



**WPI**

## **2018 Institute on Project-Based Learning**

***PBL Assessment & Feedback***  
***(Handout 3)***

***Dominic Golding***  
***IGSD***

**June 2018**

## HANDOUT CONTENTS

1. IQP Learning Outcomes .....	2
2. Project Evaluation Criteria.....	3
3. Rubric for Writing Second and Subsequent Drafts .....	7
4. Excerpt of Writing Feedback .....	10
5. Excerpt of Writing Mark-up .....	11
6. Evaluation Rubric for Presentations .....	12
7. Midterm Feedback – Team .....	13
8. Midterm Feedback – Individual.....	14
9. WPI Student Course Report.....	15
10.Student Report on IQP Learning and Advising .....	16
11.WPI Online Sponsor Survey .....	18
12.Additional Sources .....	19

## IQP Learning Outcomes\*

1. Demonstrate an understanding of the project's technical, social, and humanistic context.
2. Define clear, achievable goals and objectives for the project.
3. Critically identify, utilize, and properly cite information sources, and integrate information from multiple sources to identify appropriate approaches to addressing the project goals.
4. Select and implement a sound approach to solving an interdisciplinary problem.
5. Analyze and synthesize results from social, ethical, humanistic, technical or other perspectives, as appropriate.
6. Maintain effective working relationships within the project team and with the project advisor(s), recognizing and resolving problems that may arise.
7. Demonstrate the ability to write clearly, critically, and persuasively.
8. Demonstrate strong oral communication skills, using appropriate, effective visual aids.
9. Demonstrate an awareness of the ethical dimensions of their project work.

\*Approved by the WPI Faculty in October 2006.

# Project Evaluation Criteria

<b><i>1. Formulate and complete a project that addresses a combination of social, cultural, humanistic, and technical issues</i></b>			
<i>IQP learning outcomes: 1-5, 9; Sources of evidence: Meetings, presentations, report, and project implementation in general</i>			
	<b>Excellent (A)</b>	<b>Good (B)</b>	<b>Fair, Acceptable (C)</b>
Goal and objectives	Project has a well-conceived and clearly stated goal and objectives, and the goal is achieved.	Project has a stated goal and objectives, and the goal is achieved.	Project has a stated goal and objectives, and the goal is partially achieved.*
Background and project context	A sophisticated understanding of social, cultural, and technical issues related to the project is evident throughout the students' work	Shows a good understanding of social, cultural, and technical issues related to the project	Does not consider some important social, cultural, and/or technical issues related to the project or shows a poor understanding of them, limiting project outcomes and credibility.
Methods	Students select and implement sound methodologies to achieve the goal, understanding and communicating their limitations.	Students select reasonable methods, and implementation of methods is mostly sound. Limitations are acknowledged.	Weaknesses in methodology are often unrecognized or could have been anticipated and addressed, or students do not approach project systematically.
Analytical thinking	Students analyze data or design alternatives systematically, in-depth, and with critical thinking	Data or design alternatives are analyzed mostly systematically. Critical thinking is usually evident.	Little evidence that a systematic process was used to analyze data or design alternatives. Critical thinking is often weak.
Recommendations or other deliverables	Delivers clear, comprehensive recommendations to the sponsor that are well supported by project findings	Delivers useful recommendations to the sponsor that are supported by project findings	Recommendations may not be useful to sponsor or are weakly supported by project findings

\*Sometimes the project goal is not entirely achieved for reasons that are beyond the students' control.

Advisors evaluate only what is within the students' control.

