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Overview of Issue

The vast majority of studies shows significant gaps in time spent by women and men faculty in teaching, research, and service activities. This is problematic as spending less time on research and more on service and teaching can negatively impact a faculty member's career advancement. While awareness of equity gaps and their consequences is increasing, the processes through which work is taken up, assigned, and rewarded unequally are still not well understood.

Main Findings

Studies found that female faculty engage in more campus service and teaching-mentoring related activities than their male colleagues and that these differences become more pronounced as faculty move along in their careers (Acker & Armenti, 2004; Carrigan, Quin, & Riskin, 2011; Clark & Cocoran, 1986; Guarino & Borden, 2017; Link, Swan, & Bozeman, 2008; Misra, Lundquist, Holmes, & Agiomavritos, 2011; O'Meara, Kuvaeva, & Nyunt, 2017; Park, 1996; Winslow, 2010). These findings are consistent across different methods including national surveys of faculty (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Carrigan et al., 2011; Guarino & Borden, 2017; Link et al., 2008; Winslow, 2010), annual faculty reports (O'Meara et al., 2017), and time diaries (O'Meara, Kuvaeva, Nyunt, Waugaman, & Jackson, 2017).

Women of color face particular demands for unrewarded work as they are called upon to represent faculty of color and women. Studies have shown women faculty of color engaged in more mentoring and advising work and being asked to serve on more faculty searches and diversity-related committees than white faculty and male faculty of color (Griffin & Reddick, 2011; Joseph & Hirshfield, 2011; Stanley, 2006; Turner, González & Wood, 2008; Wood, Hilton, & Nevarez, 2015).

Moreover, the kinds of campus service that women engage in are often less prestigious, less promotable, more time-consuming, or "token" (Babcock, Recalde, Vesterlund, & Weingart, 2017; Misra et al., 2011; Mitchell & Hesli, 2013; Porter, 2007; Twale & Shannon, 1996).

Research suggests women may be committed to teaching and campus service in particular ways (O'Meara, 2016; Umbach, 2006; Winslow, 2010). Students have been found to have expectations that women faculty are more available to them than male faculty (Anderson, 2010). Studies find that women do not necessarily say yes or volunteer more often to engage in service but are asked more often to engage in service (Mitchell & Hesli, 2013; O'Meara et al., 2017).

Key Recent Studies


This study examined gender differences in how research university faculty spend their work time using a modified time diary approach. Associate and full professors in 13 universities recorded their work activities for four weeks. Consistent with previous research, this study found women faculty spend more time on campus service, student advising, and teaching related activities whereas male faculty spend more time on research. The study also found women receive more new work requests than men on average 3.4 requests more than men in four weeks.
combined. Men and women also received different kinds of work requests, with women receiving more requests to be engaged in teaching, student advising, and professional service than men.


Time is a valuable resource in academic careers. Empirical evidence suggests women faculty spend more time in campus service than men. Yet some studies show no difference when relevant variables are included. The primary source of data for most workload studies is cross-sectional surveys that have several weaknesses. This study investigated campus service inequality and factors that predict it at a research university using a novel and more comprehensive source of data—annual faculty reports. The investigation was guided by Kanter’s work on the role of power and representation and Lewis and Simpson’s rereading of Kanter’s work to focus on gender, power, and representation. The authors examined 1,146 records of faculty campus service during 2 years. In both years, women faculty reported more total campus service than men while controlling for race, rank, science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), and the critical mass of women in a department. When considering levels of service, women reported higher numbers of service activities at the department and university levels. Women in male-dominated fields tended to have service workloads more like their peers and less like women in non-STEM fields. The article concludes with considerations regarding implications for organizing practices that maintain inequity between men and women in campus service.


