

Examples of Assessment Rubrics Developed and Trialed by SDU Colleagues

Includes feedback by Donna Hurford dhu@sdu.dk

Updated December, 2018

Contents		
Rubric Number	Rubric Title	Page
1	Pass/Fail with Exemplars - Report	3
2	Pass/Fail exam question	4
3a and 3b	Pass/Fail – three categories – 2a. Research Question, 2b Research Project	5-6
4	Pass Fail – three categories -Assignment	7
5	Pass Fail – four categories - Assignment	8-12
6	Pass Fail – 2 Rubrics, the first for formative feedback during the course and the second for the final assessment	13
7	Banded Grading Scale – 12, 10-7, 4-2, 00 -3 - Assignment	14
8	7 Grade Scale – Ministerial Descriptors only - Project	15
9	Criteria for a synopsis, each with one descriptor	16
10	6 Grade Scale – Student Presentation	17
11	6 Grade Scale – Assignment introduced rubric using jigsaw activity – plus student observations on rubric	18-19
12	6 Grade Scale –Numerical Question using SPSS and explanatory question	20
13	5 Grade Scale – Assignment includes academic writing criterion and criterion for Oral Exam	21-22
14	7 Grade Scale – Assignment includes academic writing criterion – plus teacher and student observations on rubric	23-25
15	7 Grade Scale – Assignment for Law students – plus teacher guidance on how rubric will inform marking	26-27
16	Online introductory activity to the assessment rubric for the course on Microeconomics	28-31
17	Intervention Research Course – intensive 3 week course, tutor notes explain how course assessment was organised and how the rubric was applied.	32-35
18	Peer Review . instructions for peer review activity of written assignments and associated rubric	36-39
19	Case Study Assignment Rubric – showing Blackboard Rubric Design	40-41

Rubric 1: Pass/Fail with Exemplars

DH feedback – my comments tend to be about clarification of language rather than your actual expectations as that's your expert domain. I think it looks like a helpful tool; just a little re-working will make the descriptors even clearer. As it's pass/fail I can see why you are limiting the feedback to acceptable/unacceptable and you know what time you have available to develop it further but I think a third column would be helpful so they can differentiate between an excellent/good attempt and a good/satisfactory attempt.

Cluster Analysis (Unsupervised Learning). Masters, 5 ECTS		
The students have to pass a mandatory pass/fail project and afterwards there is an oral exam		
Criteria	acceptable	not acceptable
Finding optimal parameters	You have at least tried 10 different parameter sets per tool, selected in a strategic way (e.g., <i>because of X, we can expect having between 10 and 20 clusters, thus k is varied between 10 and 20. ... The authors of the tool suggest a range of ...</i>)	Either no parameter training at all or no reason at all was given for the particular choice of parameters
Tool Selection	You are able to give a reason for your choice of tools (E.g., <i>these tools all prefer a different cluster shapes and we want to find out which is most suitable ... all tools use a comparable strategy, which tool is the best?</i>)	You use less than three tools or give no reason at all for your choice
Following the protocol	You follow the protocol we have defined in class and which is states above. If you decide to deviate (perfectly fine) you give a reason (e.g., <i>K-means is known to deliver bad results with a particular measure, thus measure X is used instead</i>)	You don't follow the protocol without giving any reason
Summarizing your results	You present the results in an appropriate way (e.g., tables and figures) which support your final tool recommendation (<i>tool X clearly outperforms the other tools by at least 10% ... based on this data alone, a clear recommendation cannot be given, as the numbers are inconclusive</i>)	You do not summarize your results appropriately and/or don't give a recommendation

About the project:

- The students have to perform a cluster analysis
- I will discuss the protocol how the students have to evaluate the tools
- I do not really care about the actual results. I am interested in the students thinking about the single steps and giving reasons for their choices and write that in the report. I guess the students already have a good idea of what I want from them as we will discuss that in depth in the next lecture. Nevertheless, I want to provide the students with a small rubric, so that they can easily see if they have already done enough or not. This is actually an attempt to limit the workload of the students :-) And again, I want to make clear that I am interested in their thoughts and reasons for their decisions.

Rubric 2: Pass/fail exam question

Molecular and cellular pathophysiology of kidney disease for Pharmaceutical Master Students at SDU

Self-assessment about learning progress

Description	For an <i>excellent</i> performance which <i>completely meets</i> the course objectives, with no or only a few <i>insignificant weaknesses</i>	For a <i>sufficient</i> performance which <i>barely meets</i> the course objectives	For an <i>insufficient</i> performance which does <i>not meet</i> the course objectives
Status	Ready for exam	In progress	At the start of preparation
Intended learning outcomes I-IV	I. Explain the pathophysiology, symptoms, and diagnostics of glomerulonephritides with emphasis on molecular and cellular pathomechanisms II. Explain the pathophysiology of nephrotic syndrome with emphasis on molecular and cellular pathomechanisms III. Explain the pathophysiology of chronic diseases of the kidney with emphasis on molecular and cellular pathomechanisms IV. Explain the impact of kidney function for the homeostasis of the human body with emphasis on molecular and cellular mechanisms		
Intended learning outcome V-VII	V. Name the most common kidney diseases that result in chronic kidney disease VI. Outline the pathophysiology of calcium and phosphate disturbances in chronic kidney disease with emphasis on molecular and cellular pathomechanisms VII. Outline the pathophysiology of anemia in chronic kidney disease with emphasis on molecular and cellular pathomechanisms		

Rubric 3a: Pass/Fail

DH Feedback – 3 band pass/fail rubric for Problem Formulation provides helpful guidance for the students however the labelling could be confusing. By ‘Well’ do you mean Satisfactory and by ‘Yes’ do you mean Good? If so, I recommend revising the headings so this distinction is clearer. If the students could work in groups and review a variety of problem formulations by applying these criteria they would be able to try out these descriptors before having to apply them to their own proposed questions. Check they know what is meant by subject specific terminology e.g. trade-offs.

Formulating Research Question			
Criteria	Yes	Well	No
Clear & Specific	Narrow and specific enough to think of potential answers; easy to find example contexts and cases	Broad but has potential answers, or specific but hard to answer; having some roughly related contexts or cases	Too broad and vague, hard to think of potential answers; hard to find example contexts or cases
Theoretically Interesting	Bearing fundamental tradeoffs or dilemmas; having associated research streams (in multiple disciplines)	Having some but not that fundamental tradeoffs or dilemmas; having some roughly related research streams	Having little tradeoffs or dilemmas, so trivial; hard to find related research streams
Practically Interesting	Guiding managerial decisions with significant consequences	Roughly related to some managerial decisions	Hard to find related managerial decisions

Teacher Information

In each week, I give students a lecture on a certain topic with an example real-world case, and students have group discussions on the (how to generalize) issues and problems in the case and think about good research questions in relation to the topic. In doing so, I'm going to introduce rubric 2a and see how it may influence students' engagement, assessment and learning.

I'm also going to let them revise the rubric based on their experiences of assessment and see the effects of this as well – I kept it pretty sparse at the moment for this purpose, by the way.

Rubric 3b: Pass/Fail

DH Feedback – same feedback as Rubric 2a regarding the headings. As this is the rubric for the final project which will be graded using the 7 point scale I would recommend developing a fuller rubric with at least 6 levels. Once you have some projects as exemplars for different grades it will be easier to design distinct descriptors. However for now illustrating the Yes and Satisfactory/Well descriptors for some criteria with short extracts from exemplar projects would help the students conceptualise the distinct differences, see Rubric 1.

RUBRIC TO ASSESS TERM PAPERS (Version 2)

	Yes	Well	No
Motivated & Focused	Informative and motivating introduction (with concrete examples), focused around a clear, specific and interesting research question	Some background information, but lack of clear motivation and focus (due to underdeveloped research question)	Lack of motivation and background information; unclear and overly broad research question
Theoretically Grounded	Comprehensive and well-structured (logical and clear writing) review of (different) theories and perspectives	Review contains flaws with regard to breadth, depth, or writing	Theoretical review lacks breadth and depth, unstructured writing
Analyzed & Synthesized	In-depth analysis (e.g., of the assumptions and logics) and creative, critical synthesis of (different) theories and perspectives	Some analysis and discussions, but lack of depth and synthesis	Lack of analysis and discussions (e.g., simple listing or summarizing)
Useful	Drawing logical implications useful for theory and/or practice	Some implications, but not that logical and useful	Lack of implications

Rubric 4: Pass/Fail

DH Feedback – clarifying what is required to pass the assignment and identifying the distinction between a satisfactory and good pass would be helpful for the student especially at the start of the course when they are just beginning to understand what is required of them. The use of bullet points to list specific requirements is both succinct and informative. See feedback for 2b regarding the inclusion of some extracts from exemplars to illustrate the differences between the two pass levels.

Kriterier for en bacheloropgave – hvad adskiller den gode fra den utilfredsstillende opgave

	God	Tilfredsstillende	Utilfredsstillende
Indledningen Forstår problemstillingen	Nem at følge (rød trød) - Hovedpunkter er inddraget - Tydelig brug af argumenter - Præcise og relevante informationer	Ikke altid nem at følge - Ikke alle hovedpunkter er inkluderet eller fuldt ud gennemarbejdet - Kun delvist brug af argumenter	- Ingen demonstration af forståelse af emnet. - Informationerne er ofte upræcise eller irrelevante. - Mangelfuld brug af argumenter
Problemformulering Beskriver tydeligt opgavens formål	- Hovedpunkterne er dækket - Præcis	- Fravær af nogle hovedpunkter - Delvist upræcis	- Mangel på hovedpunkter - Upræcis
Resultater og teori Præsentation af den foreliggende viden	- Klar beskrivelse af resultater med information om relevante detaljer om studierne	- Delvis mangel på struktur i beskrivelsen af resultaterne og lidt mangel på information om relevante detaljer i studierne	- Uklar opbygning og beskrivelse af resultaterne - Ingen, meget få eller irrelevante informationer om detaljer i studierne
Diskussion Analyse og diskussion af resultaterne	- Inddrager hovedresultaterne. - Diskussion af styrker og svagheder i studierne. - Diskussion af forskelle mellem studierne. - Sammenfatninger af studierne, stillingtagen til evidens, der finder støtte i resultaterne. - Selvstændig og præcis forklaring af syntese af hypoteser eller teorier på baggrund af resultaterne.	- Nogle hovedresultater mangler i diskussionen - Delvis ufuldstændig diskussion af styrker og svagheder og forskelle mellem studierne. - Mangler ofte sammenfatninger af studierne - Delvis uselvstændig diskussion	- Diskussionen inddrager ikke hovedresultaterne. - Alvorlige mangler i diskussionen af styrker og svagheder og af forskelle mellem studierne. - Upræcis eller ufuldstændig stillingtagen til evidens og syntese af hypotese(r).
Konklusion	Konklusionen skal være i overensstemmelse med resultaterne.	Konklusionen er lidt uklar og kun delvist i overensstemmelse med resultaterne	Konklusionen er ikke baseret på resultaterne
Perspektivering	Logisk kobling til konklusionen og relevant for emnet	Uklar perspektivering, der ikke er helt logisk i forhold til konklusionen	Ingen eller irrelevant perspektivering
Struktur	Hovedpunkterne er klart adskilt fra detaljer. Velbeskrevet og flydende overgange mellem emnerne skaber en sammenhængende progression frem til konklusionen.	Delvis blanding af detaljer og hovedpunkter. Delvist upræcis sprog og nogen mangel på sammenhæng mellem afsnittene.	Svært at identificere indledningen, resultater, diskussion, konklusion og perspektivering. Ingen eller få naturlige overgange fra et emne til et andet.