<b>2. Communicate the process and outcomes of the project persuasively and professionally both in written and oral form</b>			
<i>IQP learning outcomes: 7,8; Sources of evidence: Presentations, report</i>			
	<b>Excellent (A)</b>	<b>Good (B)</b>	<b>Fair/Acceptable (C)</b>
	<b>Team Products</b>		
Use of guidelines and feedback	Students clearly make use of writing guidelines, such that each section meets its expected purpose. Students learn from advisor feedback such that advisors' role in writing improvement decreases as project progresses.	Students attempt to make use of writing guidelines, and each section/chapter mostly meets its expected purpose. Reliance on advisor feedback for writing improvements may be steady throughout the project.	Students often do not make use of writing guidelines. Report requires high levels of advisor effort to make it acceptable.
Persuasion and use of evidence	Writing and presentations reflect critical thinking: claims are persuasive because they are supported by credible evidence and because they are qualified appropriately.	Clear progress is shown in making writing and presentations more persuasive. Most claims are supported by credible evidence and are qualified appropriately, but some are overstated or exaggerated.	Some progress is shown in making writing and presentations more persuasive, but many claims are still not supported by credible evidence or qualified appropriately.
Organization and coherence	Writing and presentations are logically organized with a coherent line of reasoning. Formatting assists in conveying structure of paper or presentation. Paragraphs feature clear topic sentences and are tightly written about that point. Almost all transitions are smooth.	Writing and presentations are usually logically organized with a coherent line of reasoning. Formatting usually conveys structure of paper or presentation. Readers occasionally struggle through wandering paragraphs or unclear transitions.	Writing and presentations don't show much improvement in organization and coherence, and readers often struggle to identify a line of reasoning.
Clarity and writing mechanics	Writing is mostly clear and concise. Active constructions and a "research voice" is used throughout. Mostly free of errors in writing mechanics (e.g., grammar, spelling, punctuation, sentence structure). Word usage is almost always varied and appropriate.	Writing is usually clear and concise. Passive constructions may occasionally obscure meaning, and some writing may be conversational in tone. Most elements of writing mechanics are correct, and errors do not obscure meaning. Word choice sometimes does not convey intended meaning.	Frequent writing errors begin to obstruct meaning or cast doubt on the credibility of the authors. Overuse of passive constructions may obscure meaning and make reading hard to follow. Word choice often does not convey intended meaning. Conversational tone may not be consistent with credible research.
Visual aids	Visual aids are creative, engaging, and convey messages effectively to diverse audiences.	Visual aids are professional and add value beyond spoken remarks.	Visual aids are professional but do not add much value beyond spoken remarks.
<b>Individual Products</b>			
Quality and extent of writing contributions	Authorship page indicates a substantial writing contribution. Produces writing of good quality that requires minimal revision and editing by team members.	Authorship indicates a reasonable amount of writing contribution. Produces writing of sufficient quality that team members can proceed with reasonable levels of revision and editing.	Authorship indicates few writing contributions. Or produces writing of insufficient quality such that it cannot be used without substantial revision from team members.
Presentation skills	Demonstrates professional presentation skills. Clearly prepared and succeeds in engaging the audience.	Shows noticeable effort and improvement in presentations skills. Clearly prepared and attempts to engage the audience.	Shows some effort and improvement in presentation skills. Sometimes does not seem prepared or is unable to engage the audience.

<p><b>3. Work productively as a team, make effective use of all person-power, and reflect critically and constructively on group process</b></p>			
<p><i>IQP learning outcome: 6; Sources of evidence: Teamwork assessments, meetings, report authorship</i></p>			
	<b>Excellent (A)</b>	<b>Good (B)</b>	<b>Fair/Acceptable (C)</b>
<b><i>Team as a whole</i></b>			
Teamwork monitoring	Our team can identify specific processes, norms, and guidelines we use to work effectively and respectfully together. We regularly monitor our group processes along with individuals' ideas, feelings, and contributions. We can identify actions or adjustments made as a result.	Our team can identify processes, norms, and guidelines used to work effectively and respectfully together. We regularly monitor our group processes with individuals' ideas, feelings, and contributions. We may have some difficulty showing useful, tangible outcomes and actions from that monitoring.	Our team attempted to develop processes, norms, or guidelines to work effectively and respectfully together. We tried to monitor our group processes but often did not succeed in making adjustments. We tried but did not always succeed in monitoring individuals' ideas, feelings, and contributions.
Team critique and conflict identification	Our team reflects critically on its effectiveness and communicates with each other and with advisors regarding challenges it is facing and how it has responded effectively to those challenges.	Team reflects on its effectiveness and attempts to communicate with each other and with advisors regarding challenges it is facing and how it has attempted to respond to those challenges.	Team does not critically reflect on its effectiveness or does not communicate with each other or with advisors regarding challenges it is facing. Conflict avoidance.
<b><i>Individuals</i></b>			
Reliability, effort, quality of work	Partners would say that I am always reliable, and deliver my best effort and high quality work.	Partners would say that I am almost always reliable and deliver solid effort and good quality work.	Partners would say I am inconsistently reliable and don't always deliver solid effort. Quality of work sometimes suffers.
Openness to feedback	When partners or advisors target an issue that relates to me, I am not defensive and always open to discussion. I try to resolve the issue promptly	When partners or advisors target an issue that relates to me, I am usually not defensive and am usually open to discussion. I try to resolve the issue promptly and usually succeed.	When partners or advisors target an issue that related to me, I sometimes am defensive or not always open to discussion. I still try to improve the situation satisfactorily.
Self-assessment and response to feedback	I show critical introspection in identifying my strengths and weaknesses as a team member from the perspective of others. I can identify specific actions I have taken to modify my behavior.	I can identify my strengths and weaknesses as a team member from others' perspectives. I can identify some general ways in which I have attempted to modify my behavior.	I can identify some of my strengths and weaknesses as a team member but not always from others' perspectives. I have difficulty showing evidence of actions I took that led to noticeable improvement.
Support for other team members	I regularly share my feelings and opinions and elicit those of others. I give constructive, actionable feedback to team members and support their efforts to improve.	I usually share my feelings and opinions and consider those of others. I show attempts to give constructive feedback to team and support their efforts to improve.	I occasionally share my feelings and opinions and sometimes disregard those of others. I show little progress in learning to give constructive feedback to team members.

