

TEAMWORK - CORE OBJECTIVES RUBRIC 2025-2026

Criteria	Description	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Apply Criteria through Peer Review	Does the student provide feedback to peers that's based on accurately understood, established standards?	3. 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).	2. 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.	1. 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.
Constructive Framing of Peer Review	Does the student provide feedback that is constructive without being discouraging?	3. 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.	2. 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.	1. 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!")
Clarity of Peer Review	Is the student's feedback to peers coherent and clear?	3. 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.)	2. 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.	1. 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.
Contributes to Team Meetings	In addition to participating reliably in team meetings, does the student offer suggestions during those meetings that build on the ideas of others.	3. 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.	2. Offers new suggestions or material to advance the work of the group. Attends team meetings consistently and completes assignments in a timely manner.	1. 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.
Individual Contributions Outside of Team Meetings	Outside of team meetings, does the individual meet obligations and through communication and coordination, proactively encourage others to do the same?	3. 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.	2. Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished advances or improves the project.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Completes tasks by deadline, but in a make-work, checklist fashion.
Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members	Does the individual facilitate contributions by other team members?	3. 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.	2. 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.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Listens to others without interrupting -- but also without asking questions or restating views.

TEAMWORK - CORE OBJECTIVES RUBRIC 2025-2026

Criteria	Description	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Fosters Constructive Team Climate	Does the student foster a constructive team climate through respectful verbal and nonverbal communication, assistance, encouragement, and enthusiasm?	3. Supports a constructive team climate by doing three or more of the following: • 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.	2. Supports a constructive team climate by doing any two of the following: • 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.	1. Does not meet level 2.
Limitations and Implications	Does the student sufficiently address the limits of his or her own evidence and possible implications of the evidence that might seem to undermine the student's argument?	3. Thoroughly discusses relevant and supported limitations and implications, going beyond the obvious and simplistic.	2. Presents relevant and supported limitations and implications, but they may be obvious or simplistic.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Presents limitations and implications, but they are irrelevant and unsupported.
Perspective Taking	Does the student evaluate subjects through the lenses of multiple perspectives, whether those differing perspectives are cultural, disciplinary, or ethical?	3. When investigating subjects within natural and human systems, evaluates subjects through multiple perspectives (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical).	2. Accurately identifies and explains multiple perspectives (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical) when exploring subjects within natural and human systems.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Shows awareness of multiple perspectives, but misunderstands or inaccurately portrays one.
Cultural self-awareness	How well does the student demonstrate awareness that her culture is socially constructed and its rules may differ from other cultures?	3. Recognizes new perspectives about own cultural rules and biases (e.g., not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer.)	2. 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.)	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: May show minimal awareness of, or a refusal to acknowledge, own cultural rules and biases.
Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks	How well does the student understand another culture's values, history, communication, styles, beliefs, and/or practices?	3. 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.	2. 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.	1. 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.
Contribution to a Cohesive Team Thesis	Does the student contribute to the presentation in a way that is relevant and consistent with the team's overall thesis?	3. The speaker's contribution plays a clear and significant role in the support and development of the team's thesis.	2. 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.	1. Does not meet level 2. Guidance: If the team as a whole lacks a coherent thesis, award a 1 for this student.
Uses Multiple Perspectives in Problem Solving.	Does the student draw on multiple disciplinary perspectives to propose solutions to problems?	3. Plans and evaluates more complex solutions to social challenges that are appropriate to their contexts using multiple disciplinary perspectives (such as cultural, historical, and scientific).	2. Formulates practical yet elementary solutions to social challenges that use at least two disciplinary perspectives (such as cultural, historical, and scientific).	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Only considers one disciplinary perspective.