Rubric 5: Pass/Fail includes two rubrics. The first offers guidance on what distinguishes a good assignment and is followed by a summary of Tolmin's recommendations on developing an argument.

Kriterier for et kvalitetsprojekt – hvad adskiller den gode fra den utilfredsstillende opgave

	God	Tilfredsstillende	Utilfredsstillende
Baggrund Forstår problemstillingen	Nem at følge (rød tråd) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Hovedpunkter er inddraget ➤ Tydelig brug af argumenter ➤ Argumenter indeholder påstand, belæg og hjemmel* ➤ Præcise og relevante informationer 	Ikke altid nem at følge <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Ikke alle hovedpunkter er inddraget ➤ Delvis mangel på påstand, belæg og hjemmel i opgavens argumenter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Ingen demonstration af forståelse af emnet ➤ Informationerne er ofte upræcise eller irrelevante ➤ Mangefuld brug af argumenter ➤ Mangel på påstand, belæg og hjemmel i opgavens argumenter
Problemformuleringen Beskriver tydeligt opgavens formål	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Hovedpunkter er medtaget ➤ Præcise kvalitetsmål 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Fravær af nogle hovedpunkter ➤ Delvist -præcise kvalitetsmål 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Mangel på hovedpunkter ➤ Upræcise kvalitetsmål
Metode og teori	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Argumentation for valg af metode ➤ Beskrivelse af relevant teori set i sammenhæng med problemstillingen 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Delvis mangel på argumentation for valg af metode ➤ Beskrivelse af teori uden sammenhæng med problemstilling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Ingen argumentation for valg af metode ➤ Mangel på teori
Dataindsamling og resultater Præsentation af den foreliggende viden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Klar beskrivelse af resultater med information om relevante detaljer fra dataindsamlingen ➤ Illustrative figurer og tabeller inkl. forklarende tekst ("figur kan stå alene") og med korrekt henvisning i teksten 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Delvis mangel på struktur i beskrivelse af resultaterne ➤ Mangel på information om relevante detaljer fra dataindsamlingen ➤ Figurer og tabeller med en del mangler. Henvisning i teksten mangler nogle gange 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Uklar opbygning og beskrivelse af resultater ➤ Ingen, meget få eller irrelevante informationer om detaljer fra dataindsamlingen ➤ Figurer og tabeller mangler, er irrelevante eller uklare

		God	Tilfredsstillende	Utilfredsstillende
Diskussion Analyse og diskussion af resultaterne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Inddrager hovedresultater ➤ Sammenligner med tidligere resultater eller litteratur ➤ Brug af teori ➤ Forklaring på uventede fund ➤ Vurdering af styrker og svagheder ved anvendt metode, mulighed for bias og generaliserbarhed af fundene 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Nogle hovedresultater mangler i diskussionen ➤ Delvis ufuldstændig diskussion af styrker, svagheder, mulig bias og generaliserbarhed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Inddrager ikke hovedresultater ➤ Udtalt mangel af styrke, svagheder, mulig bias og generaliserbarhed 	
Konklusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Præcis konklusion i fuld overensstemmelse med resultaterne 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Upræcis konklusion ➤ Kun delvist i overensstemmelse med resultaterne 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Konklusionen er uklar og ikke baseret på resultaterne 	
Referencer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Relevante referencer med korrekt kildehenvisning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Mangefuld brug af relevante referencer ➤ Delvist korrekt kildehenvisning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Fravær af relevante referencer ➤ Mangel på korrekt kildehenvisning 	
Perspektivering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Logisk kobling til konklusionen og relevant for emnet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Uklar perspektivering, der ikke er helt logisk i forhold til konklusion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Ingen eller irrelevant perspektivering 	
Struktur	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Hovedpunkter er klart adskilt fra detaljer ➤ Velbeskrevet og flydende overgange mellem emnerne skaber sammenhængende progression frem til konklusionen 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Delvis blanding af hovedpunkter og detaljer ➤ Delvist upræcist sprog ➤ Nogen mangel på sammenhæng mellem afsnittene 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Svært at identificere indledningen, resultater, diskussion, konklusion og perspektivering ➤ Ingen eller få naturlige overgange fra et emne til et andet 	

Tolmins argumentmodel*

Grundmodellen – de faste elementer	
Påstand	<i>Det standpunkt afsenderen ønsker modtagerens tilslutning til</i> ➤ <i>Det centrale element i modellen</i>
Belæg	<i>Den specifikke grund afsenderen giver for at modtageren bør tilslutte sig påstanden</i> ➤ <i>Hvordan dokumenteres påstandens gyldighed?</i>
Hjemmel	<i>Den generelle regel der gør at modtageren bør acceptere påstanden på baggrund af belægget</i> ➤ <i>Forbinde påstand og belæg</i>
Fakultative elementer – den udvidede model	
Gendrivelse	<i>De forbehold og usikkerhedsmomenter der knytter sig til hjemlens generelle gyldighed</i>
Rydgækning	<i>Dokumentation der understøtter hjemlens generelle gyldighed</i>
Styrkemarkør	<i>Graden af sikkerhed hvormed påstanden fremsættes</i>

De 3 elementer i grundmodellen er obligatoriske i en argumentation, mens de fakultative elementer bruges til at nuancere argumentationen. Med dem kan man belyse alternativer og udtrykke tvivl. Den udvidede model anvendes bl.a. i en akademisk opgave.

Et argument, der indeholder samtlige seks elementer kan fx se sådan ud:

"Medicinafstemning er formentlig mangelfuld på afdelingen. Afdelingen har ingen farmakonomer ansat til at varetage medicinafstemning. Det er min og sygehusapotekets erfaring, at farmakonomer har de centrale forudsætninger for at kunne lave medicinafstemning og at de er bedre til medicinafstemning end læger. Men det kan selvfølgelig være at lægerne på denne afdeling er gode til medicinafstemning".

Påstand: Medicinafstemning er formentlig mangelfuld på afdelingen.

Belæg: Der er ingen farmakonomer ansat i afdelingen.

Hjemmel: Farmakonomer er bedre til medicinafstemning end læger.

Gendrivelse: Men det kan selvfølgelig være at lægerne på denne afdeling er gode til medicinafstemning

Rydgækning: Det er min og sygehusapotekets erfaring, at farmakonomer har de centrale forudsætninger for at kunne lave medicinafstemning.

Styrkemarkør: Formentlig

Kilde: Signe Hegelund. Akademisk argumentation – skriv overbevisende opgaver på de videregående uddannelser. Forlaget Samfunds litteratur. 3. oplag 2005.

Rubric 5: Pass/Fail includes two rubrics. The second four category rubric supports the final assessment. Note how the criteria are linked with the learning outcomes, listed below.

KFTC - Eksamens - Bedømmelse

Student _____

Opgave nr. _____

Vægtning ca %	Præstation Kriterie ^(Læringsmål 1 til 10)	Fremragende Demonstrerer udtømmende opfyldelse af fagets mål, med ingen eller få uvæsentlige mangler	God Demonstrerer opfyldelse af fagets mål, med en del mangler	Tilstrækkelig Demonstrerer den minimalt acceptable grad af opfyldelse af fagets mål.	Utilstrækkelig Demonstrerer ikke en acceptabel grad af opfyldelse af fagets mål
10	Beskrive grundsygdomme og farmakologisk behandling for den aktuelle patient²	Kendskab til alle patientens grundsygdomme og præcis kobling til farmakologisk behandling, relevant klinik og laboratorietal.	Tilfredsstillende kendskab til de fleste af patienten grundsygdomme og præcis kobling af farmakologisk behandling og relevant klinik og laboratorietal for næsten alle sygdomme	Tilstrækkelig men noget usikker kendskab til de fleste af patientens grundsygdomme. Tilstrækkelig, men nogen søgende kobling af sygdomme til farmakologisk behandling, relevant klinik og laboratorietal.	Ingen eller sparsomt kendskab til patientens grundsygdomme. Kan ikke eller kun i sparsomt omfang koble til relevant farmakologisk behandling og klinik og laboratorietal.
20	Redegøre for om behandling er korrekt mht. rationel farmakoterapi¹	Fuld og detaljeret overblik over rationel farmakologisk behandling for alle patientens sygdomme	Tilfredsstillende overblik over rationel farmakologisk behandling for de fleste af patientens sygdomme	Tilstrækligt overblik over rationel farmakologisk behandling for de fleste af patientens sygdomme men med nogle mangler. Rimelig basal farmakologisk viden.	Ingen eller, sparsom forståelse af rationel farmakologisk behandling for de fleste af patientens sygdomme. Mangel på basal farmakologisk viden.
20-25	Identifikation og vurdering af lægemiddelrelaterede problemer (LRP)^{5,6}	Fuldstændig afdækning af alle patientens LRP med ingen eller kun få uvæsentlige mangler. Detaljeret og eksemplarisk gennemgang af farmakologiske aspekter relateret hertil.	Afdækning af alle vigtigste LRP og en del andre. Kompetent og tilfredsstillende gennemgang af de fleste farmakologiske aspekter men med enkelte væsentlige mangler.	Afdækning af mere end halvdelen af LRP, og de fleste vigtigste. En del mangler om farmakologiske aspekter relateret til aktuelle LRP.	Afdækning af ingen eller kun enkelte LRP eller kun mindre relevant LRP. Utilstrækkeligt kendskab til farmakologiske aspekter relateret til aktuelle LPR.
10-15	Prioritering af LRP⁷	Eksemplarisk prioritering. Underbygget med udtømmende argumenter	Korrekt prioritering af de fleste LRP og de flest underbygget med udtømmende argumenter.	Noget usikker prioritering hvor væsentlig LRP er nedprioriteret. Prioriteringen sparsom underbygget.	Ingen, begrænset eller forkert prioritering af flere væsentlige LRP
20-25	Anbefaling/Plan (medicinændringer- undersøgelse-monitorering - opfølgning)^{7,8,9,10}	Giver klar, udtømmende og præcise anbefalinger for alle patientens LRP med ingen eller få uvæsentlige mangler	Giver klar og præcis anbefaling for de fleste af patienter LRP med få væsentlige mangler	Giver anbefalinger for nogle af patienten LRP men med en del væsentlige mangler	Giver forkert, mangefuld anbefaling for de fleste af patienten LRP

