Bi Teach 2019

# „Strategien der Bewertung und Benotung von schriftlichen Arbeiten"

## Handreichung

Dr. Susan Holtfreter
E-Mail: susan.holtfreter@uni-bielefeld.de
Büro: UHG C5-207

## Beispiel 1: Holistisches Bewertungsraster

# Departmental Evaluation Rubric
## (for evaluating Major Portfoilios)

Adapted from Wolcott, Willa with Sue M. Legg, An Overview of Writing Assessment: Theory. Research, & Practice (Urbana, IL:NCTE, 1998):

A **6** portfolio reflects work that is consistently high in quality.

- There is creativity or depth of content, and the work shows a real engagement on the part of the writer.
- The overall writing is fluent and the diction is accurate and sometimes sophisticated.
- The pieces are for the most part well developed and the organization for most selections is appropriate.
- The writer has a solid command of grammar and mechanics.

A **5** portfolio reflects work that is generally high in quality.

- There is some depth of content (and/or creativity) throughout, and the development and organization are satisfactory.
- The writing style is varied, and the diction is accurate.
- Grammar and mechanics are generally correct.
- The writer is engaged with most aspects of the portfolio.

A **4** portfolio reflects work that is usually solid in quality.

- There is some content as well as some development; the organization is usually adequate.
- A few errors appear throughout.
- The portfolio reflects some involvement on the part of the writer.

A **3** portfolio reflects work that is uneven in quality.

- The content may be shallow and the organization and development still appear weak.
- Although the writer has revised the grammar and mechanics errors, continue to exist.
- The sentence structure and diction are generally pedestrian.
- The writer's involvement with the essay often seems mechanical.

A **2** portfolio reflects work that is generally weak.

- The content is often shallow and the development is often weak.
- Errors in grammar and mechanics appear throughout and the sentence structure is usually simplistic.
- The writer's involvement with the essay is negligible.

A **1** portfolio reflects work that is very weak.

- Content development and organization need much improvement.
- Grammar problems dominate and the syntax is tangled.
- The writer seems disengaged from the essay.

*Abbildung 1: "Departmental Evaluation Rubric" from: Rubrics: Are they worth the time it takes to develop them? Presented by: Laura E. DeWald et al., Western Carolina University, Faculty Learning Community on Assessing Student Learning.*

