

TWU Core Objectives Pilot Rubric

Objective (Primary)	Objective (Secondary)	Criteria	3	2	1
---------------------	-----------------------	----------	---	---	---

Conducting Peer Reviews

For criteria in this set, raters must be able to see both the peer evaluation and the work being evaluated, as well as any standards that peers were supposed to employ.

Teamwork	Critical Thinking	Applying Criteria through Peer Review	Accurately reviews peer artifacts through the lens of multiple, established community standards, providing appropriately in-depth, thoughtful commentary on substantive issues (content, structure, rhetorical approach).	Clearly attempts to review peer artifacts through the lens of multiple, established community standards, providing occasionally in-depth or thoughtful commentary on substantive issues (content, structure, rhetorical approach), although the reviewer may at times misunderstand either the content being reviewed or the criteria being applied.	Does not meet level 2. For example: Reviewer may apply standards or criteria that are inappropriate to the subject being reviewed; may engage in rushed, token, drive-by reviewing; or may only review a narrow range of surface issues, such as grammar.
Teamwork	Communications	Constructive Framing of Peer Review	Critical perspectives are effectively framed as constructive attempts to help rather than as attacks. After considering the review, a reasonable reader could be expected to be emotionally prepared to revise.	Although the reviewer doesn't engage in overt hostility, critical feedback being provided is delivered flatly or bluntly enough -- or else, in a tone that's inconsistent enough -- that a reasonable reader might be discouraged from revising.	Does not meet level 2. For example: The reviewer seems unconcerned that there is another human being on the other end of the feedback being received, and may seem more focused on the sport of critique than on trying to help. Or, alternatively, the reviewer is entirely too polite and avoids substantive, unexpected feedback. (A typical example of the latter would be: "It looks good. I just noticed some proofreading issues. Fix those, and I'm sure you'll have an A!")
Teamwork	Communications	Clarity of Peer Review	Delivers feedback that is clearly articulated, appropriately formatted, and sufficiently detailed, so that a reasonable reader would come away informationally prepared to revise. (Feedback may refer to outside sources, like textbooks, or to specialized terms within the discipline, or to established proofreading/copy-editing marks, and still warrant level 3 if a reasonable reader would be able to look them up.)	Delivers feedback that is articulated, formatted, and detailed with enough attention that it is usually clear, though a reasonable reader may have one or two follow-up questions that could not be answered by looking up a term or consulting a textbook.	Does not meet level 2. For example: The reviewer's comments may be unclear often enough that a reasonable reader might give up trying to make sense of them.

Internal Team Dynamics

For criteria in this set, raters must be able to observe team members deliberating or collaborating.

Teamwork	Personal Responsibility	Stage of Group Development	Norming & Performing: The team has agreed on a unified purpose/vision, team roles, and norms or procedures (which may be explicitly encoded or implicitly agreed upon). The team's work is characterized by cohesiveness and interdependence among team members, as well as freely expressed substantive conflict over ideas. Team members indicate (perhaps in surveys, comments, reflective statements) that they usually feel comfortable sharing their thoughts and reservations with the rest of the group.	Storming: The team has determined a unified vision or purpose is necessary but is embroiled in disagreement over how to proceed. Group norms and procedures do not yet exist. Much of the team's energy is focused on emotional reactions to the task at hand (anxiety, fear, anger, frustration) and to disagreements about group pecking orders.	Forming: This stage does not meet level 2 and is characterized by a dysfunctional relationship with conflict. For instance: The team might avoid conflict to get along or else tend toward personal or procedural conflict rather than conflict over ideas. As a result, the team may try to break its task up into individual assignments which are then assembled without any unifying or cohesive group vision. The team may be characterized by a combination of group overconfidence and individual hesitancy.
Teamwork	Personal Responsibility	Contributes to Team Meetings	Offers alternative solutions or courses of action that build on the ideas of others. Attends team meetings consistently and completes assignments in a timely manner.	Offers new suggestions or material to advance the work of the group. Attends team meetings consistently and completes assignments in a timely manner.	Does not meet level 2. For example: Student contributes by sending uncited cut-and-pastes from the Web to teammates, or forwards links, without helping to digest, apply, or credit that material.

Teamwork	Personal Responsibility	Individual Contributions Outside of Team Meetings	As level 2, but proactively takes an interest in the contributions of other team members, ensuring they complete their tasks on time, encouraging quality work, and/or coordinating efforts to ensure the group effort is successful.	Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished advances or improves the project.	Does not meet level 2. For example: Completes tasks by deadline, but in a make-work, checklist fashion.
Teamwork	Communications	Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members	Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others. May notice when someone isn't participating and invite their perspectives.	Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by restating the views of other team members and/or asking questions for clarification.	Does not meet level 2. For example: Listens to others without interrupting -- but also without asking questions or restating views.
Teamwork	Communications	Fosters Constructive Team Climate	Supports a constructive team climate by doing three or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication. • Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work. • Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members. • Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it. 	Supports a constructive team climate by doing any two of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication. • Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work. • Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members. • Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it. 	Does not meet level 2.
Teamwork	Social Responsibility	Responds to Conflict	As level 2, but also addresses destructive conflict directly and constructively, helping to manage/resolve it in a way that strengthens overall team cohesiveness and future effectiveness.	Avoids making or responding to personal attacks while responding to alternative perspectives with active listening.	Does not meet level 2. For example: Passively accepts alternate viewpoints/ideas/opinions, or else responds to substantive disagreement with personal attacks.