Notat _____

10-20	Øvrige spørgsmål ikke dække af case fx:				
	Demonstrere grundig viden om TDM. ^{1,7}	Demonstrerer udømmende opfyldelse af fagets mål, med ingen eller få uvæsentlige mangler	Demonstrerer opfyldelse af fagets mål, med en del mangler	Demonstrerer den minimalt acceptable grad af opfyldelse af fagets mål.	Demonstrerer ikke en acceptabel grad af opfyldelse af fagets mål
	Demonstrere grundig viden om bivirkninger og håndtering heraf ³	Demonstrerer udømmende opfyldelse af fagets mål, med ingen eller få uvæsentlige mangler	Demonstrerer opfyldelse af fagets mål, med en del mangler	Demonstrerer den minimalt acceptable grad af opfyldelse af fagets mål.	Demonstrerer ikke en acceptabel grad af opfyldelse af fagets mål
	Demonstrere grundig viden om farmakokinetiske og farmakodynamiske forhold ved lever- og nyresyge ³ .	Demonstrerer udømmende opfyldelse af fagets mål, med ingen eller få uvæsentlige mangler	Demonstrerer opfyldelse af fagets mål, med en del mangler	Demonstrerer den minimalt acceptable grad af opfyldelse af fagets mål.	Demonstrerer ikke en acceptabel grad af opfyldelse af fagets mål
	Demonstrere grundig viden om naturlægemidler og kosttilskud, herunder farmakologi, evidensgrundlag og regulatoriske forhold. ⁴	Demonstrerer udømmende opfyldelse af fagets mål, med ingen eller få uvæsentlige mangler	Demonstrerer opfyldelse af fagets mål, med en del mangler	Demonstrerer den minimalt acceptable grad af opfyldelse af fagets mål.	Demonstrerer ikke en acceptabel grad af opfyldelse af fagets mål

Læringsmål

1. Demonstre grundig og opdateret viden om rationel farmakoterapi ved den geriatrisk patient, patienten i akutmodtagelsen, misbrugs- forgiftnings- og intensivpatienten, ved øjensygdomme og dermatologiske sygdomme, herunder kendskab til præparatvalg, dosering, terapistyring og patientinformation.
2. Beskrive, klassificere og fortolke patofysiologiske mekanismer for sygdomme vedrørende disse patientgrupper og redegøre for valget af den farmakologiske behandling.
3. Demonstre en grundig og opdateret viden om håndtering af bivirkninger og om farmakokinetiske og farmakodynamiske forhold ved lever- og nyresyge.
4. Demonstre grundig opdateret viden om naturlægemidler og kosttilskud, herunder farmakologi, evidensgrundlag og regulatoriske forhold.
5. Demonstre viden om særlige værktøjer til identifikation og evaluering af lægemiddelrelaterede problemer

Færdigheder:

6. Identificere problemstillinger ved farmakologisk behandling af særlige patientgrupper.
7. Foretage en systematisk medicinengennemgang af patienter indenfor disse patientgruppe herunder prioritere vigtigheden af identificerede lægemiddelrelaterede problemer.

Kompetencer:

8. Med et farmakologisk teoretisk udgangspunkt kunne vurdere og diskutere lægemiddelbehandling af patientgrupper med særlig høj risiko for komplikationer.
9. På baggrund af en systematisk og metodisk tilgang til rationel farmakoterapi selvstændigt vurdere den farmakologisk behandling indenfor disse patientgrupper på individ- og gruppenniveau.
10. Kunne indgå tværfaglig dialog og teamsamarbejde med andre sundhedsprofessionelle om patientens farmakologisk behandling.

Rubric 6: Banded Grading Scale – good, middle, good enough/minimally acceptable/borderline, unsatisfactory

Fag: Kommunikations og videnskabsteori, BA i international virksomhedskommunikation

Lærer: Anders Klitmøller og Thomas Wiben Jensen (2015)

Mål	God	Middel	Mindre god	Ikke bestået
Indhold	God forståelse og detaljeret og præcis redegørelse for emnernes videnskabsteoretiske positioner. Er i stand til at argumentere og diskutere selvstændigt ud fra stoffet. Ingen eller få uvæsentlige forståelsesmæssige fejl. Konsistent brug emnernes centrale videnskabsteoretiske begreber.	Tilstrækkelig forståelse og redegørelse for emnernes videnskabsteoretiske argumenter og positioner. Er i stand til at argumentere og diskutere i tilstrækkelig grad. Få, men væsentlige forståelsesmæssige fejl. Delvis inkonsistent brug af emnernes centrale videnskabsteoretiske begreber.	Minimalt acceptabel forståelse og redegørelse for emnernes videnskabsteoretiske argumenter og positioner. Mangeful argumentation og diskussion. En del væsentlige forståelsesmæssige fejl og inkonsistent brug af emnernes centrale videnskabsteoretiske begreber.	Uacceptabel forståelse og redegørelse for emnernes videnskabsteoretiske argumenter og positioner. Utilstrækkelig argumentation og diskussion. Mange væsentlige forståelsesmæssige fejl og yderst inkonsistent brug af emnernes centrale videnskabsteoretiske begreber.
Opbygning og struktur	God metakommunikation. Klar sammenhæng samt tydelig logik og struktur i besvarelsen.	Tilstrækkelig metakommunikation. Delvis klar sammenhæng samt tilstrækkelig tydelig logik og struktur i besvarelsen.	Minimal brug af metakommunikation. Mangel på sammenhæng og Mangefuld logik og struktur i besvarelsen.	Ingen metakommunikation. Ingen eller yderst sammenhæng samt mangefuld logik og struktur i besvarelsen.
Sprog og referencer	God brug af egne formuleringer uden eksempler på kopiering direkte fra - eller for tæt på - kilden. Præcis og selvstændig brug af referencer. Få sproglige fejl (stavning, syntaks, kommatering) der ikke influerer forståelsen af besvarelsen. God anvendelse af akademisk sprogbrug.	Tilstrækkelig brug af egne formuleringer. Enkelte eksempler på kopiering direkte fra - eller for tæt på - kilden. Tilstrækkelig brug af referencer. Få sproglige fejl (stavning, syntaks, kommatering) som i mindre grad at problematisere forståelsen af besvarelsen. Tilstrækkelig anvendelse af akademisk sprog.	Minimal brug af egne formuleringer, med flere eksempler på kopiering direkte fra - eller for tæt på - kilden. Mangefuld brug af referencer. Flere sproglige fejl (stavning, syntaks, kommatering) som i væsentlig grad problematiserer forståelsen af opgaven. Minimal anvendelse af akademisk sprog.	Utilstrækkelig brug af formuleringer mange eksempler på kopiering direkte fra - eller for tæt på - kilden. Utilstrækkelige og mangefulde referencer. Mange sproglige fejl (stavning, syntaks, kommatering) som i høj grad problematiserer forståelsen af opgaven. Utilstrækkelig anvendelse af akademisk sprog og flere eksempler på brug af talesprog.

Rubric 7: Banded Grading Scale

DH Feedback – useful and time efficient to construct 3 band rubric, recommend developing 6 band (12-2 and Fail) rubric for future use. Recommend reviewing descriptors for 7-10 which rely on an understanding of what a 12 looks like; students who are unable to conceptualise a 12 would not find this helpful. Start with descriptions of 10 and 7; include positive descriptors and feed-forward so it is clear what needs to be done to achieve the higher grade.

Innovation Management – Re-eksamensnøgle_Vinter 2015

An evaluation theme	Excellent (12) <i>The different theoretical concepts are applied and critical and reflective arguments are presented.</i>	Good (7-10) <i>The different theoretical concepts are applied. Critical and reflective argumentation for application lacks partially.</i>	Fair (2-4) <i>Some of the theoretical concepts are applied. No argumentation.</i>	Bad (-03 – 00) <i>Assignment not understood or answered.</i>
1) 4Ps of innovation space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A reflective introduction to the model is carried out. All the elements of the 4Ps of innovation space discussed in relation to the assignment. Furthermore, the argumentation, how the innovation in the given topic can /cannot be considered as one or several of the 4Ps dimensions. A critique of the model may also be discussed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The introduction to the model is presented, though with a lower level of reflection than in 'excellent' assignment. All the elements of the 4Ps of innovation space presented in relation to the assignment. However, the further argumentation does not live up to the 'excellent' level, as it is only partial. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No introduction or a short notion of the model. The student presents the dimension(s) of the 4Ps of innovation he/she thinks suits best to the assignment. Further argumentation and argumentation for, why some of the dimensions were not applied lacks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The answer is no related to the concepts given. Blank assignment.
2) Disruptive innovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well-argued introduction to the conceptual model including the way it can be applied. Well-argued discussion of the low-end market and new market disruption by also providing examples. Critical approach to the model application in this context may be provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The conceptual model presented, however, not as well-argued as in an excellent answer. <p>Alternative descriptor:</p> <p><i>The argument for the conceptual model is clear or mainly clear; how the model can be applied needs to be explained more fully and with more attention to detail.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The conceptual model partially presented, but not discussed. The introduction to the model may also lack, and low-end market and new market disruption applied directly. Examples of the model application not comprehensive. 	
3) How to search for new innovation areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflective discussion of underlying theories of searching for new ideas for developing the business (In the textbook: Search phase in Tidd and Bessant's 'Innovation Process Model') Relevant examples provided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> underpinning presented, but not discussed to a same extent as in an excellent answer Relevant examples provided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only partial theoretical underpinning presented Examples provided only partially. 	