## Beispiel 2: Analytisches Bewertungsraster - Förderndes Beurteilen schriftlicher Studienleistungen (FöbesS)

| Text und wissenschaftliche Form | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | sehr gut (1) | gut (2) | befriedigend (3) | ausreichend (4) | mangelhaft (5) | Note | Gew. |
| **Textstruktur** | Dem Erkenntnisinteresse/der Aufgabenstellung entsprechend durchweg nachvollziehbarer und zielgerichteter Aufbau, der zum Verständnis beiträgt. Leserführung wird sinnvoll eingesetzt. | Überwiegend nachvollziehbarer und zielgerichteter Aufbau, der zum Verständnis beiträgt. Leserführung wird sinnvoll eingesetzt. | Teilweise nachvollziehbarer und zielgerichteter Aufbau, der das Verständnis noch nicht erschwert. Leserführung wird eingesetzt, ist jedoch nicht immer funktional. | Kaum nachvollziehbarer, aber noch rekonstruierbarer Aufbau, der das Verständnis erschwert. | Kein erkennbarer Aufbau, die Arbeit ist unsystematisch und strukturlos, das Verständnis ist massiv erschwert. | | |
| **Argumentation** | Alle für die Zielsetzung der Arbeit relevanten Aspekte sind sachlich richtig dargestellt; es wird stringent und widerspruchsfrei argumentiert; mit klugen Überlegungen. | Die für die Zielsetzung der Arbeit zentralen Aspekte sind sachlich richtig dargestellt. Es wird widerspruchsfrei argumentiert, an einzelnen Stellen ggf. mit unfunktionalen Vertiefungen und Auslassungen. | Die für das Thema der Arbeit wichtigen Aspekte sind sachlich richtig dargestellt, jedoch mit argumentativen Lücken, Sprüngen oder irrelevanten Ausführungen. | Es gibt keine schwerwiegenden inhaltlichen Fehler, die argumentative Verknüpfung erscheint jedoch teilweise lückenhaft, unlogisch oder unplausibel. | Es gibt schwerwiegende inhaltliche Fehler und/oder der Text ist eine Aneinanderreihung von argumentativ unverbundenen Aussagen/Behauptungen. | | |
| **Zitierkonventionen** | Literaturverweise und -belege sind durchweg korrekt und einheitlich, entsprechen den Konventionen des Fachs. Das Literaturverzeichnis enthält genau die im Text verwendete Literatur. | Literaturverweise und -belege sind überwiegend korrekt und einheitlich, weichen ggf. von den Konventionen des Fachs ab. Das Literaturverzeichnis enthält genau die im Text verwendete Literatur. | Literaturverweise und -belege sind teilweise nicht korrekt. Das Literaturverzeichnis enthält nicht alle Titel und/oder Titel, die nicht im Text erwähnt wurden. | Literaturverweise und -belege sind uneinheitlich, unvollständig. Das Literaturverzeichnis hat nennenswerte Lücken. | Unvollständige oder undurchschaubare Literaturverweise und -belege; die Zuordnung der verwendeten Literatur ist erschwert oder unmöglich. | | |
| **Einsatz von Zitaten** | Wörtliche/sinngemäße Zitate werden durchweg funktional in den eigenen Text eingebunden, eigene Aussagen sind von fremden Aussagen klar abgrenzbar, unterschiedliche Positionen und Widersprüche in übernommenen Aussagen werden stets thematisiert. | Wörtliche/sinngemäße Zitate werden nachvollziehbar eingebunden, eigene Aussagen sind von fremden Aussagen klar abgrenzbar, unterschiedliche Positionen und Widersprüche in übernommenen Aussagen werden zumeist thematisiert. | Der Text enthält Zitate, die nicht immer von eigenen Aussagen unterscheidbar sind. Unterschiedliche Positionen und Widersprüche in übernommenen Aussagen werden zumindest teilweise thematisiert. | Der Text enthält Zitate, deren Einsatz unpassend/beliebig erscheint, eigene und fremde Aussagen sind nicht klar unterscheidbar. | Zitate werden nicht sinnvoll eingebunden, eigene und fremde Aussagen sind nicht unterscheidbar. | | |
| **Bemerkungen** | | | | | | | |

*Abbildung 2: Auszug angelehnt an das Bewertungsraster FöBesS, entwickelt an der Universität Duisburg-Essen im Rahmen des Projektes "ProViel", https://www.uni-due.de/proviel/handlungsfeld-vielfalt-inklusion/arbeitsfeld-sprachfoerderung/foebess/*

## Beispiel 2.1: Variante eines analytischen Bewertungsrasters mit Checkboxen

### Rubric for Film Presentation

**Task Description:** Working in groups of four or five students will develop and present to the class an analysis of a Japanese movie about World War II. This analysis should go beyond a simple synopsis of the movie to discuss how well or poorly the film reflects a particular point of view about the war. You are expected to do additional research to develop this presentation and to use visual aids of some sort. All groups members are expected to participate in the presentation.

