

Assessment of options by giving scores

Short description	In this activity, students or community members evaluate different proposals or solutions based on predetermined criteria and assign them scores. This is a simple yet highly effective method that allows participants to systematically compare options and discuss why some solutions are more suitable than others.
Objectives	The objective of this activity is to enable participants to systematically compare several alternatives by assigning scores based on predefined criteria. Through this process, they strengthen their critical thinking, justification skills, and collaborative decision-making, which supports the development of a community of practice.
Duration	15-20 minutes, depending on the number of options and the depth of discussion
Social form	The activity can be carried out individually, in pairs, or within small groups. The moderator selects the most suitable format based on the needs and dynamics of the community of practice.
Materials and organisation	Participants work with a simple scoring table listing the criteria and the options being assessed. They need either printed sheets or a digital version of the table, along with access to a whiteboard or flipchart for sharing the final results with the whole group.
Preparation	Before the activity begins, the facilitator selects the options that participants will evaluate and formulates three to five criteria relevant to the context (for example impact, relevance, feasibility, or alignment with community goals). A scoring table using a numerical scale — most commonly from one to five — is prepared in advance.

Step-by-step description

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At the beginning of the activity, the moderator introduces the options to be evaluated and explains the meaning of each assessment criterion. 2. Participants assign scores to each option according to each criterion, adding short explanations where relevant. 3. Once the scoring is completed, results are summed and compared. 4. The activity concludes with a discussion during which participants reflect on why certain options achieved higher scores, how the group approached decision-making, and what these reveals about shared priorities within the emerging community of practice.
--	---

The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Variations and differentiation

It is possible to introduce movement assessment (for example, assessing posture – sitting on the floor, squatting, sitting on a chair, standing, etc.).

Practical notes

When implementing the process, it is important to keep things simple; too many criteria can complicate the process. Visualizing the results is very helpful, as are clear rules for discussion, especially in group work.

References | Sources

Hmelo-Silver, C. E. (2013). Facilitating collaborative learning: The role of the teacher. In C. E. Hmelo-Silver, C. A. Chinn, R. Chan, & A. O'Donnell (Eds.), *The international handbook of collaborative learning* (pp. 282–296). Routledge.

picture: OpenAI. (2026). *Mind map illustrating the development of a community of practice* [AI-generated image]. DALL·E. <https://openai.com/dall-e>

The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