Rubric 8: 7 Grade Scale – Ministerial Descriptors only

DH feedback – this would be a helpful introduction to the 7 grade scale, especially for those students who are unfamiliar with the Danish grading system. Next I would recommend that you develop descriptors for each criteria and level and if possible do this with the students so they are directly involved with the co-construction.

The student shows the ability to							
to demonstrate knowledge of the central concepts, processes, models and theories of business and sustainability presented in the course	12 -For an <i>excellent</i> performance which <i>completely meets</i> the course objectives, with no or only a few <i>insignificant</i> weaknesses	10- For a <i>very good</i> performance which <i>meets</i> the course objectives, with only <i>minor</i> weaknesses	7- For a <i>good</i> performance which <i>meets</i> the course objectives but also displays <i>some</i> weaknesses	4- For a <i>fair</i> performance which <i>adequately meets</i> the course objectives but also displays <i>several major</i> weaknesses	2- For a <i>sufficient</i> performance which <i>barely meets</i> the course objectives	00- For an <i>insufficient</i> performance which does <i>not meet</i> the course objectives	0-3 For a performance which is <i>unacceptable</i> in all respects
to assess the environmental standing of enterprises and/or areas of business.							
to demonstrate skills in using relevant analytical tools for assessing sustainability-related issues for business and in ability to explain, discuss and reflect on the issues.							
to work with scientific literature							

Rubric 9: Registeranalyse – synopsis

Students were expected to bring their draft synopsis to class however most did not do this; when the rubric was presented to them during class they were surprised by the tutor's expectations. The rubric provided a structured focus for their discussions and its application was evident in the synopses which were subsequently submitted.

Karakter	Beskrivelse	Kommentar
2	Et forskningsspørgsmål og en beskrivelse af hvilke variable/registre der skal anvendes til opgaven	
4	Et velbegrundet forskningsspørgsmål. Beskrivelse af hvilke variable/registre der skal anvendes til opgaven og beskrivelse af disses relation til forskningsspørgsmålet	
7	Et velbegrundet forskningsspørgsmål. Analytiske overvejelser om hvilke variable/registre der er bedst til at besvare forskningsspørgsmålet. Brug af referencer/grå litteratur	
10	Et velbegrundet forskningsspørgsmål. Analytiske/diskuterende/begrundede overvejelser om hvilke variable/registre der er bedst til at besvare forskningsspørgsmålet. Brug af referencer/grå litteratur. Opmærksomhed på faldgruber.	
12	Velstruktureret synopsis med en klar rød tråd og diskuterende/problematiserende tilgang. Et velbegrundet forskningsspørgsmål. Analytiske/diskuterende/begrundede overvejelser om hvilke variable/registre der er bedst til at besvare forskningsspørgsmålet. Brug af referencer/grå litteratur. Opmærksomhed på faldgruber.	

Rubric 10: 6 Grade Scale

DH feedback – a resourceful rubric for student presentations which helpfully includes feedback on content, engagement with questions, use of IT resources and reality check regarding its applicability in a real management meeting. You have also made the rubric accessible by limiting the detailed descriptors to the core criteria and limiting the requirement to yes/no for the last two criteria. Great idea to provide this for the students to focus their feedback and feed-forward for their peers, will help them be objective and criteria focused. Linking it with exemplars of presentations would enable the students to have in mind ‘what good ones look like’.

Student Presentations – peer review and teacher assessment rubric						
Criteria	12	10	7	4	02	00
Application of project planning theory on the case - Project foundation - Mission breakdown - Planning structure of the project - Work breakdown structure - Milestone planning - Activity planning – critical path	Theory applied correctly Includes all tasks mentioned in the case. Cohesive solution Able to elaborate	Minor mistakes in one or more of the tasks. Minor slacks in cohesion	Some mistakes in application. One major mistakes and some lack of cohesion	Major mistakes in the application of the theory, some of the elements are perhaps not answered properly. Some lack of cohesion. 1 element of presenting theory instead of application	Major mistakes in the application and meeting only the minimum requirements. Presenting theory instead of application.	Poor performance, wrong application and/or mostly theory
Answer questions regarding own project planning proposal	Fluent, correct, able to reflect No or only minor mistakes	Few – hesitant answering of questions	Some wrong answers and hesitancy	Fair answering, insecure hesitant answers	Very few correct answers	Many wrong answers
Reflect upon IT-tools	Yes	Yes	Yes	Some	No	No
Coherent PPT (Something you would present to your manager)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

Rubric 11: 6 Grade Scale – jigsaw activity to introduce rubric

DH feedback – Thanks for the opportunity to collaborate with you on developing the rubric. You have made the criteria accessible to the students by (1.) limiting the number of criteria to 3 and (2.) by re-phrasing how they are written in the course description so they are clearer than when written in academic language. Next year when you will have exemplars to share with the students they will be able to co-assess the assignments using the rubric which will make it even more meaningful. Good to hear the introductory jigsaw idea went well, the feedback indicates this worked well to ensure the students engaged with the descriptors.

Causes of War Assessment Rubric- Bachelor and Masters						
	12	10	7	4	2	0
Strengths and weaknesses	Comprehensive and accurate understanding of strengths and weaknesses of argument with few/no mistakes	Thorough and mostly accurate understanding of strengths and weaknesses of argument with only minor mistakes	Solid summary of argument, with only some evidence of independent analysis	Reasonable summary but important misunderstandings or omissions	Basic understanding of argument but serious omissions or mistakes	No reference to literature at all
Use of evidence	Use of extensive evidence outside readings to support claims and <i>synthesise</i> ideas	Effective use of evidence from credible sources outside readings to <i>support</i> claims	Effective use of evidence to <i>support</i> claims but confined to course readings	Reasonable use of evidence but important omissions or misinterpretations	Basic use of evidence but serious omissions or misinterpretations	No use of any evidence
Reference to policy implications	Extensive evidence of consistent/comprehensive analysis of policies	Some evidence of independent analysis of policies	Reference to policies but only summarizes readings	Reasonable description of/reference to policies but important omissions or misinterpretations	Some description of/reference to policies but serious omissions or inconsistencies	No reference to policies at all

Course Objectives:

1. Describe and analyse the major causes of interstate and intrastate war in the twenty-first century
2. Discuss, using the above theories and evidence, the dynamics of key conflicts in the twenty-first century
3. Critically evaluate the complexities associated with developing policies to address and resolve the causes of conflict and war in the twenty-first century

Assessment: The assessment will consist of one 53 hour 6 (Bachelor)/10 (Master) page take-home examination that will assess all the course material. Papers can be written in English or Danish. A second re-examination period is also available in August.

Rubric 10 continued - Student feedback at the end of the course on use of rubric

1. What contribution, if any, do you think the assessment rubric will make to your understanding of what you have to do to pass this assignment?
 - Summarises what we need to do for each grade
 - Use it like a checklist
 - I like clear instructions
 - Made me aware what more I have to do for a 12, realize I have to go beyond the curriculum
 - Reduced my stress levels because I face exams thinking I will fail but by using the rubric like a checklist I can see I have done enough
 - ‘nice to have common understanding of the foundation of the course and the goals at the centre as well as student engagement and structure’
2. What are your thoughts about the way the rubric was introduced to you? (30 minutes in session 1 reconstructing the rubric and a teacher-led explanation of its content and relevance)
 - Overall well received time spent on introducing and explaining rubric
 - Some concern that if all classes started using them could become tedious or unnecessary but another perspective was it would be necessary for each teacher to explain the rubric to check there is a shared understanding.
 - ‘nice as teachers differ in whether they like outside literature or not, and deviation from the given theory/concepts’
3. Any other comments about the assessment rubric?
 - None of the students had had an assessment rubric before
 - Most have accessed it at least once
 - All (95%, think there were one or two non-voters) said they would use it when preparing the final assessment.
4. Is there anything else that could be done to help you understand what you need to do to pass a course assessment (this question applies to all courses not just this one)?

‘Just in general if independent analysis is accepted or if the answer has to be given in the readings, as has often been the case in other courses’

Rubric 12: 6 Grade Scale

Marketing Research Assessment Rubric- Bachelor						
	12	10	7	4	2 (Pass Threshold)	0 (Fail)
Numerical Question Calculation (Using SPSS)	Apply correct SPSS routine to the numerical question, and provide excellent (comprehensive and thorough) comments and explanations on the statistics methods and results without error and give in-depth discussions and extensions, where relevant, on the underlying marketing research issues involved.	Apply correct SPSS routine to the numerical question, and provide sufficient comments and explanations on the statistics methods and results. The answer provided has no error but is not comprehensive.	Apply correct SPSS routine to the numerical question, and provide sufficient comments and explanations on the statistics methods and results. The answer provided has error and is not comprehensive.	Apply correct SPSS routine to the numerical question, and provide inadequate comments and explanations on the statistics method and results with error.	Apply correct SPSS routine to the numerical question, produce the original SPSS output and identify the relevant results, (i.e. answer questions by pointing to the relevant SPSS output only) but without any comments or explanations.	Apply completely wrong SPSS routine to the numerical question or apply the correct SPSS routine but without any comments or explanations, only producing the original SPSS output without identifying relevant results to the question.
Verbal (Concept) Questions Explanation	The student can provide correct definition to the underlying verbal concept and is able to provide excellent (comprehensive and thorough) further explanations to demonstrate complete understanding for the concept without error. In addition, the student can link the verbal concept to relevant marketing research issues and discuss.	The student can provide correct definition to the underlying verbal concept and is able to provide sufficient further explanations to demonstrate sufficient understanding of the concept. The answer provided has no error but is not comprehensive.	The student can provide correct definition to the underlying verbal concept and is able to provide sufficient further explanations to demonstrate sufficient understanding of the concept. The answer provided has error and is not comprehensive.	The student can provide correct definition to the underlying verbal concept and is able to provide some further explanations to demonstrate some level of understanding of the concept with error	The student can provide correct definition to the underlying verbal concept, but without further explanation to demonstrate understanding of the concept.	The student provides completely wrong answer to the verbal concept, demonstrating complete misunderstanding of the concept and its underlying theories.

Rubric 13: 5 Grade Scale

DH Feedback- Good idea to include the Ministerial Grade descriptors at the top of the rubric, to remind the students what is informing the criteria descriptors. The descriptors include a consistent focus across the levels for each criterion, which makes it clear to see different qualitative interpretations of the actions, e.g. explaining (redegøre).