Coordinated Efforts (Team Performances and Lab Work)

For criteria in this set, raters will need to view a scripted or directed student effort (such as a musical performance or lab exercise).

Teamwork	Personal Responsibility	Follows Directions of Conductor, Captain, or Director <i>Applies to team situations in which group coordination in pursuit of a single vision is desired. The term "director" here refers to whoever is providing the team vision.</i>	Generally attends to the director most of the time when directions are initially provided, attempting to follow directions and play the assigned role; asks questions if needed to clarify expectations.	Attends to the director some of the time when directions are initially provided, attempting to follow directions and play the assigned role; does not ask questions, even if not performing the role correctly.	Does not meet level 2. For example: Attends minimally to the director without real attempts to participate actively in the activity.
Teamwork	Personal Responsibility	Handles or Sets-Up Shared Property	Carries gear to and from storage areas (as able), with appropriate attention to avoiding damage and ensuring safety.	Carries gear to or from the storage area (as able), but demonstrates some carelessness and lack of concern for damage and/or safety.	Does not meet Level 2. For example: Does not, though able, sufficiently participate in the set-up and cleanup of the work area.
Teamwork	Personal Responsibility	Responding to Director Feedback <i>Applies to team situations in which group coordination in pursuit of a single vision is desired. The term "director" here refers to whoever is providing the team vision.</i>	Usually adjusts performance of team role based on director feedback.	Sometimes adjusts performance of team role based on director feedback.	Does not meet level 2. For example: Makes minimal attempts to conform to director feedback to group or individuals.

Working with Conflicting Perspectives

The criteria in this set may be applied to any artifact created by an individual, provided that the individual has had to engage with or anticipate multiple perspectives.

Personal Responsibility	Teamwork	Limitations and Implications	Thoroughly discusses relevant and supported limitations and implications, going beyond the obvious and simplistic.	Presents relevant and supported limitations and implications, but they may be obvious or simplistic.	Does not meet level 2. For example: Presents limitations and implications, but they are irrelevant and unsupported.
Social Responsibility	Teamwork	Perspective Taking	When investigating subjects within natural and human systems, evaluates subjects through multiple perspectives (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical).	Accurately identifies and explains multiple perspectives (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical) when exploring subjects within natural and human systems.	Does not meet level 2. For example: Shows awareness of multiple perspectives, but misunderstands or inaccurately portrays one.

Teamwork	Critical Thinking	Recognizing Areas of Agreement and Disagreement	In addition to accurately explaining explicit areas of agreement and disagreement among conflicting positions, the writer makes a persuasive case for underlying differences or similarities in implied values, priorities, assumptions, or definitions.	Accurately explains explicit areas of agreement and disagreement among conflicting positions.	Does not meet level 2. For example: Displays simplistic or distorted awareness of conflicting perspectives or ideas.
----------	-------------------	---	--	---	--

Cultural Awareness

Social Responsibility	Teamwork	Cultural self-awareness	Recognizes new perspectives about own cultural rules and biases (e.g., not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer.)	Identifies own cultural rules and biases (e.g., with a strong preference for those rules shared with own cultural group and seeks the same in others.)	Does not meet level 2. For example: May show minimal awareness of, or a refusal to acknowledge, own cultural rules and biases.
Social Responsibility	Teamwork	Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks	Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Demonstrates adequate understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Does not meet level 2. For example: Demonstrates surface or partial understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.
Social Responsibility	Teamwork	Empathy	Interprets intercultural experience from the perspectives of more than one worldview and demonstrates ability to act in a supportive manner that recognizes the feelings of another cultural group.	Identifies components of other cultural perspectives but responds in all situations with own worldview.	Does not meet level 2. For example: Views the experience of others through own cultural worldview.

Team Presentations

Teamwork	Communications	Transitions from and to Teammates	The speaker's contributions are smoothly integrated into the group's work, picking up where the previous speaker left off and/or setting up the speaker to follow.	The speaker clearly attempts to connect his or her portion of the presentation to the contributions of speakers who precede and/or follow.	Does not meet level 2.
Teamwork	Personal Responsibility	Supports Team When Not Speaking	The student in question supports the whole team even when not speaking. In addition to dressing appropriately for the team's purposes, remaining engaged, and maintaining supportive body language, the team member helps out as appropriate by operating technology, watching time, fetching materials, dimming lights, distributing handouts, or fulfilling other team needs before, during, or after the event.	When not speaking, the student in question is nonverbally supportive of whichever teammate is talking by avoiding distracting dress, body language, or behavior, and by appearing engaged in what the team is doing.	Does not meet level 2.
Teamwork	Critical Thinking	Contribution to a Cohesive Team Thesis	The speaker's contribution plays a clear and significant role in the support and development of the team's thesis.	The speaker's contribution is consistent with the team's overall thesis, and his or her material appears relevant to the team's subject and purpose.	Does not meet level 2. <i>Guidance:</i> If the team as a whole lacks a coherent thesis, award a 1 for this student.