This paper investigates the amount of academic service performed by female versus male faculty. We use 2014 data from a large national survey of faculty at more than 140 institutions as well as 2012 data from an online annual performance reporting system for tenured and tenure-track faculty at two campuses of a large public, Midwestern University. We find evidence in both data sources that, on average, women faculty perform significantly more service than men, controlling for rank, race/ethnicity, and field or department. Our analyses suggest that the male–female differential is driven more by internal service—i.e., service to the university, campus, or department—than external service—i.e., service to the local, national, and international communities—although significant heterogeneity exists across field and discipline in the way gender differentials play out.

**Equity Minded Strategies**

- Create greater awareness of workload inequity by collecting data on it and sharing it widely (e.g., through dashboards that show minimum, average, and high teaching, advising, and campus service workloads)
- Require rotations for time-intensive service roles, fair distribution of advising loads, and credit for faculty who take on more than their fair share through merit review processes
- Implicit bias training for faculty, department chairs, deans, and other institutional leadership on division of labor and how to mitigate bias
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Based on a qualitative study of sixteen faculty of color at a private research university, this article argues that service, though significantly presenting obstacles to the promotion and retention of faculty of color, actually may set the stage for critical agency that resists and redefines academic structures that hinder faculty success. The construct of 'service,' therefore, presents the opportunity for theorizing the interplay of human agency and social structures. The article suggests that faculty may seek to redefine oppressive structures through service, thus, exercising an agency that emerges from the very structures that constrain it. Faculty of color, in particular, may engage in service to promote the success of racial minorities in the academy and elsewhere. Thus, service, especially that which seeks to further social justice, contributes to the redefinition of the academy and society at large.


Gender differences in task allocations may sustain vertical gender segregation in labor markets. We examine the allocation of a task that everyone prefers be completed by someone else (writing a report, serving on a committee, etc.) and find evidence that women, more than men, volunteer, are asked to volunteer, and accept requests to volunteer for such tasks. Beliefs that women, more than men, say yes to tasks with low promotability appear as an important driver of these differences. If women hold tasks that are less promotable than those held by men, then women will progress more slowly in organizations.


Engineering education scholars have demonstrated an interest in broadening the scope of the field in multiple ways, including issues addressed and approaches employed. These scholars have argued the need to broaden the epistemological and methodological boundaries of the field. However, numerous challenges to such expansion exist, and they must be better understood if the potential of broadening the field's boundaries is to be fulfilled. To that end, this paper has three aims: 1) to demonstrate how new metaphors can contribute to grounded theory development, 2) to explain the significance of such approaches, and 3) to identify challenges of introducing grounded theories and new metaphors in engineering education research. The paper begins with a discussion of the methodological justification for developing grounded theories via new metaphors. An overview of one of our prior studies that attempted to develop a new metaphor-based grounded theory is then presented. Based on our experiences with that project, as well as other prior work, the challenges encountered in this type of work are then discussed. The discussion also raises larger questions about the nature of theory in engineering education research.

Growing awareness of the underrepresentation of women in male-dominated fields like science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM), has inspired universities across the United States to examine more carefully their strategies for recruiting, retaining, and promoting women students and faculty. To do so has required assembling personnel to organize and execute data collection, analyses, and interpretation. Not surprisingly, women faculty are the primary participants in this type of work. We examine the process of creating a status of women report at Iowa State University, including what this process means for institutional responsibility for gender issues and for the careers of women who produce such reports. We also recommend ways to address the problems associated with women’s unrecognized service work. We refer to such work as “institutional housekeeping” because it involves the invisible and supportive work of women to improve women’s status within the institution.


We find that faculty members are more satisfied with their jobs when they perceive that their colleagues respect their research work and they are paid what they are worth. Women tend to be less satisfied, and the tenured are more satisfied. Industry and university research center affiliations do not predict job satisfaction.


This study explored whether there is a gendered division of labor for faculty in academic science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) at research universities and examined the connections between time allocation and satisfaction for STEM faculty within the context of a critical mass of women in the discipline. Using a weighted sample of 13,884 faculty from the 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:04), we found a gendered division of labor that is mitigated by a critical mass of women faculty in the discipline. Results lend empirical support to theories that argue critical-mass attainment positively impacts equity in resource distribution and time allocation.