RUBRIK FOR KULTURANALYTISK METODE FORÅRSSEMESTER 2015

Læringsmål	12	10	7	4	02
<i>Den studerende skal efter endt Kulturanalytisk metode overordnet kunne:</i>	Den fremragende præstation med få uvæsentlige mangler	Den fortrinlige præstation med nogle mindre væsentlige mangler.	Den gode præstation med en del mangler.	Den jævne præstation med adskillige væsentlige mangler.	Den tilstrækkelige minimalt acceptable præstation.
- <i>gøre rede for relevante metoder</i>	Beherske, redegøre og diskutere fyldestgørende for metodernes centrale begreber, praktiske anvendelse og metodisk-analytiske implikationer.	Beherske og redegøre fyldestgørende for metodernes centrale begreber, praktiske anvendelse og analytiske implikationer.	Redegøre overbevisende for metodernes centrale begreber og praktiske anvendelse med blik for analytiske muligheder	Redegøre for metodernes centrale begreber og praktiske anvendelse.	Redegøre mangelfuld for metodernes centrale begreber og praktiske anvendelse.
- <i>og metodiske problemstillinger</i>	Kunne diskutere, reflektere og redegøre for etiske problematikker på tværs af forskellige metoder og selvstændigt præsentere metodiske og praktiske løsninger.	Kunne diskutere, reflektere og redegøre for etiske problematikker i forbindelse med mindst en metode og selvstændigt præsentere en metodisk og praktisk løsning.	Kunne redegøre og reflektere for etiske problematikker på tværs af forskellige metoder.	Kunne redegøre for etiske problematikker i forbindelse med mindst en metode.	Kunne nævne etiske problematikker.
- <i>argumentere kritisk for til- og fravalg af bestemt metodiske tilgange</i>	Sammantænke, diskutere og forene forskellige metoder til en samlet metodisk strategi, der med henblik på de enkelte metoders svagheder og styrker minimerer metodernes mangler.	Sammantænke og forene forskellige metoder til en samlet anvendelse, der har blik for de enkelte metoders svagheder og styrker.	Diskutere og redegøre for forskellige metoders svagheder og styrker med fokus på at anvende flere metoder til samme undersøgelse.	Redegøre for forskellige metoders svagheder og styrker.	Redegøre for mindst en metodes svaghed og styrke.

Rubric 13 continued

DH Feedback – Including specific descriptors for the assessment methods (Formelle krav) provides students with insights into what you are looking for in terms of their academic writing and during the oral exam.

- selvstændigt opstille en metodisk ramme for en kulturanalytisk case	Præsentere en samlet metodisk strategi på baggrund af mindst to metoder, som er velegnet og tilpasset den selvvælgte og relevante kulturanalytisk case. Herunder kunne redegøre og diskutere for den praktiske udførelse af undersøgelsen med brug af metodiske begreber.	Præsentere en samlet metodisk tilgang på baggrund af mindst to metoder, som er velegnet og tilpasset den selvvælgte og relevante kulturanalytisk case. Herunder kunne redegøre for den praktiske udførelse af undersøgelsen med brug af metodiske begreber.	Præsentere mindst to metoder, som er velegnet og tilpasset den selvvælgte og relevante kulturanalytisk case. Herunder kunne redegøre for den praktiske udførelse af undersøgelsen med brug af metodiske begreber.	Præsentere mindst to metoder og kunne redegøre for den praktiske udførelse af undersøgelsen med brug af nogle metodiske begreber på en selvvælgte kulturanalytisk case.	Kunne redegøre for den praktiske udførelse af undersøgelsen med brug af nogle metodiske begreber på en selvvælgte kulturanalytisk case.
<i>Formelle krav:</i>					
- skriftlig præsentation	Synopsen er sproglig sikker og uden/få mangler. Sproget og argumentation er præcist og klart. Herunder klar disposition og sammentænkt struktur for eksaminationen i sin helhed (synopsis, oplæg, diskussion)	Synopsen er sproglig sikker med uvæsentlige mangler. Sproget er præcist og klart. Herunder klar disposition og sammentænkt struktur for eksaminationen i sin helhed (synopsis, oplæg, diskussion)	Synopsen er sproglig sikker dog med mangler. Sproget og argumentation er fyldestgørende og klart. Herunder klar disposition og struktur.	Synopsen er sproglig sikker dog væsentlige mangler. Sproget og argumentation er tilstrækkelig. Herunder klar disposition.	Synopsen er sproglig usikker og med væsentlige mangler. Sproget og argumentation er utilstrækkelig, men sammenhængende. Der er en disposition.
- mundtlig præsentation	Den studerende præsenterer udømmende selvstændigt og tidsmæssigt afstemt oplæg. Kan diskutere og reflektere på udømmende niveau.	Den studerende præsenterer selvstændigt og tidsmæssigt afstemt oplæg. Kan diskutere og reflektere på omfattende niveau.	Den studerende præsenterer selvstændigt og tidsmæssigt afstemt oplæg med en del mangler Kan diskutere på tilfredsstillende niveau.	Den studerende præsenterer tidsmæssigt afstemt oplæg. Kan svare på spørgsmål, dog med en del mangler.	Den studerende præsenterer oplæg. Kan svare på spørgsmål med væsentlige og omfattende mangler.

Rubric 14 – 7 Grades

DH Feedback - Thorough descriptors which include consistent reference to actions. Having exemplars next year will enable the students to collaborate and review previous assignments which should highlight its purpose and help them understand how it can support their own assignment writing. You could add the Grade descriptors as a top row to remind the students what is informing the descriptors. Good idea to set aside time and to offer a Discussion Board forum for student involvement, although some students regard this as the teacher's role, I'd recommend persevering with involving students as without this the rubric will be limited to a grading tool rather than a learning resource.

Grading Rubric for Public Health Ethics Essays							
Criteria	12	10	7	4	02	00	-3
Identification and description of selected topic and problem/ethical issue	Concisely describes the topic and identifies and summarizes the major ethical issues using the most relevant literature	Concisely describes or summarizes the facts and highlight most of the relevant ethical issues using parts of the relevant literature	Describes or summarizes the facts and highlight some relevant ethical issues using parts of the relevant literature	Summary rambles; misses several relevant issues	Description of topic is too long or merely repeats information from sources used	Description of topic is minimal or merely captures small portions of the information available. Does not identify major facts/issues	Description is not made at all
Links to course material <i>(In addition, it is of course allowed to use materials not presented during the course)</i>	Explains important links to relevant concepts from the course that are properly introduced and ties these to the major ethical issues	Describes relevant course concepts and introduces them properly when discussing the topic and addresses the relevant ethical issues	Refers to relevant course concepts and introduces them properly when discussing the topic and addresses the relevant ethical issues	Refers to relevant course concepts but does not properly introduce/define the concepts or does not address relevant ethical issues	Refers to course content, but does not select relevant course concepts or does not address relevant ethical issues	Does not use any course content to discuss the topic or address the ethical issues	Does not use any course content at all
Depth of analysis	The analysis is thorough, addresses all major issues and draws important connections among related issues	The analysis addresses relevant issues thoroughly	The analysis addresses most relevant issues but is not thorough in its discussion	The analysis addresses only parts of the relevant issues and is not thorough in its discussion	The analysis is superficial and/or misses key issues relevant to the discussion	The analysis does not address relevant issues	The analysis does not address relevant issues

Ethical reflection	Very insightful ethical reflection on the topic with meaningful discussion of its relevance in connection with the course material	Well thought out ethical reflection on the topic and the relevance to the course material	Needs minor improvements to provide meaningful ethical reflection on the topic and its relevance to the course material	Needs major improvements to provide meaningful ethical reflection on the topic and its relevance to the course material	Superficial and/or inappropriate points of ethical reflection on the topic and its relevance to the course material	No ethical reflection on the topic or its relevance to the course material	No ethical reflection on the topic or its relevance to the course material
Recommendation for future	Clearly recommends a reasonable, and relevant attention point, action, decision and/or policy very clearly based on the analysis	Recommends a reasonable or relevant attention point, action, decision and/or policy based on the analysis	Recommends a reasonable or relevant attention point, action, decision and/or policy based on some elements of the analysis	Recommends an attention point, action, decision and/or policy but not that reasonable or relevant and the coherence with the analysis are lacking to some degree	No recommendation or issues with the coherence between recommendation and the analysis	No recommendation	No recommendation
Reference format	All resources are correctly cited and referenced	All resources are correctly cited and referenced	All resources are correctly cited and referenced with minor errors in citations, references or both	All resources are correctly cited and referenced with some errors in citations, references or both	Most resources are correctly cited and referenced but there are many errors in citations, references or both	No citations or references are included or plagiarism is evident	No citations or references are included or plagiarism is evident
Writing clarity and quality	Very clearly written, well-organized, and in general free of grammar and other language use errors	Clearly written, well-organized, and only minor grammar and other language use errors	Fairly well written and organized with only minor issues and a few grammar and other language use errors	Minor issues in relation to writing style and organization/flow and some grammar and other language use errors	Some important issues in writing style and organization/flow and a substantial amount of grammar and other language use errors	Major issues in writing style and organization/flow and a substantial amount of grammar and other language use errors	Major issues in writing style and organization/flow and a substantial amount of grammar and other language use errors

Rubric 14 continued – Student and teacher feedback on using the rubric

Masters Course – 60 in class

Teacher prepared rubric then shared with class discussion and offered Discussion Board forum for further comments – teacher edited and confirmed final version

Student feedback included some who thought teacher should be solely responsible for preparing rubric, thought too much time was spent on it but others valued it and recognised how it would help with their assignments.

Teacher and internal censor used rubric to confirm uncertain grades.

Teacher said although she did not refer to the rubric when marking all the assignments she was sure the process of having prepared it helped her be much clearer about what she was looking for in each grade.

Next time

May use rubrics tool on Blackboard so students can access their rubric when the assignment has been marked

Has saved examples of assignments from this cohort to share with next year's students – they can peer review the assignment using the rubric and then teacher can discuss their marking and grades and compare with her own.

Rubric 15 – 7 Grades

Rubric til bedømmelse af artikel-eksamen, forfatningsret, Juridisk Institut, SDU

Fra fagbeskrivelsen:

Indenfor et mindre, afgrænset emne, skal den studerende i en rapport selvstændigt kunne perspektivere spørgsmål af forfatningsretlig interesse og derved opvise gode praktiske færdigheder i juridisk metode, kildebehandling og sprogbehandling.