<b>4. Show professionalism</b>			
<p><i>IQP learning outcomes:</i> All, but especially 6 ; <i>Sources of information:</i> Project implementation, meetings, development of report and presentations</p>			
	<b>Excellent (A)</b>	<b>Good (B)</b>	<b>Fair/Acceptable (C)</b>
Conduct of meetings	Meetings between the team and advisors/liaisons are useful and productive. The team is always well prepared, and all team members have a meaningful role in meetings.	Most meetings between the team and advisors/liaisons are useful and productive. The team is almost always well prepared, and all team members usually play a role.	Team often comes to meetings unprepared, or not all members are engaged. Advisors often step in to ensure that important and useful discussion occurs during meetings.
Initiative	Students take the lead in project formulation and implementation. They are proactive and take initiative. They become increasingly self-directed with positive outcomes.	Students become more self-directed and less reliant on advisors as the project progresses. They are usually proactive, take initiative, and show some independent thinking.	Students are often reliant on direction from advisors to deliver a quality project. They do not show much initiative or original independent thinking that is sound.
Overall use of feedback	Students respect feedback from advisors and liaisons, critically reflect on it, ask for clarification when necessary, and always respond to the feedback in recognizable ways.	Students respect feedback from advisors and liaisons and attempt to critically reflect on it. They usually ask for clarification when necessary and respond to the feedback in recognizable ways.	Students don't always value feedback from advisors and liaisons and may not reflect critically on it. Feedback that isn't understood is often ignored, or team does not respond to feedback in recognizable ways.
Attitude	The team always responds with a positive attitude to unexpected changes in the project. They consistently show flexibility and adaptability.	The team usually responds with a positive attitude to unexpected changes in the project. They attempt to be flexible and adaptable.	The team has difficulty responding positively to unexpected changes and tends to get bogged down by them.
Commitment	The team is always in “continuous improvement” mode, shows intrinsic motivation to deliver the best project they can, and shows a commitment to learning.	The team is clearly committed to delivering a high quality product. May rely on advisors' evaluations in deciding how much effort to expend.	The team does what is necessary to deliver an acceptable project.

Points	Grading Criteria
40	<i>Demonstrate critical thinking about and analysis of the appropriate literature.</i> (Has the team made a reasonable effort to uncover a broad sample of the relevant research findings and other background information? Are the claims supported with adequate evidence? Are different viewpoints considered? Is the material demonstrably relevant to the problem under consideration?)
40	<i>Clear, logical structure and smooth flow</i> (Does the paper reveal that the team has worked hard to craft a well-written and unified document, or is it a grab-bag of disparate ideas and poorly developed arguments? Is the paper logically organized? Does it flow smoothly? Does the whole paper read as if written by one person, or does each section/sub-section appear to have been written by a different person? Does each section/sub-section use headings and subheadings appropriately? Does the paper use introductory paragraphs to orient the reader and bridging sentences to smooth the flow between sections/sub-sections?)
5	<i>Figures and tables</i> (Are figures and tables used clearly, effectively and appropriately? Does each figure and table have a meaningful caption, source, and number? Is each figure and table referenced and explained as necessary in the text? Are the figures and tables legible?)
10	<i>Grammar, spelling, style, and format</i> (There are no excuses for spelling mistakes with automated spell-checkers, but has the team edited the paper to ensure consistent use of the active voice and to limit grammatical mistakes? Are there lots of convoluted and confusing run-on sentences? Can these sentences be clearer and more concise? Did the team follow the guidelines for the format of the document?)
5	<i>References</i> (Has the team provided appropriate references to support their claims? Are the references formatted in APA style? Are the in-text citations consistent with the cumulative list of references at the end of the paper?)

## Rubric for Writing Second and Subsequent Drafts

Each team will produce several drafts of the Background/Literature Review of the proposal—a draft that moves considerably beyond what was accomplished in the first draft. To do it well, the team and individuals will use the feedback given for the first draft and make improvements. As in the first draft, the literature review should lead the reader through the basic material necessary to understand the theoretical bases and direction of the research. It goes beyond reporting the information to framing logical arguments about the topic of the paper. A well done second draft means that grammar will be correct, spelling will be accurate, and sections and paragraphs will be organized and relate to each other. In addition, the students will use the correct citation format as assigned. Sources of material will be varied, and the authority for each source established before using the material. Your ID2050 instructor will consult with teams about all of the above issues, but the responsibility for solving problems is a team task. Student initiative and imagination are keys to success.

