



# SOCI2120: Society and Technology Assignment: Group Contract & Collaboration Rubric

## Due Date

Thurs 3/16  
Beginning of class, via  
hard copy

## Format

Two documents:  
1. Group Contract  
2. Collaboration  
Evaluation Rubric

Ensure all group  
members' names are on  
the document. Feel free  
to name your group.

**Have an area on the  
rubric for the total  
grade so I don't have  
to add it myself.**

## Group Contract and Collaboration Rubric Overview

Even though working with others towards a common goal is a regular part of everyday life, employment, and interpersonal relationships, the process of how to work together is rarely explicitly taught. This assignment makes the social arrangements of group work explicit so they can be agreed upon and followed by the group.

The contract will help your group discuss the best practices, values, and ideal behaviours of working together, how conflicts will be dealt with, and how work will be divided. It makes the values and goals of the group clear to everyone. The Collaboration Evaluation Rubric will formalize that contract so that you can evaluate and be evaluated by your peers on how well everyone did following the contract and completing shared goals.

Contracts and evaluations do not make group work easy, but they do increase the possibility of things going well because expectations are agreed upon ahead of time. Some people will still try to do a disproportionate amount of the work and leave out other's input, and some people will still bail out and leave the group holding the bag. The evaluation is designed to redistribute the final grade equitably—give credit to those that followed the expectations laid out by the group. This will not *eliminate* frustrations; the contract is designed to help you *maneuver* those frustrations and the rubric is designed to *address* those frustrations.

For the final project, you will get a collaboration grade worth 20% of the final project grade based on your peer's evaluations of your group work. These rubrics will also be put in the D2L Dropbox on the same day the final is due, but they will not be distributed to students. Only I will see them.

## Group Contract

You have been assigned a “kit” of readings on group work:

- “Introduction to Types and Teams” – This document outlines how different personality types work best. People in your group will have to take the Brigg Myers Typology Indicator for this to work: <http://www.humanmetrics.com/cgiwin/jtypes1.htm>
- Cheat sheet for Consensus-based decision making – Voting disenfranchises a minority of voters, every time. We need look no further than the US election to see that voting is not the best way for a diverse group to come to an agreement. But usually voting is all we’re familiar with. CBDM is another way. The steps are outlined here.
- Aorta Collective (n.d.). “Anti-oppressive facilitation: Making meetings awesome for everyone.” Anti-Oppression Resource and Training Alliance. There are better and worse ways to run a meeting. These are the better ways.

Based on these readings, as well as your own experiences thinking about what has made for healthy and less healthy collaboration environments in the past, each group will make a contract that outlines how they want to work together. Several things must be included with *clear, specific details* or else it won’t work, and the grades will be wonky (that is, wildly different from each group member). Your contract needs to address the following:

1. What are the **logistics** of working together? How will you contact one another? How often will you meet? Will you keep notes? How will you keep track of who is doing what?
2. How does **class attendance** factor into being a fully participating member of the group? Does it matter?
3. What is the status of being **late to or absent** from group meetings? Is it allowed? If so, under what circumstances? Should people alert the rest of the group? How and how early?
4. How will you **divide work**, especially when people have different strengths and are better or less-better at some tasks to begin with? If you say “Evenly,” what does that mean, especially because different types of tasks are hard to compare via time, effort, etc? Consider the strengths that are already in the group.
5. How will you **resolve conflicts**? Be specific. Coming to the teacher is only a last resort. Outline a process for finding and resolving conflicts. I recommend check ins/outs for allowing them to surface in a non-confrontational ways.
6. How will you **account for different personality types**? What if you have three introverts and one extrovert—how will you make space for your extrovert to think out loud, even if that’s not everyone else’s preference? What if you have no people who scored high on judgment—how will you make up for not having those strengths?
7. **Everyone must sign the contract** and have a copy.

## Evaluation Rubric

The Evaluation Rubric says how well you followed the contract and moved towards the completion of the final project. How can you tell if your group values are being followed? If “Respect others” is a value, what does that look like? How can each group member grade people the same? Grading is really hard, FYI. Create a Collaboration Evaluation Rubric (a grading rubric) to evaluate the level at which you and your groups are meeting the goals of your contract. I will be looking for these items when I evaluate your contract:

1. Are the **main points of the contract** reflected in the rubric? Ie, if your contract says you can't be late, is there a corresponding part of the rubric about lateness?
2. Are the sections of the rubric **mutually exclusive**? (ie, not "Consistently shows up on time and is on task in meetings" as one section, but "Consistently shows up on time" and "Is consistently on task in meetings" as separate sections for evaluation). You have to have a different line for each kind of behaviour.
3. Are the **attributes to be evaluated specific**? (ie, not "Communicates well," but "Does not interrupt others. Always offers opinions in round robins"). You have to be able to point to the behaviours you want so that group members can grade the same. So if you have "respect" as a value, be specific about what *that looks like*.
4. Is there a **full range of probable grades** represented? A+s are rare. C is average. Does the evaluation scheme account for A+s (people going above and beyond basic expectations? ie, instead of having "always comes to meetings" as the top grade, have something like "always comes to meetings, often early, and is instrumental in setting up new meetings" as the top grade). Average participation should be a C grade. No or very low participation should be a 0 rather than 1 point. There should be points that distinguish an A from an A+. Everyone in your group should not get an A+.
5. There should be a **total at the bottom and a percentage** so the grade is clear when you're done tallying. That way, when you're done, if it tallies up to a 60%, and you have a feeling that's much too low or much too high, you know you have to relook at how you graded someone. Also include a **comment box**. People don't have to fill these out, but they're nice to have.

See examples of previous contracts and rubrics on D2L. If previous contracts match your values, feel free to borrow from their examples.

### **Grading:**

This assignment is worth TWO DAILIES. It is pass fail, but if you fail, I will hand it back and you can resubmit it until it passes. This is because a poorly created grade rubric will affect your final project grade if it is not robust.

A note about using the final rubrics to evaluate your peers:

I use these to write letters of recommendation for students in the future.

If someone gets 100%, I am suspicious. Usually it means that the evaluator didn't put in the time to evaluate their peers properly, or they weren't at many meetings and had no data to evaluate them.

Unless there is a strong argument in the comment section of the rubric, any evaluation with 100% will be disregarded.

If one group member doesn't hand in evaluation for their peers, they get a 0% factored into their own collaboration grade.