| | Exemplary | Competent | Developing |
|---|---|---|---|
| Individual presentation skills | ☐ The presenter spoke clearly, slowly, and loudly enough to be heard without shouting, modulating voice tone and quality.<br>☑ The presenter used expressive, appropriate body language and maintained eye contact with the audience.<br>☐ The presenter used all the time allotted but did not speak too long.<br>☑ The presenter used humor and anecdotes appropriately to liven up and illustrate the presentation.<br>☑ The presenter or an assistant competently handled the equipment. | ☑ The presenter was understood but mumbled, spoke (too fast) or too slow, whispered, shouted, or droned: intelligibility however, was not compromised.<br>☐ The presenter's body language did not distract significantly, but the presenter fidgeted, remained rigid, never looked at the audience, or engaged in other inappropriate body language.<br>☑ The presenter's timing was (too long) or too brief.<br>☐ Humor and anecdotes were used, but they were over- or underused to liven up and or illustrate the presentation.<br>☐ Equipment was used, but there was some fumbling although not to the point where it seriously distracted from the presentation. | ☐ The presenter mumbled, spoke too fast or too slow, whispered or shouted, or droned to the point where intelligibility was compromised.<br>☐ The presenter fidgeted, remained rigid, never looked at the audience, or engaged in other body language that distracted seriously from the content.<br>☐ The presenter barely used the time allotted or used much too much time.<br>☐ The lack of humor and anecdotes made the presentation dull.<br>☐ There was a lot of fumbling with the equipment that could have been prevented with a little practice. |
| Group presentation skills | ☑ The presentation allowed each member an equal opportunity to shine.<br>☐ The individual presentations followed one another in a way that promoted a logical discussion of the topic, and connections between individual presentations were clearly shown.<br>☑ Shown members treated each other with courtesy and respect. | ☐ The presentation was unbalanced in the way time or content was assigned to members.<br>☑ The individual presentations followed one another in a way that mostly promoted a logical discussion of the topic, but connections between individual presentations were not clearly shown, or the presentation lost direction from time to time for other reasons.<br>☐ Group members mostly treated each other with courtesy and respect, but there were lapses where members were not listening to each other. | ☐ The presentation was seriously unbalanced so that one or a few people dominated or carried the ball.<br>☐ There was little if any evident logic in how the individual presentations followed one another, and the connections between individual presentations were unclear.<br>☐ Group members showed little respect of courtesy toward one another. |

*Abbildung 3: Ausschnitt aus der „Three-level rubric with check boxes", entnommen aus Stevens/Levi (2005): Grading with rubrics. In: Introduction to Rubrics, S. 76.*

## Beispiel 2.2: Variante eines analytischen Bewertungsrasters mit Einkreisungen

### Rubric for Film Presentation

**Task Description:** Working in groups of four or five, students will develop and present to the class an analysis of a Japanese movie about World War II. This analysis should go beyond a simple synopsis of the movie to discuss how well or poorly the film reflects a particular point of view about the war. You are expected to do additional research to develop this presentation and to use visual aids of some sort. All group members are expected to participate in the presentation.

| | Exemplary | Competent | Developing |
|---|---|---|---|
| Individual presentation skills 20% | The presenter spoke clearly and intelligibly, modulating voice tone and quality, maintaining eye contact, and using appropriate body language. The use of humor and competent handling of technology also contributed to the excellence of the presentation. The presenter used all the time available but did not go over the time limit. | The presenter was intelligible but mumbled or droned, spoke too fast or to slow, whispered or shouted, used inappropriate body language, or failed to maintain eye contact, inappropriate excessive, or too little humor or technical problems detracted from the presentation. The presentation ran over or under the time limit but not dramatically. | The presenter mumbled or droned, spoke too fast or too slow, whispered or shouted used inappropriate body language, or failed to maintain eye contact to the point where intelligibility was compromised. Too much or too little humor or technological problems seriously detracted from the presentation. The presentation ran seriously over or under the time limit. |
| Group presentation skills 20% | The presentations followed a logical progression and allowed each member an equal opportunity to shine. Group members treated each other with courtesy and respect and assisted each other as needed. | The presentations followed a logical progression but were unbalanced in the way time or content was assigned to members, or the division of labor was fair but impeded the logical progression of the argument. Group members were mostly respectful and helpful toward one another, but there were lapses. | The presentations followed no logical progression, seriously overlapped one another, or allowed one or a few people to dominate. Group members showed little respect or courtesy toward one another and did not assist one another even when it was clear that a group member was in trouble. |
| Group organization 20% | The group thesis, topics to be covered and the direction the individual presentations will like are clearly stated at the beginning and carried through in the test of the presentation. | The thesis, topics to be covered, and the direction the individual presentations will take are clearly stated at the beginning but not carried through in the rest of the presentation, or the thesis, topics to be covered, and direction emerge in the presentation but are not clearly stated in the introduction. | The thesis, topics, and direction are unclear, unstated or not evident in the body of the presentation. |