	Very Satisfactory (A)	Satisfactory (B)	Barely Satisfactory (C)	Unsatisfactory (=NR)
Organization and style of writing and team impact.	The overall logic of the paper is clear remains clear or has been made clear.  Sections and paragraphs continue to be well planned and executed. The titles for section headings relate well to the information in them. The draft uses argument and discussion effectively and is not an information “dump.” What is included passes the test of relevancy. The transitions between sections are clear. Authors are cited when appropriate to make the necessary points, and the positioning of the citations clearly associates the points with the authors cited.	The overall logic of the draft is clear for the most part. New sections contribute to overall clarity. All material passes the test of relevancy. Old sections and paragraphs were revised and new ones are at the same level as the revised ones. Transitions are clear. Only occasionally is argument and discussion absent <i>or</i> information not highly developed. Only occasionally some of the material seems irrelevant. Good progress has occurred to position citations properly.	Sometimes the logic of the draft is still not clear, but there have been attempts at reorganizing. The relevancy of some of the material is still questionable or has not been established. Some parts of the draft develop material well and others less well. There has been some obvious group effort but the parts are not yet well integrated.  Citations frequently seem out of correct positioning and effort seems lacking to correct the problem. There still may be some team dynamic issues affecting the quality of the draft, but they are being addressed.	The quality or quantity of output by individuals continues to be low. Relevancy of much of the material is still questionable <i>or</i> there is still a lack of information so the reader cannot know the direction of the paper. The logic of the presentation continues to be unclear. There continues to be highly visible unevenness in the writing, indicating that the team is not working together on quality control. Team dynamics may be affecting the quality of the draft and the problems appear to continue and do not seem to be addressed.

Mechanics of writing and editing	There has been obvious continued attention to grammar and spelling. Punctuation is largely correct and earlier errors addressed. The distinction in authorship between individual sections is seamless, and the team attests to a full edit of the draft to fix errors.	Mostly, the grammar and spelling are acceptable, although errors pointed out in the last draft occasionally recur. The lines between individual sections are beginning to blur, and the group has attested to a full edit of the entire draft to fix errors.	There seems to be a continued lack of attention to grammar or spelling, which compromises the quality of the draft. There is some progress in addressing differences in individual writing styles, but the progress is limited. Evidence for group editing is lacking even if the group attests to it.	Little attention has been paid to grammar and spelling. Integration of individual writers' styles is still largely absent. Individual and group editing continues not to be apparent.
Sources of information	There are sources from a variety of media whose authority is established.	Occasionally, a reference comes from a source whose authority does not seem well established. Nevertheless, there is a variety of sources, although there may be too many web sources.	There is still too much emphasis on use of the web. Effort continues to be lacking in establishing the authority of sources. There may not be a sufficient number of sources to legitimize arguments. Nevertheless, the material provided, in the main, is acceptable.	The sources are still not varied or are insufficient in number to frame arguments. There is still insufficient attention to establishing the authority of sources.
Use of citation style	References within the text are according to APA publication style. The reference section at the end of the draft follows the APA rules and there are few errors. The team clearly used the APA reference sources on line or in the <u>APA Publications Guide</u> first before seeking help when source information was lacking or was unconventional	References still are usually in APA style, both in the text and at the end of the draft. Old errors were fixed from the first draft, but new ones may have appeared in the second draft. The team needs to show evidence that it is learning the APA style before seeking help for the few sources that are unconventional or not in the <u>APA Publications Guide</u> .	References were often in APA style but there were errors that could have been avoided by using on line APA guidelines sources or the APA Publications Guide. Insufficient attention is being paid to learning to use APA. The team should have demonstrated more responsibility for solving the citation problems before seeking help.	Individuals or team continues to show insufficient effort or responsibility in using references or citations properly. Citations were frequently not in accordance to APA, and the available materials provided in the text, library, or on line do not seem to be used. Either help was not sought or was not used.

## Excerpt of Writing Feedback

on the particular issues you are trying to address. As noted, I think you need to reframe the opening section to provide a little more detail on the nature of the problem MMA faces and perhaps move some of the background history to an appendix. I think it would help to begin the major section on wayfinding by focusing on the general principles that apply in urban planning and design to enhance wayfinding before discussing the approach to wayfinding in museums, on campuses, etc. As much as possible, try to focus on examples of planning/wayfinding that highlight the problem of dealing with historic buildings and historic urban areas. I think it would be helpful to ‘step’ the reader through Figure 3 in more detail and use this figure and discussion to help organize other findings from the literature. You want try to use the language and findings from the main discussion to frame your more detailed discussion of the nature of the problem at MMA in the final section (e.g., does the MMA have directional and interpretive signage? Where? What pre-arrival technology does the MMA use if any? Etc.)

