|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Score range (10-7)** | The group member made rigorous and regular contributions. |
| **Score (7-5)** | The group member was mostly present and contributing, with minor lapses. |
| **Score (5-3)** | The group member was average in terms of contribution, disappeared from time to time. |
| **Score (3-0)** | This group member made minimal contribution and was disengaged for most of the project. |



Group Number:

1

**WDT**

**Assignment**

**Group**

**Effort**

Form

**1st** - Use the self-assessment rubric above to come up with a final score for each of the group members in the team.

Enter a score from 0 to 10.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Group Member (Name | Student ID)** | **Score #** |
| *Sample: Jane Doe | s3123456* | *6* |
| First member: Amit Munjal | s3925455 | 10 |
| Second member: Nikhil Govula | [s3900665](mailto:s3900665@student.rmit.edu.au) | 10 |
| Third member: Idris Anwar - [s3894215](mailto:s3894215@student.rmit.edu.au) | 10 |

**2nd** - Discuss this among yourselves and rate the efficiency of your group dynamics.

Enter a score from 1 to 4.

1 = awful; 2 = average; 3 = most of the time; 4 = always

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Group dynamics** | **Score #** |
| We were in complete sync with each other. | 4 |
| We communicated on a regular basis. | 4 |
| We had positive disagreements. | 4 |
| We were very productive in terms of outcomes. | 4 |
| We took initiative. | 4 |