Scholarly productivity reaps tangible internal and external rewards, while the "reward" for excellent faculty committee work performance often is additional committee work. Some faculty members perform substantial institution-sustaining committee work while others are institutional service work "social loafers". This essay suggests this traditional workload distribution model may be unsustainable. Innovations in legal education are resulting in increased committee work while reductions in full-time faculty at many schools leave fewer faculty members available to do that work. Those currently doing the lion's share of the work may be unable, or unwilling, to take on additional committee work responsibilities. This article examines methods for avoiding an institutional governance crisis. Grounding the discussion in social science literature, it explores ways to engage more faculty members in committee work by creating accountability structures via smaller committees and evaluation of committee work contributions. It posits that evaluating
committee work sets normative standards, potentially changing cultural expectations about institutional committee work participation. The appendix contains a sample committee work contribution evaluative rubric. The article also discusses an equitable solution to disparate committee workloads – providing those who consistently take on significant committee work responsibilities with a temporary release from committee work. This kind of workload release could help level the playing field and allow those who carry heavy committee workloads the opportunity to engage more fully in their scholarship. Throughout, the article discusses the implications of failing to address committee workload inequities and proposes ways to engage more faculty in the work necessary to maintain thriving self-governing educational institutions in today's changing legal environment.


This study examined the connections among race, gender, sources of stress, and productivity in the areas of research, teaching, and service for 21,840 full-time, undergraduate faculty across 411 four-year institutions. Data was obtained from the Higher Education Research Institute's (HERI) 2010–2011 Faculty Survey. Multilevel modeling revealed that stress due to discrimination had a negative impact on research productivity for faculty of color. Stress due to family obligations however, was found to significantly and positively impact faculty's adoption of student-centered teaching practices and participation in civic-minded activities. When other variables in the model were controlled for, female faculty tended to incorporate student-centered practices into their teaching with significantly greater regularity than their male counterparts—nearly a quarter of a standard deviation higher. The authors conclude that as faculty experienced greater stress due to changes in work responsibilities and family obligations, they seemed to rise to the challenge with regard to their use of evidence-based teaching practices in their classrooms.


Although the number of U.S. female professors has risen steadily in recent years, female professors are still subject to different student expectations and treatment. Students continue to perceive and expect female professors to be more nurturing than male professors are. We examined whether students may consequently request more special favors from female professors. In a survey of professors (n = 88) across the United States, Study 1 found that female (versus male) professors reported getting more requests for standard work demands, special favors, and friendship behaviors, with the latter two mediating the professor gender effect on professors' self-reported emotional labor. Study 2 utilized an experimental design using a fictitious female or male professor, with college student participants (n = 121) responding to a scenario in which a special favor request might be made of the professor. The results indicated that academically entitled students (i.e., those who feel deserving of success in college regardless of effort/performace) had stronger expectations that a female (versus male) professor would grant their special favor requests. Those expectations consequently increased students' likelihood of making the requests and of exhibiting negative emotional and behavioral reactions to having those requests denied. This work highlights the extra burdens felt by female professors. We discuss possible moderators of these effects as well as the importance of developing strategies for preventing them.

This paper investigates the amount of academic service performed by female versus male faculty. We use 2014 data from a large national survey of faculty at more than 140 institutions as well as 2012 data from an online annual performance reporting system for tenured and tenure-track faculty at two campuses of a large public, Midwestern University. We find evidence in both data sources that, on average, women faculty perform significantly more service than men, controlling for rank, race/ethnicity, and field or department. Our analyses suggest that the male–female differential is driven more by internal service—i.e., service to the university, campus, or department—than external service—i.e., service to the local, national, and international communities—although significant heterogeneity exists across field and discipline in the way gender differentials play out.