*Abbildung 4: Ausschnitt aus der „Three-level rubric with circled feedback", entnommen aus Stevens/Levi (2005): Grading with rubrics. In: Introduction to Rubrics, S. 80.*

## Beispiel 3: Generisches Bewertungsraster für die Bewertung der schriftlichen Ausdrucksfähigkeit

| | Capstone – 4 | Milestone – 3 | Milestone – 2 | Benchmark – 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Context of and Purpose for Writing** *Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s).* | Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work. | Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context). | Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions). | Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience). |
| **Content Development** | Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work. | Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work. | Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work. | Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work. |
| **Genre and Disciplinary Conventions** *Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields (please see glossary).* | Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task (s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices. | Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices. | Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation. | Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation. |
| **Sources and Evidence** | Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing. | Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing. | Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing. | Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing. |
| **Control of Syntax and Mechanics** | Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free. | Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors. | Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors. | Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage. |

*Abbildung 5: Angelehnt an die „Written Communication Value Rubric", bereitgestellt von der Association of American Colleges and Universities, https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/written-communication*

## Beispiel 4: Aufgabenspezifisches Bewertungsraster – analytisch

**EXHIBIT 14.3**

# Task-Specific Rubric for a Genre: Practical Proposal

| Letter of Transmittal and Document Design | 10  9  8 | 7  6  5  4 | 3  2  1  0 |
|---|---|---|---|
| • Has an effective letter of transmittal (addressed to appropriate decision maker; serves as executive summary: briefly explains problem, describes proposed solution, and summarizes supporting reasons)<br>• Has professional appearance; good document design with clear headings and appropriately labeled diagrams (if needed); conveys strong ethos | Meets all criteria at high level | Meets some criteria; uneven | Meets few criteria |
| **Presentation of the Problem** | 10  9  8 | 7  6  5  4 | 3  2  1  0 |
| • Clearly describes the problem without presupposing the solution<br>• Gives problem "presence" (chooses appropriate methods for motivating reader to care about problem)<br>• Adequately develops the problem (shows who is affected, what is at stake); anticipates objections of a skeptical reader who dismisses the problem | Meets all criteria at high level; clear and developed | Meets some criteria; uneven; occasionally thin; some lapses in clarity | Meets few criteria; often unclear or undeveloped |
| **Description of the Proposed Solution** | 10  9  8 | 7  6  5  4 | 3  2  1  0 |
| • Describes proposed solution clearly<br>• Explains costs; pays attention to practical details; convinces reader that writer has done his or her homework<br>• Solution is made to seem doable<br>• If writer proposes a planning committee to develop details of solution, writer clearly points out the details of a successful solution | Meets all criteria at high level; clear, easy to follow | Meets some criteria; uneven or has some lapses in clarity or development | Meets few criteria; often unclear or undeveloped |
| **Justification for Proposed Solution** | 10  9  8 | 7  6  5  4 | 3  2  1  0 |
| • Strongly motivates reader to act on the proposal; designs justification section by imagining chief reasons for audience resistance<br>• States clear, effective reasons in support of proposal<br>• Supports reasons with effective evidence<br>• Effectively ties into values and beliefs of audience | Meets all criteria at high level; clear, easy to follow | Meets some criteria; uneven or has some lapses in clarity or development | Meets few criteria; often unclear or undeveloped |

*(Continued)*

*Abbildung 6: Ausschnitt aus der „Task-Specific Rubric for a Genre: Practical Proposal", entnommen aus Bean (2011): Using Rubrics to Develop and Apply Grading Criteria. In: Engaging Ideas, S. 273.*

## Beispiel 5: Aufgabenspezifisches Bewertungsraster ohne Tabelle - analytisch

### EXHIBIT 14.5

## Analytic Rubric with Non-Grid Design: Argument Assignment

1. Does the introduction effectively present the issue and the thesis, while evoking reader interest? (10 points)

2. Are the ideas sufficiently complex? Are there good reasons in support of the thesis? Is the argument logical? (30 points)

3. Are opposing or alternative views adequately and fairly summarized? Are the responses to the opposing views effective? (20 points)