¶

In spite of the trail of green ink, you are off to a good start.

Analysis: → 36 ¶

Structure: → 35 ¶

Grammar: → 9 ¶

Figures: → 3 ¶

References: → 3 ¶

## Excerpt of Writing Mark-up

### 2.1 Definition of Wayfinding

Passini (1996) defined wayfinding as "three interrelated processes: 1) decision making; and the development of decision plans (also called action plans); 2) decision execution; transforming decision plans into behaviour at the right time and place along a route; and 3) information processing, comprising environmental perception and cognition which provide the person with the information necessary for the two decision related processes." This process is shown more clearly in Figure 2. It is important to consider how people will move from one location to another in order to ensure they are able to do so without difficulty. Passini argued that poor wayfinding leads to visitors both feeling negatively about the location and having less desire to return. "Disparate studies have identified a few of the environmental attributes that influence navigation including visual configuration of space, signage, landmarks, architectural differentiation, and symmetry of layout" (Patti et al., 2015). As shown in Figure 3, there are five different facets of wayfinding: signage, pre-arrival technology, place technology, environment/spaces, and support information. There are a variety of options within each of these five categories, but in order to have a successful wayfinding experience it is important to consider multiple categories and not just focus on one of them (McClead, 2014).

1 Use this opening to highlight the structure of the discussion that follows in the remainder of this section (i.e., wayfinding in different contexts—urban areas, college and other campuses, museums, hospitals, etc.).



Golding, Dominic

These definitions would fit better in a larger discussion of wayfinding in an urban context and the general lessons learned and principles from urban design and planning.

1

Having set the major background/context you can then discuss wayfinding in special environments (e.g., museums, college campuses, etc.).



Golding, Dominic

Without more discussion this figure does not really help the reader understand the issues... Are there better summary figures you might use?



Golding, Dominic

I think this figure is useful, but you need to provide a more detailed description of the elements and how they fit into the overall approach to urban design and planning.

## Evaluation Rubric for WPI Project Presentations

	<b>1 - Ineffective</b>	<b>2 - Adequate</b>	<b>3 - Effective</b>
<b>Audience</b>	Presentation not geared towards appropriate audience.	Presentation takes into consideration appropriate audience.	Presentation right on target for appropriate audience.
<b>Organization</b>	Difficulty following presentation because there is lack of logical sequence.	Student presents information in logical sequence which audience can follow.	Well organized, logical, and interesting sequence which audience can easily follow.
<b>Learning/Visual Aids</b> <i>Such as diagrams, maps, video clips, props, or handouts.</i>	Lacks aids or use of superfluous aids, or those provided do not effectively support the presentation.	Aids appropriate and relate to the presentation.	Visual aids explain, reinforce and enliven the presentation.
<b>Delivery</b>	No eye contact with audience, or oral presentation difficult to understand or hear. Speakers nervous or disengaged from audience.	Some eye contact, oral presentation effective but reliance on notes. Minimal audience awareness.	Presenters speak clearly, audibly, energetically, seldom returning to notes, maintaining eye contact and audience awareness.
<b>Teamwork/Group Collaboration</b>	Not all students participate in giving presentation or responding to questions and/or minimal coherence when transitioning.	Students present and respond to questions equally.	Obvious students practiced as a team and highly effective, equal presentation with smooth transitions and response to questions by all team members.
<b>Project Context</b>	Does not present the problem as having connections to other contexts--cultural, political, etc.	At a basic level, identifies and considers the influence of the context of the project	Well-developed explanation of contextual issues with a clear sense of scope and considers the influence of the context of the project.
<b>Problem Statement</b>	Does not identify or summarize the problem/question accurately if at all.	Accurately identifies the problem/question and provides a brief summary.	Accurately identifies the problem/question and provides a well-developed summary.
<b>Synthesis and Evaluation of Sources</b>	Demonstrates superficial ability to integrate ideas, theories, processes, or principles or demonstrates limited ability to assess the value, credibility and power of these ideas. Incorporates no credible sources.	Demonstrates adequate ability to integrate ideas, theories, processes, or principles or demonstrates limited ability to assess the value, credibility and power of these ideas. Incorporates some sources.	Demonstrates insightful ability to take ideas, theories, processes, or principles to new territory as well as to assess the value, credibility and power of these to decide on well-considered choices and opinions. Incorporates balanced credible sources.
<b>Conclusions</b>	Does not identify conclusions, implications, and consequences of the project or key relationships between elements of the problem, such as context, implications, assumptions, or data and evidence.	At a basic level, identifies and discusses conclusions, implications, and consequences considering context, assumptions, data, and evidence.	Identifies and discusses conclusions, implications, and consequences considering context, assumptions, data, and evidence.