Contrary to notions that faculty women are overly sensitive and over-dramatize their work-life challenges, quantitative and qualitative data from a large public research university provide contrasting work-life experiences for female and male faculty. Significant gender differences, emphasized by rich description from faculty, are reported in teaching, service, and research responsibilities that contribute to increased levels of stress for women. Specific strategies for creating more equitable and less stressful work environments are highlighted.


This study examined the effects of gender stereotypes and the expectations they produce about both what women are like (descriptive) and how they should behave (prescriptive) in leadership roles. These stereotypes and prejudices resulted in the devaluation of women's performance, denial of credit for their successes, and/or penalization for being competent. Because of gender bias and the way in which it influences evaluations in work settings, the authors argue that being competent does not ensure that a woman will advance to the same organizational level as an equivalently performing man. Additionally, reflecting the injunctive aspects of the female role, women's especially agentic behavior tended to produce negative reactions, whether delivered in a leaderless situation or as a leader, especially from male observers.


Many previous time allocation studies treat work as a single activity and examine trade-offs between work and other activities. This paper investigates the at-work allocation of time among teaching, research, grant writing and service by science and engineering faculty at top US research universities. We focus on the relationship between tenure (and promotion) and time allocation, and we find that tenure and promotion do affect the allocation of time. The specific trade-offs are related to particular career paths. For example, full professors spend increasing time on service at the expense of teaching and research while longer-term associate professors who have not been promoted to full professor spend significantly more time teaching at the expense of research time. Finally, our results suggest that women, on average, allocate more hours to university service and less time to research than do men.

Research indicates that women faculty hit a glass ceiling near the top of the ivory tower. This study explores evidence of a glass ceiling among faculty at a research-intensive university. The authors found differences in when and what type of service men and women faculty take on as associate professors. Certain service roles (e.g. undergraduate director) were found to be associated with longer time to promotion. The authors also found differences in how much time associate professor men and women spend on service vs research, even though both men and women express a preference for research. The article ends with suggestions for policy changes to alter the service culture.


This article examines the dual problems of “women don’t ask” and “women don’t say no” in the academic profession. First, we consider whether female faculty bargain more or less frequently than male faculty about such resources as salary, research support, clerical support, moving expenses, and spousal accommodation. Analyzing a 2009 APSA survey, we find that women are more likely to ask for resources than men when considering most categories of bargaining issues. This finding goes against conventional wisdom in the literature on gender and bargaining that suggests that women are less likely to bargain than men. Second, we seek to understand if women are reluctant to say no when asked to provide service at the department, college, university, or disciplinary levels. We find that women are asked to provide more service and that they agree to serve more frequently than men. We also find that the service women provide is more typically “token” service, as women are less likely to be asked by their colleagues to serve as department chair, to chair committees, or to lead academic programs. The implications of these results for the leaky pipeline in the academic profession are discussed.


Empirical evidence suggests women faculty spend more time in campus service than men, which perpetuates inequality between men and women because research is valued more than service in academic reward systems, especially at research universities. In this qualitative study, I apply insights from research on gender inequality to examine whether women and men faculty at a research university were thinking about their campus service differently. I found that, overall, more women framed campus service in communal terms and expressed local orientations toward campus service; more men positioned service as a campus problem, and noted their own interests to avoid or minimize involvement in campus service so as not to hurt their career. In a smaller group of cases, the faculty member expressed the dominant pattern for the other gender; however, even in these cases participants provided examples of the dominant pattern for their gender as well. In all cases, women and men were influenced by gendered ways of thinking about work and gendered organizational practices that permeated their socialization and work environments.