4. Is there appropriate and sufficient evidence? Is the argument well-developed, with appropriate details? (20 points)

5. Is the essay well organized into a unified whole? Are there good transitions? Do paragraphs have topic sentences? (20 points)

6. Is language style effective? Is language well chosen for the intended audience? Is the tone appropriate? (10 points)

7. Are sentences well constructed? Is the paper carefully edited? (20 points)

*Abbildung 7: Analytisches Bewertungsraster ohne Tabellendesign, entnommen aus Bean (2011): Using Rubrics to Develop and Apply Grading Criteria. In: Engaging Ideas, S. 277.*

## Beispiel 6: Reduziertes analytisches Bewertungsraster mit Feedback für ein Portfolio – aufgabenspezifisch

### Seminar: Narrative Texte. Erzähltheorie und Schreibpraxis

**Name:** xxxx                                                                                      **Note: 1,0**

| sehr gut | gut | OK | überarbeitungs-würdig | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| x | | | | **Reflexion des Schreib- und Lernprozesses** |
| x | | | | **Sichere Anwendung erzähltheoretischer Begriffe** |
| x | | | | **Überarbeitung der Texte** |
| x | | | | **Entwicklung innerhalb der Textserie** |
| | x | | | **Formalia (Rechtschreibung, Grammatik, Zeichenset-zung, Layout)** |

**Kleines schriftliches Feedback:**
Lieber Herr XXX
danke für Ihre ausführliche und interessante Reflexion. Sie reflektieren sowohl über die Seminarinhalte als auch über Ihre eigene Entwicklung als Schreiber auf hohem Niveau. Schön, dass Sie die Palette der im Seminar behandelten Schreibtechniken für andere Textsorten (wissenschaftliche) adaptieren und nutzbar machen konnten. Auch Ihre literarische Entwicklung mit zu verfolgen, macht Spaß. Falls Sie gerne Feedback auf die literarischen Texte hätten, sind Sie in Frau xxx Sprechstunde herzlich willkommen.
Bitte sehen Sie sich unbedingt noch mal die Kommaregeln an, v.a. in Bezug auf Relativsätze!
xxx und xxx

*Abbildung 8: Kombiniertes Bewertungsraster erstellt von Nadja Sennewalt und Swantje Lahm an der Universität Bielefeld.*

## Beispiel 7: Analytisches Bewertungsraster Qualifikationsarbeit (Lab Report Rubric)

### Introduction

**Background for the Experiment**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Superior** effectively establishes the context of the experiment by citing relevant scientific literature and showing how the literature is relevant to the experiment. | |
| **Fair** establishes the context of the experiment by citing relevant scientific literature but failing to show how the literature is relevant to the experiment. | |
| **Poor** addresses the context of the experiment by citing scientific literature that has little or no relevance to the experiment. | |
| **Inadequate** cites no scientific literature. | |

**Hypothesis**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Superior** includes a clear, precise hypothesis that describes what the student expects to happen and predicts the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. Uses language that is consistent with hypothesis testing *(hypothesize*, *predict*, *expect)*. | |
| **Fair** states the hypothesis incompletely, vaguely, or imprecisely. May or may not use language consistent with hypothesis testing. | |
| **Poor** states a hypothesis that shows confusion or misunderstanding of the experiment. Uses language that is inconsistent with hypothesis testing. | |
| **Inadequate** provides no hypothesis. | |

### Methods

**Materials**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Superior** provides the details about materials (organisms, equipment, etc.) that would enable the reader to replicate the experiment. Avoids unnecessary detail for a reader with a scientific background. | |
| **Fair** provides a general description of the materials but leaves the reader guessing about some significant details OR provides unnecessary detail. | |
| **Poor** omits enough significant detail about the materials that the reader would be unable to replicate the experiment. | |
| **Inadequate** provides no information about the materials used. | |

**Procedure**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Superior** provides enough detail about the procedure (preparation of materials, treatments, measurement procedures, calculations and statistical tests used, etc.) to enable the reader to replicate the experiment. Uses a narrative, not a list. | |
| **Fair** provides a general account of the procedure but leaves the reader guessing about some significant details or provides unnecessary detail. May use a list. | |
| **Poor** omits enough significant detail about the procedure that the reader would be unable to replicate the experiment. | |
| **Inadequate** provides no description of the procedure. | |