Nedenstående skema illustrerer de kriterier, artiklerne vil blive bedømt efter. De elementer, der er fremhævet med fed skrift, indgår med særlig vægt. Der er dog **ikke** tale om en checkliste, og den endelige karakter afhænger derfor af en samletvurdering.

DH Feedback- using bullet points for each criterion, keeps the rubric succinct without losing the necessary detail. The teacher included the note that the assessment grade would not be the result of applying the rubric like a checklist, by saying this they are maintaining the right to include more nuanced interpretations of the quality of the assignment. In view of how law as a subject may influence students' expectations of assessment outcomes, it was felt to be particularly important to include this reminder.

Kriterier	Vurdering	12 – Fremragende præstation med få uvæsentlige mangler	10 – Fortrinlig præstation med nogle mindre væsentlige mangler	7 – God præstation med en del mangler	4 – Jævn præstation med adskillige væsentlige mangler	02 – Tilstrækkelig, minimalt acceptabel præstation
Valg af emne <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Perspektivering● Egnet emne● Problem-formulering/afgrænsning	Artiklen indeholder en velargumenteret selvstændig perspektivering af emnet. Emnet er forfatningsretligt særdeles relevant. Emnet er logisk afgrænset, på en måde, der gør det egnet til behandling i en artikel af denne størrelse.	Artiklen indeholder en selvstændig perspektivering af emnet. Emnet er forfatningsretligt meget relevant Emnet er relevant afgrænset, på en måde, der gør det egnet til behandling i en artikel af denne størrelse	Artiklen indeholder gode elementer af selvstændig perspektivering af emnet. Emnet er forfatningsretligt relevant. Emnet er afgrænset, men ikke på en måde, der gør det helt velegnet til behandling i en artikel af denne størrelse.	Artiklen indeholder få elementer af selvstændig perspektivering af emnet. Emnet er nogenlunde forfatningsretligt relevant. Emnet er nogenlunde afgrænset og/eller ikke helt egnet til behandling i en artikel af denne størrelse	Artiklen indeholder kun antydning af selvstændig perspektivering af emnet. Emnet er knapt forfatningsretligt relevant. Emnet er ikke afgrænset, og/eller ikke egnet til behandling i en artikel af denne størrelse.	
Juridisk metode <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Subsumption● Brug af kilder til understøttelse af argumentation	Der demonstreres sikker beherskelse af juridisk metode, med relevante subsumptioner, uden fejlvurderinger. Der benyttes præcise og relevante informationer og argumenter fra kilderne.	Der demonstreres beherskelse af juridiske metode, med relevante subsumptioner, måske med enkelte mindre fejlvurderinger. Der benyttes relevante informationer og argumenter fra kilderne.	Der demonstreres relevant brug af juridisk metode, med nogenlunde relevante subsumptioner, men der kan dog forekomme enkelte fejlvurderinger. Der benyttes nogenlunde præcise og relevante informationer og argumenter fra kilderne.	Der demonstreres nogle elementer af relevant brug af juridisk metode, med nogle relevante subsumptioner, men muligvis med en del fejlvurderinger. Der inddrages informationer og argumenter fra kilderne, men kilderne kan være delvist misforstået.	Der er momenter af relevant brug af juridisk metode, med enkelte relevante subsumptioner, men med mange fejlvurderinger. Der er kun sporadisk inddragelse af informationer og argumenter fra kilderne, og/eller kilderne er misforstået.	
Sprogbehandling <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Struktur● Læsbarhed● Argumentation● Brug af citater/parafraser● Korrekturlæsning	Artiklens struktur er logisk og nem at følge (rød tråd). Sproget er særdeles læsbart og passer til genren. Alle argumenter har en klar konklusion. Eventuelle citater har en klar og nødvendig funktion i forhold til argumentationen. Der er ingen eller kun ganske få fejl i korrekturlæsningen, og eventuelle fejl er ikke forstyrrende for læsningen.	Artiklens struktur er logisk. Sproget er overvejende læsbart, og passer til genren. Langt de fleste argumenter har en klar konklusion. Eventuelle citater har en klar funktion i forhold til argumentationen. Der er kun ganske få fejl i korrekturlæsningen, og eventuelle fejl er stort set ikke forstyrrende for læsningen.	Artiklens struktur er logisk. Sproget er læsbart og passer nogenlunde til genren. De fleste argumenter har en klar konklusion. Eventuelle citater har en funktion i forhold til argumentationen. Der er en del fejl i korrekturlæsningen, og de kan være lidt forstyrrende for læsningen.	Artiklens struktur er nogenlunde logisk. Sproget er relativt læsbart, og passer nogenlunde til genren. De farreste argumenter har en klar konklusion. Eventuelle citater er stort set overflødige i forhold til argumentationen. Der er mange fejl i korrekturlæsningen, og de kan være ret forstyrrende for læsningen.	Artiklens struktur er knapt logisk. Sproget er knapt læsbart og/eller passer knapt til genren. Kun få argumenter har en klar konklusion. Eventuelle citater er overflødige i forhold til argumentationen. Der er mange fejl i korrekturlæsningen, og de er meget forstyrrende for læsningen.	
Kildebehandling <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Kritisk argumentation for til- og fravælg af bestemte kilder (inklusive litteratur).● Valg af relevante kilder	Der gives en fyldestgørende argumentation for til- og fravælg af kilder. De valgte metoder for kildesøgning beskrives udømmende, med relevant grundelse. Efterlader indtryk af at have foretaget en udømmede søgning efter relevante kilder, og derefter have foretaget en saglig udvælgelse på baggrund af problemformuleringen.	Der gives en overvejende fyldestgørende argumentation for til- og fravælg af kilder. De valgte metoder for kildesøgning beskrives med relevant grundelse. Efterlader indtryk af at have afsøgt udvalget af relevante kilder, og derefter have foretaget en saglig udvælgelse på baggrund af problemformuleringen.	Der argumenteres for til- og fravælg af kilder. De valgte metoder for kildesøgning beskrives kort, men dog korrekt. Efterlader indtryk af at have foretaget en kildesøgning, der dog ikke har været udømmende. De udvalgte kilder ses ikke direkte at være valgt på baggrund af problemformuleringen, men er dog relevante i en vis grad.	Der argumenteres kort for til- og fravælg af kilder. De valgte metoder for kildesøgning beskrives stort set ikke. Efterlader indtryk af at have foretaget en form for kildesøgning, der dog ikke har været udømmende. De udvalgte kilder er kun delvist relevante og/eller der er overset ret centrale/åbenlyse kilder.	Der er ikke argumenteret for til- og fravælg af kilder, men dog kort beskrevet metode for kildesøgning <i>eller</i> Der er ikke beskrevet metode for kildesøgning, men dog kort nævnt enkelte grunde til valg af kilder. De valgte kilder er knapt relevante og/eller der er overset helt centrale kilder.	
Henvisninger og kilde-/litteraturliste	Følger kravene til henvisninger og kilde- og litteraturliste uden fejl, eller med enkelte uvæsentlige fejl, der ikke er misvisende.	Følger overvejende kravene til henvisninger og kilde- og litteraturliste, men med enkelte uvæsentlige fejl, der ikke er misvisende.	Følger nogenlunde kravene til henvisninger og kilde- og litteraturliste, med en del mindre fejl, der ikke er misvisende.	Følger nogenlunde kravene til henvisninger og kilde- og litteraturliste, med en del mindre fejl, der kan være noget misvisende.	Følger kravene til henvisninger og kilde- og litteraturliste, men med mange og/eller direkte misvisende fejl.	
Layout og omfang	Følger kravene til layout uden fejl, eller med enkelte uvæsentlige fejl, der ikke påvirker læseoplevelsen. Overholder omfang.	Følger overvejende kravene til layout uden fejl, eller med enkelte uvæsentlige fejl, der ikke påvirker læseoplevelsen. Overholder omfang.	Følger nogenlunde kravene til layout, med en del fejl, der ikke grundlæggende påvirker læseoplevelsen. Overholder omfang.	Følger kravene til layout, men med en del fejl, der påvirker læseoplevelsen. Overholder omfang.	Følger kravene til layout, men med mange fejl, der påvirker læseoplevelsen. Overholder omfang.	

Rubric 16 – Online introductory activity to the assessment rubric for the course on Microeconomics

This activity was introduced in class. The students worked in pairs and downloaded these two word documents from Blackboard; they had to discuss and decide which descriptors they should copy and paste into the relevant cells and to compose their own versions of the missing descriptors. This made the jigsaw activity accessible to a large group of students and meant the tutor did not have to prepare cut out versions. The teacher then made the final version available. Later in the session the teacher provided two exemplars of anonymised assignments which the students assessed using the rubric, their feedback on this activity was very positive, they found it helpful and reassuring. The session concluded with a discussion about key points in each assignment which illustrated the assessment criteria.

Learning Objectives: Develop the capability to:

Critically evaluate the credibility of (advanced) econometric methods in relation to the particular empirical application at hand (LO1).

Independently design and perform credible empirical applications (LO2).

Learning Objective	12	10	7	4	02	00
L.O.1: Critical evaluation Critically evaluate an empirical application, i.e., recognize the methods used, discuss the plausibility of the assumptions made, compare different methods and provide valid alternatives.						
L.O.2: Independent choice Independently design your own empirical application, i.e., choose the most appropriate methods, convince the reader of the plausibility of the assumptions made, and compare the chosen method to possible competitors.						

The choice of the methods is appropriate. Detailed explanation of their underlining assumptions in relation to the application at hand.	Capability to convey the basic intuition behind each method, with some evidence of a critical approach.	Formulation of convincing arguments in favor of the chosen methods. Detailed and convincing reflection on their underlining assumptions in relation to the application at hand.	Inadequate choice of the methods and only vague and not convincing discussion of their underlying assumptions.	None or almost nonexistent capability to convey even the basic intuition behind each method.	The choice of the methods is most of the time convincing and the discussion of their underlying assumptions is rarely implausible.
Very limited capability to convey even the basic intuition behind each method.	Overwhelming evidence of critical approach towards each method.	The choice of the methods is most of the times completely wrong.	Evidence of a critical approach towards each method, with only few major weak points.	missing	missing

Final Rubric

Learning Objective	12	10	7	4	02	00
L.O.1: Critical evaluation Critically evaluate an empirical application, i.e., recognize the methods used, discuss the plausibility of the assumptions made, compare different methods and provide valid alternatives.	Overwhelming evidence of critical approach towards each method.	Well sustained critical approach towards each method, with only minor weak points.	Evidence of a critical approach towards each method, with only few major weak points.	Capability to convey the basic intuition behind each method, with some evidence of a critical approach.	Very limited capability to convey even the basic intuition behind each method.	None or almost nonexistent capability to convey even the basic intuition behind each method.
L.O.2: Independent choice Independently design your own empirical application, i.e., choose the most appropriate methods, convince the reader of the plausibility of the assumptions made, and compare the chosen method to possible competitors.	Formulation of convincing arguments in favor of the chosen methods. Detailed and convincing reflection on their underlining assumptions in relation to the application at hand.	The choice of the methods is appropriate. Detailed explanation of their underlining assumptions in relation to the application at hand.	The choice of the methods is most of the time convincing and the discussion of their underlying assumptions is rarely implausible.	The choice of the methods is only sometimes convincing and the discussion of their underlying assumptions is not always plausible.	Inadequate choice of the methods and only vague and not convincing discussion of their underlying assumptions.	The choice of the methods is most of the times completely wrong.

