

Courtesy of Nishani Singh, Faculty of Professions, University of Adelaide
Rubrics for Business Communications Course
Group Work Assessment Profile

Cohesiveness of the Group (30)			
Very good to excellent 27-30	Good to very good 22-26	Satisfactory 16-21	Unsatisfactory 0-15
<p>Effective and efficient organisation and management</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agreed goals and ground rules fully established and maintained 2. Group members work together cooperatively 3. Adopts strategy for working cohesively as a team and resolving conflict if/when it occurs. The strategy is effectively implemented 4. Dynamic discussion occurs, always at a group level 5. All members are involved in planning and decision making 6. Timelines established and maintained, occasionally ahead of schedule 	<p>Efficient organisation and management</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agreed goals and ground rules fully established and usually maintained 2. Adopts strategy for working cohesively as a team and for resolving conflict if/when it occurs. The strategy may not always be effectively implemented 3. Discussion occurs regularly and usually at a group level 4. All members are involved in planning or decision making 5. Timelines established and maintained 	<p>Sufficient organisation and management</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agreed goals and ground rules partially established and usually maintained, 2. Works cohesively as a team, not able to resolve conflict when it occurs 3. Discussion occurs regularly but it may not always be at a group level 4. Most members are involved in planning and decision making, 5. Timelines established, and usually maintained 	<p>Poor organisation and management</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agreed goals and ground rules not established 2. Work poorly as a team, not able to resolve conflict when it occurs 3. Discussion seldom occurs and there is little group level interaction 4. Only a few members are involved in planning and decision making, 5. No timelines established

Fair & Equal Distribution of Workload (30)			
<p>Clearly defined roles and responsibilities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All members meet their commitments to a high level 2. Main task broken up into manageable subtasks 3. Workload equitably distributed, members carry the workload equally 	<p>Clearly defined roles and responsibilities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All members meet their commitments 2. Main task broken up into manageable subtasks 3. Workload equitably distributed, members carry the workload equally 	<p>Identifiable roles and responsibilities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One member does not meet their commitments 2. Main task broken up into manageable subtasks 3. Workload equitably distributed, a few members carry most of the workload 	<p>No identifiable roles and responsibilities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Most members do not meet their commitments 2. Main task not broken up into manageable subtasks 3. A few members carry most of the workload

Monitoring & Evaluation Of Group Progress (20)			
Very good to excellent 18-20	Good to very good 14-17	Satisfactory 11-13	Unsatisfactory 0-10
<p>Regular and effective monitoring and evaluation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review mechanism established to monitor plans. Mechanism in place to review group function. 2. Plans are adapted according to review 3. Group function adapted according to review 4. All group members are fully aware of group strengths and areas that can be improved. 	<p>Regular monitoring and evaluation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review mechanism established to monitor plans. Mechanism in place to review group function. 2. Plans are adapted according to review 3. Group function usually adapted according to review 4. All group members have an awareness of group strengths and areas that can be improved. 	<p>Sufficient monitoring and evaluation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review mechanism established to monitor plans. No mechanism in place to review group function. 2. Plans are usually adapted according to review 3. Some group members have an awareness of group strengths and areas that can be improved. 	<p>Insufficient monitoring and evaluation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No review mechanism of plans or group function 2. Plans are not adapted to changed circumstances 3. Group members are unaware of group strengths and areas that can be improved.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All goals achieved to a high standard. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All goals achieved. 	<p>Outcomes (20)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Most but not all goals met. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Most goals not met.