**Experimental design**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Superior**   Identifies and fully describes experimental treatments. | |
| **Fair**   Identifies and incompletely describes the experimental treatments. | |
| **Poor**   Identifies the experimental treatments without describing them. | |
| **Inadequate**   does not identify the experimental treatments. | |

## Results

**Tables and Figures**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Superior**   presents all of the experiment's major results in tables and figures that are easy-to-read and properly labeled and titled so they can be understood without reading the text. | |
| **Fair** presents most of the experiment's major results in tables and figures. May present some minor results in tables and figures. The tables and figures may be difficult to read and have improper or confusing labels and titles. Readers may need to refer to the text to understand the figures and tables.. | |
| **Poor**   presents only a fraction of the experiment's major results in tables and figures. The tables and figures are difficult to read and have improper and confusing labels and titles. They cannot be understood without reading the text. | |
| **Inadequate**   provides no tables or figures. | |

**Text**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Superior**   presents all major results in paragraphs. Describes the results fully and precisely. Refers to all of the relevant tables and figures. Where statistical results are presented, tells whether the differences between treatments were statistically significant. | |
| **Fair**   presents some major results in paragraphs. Describes the results incompletely or imprecisely. Refers to some (but not all) of the relevant tables and figures. Tells whether some (but not all) differences between treatments were significant. | |
| **Poor**   fails to present the major results. Fails to refer to the relevant tables and figures. Fails to tell whether any of the differences between treatments were significant. | |
| **Inadequate**   provides no text in the results section. | |

## Discussion

**Hypothesis**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Superior**   restates the hypothesis and tells whether the results support or reject it. | |
| **Fair**   refers to the hypothesis without restating it OR fails to tell whether the results support or reject it. | |
| **Poor**   makes vague reference to the hypothesis AND fails to tell whether the results support or reject it.    OR refers to a hypothesis not stated in the introduction. | |
| **Inadequate**   provides no reference to the hypothesis and fails to tell whether the results support or reject it. | |

**Reasoning with regard to hypothesis**

| **Superior** argues persuasively how the results support or reject the hypothesis. Justifies the decision about the hypothesis by explicitly relating specific results presented in the results section to the hypothesis. | |
| :--- | :--- |
| **Fair** makes a somewhat persuasive argument about the hypothesis. Refers to only some of the specific results that are relevant or else creates only a loose link between the results and the decision about the hypothesis. | |
| **Poor** Makes a weak argument about the hypothesis. Provides vague references to specific results or none at all. | |
| **Inadequate** provides no argument that relates the results to the hypothesis. | |

### Relation of findings to the previous research

| **Superior** provides a detailed, specific discussion of how the experimental results confirm, expand, or contradict previous knowledge. The discussion refers to the relevant articles. | |
| :--- | :--- |
| **Fair** provides a general, or erroneous discussion of how the experimental results confirm, expand, or contradict previous knowledge. The discussion refers to the relevant articles. | |
| **Poor** provides a vague, general reference to how the experimental results confirm, expand, or contradict previous knowledge. The discussion fails to refer to the relevant articles. | |
| **Inadequate** provides no discussion of the relation of the experimental results to previous knowledge. | |

### Proposal for future research

| **Superior** suggests one or more specific studies that could explain or expand the experiment's results. | |
| :--- | :--- |
| **Fair** suggests one or more general approaches that could explain or expand the experiment's results. | |
| **Poor** suggests one or more general or specific approaches that would not succeed in explaining or expanding the experiment's results. | |
| **Inadequate** provides no proposal for future research. | |

## Student's Overall Understanding

### Understanding of scientific experimentation

| **Superior** provides evidence that the student has a full understanding of the design and logic of scientific experimentation. | |
| :--- | :--- |
| **Fair** provides evidence that the student has a largely complete and accurate understanding of the design and logic of scientific experimentation. | |
| **Poor** provides evidence that the student has little understanding of the design and logic of scientific experimentation. | |
| **Inadequate** provides no evidence that the student understands the design and logic of scientific experimentation. | |