CMD 2012

## Midterm Feedback – Team in General

Dear Greg,

The term is about half completed, and we would like to provide you with feedback regarding our impressions of your performance thus far. Below we have organized our comments according to the evaluation criteria on pp. 9-15 in the *Guidelines and Procedures Manual*. First we present our assessment of your team's work as a whole and then we add some observations about your individual work. Evidence that we are using in this assessment includes drafts you have submitted, your presentations, meetings and discussions, teamwork assessment, and overall progress. At the end we provide a summary grade to indicate the level at which we feel you are performing at this point in time, in the context of the range of performance we typically see at the midpoint of projects. In order to give you more information, we are using + and - grades, which of course are not available for final grades at WPI.

- 1. Formulating and completing a project – goal and objectives, research, methods, analysis, results, and IQP balance: *Fair*.** You were patient and persistent in the first weeks of the project to utilize Paul's extensive feedback and adjust your objectives and data gathering instruments accordingly. You discovered that writing good interview questions requires lots of critical thinking, and received lots of assistance from us to get those into shape. You have begun the process of making claims from the data that you have gathered; the challenge will be to make them specific and useful while also acknowledging the limitations of your findings. A key to the success of the project will be your ability to do an integrative analysis and utilize critical thinking to provide clear, insightful guidance about the feasibility of this new type of public-access boat storage facility.
- 2. Communicating effectively in written and oral form: *Fair to good*.** Your Introduction, Background, Methodology, and Findings drafts have been acceptable for this stage of the project, but have a long way to go to become a clear, persuasive argument about the feasibility of public boat clubs. We think that as your thinking about the project advances, your writing will too. We know that you have the ability to produce good quality writing, and we can tell you are making earnest efforts to use our feedback. Your presentations have shown some improvement, and will improve further with more practice and more reflection on your key messages.
- 3. Working productively as a team, and working constructively to improve team effectiveness: *Very good*.** Your formative team assessment was insightful and you identified some concrete action items in the areas of task delegation, group editing, inclusivity, and cutting down on distractions to help the team become better organized, focused, and effective. Now that you've identified those issues, we encourage you to show real progress in those areas.
- 4. Professionalism – being proactive, positive, self-directed, and flexible: *Some very good, some just fair*.** Your team has been done well to manage the situation of a very busy liaison who provides high volumes of feedback in quick bursts. Your interactions with us and Paul have always been professional, and you have maintained a positive attitude. We have not seen a lot of initiative, motivation, or self-direction from your team. We encourage you to be as proactive as you can during these final weeks of the project. Weekly meetings are challenging to run with multiple participants from DHK and HBF. Think critically about how to best use the time during the meetings – move away from a mechanical focus on "accomplishments and plans" to leave more time to discuss the most important findings and information needs. As the project moves into its final stages, we encourage you to keep focused on the big picture—analyzing the feasibility of these boat

## Midterm Feedback – Individual Student

Greg, it is clear that you are making useful contributions to this project, and that your teammates appreciate your supportive nature, level of effort, and good thinking. As your teammates have suggested, we encourage you to work on being more open to feedback and the ideas of others—really seeking to understand and being willing to change your mind before arguing a point. That will help you become more persuasive when you put forth your best ideas. In meetings, you often appear unengaged – not taking notes and sometimes appearing to “zone out.” Maybe you don’t take notes because you feel you learn better just by listening, and maybe you are thinking very hard, but it doesn’t come across. Strive to be as engaged as possible and get as much from the meetings as you can.

Overall, considering all of these criteria together, we would characterize your work thus far this term as fair to good, corresponding to a letter grade B-. We believe you can complete this project at a high level. The key factors in achieving this will be more initiative, independent critical thinking, and useful results.

We have enjoyed working with you so far, and look forward to seeing what you will accomplish. We are entering what should be the most intensive and challenging part of the term. As always, let us know if you have any questions or suggestions about how we can be more effective coaches.

# WPI Student Course Report

Class Climate	WPI Student Course Report	 
---------------	---------------------------	--

Mark as shown:      Please use a ball-point pen or a thin felt tip. This form will be processed automatically.

Correction:     Please follow the examples shown on the left hand side to help optimize the reading results.