Rubric 17: Intervention Research Course – intensive 3 week course, tutor notes explain how course assessment was organised and how the rubric was applied.

(15% Quiz 2 + 15%, 25% Quiz 3 + 15%).

There are 7 groups of students which will be distributed each, one article of an RCT. The main aim is: to show the capacity to acquire an understanding of such a study by examining a real-world RCT and to detect important features of an RCT. There is going to be a small number of rubrics (2 for every week's assessment of which, one rubric is common for both times) which will be introduced to the students at the very beginning of the course. A discussion will be held with the students during a group work on the topic. Possibilities of improving the rubrics together with the students while the course progresses are also there.

Three criteria will be graded. This is fully based on team work and common grades will be given (too complex to give individual grades). Students will be informed about their tasks early on in the course, as well as their peers: they will receive the articles, the rubrics and the checklist (criterion 1) and they will be informed that they need to prepare a one page summary (criterion 2, evaluated twice) and to do a short presentation of 10 slides (criterion 3).

Every group will make an assessment of the others work based on the rubrics created by the teacher (peer assessment). Students will not only assess and discuss the work of their peers based on the rubrics but also grade them using the rubrics given. The peer assessment is encouraged because as it can be seen bellow, the students will gain points for their efforts to grade their peers.

During the 2nd week, there will be 7 presentations with grading from the teacher and other teams at the same time. Then, results will be discussed for every group and feedback from the peers and teacher will be given. Grading will be done on the spot. As for the summary, it will be given a few days in advance to the teacher and peers (Tuesday). In addition, results for the written part will be discussed and oral feedback will be given to the students.

During the 3rd week, a checklist will be given and corrected on the spot from teacher and other teams and also the written part as well (Monday).

It has to be mentioned that the rubric on the checklist is not supporting in explaining the requirements but only gives the distribution of grade based on correct answers. In addition, it is not supporting other students prepare a peer review but instead it is also checking their own knowledge.

The criterion related to the summary writing gives the opportunity to use the rubric as a tool to improve one's work, due to the feedback and feed-forward given and to the assessment based on specific points.

Comments:

Students were motivated to work on their own articles but time was not enough for working in advance on the articles of their peers. Reading of the summaries and articles of peers happened during the grading day (reading for evaluating the summary but not for evaluating the oral presentation). There were a few days available for them to prepare their summary and oral presentation which were initially put as extra work (home) but it was decided to be during their usual group work (so that they can be together and work in their team). Group works of those days were not given but the answers were sent to the students.

As for the grading of oral presentations, students tended to overestimate the grade in some of them and some were in agreement with the teacher's grade with accompanying valid arguments. The reasons for overestimating were probably not reading attentively the rubric or grading only one criterion (ex. Presentation within the given time limit). They were encouraged further to read the rubric but the overestimation might still be due to their lack of experience in having a refined judgment.

As for their own summary, most of the groups followed the criteria but some did not especially for the point underlying no copying and expressing in their own words.

As for the summary of others, they tend to overestimate the grades of others and not to want to give low grades. However, it seems that students that have better performance give better remarks and are more precise in their judgment. This task required a thorough reading of the articles of their peers, but students read mostly the summaries and briefly checked the articles; this might also be the reason for an overestimation in the grading.

	(5%) Excellent	(4%) Very good	(3%) Good	(2%) Fair	(1%) Poor	(0%) Bad
Short oral presentation of the RCT	Complete description of the RCT (eg. <i>Design, results and conclusions</i>), comprehensive (easy to explain with possible schemes, tables or figures), inclusive of all important elements eg. <i>Randomization, type of outcome and treatment, masking, adverse events</i>), exceptional illustration (<i>clear presentation with nice transitions and not too much text</i>)	Complete description of RCT with minor missing aspects, comprehensive, inclusive of most important elements missing, very good illustration	Adequate description of RCT with some missing aspects, comprehensive but some unclear points, inclusive but some important elements missing, good illustration	Limited description of RCT with some important missing aspects, not fully comprehensive, partial with important elements missing, some good illustration	Inadequate description of RCT with many important missing aspects, not comprehensive, inconsistencies, important elements barely present, poor illustration	Not met most of the criteria described; either not at all present or major problems

Understanding of major components in an RCT through completing an RCT description form	Answered all 29 points correctly	Answered ANY 25 points correctly OR 20 points related to all aspects but: 1. Sample size, 2. Methods of analysis, 3. Study location and centers	Answered ANY 20 points correctly (not the 20 points related to the aspects mentioned)	Answered ANY 15 points correctly OR 11 points related to: 1. Design features, 2. Treatments	Answered ANY 10 points correctly	Answered less than 10 points correctly
Understanding of details-capacity to explain thoroughly through the creation of a one page summary of the RCT study (2 nd week)	Thorough understanding of the design aspects (<i>explains in detail and with an excellent flow the different aspects of the study</i>), exemplary explanation of results (<i>major findings, type of analyses and potential problems</i>), Critical discussion of the results and possible suggestions/comments (<i>final conclusions, usefulness of results, possible pitfalls and problems</i>), fully explained in ones' own words	Extensive understanding of the design aspects, well-thought explanation of results, Critical discussing of the results and some important possible suggestions/comments, mostly explained in ones' own words	Acceptable understanding of the design aspects, satisfactory explanation of results, Some critical thinking in discussing the results and some possible suggestions/comments, partially explained in ones' own words	Limited understanding of the design aspects, partial explanation of results, Some critical thinking in discussing the results but inconclusive and lacking possible suggestions/comments, Variably explained in ones' own words	Poor understanding of the design aspects, minimal explanation of results, Uncritical discussing of the results and lacking possible suggestions/comments, barely explained in ones' own words	Incorrect understanding of the design aspects, inadequate explanation of results, inadequate discussing of the results and lacking possible suggestions/comments, barely/not explained in ones' own words
Understanding of details-capacity to explain thoroughly through the creation of a one page summary of the RCT study (3 rd week)	Thorough understanding of the design aspects (<i>explains in detail and with an excellent flow the different aspects of the study</i>), exemplary explanation of results (<i>major findings, type of analyses and potential problems</i>), Critical discussion of the results and possible suggestions/comments (<i>final conclusions</i>),	Extensive understanding of the design aspects, well-thought explanation of results, Critical discussing the results and some important possible suggestions/comments, mostly explained in ones' own words	Acceptable understanding of the design aspects, satisfactory explanation of results, Some critical thinking in discussing the results and some possible suggestions/comments, partially explained in ones' own words	Limited understanding of the design aspects, partial explanation of results, Some critical thinking in discussing the results but inconclusive and lacking possible suggestions/comments, Variably explained in ones' own words	Poor understanding of the design aspects, minimal explanation of results, inadequate discussing of the results and lacking possible suggestions/comments, barely explained in ones' own words	Incorrect understanding of the design aspects, inadequate explanation of results, inadequate discussing of the results and lacking possible suggestions/comments, barely/not explained in ones' own words

	<i>usefulness of results, possible pitfalls and problems), fully explained in ones' own words</i>					
	(2.5%) Excellent	(2.0%) Very good	(1.5%) Good	(1%) Fair	(0.5%) Poor	(0%) Bad
Peer-review on 2 nd week (presentations)	Comment on all 6	Comment on 5	Comment on 4	Comment on 3	Comment on 1-2	No commenting
	(2.5%) Excellent	(2.0%) Very good	(1.5%) Good	(1%) Fair	(0.5%) Poor	(0%) Bad
Peer-review on 2 nd week (summary)	Comment on all 6	Comment on 5	Comment on 4	Comment on 3	Comment on 1-2	No commenting
	(2.5%) Excellent	(2.0%) Very good	(1.5%) Good	(1%) Fair	(0.5%) Poor	(0%) Bad
Peer-review on 3 rd week (checklist)	Comment on all 6	Comment on 5	Comment on 4	Comment on 3	Comment on 1-2	No commenting
	(2.5%) Excellent	(2.0%) Very good	(1.5%) Good	(1%) Fair	(0.5%) Poor	(0%) Bad
Peer-review on 3 rd week (summary)	Comment on all 6	Comment on 5	Comment on 4	Comment on 3	Comment on 1-2	No commenting

Rubric 18 : Peer Feedback instructions on how to use the rubric when giving feedback.