Time is a valuable resource in academic careers. Empirical evidence suggests women faculty spend more time in campus service than men. Yet some studies show no difference when relevant variables are included. The primary source of data for most workload studies is cross-sectional surveys that have several weaknesses. This study investigated campus service inequality and factors that predict it at one research university using a novel and more comprehensive source of data - annual faculty reports. The investigation was guided by Kanter’s work on the role of power and representation and Lewis and Simpson’s re-reading of Kanter’s work to focus on gender, power, and representation. The authors examined 1,146 records of faculty campus service during 2 years. In both years, women faculty reported more total campus service than men while controlling for race, rank, science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), and the critical mass of women in a department. When considering levels of service, women reported higher numbers of service activities at the department and university levels. Women in male-dominated fields tended to have service workloads more like their peers and less like women in non-STEM fields. The article concludes with considerations regarding implications for organizing practices that maintain inequity between men and women in campus service.


Guided by research on gendered organizations and faculty careers, we examined gender differences in how research university faculty spend their work time. We used time-diary methods to understand faculty work activities at a micro-level of detail, as recorded by faculty themselves over 4 weeks. We also explored workplace interactions that shape faculty workload. Similar to past studies, we found women faculty spending more time on campus service, student advising, and teaching-related activities and men spending more time on research. We also found that women received more new work requests than men and that men and women received different kinds of work requests. We consider implications for future research and the career advancement of women faculty in research universities.


This article describes social structural inequities in the academy that contribute to gender imbalances in faculty service demands, which can slow women’s career advancement. The author criticizes as ill-considered and ineffective the popular notion that the solution rests with individual female faculty, who should “just say no” to service. Instead, she proposes structural and cultural solutions to this systemic problem, including a revaluation of faculty labor required to maintain the day-to-day operation of institutions of higher learning and research.


According to the perspective developed in this article, widely shared, hegemonic cultural beliefs about gender and their impact in what the authors call “social relational” contexts are among the core components that maintain and change the gender system. When gender is salient in these ubiquitous contexts, cultural beliefs about gender function as part of the rules of the game, biasing the behaviors, performances, and evaluations of otherwise similar men and women in systematic ways that the authors specify. While the biasing impact of gender beliefs may be small
in any one instance, the consequences cumulate over individuals’ lives and result in substantially different outcomes for men and women. After describing this perspective, the authors show how it sheds new light on some defining features of the gender system and illustrate its implications for research into specific questions about gender inequality.


This article focuses on faculty members’ allocation of time to teaching and research, conceptualizing these—and the mismatch between preferred and actual time allocations—as examples of gender inequality in academic employment. Utilizing data from the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, I find that (1) women faculty members prefer to spend a greater percentage of their time on teaching, while men prefer to spend more time on research, although these preferences are themselves constrained; (2) women faculty members spend a greater percentage of their workweek on teaching and a smaller percentage on research than men, gaps that cannot be explained by preferences or educational and institutional attributes; and (3) women faculty members have larger time allocation mismatches than men—that is, their actual time allocations to both teaching and research diverge more from their preferred time allocations than those of men. These findings shed light on how gender inequality is both produced and maintained in this aspect of academic employment and have implications for job satisfaction, productivity, and the recruitment and retention of current and future faculty members, especially women.
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Guided by research on gendered organizations and faculty careers, we examined gender differences in how research university faculty spend their work time and the everyday workplace interactions that produce differences, with a particular emphasis on campus service. Our study used a time-diary approach that allowed us to understand faculty work activities at a micro level of detail, as recorded by faculty themselves over four weeks. Thought time-diary approaches have a long history in social science research that strives to understand events that occur in a specific period of time (Edgerton & Sandberg, 2001; Juster & Stafford, 1983), they have not been a popular method in studies of faculty workload and time use. In addition to recording their work activities in 5-minute intervals in the time diary, we asked participants to complete an in-take survey to share information about their ongoing work activities. Participants also recorded new work requests that they received during the four weeks and their responses.

Our participants were 111 associate and full professors from 13 universities that are members of the Big 10 Conference, the oldest Division I collegiate athletic conference in the U.S., and the Association of American Universities. Our participants were representative of the invited sample by race/ethnicity. However, women and associate professors were overrepresented, suggesting that faculty with higher service and/or teaching loads were more willing to participate.

