**Team Values and Norms**

Each team should prepare a list of values (expected behaviors) and norms (expected levels of performance measuring those behaviors) against which they will assess themselves and their peers. You will develop a list of team values and norms during the Team Dynamics MSD workshop. As the project progresses, the team may wish to revisit these values and norms to address issues that arise, but may not have been predicted at the outset. The document should not be revised too frequently (such as weekly).

Things to consider:

* Frequency of conducting peer evaluations (recommended: every three weeks, or after each phase of the design)
* Whether to complete evaluations in private or as a team
* Escalation process for team problems (recommended: address within team -> guide -> department (BME, CE, EE, ISE, or ME) coordinator -> course coordinator)

Peer Evaluation Forms

Sample peer assessment forms can be provided to you upon request. Your team should adapt these to best fit your needs.

Team Values

The items below are listed as a starting point, but should be adapted as needed for the team's use and self-direction. This starting point was prepared by collecting best practices from a number of successful previous senior design teams. Generally, the list of core values should be fairly short, and compelling. Don't try to legislate every aspect of team behavior, but make sure that the really important expectations are laid out clearly.

**Punctual**

Each team member will be prompt and arrive at the team meetings on time. If an unexpected conflict comes up, the absent team member will notify at least one team-mate prior to the expected absence. An absent team-member should confirm that a team-mate has received their message (in person, voice mail, email, etc).

**Thorough**

Each team member will complete their tasks thoroughly and completely, so that the work does not have to be re-done by a peer on the team. If a member does not know how to complete a task, feels overwhelmed, or needs assistance then the member notifies peers, and seeks assistance either from a peer, the faculty guide, a faculty consultant, or another person.

**Accurate**

Each team member completes their work accurately and in a way that can be easily checked for accuracy by peers and the faculty guide. All work is fully documented and easy to follow.

**Professional and Ethical**

Each team member gives credit where credit is due. All work completed includes citations to appropriate literature, or sources of assistance. If a team member has gotten assistance from a publication or individual, then that assistance or guidance is fully documented in the reports prepared. Each team member is honest and trustworthy in their dealings with their peers.

**Demonstrates the core RIT values of SPIRIT <http://www.rit.edu/overview/vision.html>**

**Committed**

Each team member will contribute an equal share to the success of the project.

Team Norms: Peer Assessment Rubric

Every team member will conduct a weekly peer assessment of their team-mates. The rubric below indicates how each team member will assess their peers. These 'Norms' reflect how each team member expects their peers to meet the team 'Values'. The entries in the table below represent a starting point, or example, typical of what other design teams have successfully employed in the past. Each team should modify or update their Norms each time the team Values are updated.

**Accepted Norms of Performance: Peer Assessment Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Value** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Needs Improvement** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Punctual** | The team member has had one or more unexcused absences or tardy arrivals to a scheduled team activity. The team member is not notifying others of conflicts with meeting times, or has allowed other commitments to impede the member's duties to this team. The team member is detracting from the performance of the entire team. | The team member has had one or more unexcused absences or tardy arrivals. The individual could and should have done a better job at notifying (in advance) a peer of the absence or tardiness. At the current time, the problem has not caused significant harm to the team, but this behavior needs to improve. It is not unusual for a team member to receive this rating a couple of times during the project. | The team member was prompt and present at every team event this week, or any absences were excused in advance. If there was an unexcused absence or tardiness, then the team-mates agreed that the reason disclosed after the fact was indeed unavoidable. For example, a member is in a fender bender on the way to campus, and was unable to contact a team-mate about being late. The absent member caught up with a peer as soon as practical, and informed them of the problem. | Not only is the team member always prompt and present, but the member clearly plans ahead for excused absences (such as job trips) and insures that the absence will not adversely affect the team's performance. The member notifies the team of heavy loads and external conflicts (such as exams in other classes) that COULD have an adverse impact on the team, and works with the peers on this team to make sure that the information flow from the member to and from the peers is smooth even in such cases. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Value** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Needs Improvement** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Thorough** | The team member has not completed the task assigned, or has submitted a response that is clearly insufficient. The work will need to be re-done by another team member in order for the team to move forward. Some of the work may have been done, but it was incomplete. The team member is detracting from the performance of the entire team. | The team member made some progress towards the task assigned, but not as much progress as should have been accomplished. The work may be done, but the other team member's have no way of checking the results, because the supporting documentation is incomplete. The team member is getting behind on the tasks that need to be completed. The team member needs to make up the missed work during the next evaluation period. | The team member has made solid progress towards the task assigned. The task is complete, and is well done, though it may need some additional work and refinement to be fully complete. The assignment may be incomplete, but the team member has clearly made a good effort towards getting the task done. In retrospect, this task may have been too much for the member to do in the time allocated, so the fact that the task is not done yet is not due to lack of effort by the member. | The task has been completed fully, and is in essentially finished form. The other team members can readily check the work submitted since the documentation is so clear. Not only is the work done, but everyone on the team recognizes that the task is complete with little or no need for additional effort. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Value** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Needs Improvement** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Accurate** | The work completed by the team member is unacceptable and does not meet the basic standards of engineering work. Engineering principles were not applied, or were grossly mis-applied. Basic elements of the engineering task were overlooked. The work completed must be re-done completely. | The work completed by the member contains many errors that must be corrected. While the basic approach to problem solving may be ok, the actual work completed needs to be largely re-done in order to be useful to the team. Some things were not done by the team member, that should have been obvious to complete. | The work completed by the member contains a few errors that must be corrected. The basic approach to problem solving is good, and the errors are relatively minor and could be readily corrected through normal peer review and checking. The work was corrected through consultation with the team members or faculty guide. | The team member completed the task with virtually no errors or omissions. The work was accurate, and can be easily scaled to other applications or tasks that the team may encounter. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Value** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Needs Improvement** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Professional and Ethical** | The team member has committed plagiarism, falsified data, ignored their responsibility as an engineer. The team member may have behaved inappropriately at a team event, or in a manner that reflects adversely on the team. The members' actions may cause the entire team to fail. | The team member has overlooked some references or consistently fails to cite sources and conduct individual tasks. The team member may have made some off-color remarks or been offensive to a team-mate or other individual. The team member needs to clean up his/her act. | The team member behaves responsibly and fully documents sources and collaborators on all work. | The team member is a role model for others, and behaves in a professional and ethical fashion even under very trying and difficult circumstances. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Value** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Needs Improvement** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Committed** | The team member is a burden to the rest of the team. | The team member is carrying less than their fair share of the work load. | The team member is carrying their fair share of the workload. | The team member is carrying more than their fair share of the workload. |