EVALUATION OF TEAM AND TEAM MEMBERS
2W.732 PROJECT II[*]

Before Monday, Nov. 1, send Elizabeth an email that contains the following information:

For each team member, including yourself:

1. **rating**—rate the degree to which each member fulfilled his/her responsibilities in completing the team assignments according to the adjectives listed and defined in Table 1. If you find these adjectives are inadequate, additionally provide your own adjective & its definition.
2. **star**—identify at least one strength that you attribute to this team member in light of his/her work on project II
3. **wish**—identify one thing you would like this team member to do differently for project III
4. **time**—for yourself only, estimate the *average* time *you* spent each week—excluding in-class time—on project II

Table 1: team member ratings

excellent	Consistently carried more than his/her fair share of the workload.
very good	Consistently did what he/she was supposed to do, very well prepared and cooperative.
satisfactory	Usually did what he/she was supposed to do, acceptably prepared and cooperative.
ordinary	Often did what he/she was supposed to do, minimally prepared and cooperative.
marginal	Sometimes failed to show up or complete assignments, rarely prepared.
deficient	Often failed to show up or complete assignments, rarely prepared.
unsatisfactory	Consistently failed to show up or complete assignments, unprepared.
superficial	Practically no participation.
no show	No participation at all.

For your team as a whole:

1. **rating**—on a scale from 1 to 7, where 1=the absence of success/poor quality and 7=complete success/excellent:
   - rate the degree to which your team has succeeded in adhering to the processes of design, collaboration, meetings, and communication
   - rate the degree to which your team has succeeded in completing the team assignments and objectives
   - rate the quality of the deliverables (assignments) produced by the team
2. **star**—identify at least one strength of your team in light of project II
3. **wish**—identify one thing you would like your team do differently for project III
4. **time**—estimate the *total* number of man-hours spent by all team members on project II during the 5 week duration of the project.

THE FINE PRINT

This evaluation is meant primarily as a formative assessment; *i.e.* it should provide you with feedback on the basis of which you and your teammates can improve your design, communication, and teamwork skills and habits. Dave will not see the results until after grades have been turned in for the semester. However, the results of this assessment may affect your 21W.732 grade in two ways, both mediated by Elizabeth. First, if Dave has assessed your project II performance at a level that is significantly lower than that evident in the peer/self evaluation, the results of this assessment will included in your favor. Second, if the similar assessment administered at the end of project III suggests improvement, this improvement will be noted in your favor.

[*] Adapted from a form reprinted in B. J. Millis and P. G. Cottell, Jr., Cooperative Learning in Higher Education Faculty, Oryx, Phoenix, in Oakley et.al*., Turning Student Groups into Effective Teams,* Journal of Student Centered Learning, Volume 2, No. 1, 2004 / 9

21W.732 / ESG.21W732 Science Writing and New Media
Fall 2010