Our findings supported previous research that indicated that women spend more time on teaching and service-related activities than men (Acker & Armenti, 2004; Carrigan, Quinn, & RisBun, 2011; Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Link, Swan, & Bozemman, 2008; Misra, Landquist, Hildreth, & Agiomavritis, 2011; O'Mara, Kuvaev, & Nyunt, 2017; Park, 1996; Winslow, 2010). Our study also supported previous findings that associate professors are more involved in teaching and service than full professors and less satisfied with the work distribution (Modern language Association of America, 2009; Stout, Stalges, & Jennings, 2007).

Specifically, we found statistically significant gender differences with women reporting more involvement in teaching-related activities (i.e., chairing masters' theses, comps papers or undergraduate projects) and men more involvement in research and professional service-related activities (i.e., publishing journal articles, having or planning on submitting one or more grants, serving as a journal editor). Based on faculty time diaries, women reported more hours per week spent on teaching-related activities than men (i.e., reading dissertations/theses/ capstone projects/comps paper), while men reported spending more hours per week on research-related activities (i.e., lab/ fieldwork/general research preparation). Men also reported spending almost twice as much time as women in professional conversations with colleagues.

![Fig. 1: Type of Request - Male Faculty](Image)

![Fig. 2: Type of Request - Female Faculty](Image)
In regard to rank, we found statistically significant differences between associate and full professors with full professors being more likely to serve in more professional service and research-related roles (i.e., journal editor, off-campus professional presentations, PI of active grant). Associate professors were less likely to believe that the distribution of service work in their department is fair. In their time diaries, full professors reported more total work, more time on research overall as well as more time on select research activities (i.e., manuscript preparation; lab, field work, general research preparation, research group meetings), while associate professors reported more time spent on teaching and advising (i.e., course administration and advising undergraduate students).

Our most interesting finding, however, related to gendered workplace interactions shaping workload. Over the four weeks, the 111 participants reported a total of 496 work activity requests (see Fig. 1 and 2 for type of requests by gender and Fig. 3 for who the requesters were). Across all four weeks, women received 3.4 more requests for new work activities than men; the requests women received were more likely to focus on teaching, student advising, and professional service. We also found that women received more work activity requests from women and men more requests from men. Women were not necessarily saying yes more often than men, in fact both she and her male colleague said yes about 3/4th of the time (women said yes to 72% of the requests received; men said yes to 82% of the requests received); nor were their reasons for saying yes or no that different. Rather, the woman faculty member received more requests; prompting more decisions.

Our findings shed light on how time use is shaped by a number of factors that foster cumulative disadvantage for women faculty careers and reproduce inequality. Imagine a male and female faculty member; both start their academic careers within a gendered research university wherein organizational logic values research over teaching and service (Acker, 1990; Ely & Meyerson, 2000). Before the female faculty member even begins her work week, she is scheduled to be involved in more teaching related activities while her male colleagues is scheduled to serve as an editor, prepare publications, and engage in professional conversations about research with colleagues. The work week begins and she receives more new work requests than he does. She does not say yes or no more than her colleague; however, she has to consider and come up with more responses. More of the male faculty member’s requests will be from off-campus colleagues who can advance his career and involve him in more research activities; more of the female faculty member’s requests will be related to teaching and campus service. Though these activities may be fulfilling, they will not count much toward career advancement in her institution or field. Furthermore, more of her requests will be from other women who she recognizes expect her kinship.
and communal behavior (O’Meara, 2016). By the time these two faculty have reached mid-career one has accumulated more of the social capital necessary to advance. They did not start as equals, but what happened in the organizing of work along the way, further enhanced the male faculty member’s career advantage, reproducing a gendered organization. Our full-length article outlines implications for new research on gendered social interactions in faculty careers and for gender equity reform in universities.


