Table 1: Assessment rubric for group-based assessment

CRITERIA	Table 1: Assessment rubrice Excellent/Very Good	Good/Satisfactory	Poor	
Weekly meetings (refers to weekly group meetings)				
1. Attends group meetings	Regular attendance at meetings; always punctual; informs group members if unable to attend	Missed occasional meeting without informing peers; and/or late to occasional meetings	Regularly missed meetings and/or regularly late to meetings	
2. Participates in meetings	Frequently contributes to meetings; open to others' ideas; does not dominate meeting	Generally contributes well to meetings, however may require a bit of a push to contribute, or can have a tendency to dominate meetings at times	Little or no useful contribution in group meetings; or disruptive influence on meetings; or completely dominates meetings and ignores other team members ideas and suggestions	
3. Feedback on other team members work or ideas	Provides constructive criticism of other team members work or ideas	Generally provides useful feedback, but can be too critical or negative at times	Provides very little feedback on other team members ideas or work; or is consistently negative about other team members' work.	
Quality of work				
4. Produces work of high quality	Work is consistently of a high quality; adheres to group quality stan- dards/practices;	Work generally of a reasonable quality; generally follows group quality standards	Work generally of a poor quality; generally does not follow the group quality standards	
5. Supports the development of group quality culture	Strongly involved in the development of group quality standards and practices	Provides some input into the development of group quality standards and practices	Very little input into the development of group quality standards and practices; negative attitude towards the need for quality management	
6. Reviews other team members' work	Frequently involved in reviewing other group members' work in or- der to meet team qual- ity standards; performs in-depth reviews	Occasionally reviews other team members' work	Minimal involvement in reviewing; any efforts are at a very superficial level	

Page 24 of 25 1 May 2008

Table 2: Assessment rubric for group-based assessment (cont.)

	ole 2: Assessment rubric fo		
CRITERIA	Excellent/Very Good	Good/Satisfactory	Poor
Task Allocation			
7. Completes allocated tasks 8. Task scheduling	Allocated tasks completed in a timely manner; additional tasks not originally allocated are also completed; does more than fair share of work Actively involved in task scheduling; provides useful input (such as time logs) to	Majority of tasks completely in a timely manner; small number of tasks not completed or not delivered on time; does their fair share of work Provides some input into task scheduling	Majority of assigned tasks not completed; does significantly less than fair share of work No significant involvement in task scheduling
9. Communicates progress	improve the accuracy of task scheduling and planning Communicates progress on tasks to other group members; informs group members of any possible slippages; suggests measures to address the problems	Keeps group informed of any major problems; may tend to give only short notice of prob- lems	Does not communicate progress to group members; covers up any potential problems until it is too late
Leadership			
10. Engages in a leadership role	Actively engages in one or more key management roles within the group (e.g. documentation manager, configuration manager; project chairperson)	Takes on a lesser management role within the group; does a reasonable job	Does not fulfil any management role in the group; or very poor coordination of tasks; or does all the work for the tasks they are meant to be managing (i.e. no delegation of work)
11. Coordination of tasks under their management	As manager they allocate tasks in a fair and equitable manner; does not take on all the work themselves; avoids giving trivial tasks to weaker students	Does a fair job in allocating tasks; may take on a bit too much themselves, but gets the job done	Does not allocate tasks to other members; tries to take on all the work themselves (unable to delegate); or simply does not give the work to anybody and the task does not get done

Page 25 of 25 1 May 2008