You can help improve the quality of teaching at WPI by providing your responses on this form. Please consider each reply thoughtfully. These reports are used by the instructor for self-improvement, by students during course selection and by members of the administration and faculty committees. Your responses are anonymous and optional. Your comments will not be returned to your instructor until after the grading deadline.

1. My overall rating of the quality of this course is	Very Poor (1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5) Excellent				
2. My overall rating of the Instructor's teaching is	(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5)				
3. The educational value of the textbook and/or assigned reading was	(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5)				
4. The educational value of the assigned work was	(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5)				
5. The Instructor's organization of the course was	(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5)				
6. The Instructor's clarity in communicating course objectives was	(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5)				
7. The Instructor's skill in providing understandable explanations was	(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5)				
8. The Instructor's skill in speaking clearly and audibly was	(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5)				

Relative to other college courses I have taken:

9. The amount I learned from the course was	Much less (1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5) Much more				
10. The intellectual challenge presented by the course was	(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5)				
11. The Instructor's personal interest in helping students learn was	(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5)				
12. The Instructor stimulated my interest in the subject matter	(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5)				
13. The Instructor encouraged communication outside of regular contact hours	(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5)				
14. The amount of reading, homework, and other assigned work was	(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5)				
15. My attendance and participation for this course was	(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5)				
16. The amount of effort I put into this course was	(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5)				

How frequently were the following statements true in this course?

17. The Instructor was well prepared to teach class.	Never (1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5) Always
18. My Instructor used course time effectively.	(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5)
19. The Instructor encouraged students to ask questions.	(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5)
20. The Instructor treated students with respect.	(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5)
21. Instructor feedback on exams/assignments was timely and helpful.	(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5)
22. The exams and/or evaluations were good measures of the material covered.	(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5)
23. My grades were determined in a fair and impartial manner.	(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5)
24. What grade do you think you will receive in this course?	<input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> NR/D/F	<input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> Other/Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/> C				
25. Which of the following best describes the role of this course in your academic program?	<input type="checkbox"/> In your major field <input type="checkbox"/> Required for minor	<input type="checkbox"/> Required for major <input type="checkbox"/> Other Requirement	<input type="checkbox"/> Free elective				
26A. On average, how many hours of the formally scheduled hours for lecture, conference, and labs did you ATTEND each week?	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 hr/wk or less <input type="checkbox"/> 6 hr/wk	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 hr/wk <input type="checkbox"/> 7 hr/wk or more	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 hr/wk				
26B. On average, what were the total hours spent in each 7-day week OUTSIDE of formally scheduled class time in work related to this course (Including studying, reading, writing, homework, rehearsal, etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 hr/wk <input type="checkbox"/> 11-15 hr/wk	<input type="checkbox"/> 1-5 hr/wk <input type="checkbox"/> 16-20 hr/wk	<input type="checkbox"/> 6-10 hr/wk <input type="checkbox"/> 21 hr/wk or more				

**STUDENT REPORT ON IQP LEARNING & ADVISING**

Students are invited to complete this form on-line when they are electronically submitting their IQP reports, which is before they receive their grade.

Terms &amp; Credits:

Date:

Advisor:

Project Code:

**WPI STUDENT REPORT ON IQP LEARNING & ADVISING**

By providing your perceptions of the effectiveness of your project and advisor in fostering your intellectual and personal development, you can help to improve the overall quality of education at WPI. Therefore, please take the time to respond thoughtfully to each question on this report form. These reports are used by the advisor for self-improvement and by members of the administration and faculty committees as one important factor in determining salary, promotion, and tenure. Other students may also use this information in selecting projects and advisors.

**A NOTE ON CONFIDENTIALITY:** Your report will remain anonymous and no information linking you to your responses will be collected. We have linked the form electronically to your CDR submission simply to assure that all students are afforded the opportunity and encouraged to report on their IQP experience. Your report form will be grouped with those of all other advisees completing IQPs with your advisor(s) and will not be released until all your IQP grades are final and on file with the Registrar. You may choose not to answer any questions you wish.

**Rating of STUDENT LEARNING****Please rate your progress on the following learning objectives:**

		Very poor	Average	Excellent
1. Learning how to set and meet goals for research and projects	1	2	3	4
2. Learning how to find and use information resources	1	2	3	4
3. Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas and information	1	2	3	4
4. Developing skill in expressing oneself in writing	1	2	3	4
5. Developing skill in expressing oneself orally	1	2	3	4
6. Acquiring skill in working with others as a member of a team (if applicable)	1	2	3	4
7. Overall, I rate my learning from this project as	1	2	3	4

**Rating of ADVISOR PERFORMANCE** {for 2 or more advisors, the students will be asked to evaluate each advisor individually on a separate page.}**Please rate the Advisor's performance on the following criteria:**