Dr. Kerry Ann O’Meara is Professor of Higher Education, Director of the ADVANCE Program for Inclusive Excellence, and Affiliate Faculty in Women’s Studies at the University of Maryland, College Park. Dr. O’Meara received her B.A. in English Literature from Loyola University in Maryland, her M.A. in Higher Education from The Ohio State University, and her Ph.D. in Education Policy from the University of Maryland. Dr. O’Meara research on organizational practices that facilitate the full participation of diverse faculty and the legitimacy of diverse scholarship in the academy. She studies organizational policies, practices and cultures with an eye toward changing them to be more inclusive, equitable, and agency-enhancing for all faculty. All correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to Dr. O’Meara at komeara@umd.edu.
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## Appendix A – Committee Work Contribution Rubric - Adapted from: SMET Group work rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Work Assessment</th>
<th>4 - Exceeds</th>
<th>3 - Meets expectations</th>
<th>2 - Does not fully meet expectations</th>
<th>1 - Does not meet minimum expectations</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation/constructive work</td>
<td>Frequently offers ideas that move the committee’s work forward; extremely good at identifying problems or complex issues and proposing workable solutions</td>
<td>Sometimes offers ideas that move the committee’s work forward; good at identifying problems or complex issues and sometimes proposes potential workable solutions</td>
<td>Seldom offers ideas that move the committee’s work forward; Rarely identifies problem spots or complexities or proposes workable solutions</td>
<td>Ideas and attitude tends to be disruptive rather than helpful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening/working with others</td>
<td>Works extremely well with others; actively listens; encourages all to participate</td>
<td>Generally works well with others; sometimes encourages others to express their views</td>
<td>Struggles to work well in a group setting; struggles with listening respectfully to others’ ideas and allowing others an opportunity to express their ideas</td>
<td>Does not work well with others, fails to listen to others, tries to dominate the discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team role fulfillment</td>
<td>Participates in all meetings, assumes leadership role as necessary.</td>
<td>Participates in most meetings; provides leadership when asked.</td>
<td>Participates in some meetings; seldom takes leadership role.</td>
<td>Participates in few or no meetings; provides no leadership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/Information sharing</td>
<td>Provides effective feedback to other members. Relays a great deal of useful information when asked to gather information as part of committee’s task</td>
<td>Provides some useful effective feedback to others. Relays some basic information when asked to gather information as part of committee’s task</td>
<td>Provides little useful feedback to others. Relays very little useful information when asked to gather information as part of committee’s task</td>
<td>Provides no useful feedback to others. When asked to gather information, does not do so or relays information that is not useful to the committee’s work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>Always willing to help and do more work; Does substantially more than others; often volunteers for tasks; often helps others with their work – highly productive;</td>
<td>Cooperative and willing to do their fair share; occasionally volunteers for tasks; occasionally helps others; does his/her fair share of the work</td>
<td>Sometimes does committee work; rarely if ever volunteers; Could do more of the committee’s work</td>
<td>Rarely does any work; never volunteers; avoids taking on any work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work quality</td>
<td>Work is complete, well organized, error free; submitted on time or early. Committee can use the work as drafted.</td>
<td>Work is generally complete, meets the requirements of the task, and is mostly done on time. Committee can use work as drafted with minor revisions.</td>
<td>Work tends to be disorderly, incomplete, inaccurate, and is often late. Committee must do significant re-writes or edits before being able to use work.</td>
<td>Work is sloppy, incomplete, has excessive errors and is mostly late or not turned in at all. Committee often cannot use the work and must assign to someone else.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Updated 11/5/03 web.freedstate.edu/assessment/GenEd/

What is the single most valuable contribution you made to your committee?

What is the single most important thing you could do to more effectively help your committee?

* The original author of this rubric cannot be determined. The original rubric is available online as a Word Doc at [http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:lmqo1Ww1zEJ:go.wise.edu/34ys5g8q&cd=1&hl=en&ct=drk&gl=us&ch=satian](http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:lmqo1Ww1zEJ:go.wise.edu/34ys5g8q&cd=1&hl=en&ct=drk&gl=us&ch=satian)