### Understanding of the science relevant to this experiment

| **Superior** provides evidence that the student has a full understanding of the science relevant to this experiment. | |
| :--- | :--- |
| **Fair** provides evidence that the student has a largely complete and accurate understanding of the science relevant to this experiment. | |

| **Poor**   provides evidence that the student has little understanding of the science relevant to this experiment. | |
| --- | --- |
| **Inadequate**   provides no evidence that the student understands the science relevant to this experiment. | |

**Quality of presentation**

| **Superior**   uses prose that is clear and logically developed throughout. | |
| --- | --- |
| **Fair**   uses prose that is generally clear and logically developed | |
| **Poor**   uses prose that is only occasionally clear and logically developed. | |
| **Inadequate**   uses prose that is very difficult to understand. | |

*Abbildung 9: Bewertungsraster für eine Laborarbeit erstellt im Rahmen des Projekts „ richtig einsteigen." „ mit literalen Kompetenzen".*

## Beispiel 9: Metarubric zur Bewertung eines Bewertungsrasters

Metarubric

| Rubric part | Evaluation criteria | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|---|
| The dimensions | Does each dimension cover important parts of the final student performance? | | |
| | Does the dimension capture some key themes in your teaching? | | |
| | Are the dimensions clear? | | |
| | Are the dimensions distinctly different from each other? | | |
| | Do the dimensions represent skills that the student knows something about already (e.g., organization, analysis, using conventions)? | | |
| The descriptions | Do the descriptions match the dimensions? | | |
| | Are the descriptions clear and different from each other? | | |
| | If you used points, is there a clear basis for assigning points for each dimension? | | |
| | If using a three-to-five level rubric, are the descriptions appropriately and equally weighted across the three-to-five levels? | | |
| The scale | Do the descriptors under each level truly represent that level of performance? | | |
| | Are the scale labels (e.g., exemplary, competent, beginning) encouraging and still quite informative without being negative and discouraging? | | |
| | Does the rubric have a reasonable number of levels for the age of the student and the complexity of the assignment? | | |
| The overall rubric | Does the rubric clearly connect to the outcomes that it is designed to measure? | | |
| | Can the rubric be understood by external audiences (avoids jargon and technical language)? | | |
| | Does it reflect teachable skills? | | |
| | Does the rubric reward or penalize students based on skills unrelated to the outcome being measured that you have not taught? | | |
| | Have all students had an equal opportunity to learn the content and skills necessary to be successful on the assignment? | | |
| | Is the rubric appropriate for the conditions under which the assignment was completed? | | |
| | Does the rubric include the assignment description or title? | | |
| | Does the rubric address the student's performance as a developmental task? | | |
| | Does the rubric inform the student about the evaluation procedures when their work is scored? | | |
| | Does the rubric emphasize the appraisal of individual or group performance and indicate ways to improve? | | |
| Fairness and sensibility | Does it look like the rubric will be fair to all students and free of bias? | | |
| | Does it look like it will be useful to students as performance feedback? | | |
| | Is the rubric practical given the kind of assignment? | | |
| | Does the rubric make sense to the reader? | | |

*Abbildung 7: „Metarubric", entnommen aus Stevens/Levi (2005): Grading with rubrics. In: Introduction to Rubrics, S. 94.*

## Literaturverzeichnis

Bean, John C. (2011): *Engaging Ideas. The Professor's Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking and Active Learning in the Classroom.* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stevens, Dannelle D. & Levi, Antonia J. (2005): *Introduction to Rubrics. An Assessment Tool to Save Grading Time, Convey Effective Feedback, and Promote Student Learning.* (1st ed.). Sterling: Stylus Pub.

## Internetseiten

Universität Duisburg-Essen / FöbesS : https://www.uni-due.de/proviel/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/F%C3%B6BesS-Beurteilungsraster_Druckversion_17.5.pdf [19.11.2019]

Association of American Colleges & Universities / Written Communikation Value Rubric: https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/written-communication [19.11.2919]