		Very poor	Average	Excellent
8. The advisor's personal interest in helping students learn	1	2	3	4
9. The advisor's treatment and respect for students	1	2	3	4
10. The advisor's helpfulness in fostering good professional habits	1	2	3	4
11. The advisor's encouragement of creativity in meeting project goals and needs	1	2	3	4
12. The advisor's facilitation of team functioning (if applicable)	1	2	3	4
13. The advisor's ability to challenge me in a constructive manner	1	2	3	4
14. The advisor's creation of an atmosphere of trust	1	2	3	4
15. The advisor's articulation of expectations and grading criteria	1	2	3	4
16. The advisor's feedback on my work	1	2	3	4
17. The advisor was easily accessible when needed	1	2	3	4
18. The advisor's timeliness in responding to my work	1	2	3	4
19. Overall, I rate the advisor's effectiveness as	1	2	3	4

### Rating of **OTHER PROJECT DIMENSIONS**

	Very poor	Average	Excellent
20. The intellectual challenge presented by the project was	1	2	3
21. The project's overall value as an educational experience was	1	2	3
22. Overall, my level of effort on this project was	1	2	3
23. In the final term, I worked on average the following number of hours per week on the project ____.			
24. What grade do you expect to receive on this project? A B C			

**For Off-Campus Projects Only** {for 2 or more advisors, the students will be asked to evaluate each advisor individually on a separate page.}

	Never	Sometimes	Always
25. I felt I could go to the advisor for advice on nonacademic issues	1	2	3
26. The advisor made me aware of on-site safety issues in a timely way	1	2	3
27. The advisor kept me aware of on-site health issues as appropriate	1	2	3
28. The advisor encouraged me to participate in cultural activities	1	2	3
29. The advisor provided useful information concerning local customs	1	2	3
30. The advisor's expectations were consistent from on-campus preparation to project conclusion	1	2	3
			4
			5

---

### Additional Ranked Questions (use only if directed by advisor):

31.	1	2	3	4	5	35.	1	2	3	4	5
32.	1	2	3	4	5	36.	1	2	3	4	5
33.	1	2	3	4	5	37.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	1	2	3	4	5	38.	1	2	3	4	5

---

### Written Comments

1. What did you particularly like about this project experience?
2. What did you particularly dislike about this project experience?
3. What could the advisor have done to improve your learning?
4. What could you have done to improve your learning?

### Other comments

# WPI Online Sponsor Survey

**1. Your name and organization (optional):**

---

**2. Project location:**

---

**3. How much experience does your organization have with WPI's student project programs?**

We have sponsored three or more previous projects

---

**4. How satisfied is your organization with the students' level of effort?**

Highly satisfied

Students are typically self-starters and organize themselves effectively into teams.

---

**5. How satisfied is your organization with the quality of results the students generated?**

Highly satisfied

**6. How satisfied is your organization with WPI's oversight of its student project program?**

Highly satisfied

**7. How likely is your organization to make use of the results of the students' work?**

Likely

Of the numerous projects, probably half will result in some improvements/changes in the Town of Nantucket.

---

**8. Besides the results, what other value does your organization perceive from sponsoring WPI student projects?**

These projects force our elected officials to contemplate smart ideas for accommodating the future. They furnish important grist for the mill!

---

**9. How likely is your organization to sponsor more WPI projects in the future?**

Highly likely to sponsor more projects

**10. What is the most important factor in deciding whether to sponsor a project?**

Feasibility and availability of an effective sponsor here.

---

**11. Do you have any suggestions for how WPI's project program might be improved?**

Nope!

---

**12. Any other comments?**

Your student teams are a wonderful resource, and we try to stay in touch with our alumni/ae

## Additional Sources

AAC&U Value Rubrics address a variety of intellectual and social abilities; the ones devoted to teamwork, oral presentation, and problem-solving may be especially helpful. <http://www.aacu.org/VALUE/rubrics/>

Amador, José A., Libby Miles, Calvin B. Peters. *The Practice of Problem-Based Learning: A Guide to Implementing PBL in the College Classroom*. 2006.

Buck Institute for Education. *PBL for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Success: Teaching Critical Thinking, Collaboration, Communication, and Creativity*. CA: Novato. 2013.

Buck Institute for Education. <http://bie.org/?gclid=CLuZkeGg0b4CFcpcMgodYAYAAQ>.

Helle, Laura. *Lessons from research on project-based learning in higher education: A review of the literature and a comparative analysis in the context of higher education and adult education* Paperback. 2011.

Wolfe, Joanna. *Team Writing: A Guide to Working in Groups*. Boston: Beford/St. Martins. 2010.