PEER FEEDBACK-ØVELSE

Følg denne tidsplan for evalueringsøvelsen

10.35-10.40: find sammen i par og byt opgaver

10.40 – 10.55: læs igennem

- Individuel øvelse
- Læs den andens opgave igennem og noter evt. undervejs afsnit, sætninger, der er interessante, der undrer eller er uforståelige

10.55-11.10: pause

11.10-11.30: Rubrics og skriftlig feedback

- Ret i opgaven: fremhæv SKRIFTLIGT styrker og svagheder
- Skriv 4-8 sætninger, der sammenfatter din tolkning af opgaven
- Giv opgaven Rubrics-bedømmelse (dvs. placer den ift. de tre forskellige koder)

11.30-11.45: diskussion med makker om begges evalueringer og sammenhold med min feedback

I har hver 5 minutter. Og til sidst 5 min fælles

- Makker 1: gennemgå opgaven med din makker. Hvorfor har du bedømt den, som du har
- Makker 2: gør det samme
- Fælles: I viser hinanden min bedømmelse og diskuterer de indsigtter, det måtte give anledning til

11.45-12: opsamling og evaluering

- plenum

Introduktion til feedback-øvelsen

- **Min rolle:** facilitator. Jeg styrer tiden
- **Læringsmetode:** Videofilmer – adj.pæd.forløb: intro, start og evaluering
- **Formål:** kobles til målbeskrivelsen:

Målbeskrivelse:

Undervisningen tilrettelægges med fokus på de centrale læringsmål for den studerende som anført nedenfor. Dette understøttes af den valgte eksamsform, der fremmer og udprøver den studerendes viden og færdigheder på følgende punkter:

Viden

Efter endt kursus har den studerende viden om

- **centrale videnskabsteoretiske positioner og argumenter**
- **centrale humanvidenskabelige retninger i det 20. og 21. århundrede**
- **centrale sprog- og kommunikationsteoretiske positioner og argumenter, med særlig vægt på det 20. og 21. århundrede**

Færdigheder

Efter endt kursus har den studerende færdigheder ift. at

- **kunne identificere og vurdere videnskabsteoretiske antagelser og argumenter i gængse sprog- og kommunikationsteorier**
- **kunne arbejde ud fra en basal forståelse for forskellige sprog- og kommunikationsteoriers analytiske muligheder og begrænsninger**
- **kunne anvende en basal forståelse for forskningsprocessen i sprog- og kommunikationsvidenskaberne**

Kompetencer

Efter endt kursus har den studerende kompetencer ift. at

- **kunne præsentere og diskutere kommunikations- og videnskabsteoretiske problemstillinger i skrift og tale, samt indgå i en dialog herom**
- **kunne reflektere kritisk på et videnskabsteoretisk niveau i operationelle kommunikationsmæssige og kulturelle sammenhænge**

- **Formål ift. metode:** I selv arbejder aktivt med læringsmålene. De vedrører: viden, færdigheder og kompetencer. Viden og færdigheder er de 'nemmeste', og kompetencer det sværeste – men I bliver nødt til at bevæge jer på kompetenceniveauet, når I skal give feedback, diskutere og argumentere for valg og bedømmelser
- **Feedbacken & relationer:** beror på tillid og ønske om at udfordre sig selv og hinanden for at komme tættere på læringsmålene
- **Feedback og form:** I giver feedback ud fra det niveau, I er på. Validiteten sikres, når I sammenholder jeres feedback med min. Overvej, hvordan I giver feedback. Man kan ikke skrive ”det synes jeg, lyder godt” ”det virker ikke rigtigt”. Jeres feedback give svar på HVORFOR noget fungerer henholdsvis ikke fungerer. Jeres sprog skal afspejle Rubrics-kategorierne. Man kan ikke give ’middel’ og skrive ’fremragende analyse’ etc....

Mål	God -4	Middel -3	Mindre god -2	Ikke bestået -1
Indhold 60%	God forståelse og detaljeret og præcis redegørelse for emnernes videnskabsteoretiske positioner. Er i stand til at argumentere og diskutere selvstændigt ud fra stoffet. Ingen eller få uvæsentlige forståelsesmæssige fejl. Konsistent brug emnernes centrale videnskabsteoretiske begreber.	Tilstrækkelig forståelse og redegørelse for emnernes videnskabsteoretiske argumenter og positioner. Er i stand til at argumentere og diskutere i tilstrækkelig grad. Få, men væsentlige forståelsesmæssige fejl. Delvis inkonsistent brug af emnernes centrale videnskabsteoretiske begreber.	Minimalt acceptabel forståelse og redegørelse for emnernes videnskabsteoretiske argumenter og positioner. Mangelful argumentation og diskussion. En del væsentlige forståelsesmæssige fejl og inkonsistent brug af emnernes centrale videnskabsteoretiske begreber.	Uacceptabel forståelse og redegørelse for emnernes videnskabsteoretiske argumenter og positioner. Utilstrækkelig argumentation og diskussion. Mange væsentlige forståelsesmæssige fejl og yderst inkonsistent brug af emnernes centrale videnskabsteoretiske begreber.
Opbygning og struktur 20 %	God metakommunikation. Klar sammenhæng samt tydelig logik og struktur i besvarelsen.	Tilstrækkelig metakommunikation. Delvis klar sammenhæng samt tilstrækkelig tydelig logik og struktur i besvarelsen.	Minimal brug af metakommunikation. Mangel på sammenhæng og mangefuld logik og struktur i besvarelsen.	Ingen metakommunikation. Ingen eller yderst sammenhæng samt mangefuld logik og struktur i besvarelsen.
Sprog og referencer 20 %	God brug af egne formuleringer uden eksempler på kopiering direkte fra - eller for tæt på - kilden. Præcis og selvstændig brug af referencer. Få sproglige fejl (stavning, syntaks, kommatering) der ikke influerer forståelsen af besvarelsen. God anvendelse af akademisk sprogbrug.	Tilstrækkelig brug af egne formuleringer. Enkelte eksempler på kopiering direkte fra - eller for tæt på - kilden. Tilstrækkelig brug af referencer. Få sproglige fejl (stavning, syntaks, kommatering) som i mindre grad at problematisere forståelsen af besvarelsen. Tilstrækkelig anvendelse af akademisk sprog.	Minimal brug af egne formuleringer, med flere eksempler på kopiering direkte fra - eller for tæt på - kilden. Mangefuld brug af referencer Flere sproglige fejl (stavning, syntaks, kommatering) som i væsentlig grad problematiserer forståelsen af opgaven. Minimal anvendelse af akademisk sprog.	Utilstrækkelig brug af formuleringer mange eksempler på kopiering direkte fra - eller for tæt på - kilden. Utilstrækkelige og mangefulde referencer. Mange sproglige fejl (stavning, syntaks, kommatering) som i høj grad problematiserer forståelsen af opgaven Utilstrækkelig anvendelse af akademisk sprog og flere eksempler på brug af talesprog.

Rubric 19: showing the Blackboard Rubric layout

Name	Case Study final exam						
Description	<p>This rubric provides an overview of the assessment criteria for the final exam. The exam will generally test the following skills and competences (from the course description): Skills: "Students will (...) learn to apply their knowledge by independently formulating a research proposal, with a schedule of tasks, for a research topic of their choosing. At the end of the semester they should be able to solve some crucial methodological problems of case study design as well as communicate design decisions, strengths and weaknesses of the case study approach as well as of individual studies to peers and non-specialists." Competences: "The competences gained in this course comprise the ability to perceive situations where case study research can generate relevant results across various sub-areas of political science and apply the practical skills needed to set up the required research design."</p>						
Rubric Detail							
Criteria		Levels of Achievement					
Criteria	Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Adequate	Inadequate	
Independence	Independent and highly creative case study. Pioneering topic or entirely new approach to existing topic.	Shows a great deal of independence and creativity. Goes beyond existing topics or uses some new methods to study existing topic.	Quite creative and independent. Loosely based on existing research, but goes beyond existing topics but uses new data, new methods of analysis etc. to study them.	Shows some similarities with existing case studies, but also independent elements.	The research design is closely based on an existing study.	The research design is virtually copied from an existing study.	
Research goals	There is a clearly formulated research goal, that defines the scope of the study and delineates the kind of conclusions to be reached (as well as the ones not reached). The student demonstrates that he/she knows what he/she wants. A case study is the perfect design for the research question.	There is an explicit research goal, that defines the scope of the study and gives a sense of the kind of conclusions to be reached. A case study fits very well with the research question.	There is a clearly formulated research goal, the kind of conclusions to be reached are not fully specified. A case study fits well with the research question.	The research goal is mentioned but in an abstract way, but concrete ambitions are lacking. A case study can make sense for the research question.	The research goal is mentioned, but many questions regarding scope and ambition remain open. A case study may be problematic for the research question.	The research goal is not explicitly mentioned. The ambition and function of the case study remains open.	
Case selection	Case selection very clearly laid out and ideally suited for research design.	Case selection very clearly laid out and well suited for research design.	Case selection explained and well suited for research design.	Case selection mentioned, but explanation too brief or case selection of limited use only.	Case selection mentioned but not explained or case selection problematic for the task.	No case selection mentioned or completely inappropriate.	
Data	Excellent and thorough discussion of data requirements, including alternatives, data gathering and data quality. Creative use of high quality data.	Very good discussion of data requirements, including some discussion of alternatives, data gathering and data quality. Creative use of	Good discussion of data requirements, including some discussion of alternatives, data gathering or data quality. Good data.	Data requirements are mentioned, but only briefly discussed. Alternatives are not mentioned, for example. Relatively	Data requirements are mentioned, but no discussion and some problems with data.	Data is not mentioned or completely inappropriate.	

Criteria	Levels of Achievement					
	Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Adequate	Inadequate
Schedule of tasks	The schedule is very well laid out, comprehensive and realistic.	The schedule is well laid out and realistic.	The schedule is well laid out and mostly realistic.	Schedule with some gaps. Some tasks seem unrealistic or difficult to understand.	The schedule has big gaps, is hard to understand or totally unrealistic.	No schedule.
Integration	The research proposal is very well integrated. The different elements explicitly build upon each other and contribute to the research goal.	The proposal is well integrated. The different elements are explicitly linked. Only very few tensions between the different parts.	There is a high degree of integration and very few tensions. Some of the links remain implicit.	There is some degree of integration, but also a few tensions and missing links.	There is some degree of integration, but also some contradictions and missing links.	None of the different elements of the proposal fit together. The design is contradictory.
Self-critical	Thorough discussion of the reasons for strengths and weaknesses and limitations of the research design.	Some discussion of reasons for strengths and weaknesses and limitations of the research design.	Clear mention of some strengths and weaknesses and limitations of the research design.	Limitations are mentioned, but vague formulations are used.	Limitations are mentioned in passing, but very vague or incorrect.	No limitations mentioned.
Writing	Very clear and concise writing throughout. A pleasure to read.	The writing is generally clear and has very few vague or overly complex formulations.	The writing is generally clear and has only few vague or overly complex formulations.	The writing is generally clear, but has quite a few vague or overly complex formulations.	The writing has some formulations that are incomprehensible.	The writing is hardly understandable throughout.
Organization	Organization of the text is excellent. The reader always knows where he/she is and where the text is headed.	Organization of the text is very good. Most of the time, the reader knows where he/she is (e.g. through subsections, paragraphs, transitions, conclusions).	Quite well-organized text. Some guidance of the reader (e.g. through subsections, paragraphs, transitions, conclusions).	The text has a decent structure, but some confusion remains.	Shows a minimum degree of organization (e.g. an introduction, main part, conclusion).	The text is messy and confusing to the reader.

[View Associated Items](#)

[Print](#) [Close Window](#)

