |

## Student Assessment of Group Product

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Assessment Option | Advantages | Disadvantages |
| Student distribution of pool of marks Instructor awards a set number of scores and let the group decide how to distribute them. Example: 4 member group  * Product grade: 80/100. * 4 \* 80 = 320 pts to be distributed. * No one student can be given less than zero or more than 100. * If members decide that they all contributed equally then each get 80 * If they decided that person A deserved much more, then A might get 95, and the remaining if equal would get 75. | * easy to implement * may motivate students to contribute more * negotiation skills become part of the learning process * potential to reward outstanding performance * may be perceived as fairer than shared or average group mark alone | * open to subjective evaluation by friends * may lead to conflict * may foster competition and therefore be counterproductive to team work * students may not have the skills necessary for the required negotiation |
| Students allocate individual weightings Instructor gives shared group grade & individual grade adjusted according to a peer assessment factor. Example  * Group Grade = 80/100 * The individual student's peer grade ranges from .5 – 1.5, with 1 for full * Grade = Group grade \* peer * Below=80 \*.75 =60 * Above=80 \* 1.2 = 96 | As Above | As Above |
| Peer Evaluation - random marker, using criteria, moderated Assessment items are anonymously completed by students who identify whether their peer has met the assessment criteria and awards a grade These grades are moderated by instructor and rating sheets returned to student. | * helps clarify criteria for assessment * encourages sense of involvement and responsibility * assists students to develop skills in independent judgement * increases feedback to students * random allocation addresses potential friendship and other influences on assessment * provides experience to careers where peer judgement occurs | * time may have to be invested in teaching students to evaluate each other * instructor moderation is time consuming |

From Winchester-Seeto, T. (April, 2002). Assessment of collaborative work – collaboration versus assessment. Invited paper presented at the Annual Uniserve Science Symposium, The University of Sydney

**Group and Self-Assessment Tool**

Please use the following six categories to assess your peers and yourself for the class project. For each item, rate each person and yourself using the 4-point scale given. Please think hard and honestly about each of the categories and how you and each group member performed. It is not necessary that everyone get the highest score on each item. Different people will have different strengths and different contributions. Knowing that you are strong in some areas and weak in others helps you and your teammates to know how to work on areas and when to volunteer their strengths to support the team effort.

Beside each rating item, I have included a space for comments. Please include examples or explanations that will help me understand your ratings. Use the **S**ituation, **B**ehavior, **I**mpact model (SBI). Provide a brief description of the situation; briefly describe the behavior/s that you saw, and articulate the impact on the team.

Evaluation is not a team activity. Please do your evaluations independently. I want a rating from each of you, based on your perceptions and experiences.

Submit one form for each person, including yourself, with your name and the assessed person’s name on each form.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Scoring** For each category, award yourself and each member of your team a score using this scale. | **4** – Better than most of the group in this respect  **3** – About average for the group in this respect  **2** – Not as good as most of the group in this respect  **1** – No help at all to the group in this respect |

**Rater’s Name:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Assessment of:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating** | | **Provide SBI as an example** |
| **Group Participation** Attends meetings regularly and on time. |  |  |
| **Time Management & Responsibility** Accepts fair share of work and reliably completes it by the required time. Keep in mind that asking a person of a particular identity to take on work typically associated with that identity is not equitable. Evaluating people who take on work not traditionally associated with their particular identities by a higher standard is equally unfair. |  |  |
| **Adaptability** Displays or tries to develop a wide range of skills in service of the project and team, readily accepts changes to approach or constructive feedback. |  |  |
| **Creativity/Originality** Initiates problem-solving when faced with impasses or challenges, originates new ideas, moves the team to make decisions. |  |  |
| **Communication Skills** Effective in discussions, good listener, capable presenter, proficient at diagramming, representing, and documenting work. |  |  |
| **General Team Skills** Positive attitude, encourages and motivates team, supports team decisions, helps team reach consensus, helps resolve conflicts in the group. |  |  |
| **Technical Skills** Ability to create and develop materials on own initiative, provides technical solutions to problems. |  |  |

*(adapted from Goldfinch, 1994; Lejk & Wyvill, 2001; Center for Creative Leadership, 2016)*