



**UNIVERSITÉ
DE GENÈVE**

PÔLE DE SOUTIEN
À L'ENSEIGNEMENT
ET L'APPRENTISSAGE

Exemples de grilles d'évaluation

Voici quelques exemples de dimensions et critères pour évaluer :

- Une expérience en laboratoire
- Une affiche scientifique (poster)
- Un exposé oral
- Un travail de recherche
- La capacité de travailler en équipe

Références complètes des œuvres citées dans ce document :

LOVITTS, B. R. (2007). *Making the Implicit Explicit: Creating Performance Expectations for the Dissertation*. Sterling, VA : Stylus Publishing.

PRÉGENT, R., BERNARD, H., & KOZANITIS, A. (2009). Chapitre 5 : Evaluer des compétences en situation authentique. Dans *Enseigner à l'université dans une approche-programme*. Montréal : Presses Internationales Polytechnique, 137-189.

STEVENS, D. D., & LEVI, A. J. (2005). *Introduction to rubrics: an assessment tool to save grading time, convey effective feedback and promote student learning*. Sterling, Virginia : Stylus Publishing.

Expérience en laboratoire

Task Description: Conduct the assigned lab using the procedures and methods described below. Turn in your laboratory report at the beginning of the next class period.

| | Exemplary | Competent | Needs Work |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Materials | All materials needed are present and entered on the lab report. The materials are appropriate for the procedure. The student is not wasteful of the materials. | All materials needed are present, but not all are entered on the lab report, or some materials are absent and must be obtained during the procedure. The materials are appropriate for the procedure. | All materials needed are not present and are not entered on the lab report. The materials are not all appropriate for the procedure or there are some major omissions. |
| Procedure | The procedure is well designed and allows control of all variables selected. All stages of the procedure are entered on the lab report. | The procedure could be more efficiently designed, but it allows control of all variables selected. Most stages of the procedure are entered on the lab report. | The procedure does not allow control of all variables selected. Many stages of the procedure are not entered on the lab report. |
| Courtesy and Safety | While conducting the procedure, the student is tidy, respectful of others, mindful of safety, and leaves the area clean. | While conducting the procedure, the student is mostly tidy, sometimes respectful of others, sometimes mindful of safety, and leaves the area clean only after being reminded. | While conducting the procedure, the student is untidy, not respectful of others, not mindful of safety, and leaves the area messy even after being reminded. |
| Purpose | Research question and hypothesis are stated clearly, and the relationship between the two is clear. The variables are selected. | Research question and hypothesis are stated, but one or both are not as clear as they might be, or the relationship between the two is unclear. The variables are selected. | Research question and hypothesis are not stated clearly, and the relationship between the two is unclear or absent. The variables are not selected. |
| Data Collection | Raw data, including units, are recorded in a way that is appropriate and clear. The title of the data table is included. | Raw data, including units, are recorded although not as clearly or appropriately as they might be. The title of the data table is included. | Raw data, including units, are not recorded in a way that is appropriate and clear. The title of the data table is not included. |
| Data Analysis | Data are presented in ways (charts, tables, graphs) that best facilitate understanding and interpretation. Error analysis is included. | Data are presented in ways (charts, tables, graphs) that can be understood and interpreted, although not as clearly as they might be. Error analysis is included. | Data are presented in ways (charts, tables, graphs) that are very unclear. Error analysis is not included. |
| Evaluation of Experiment | The results are fully interpreted and compared with literature values. The limitations and weaknesses are discussed and suggestions are made as to how to limit or eliminate them. | The results are interpreted and compared with literature values, but not as fully as they might be. The limitations and weaknesses are discussed, but few or no suggestions are made as to how to limit or eliminate them. | The results are not interpreted in a logical way or compared with literature values. The limitations and weaknesses are not discussed, nor are suggestions made as to how to limit or eliminate them. |

Référence: Stevens & Levi (2005:96-97)

Poster scientifique

Apparence générale

| | |
|---|---|
| 0 | Peu attractif de loin, donne une impression de masse solide, ou de blocs imposants éventuellement déconnectés entre eux. Peu d'espace blanc |
| 1 | Plaisant à regarder. Harmonieux dans l'usage des couleurs et du graphisme général |
| 2 | Très plaisant à regarder. Couleurs très bien choisies, graphisme attirant |

Équilibre textes/graphiques

| | |
|-----|--|
| 0 | Trop de texte. Le poster donne une impression accablante de texte seul |
| 0.5 | Pas assez de texte, graphiques incompréhensibles par manque de commentaires |
| 1 | Bon équilibre. Texte et graphiques bien étalés sur le poster, bonne explication des graphiques |

Taille du texte

| | |
|---|---|
| 0 | Texte trop petit pour lire aisément de loin (plus de 1,5 m) |
| 1 | Corps du texte principal bon mais légendes trop petites |
| 2 | Facile à lire à 1,5 m de distance |

Identification

| | |
|-----|---|
| 0 | Pas d'auteur(s) ni de contact (adresses, mail...) |
| 0.5 | Identification partielle |
| 1 | Identification complète |

Organisation du poster

| | |
|---|---|
| 0 | On ne comprend pas le sens de lecture dans le poster |
| 1 | Implicite. Titres (Introduction, Méthodes, etc.) et sous-titres organisent la lecture |
| 2 | Numérotation explicite, structure claire avec des sous-titres, objectifs, résultats, conclusions... |

Style

| | |
|---|---|
| 0 | Niveau de langage soutenu, structure syntaxique compliquée, phrases trop longues |
| 1 | Vocabulaire adapté mais structure lourde, tournures de phrases complexes |
| 2 | Vocabulaire adapté au grand public, tournures de phrases simples, phrases courtes, charnières logiques bien employées |

Contenu

| | |
|---|--|
| 0 | Trop simpliste ou trop compliqué |
| 1 | Objectifs de la communication clairement établis mais le contenu reste trop flou ou trop compliqué |
| 2 | Public bien ciblé, contenu clair. Le poster permet d'engager la discussion, le dialogue |

TOTAL sur 12 points

Récupéré du site de l'Université d'Angers : <http://www.univ-angers.fr/fr/recherche/actualites/e-forum-des-doctorants-1/concours-l-10e-forum.html>

Exposé oral

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Total |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|--|-------|
| Organization | Audience cannot understand presentation because there is no sequence of information. | Audience has difficulty following presentation because student jumps around. | Student presents information in logical sequence which audience can follow. | Student presents information in logical, interesting sequence which audience can follow. | |
| Subject Knowledge | Student does not have grasp of information; student cannot answer questions about subject. | Student is uncomfortable with information and is able to answer only rudimentary questions. | Student is at ease with expected answers to all questions, but fails to elaborate. | Student demonstrates full knowledge (more than required) by answering all class questions with explanations and elaboration. | |
| Graphics | Student uses superfluous graphics or no graphics | Student occasionally uses graphics that rarely support text and presentation. | Student's graphics relate to text and presentation. | Student's graphics explain and reinforce screen text and presentation. | |
| Mechanics | Student's presentation has four or more spelling errors and/or grammatical errors. | Presentation has three misspellings and/or grammatical errors. | Presentation has no more than two misspellings and/or grammatical errors. | Presentation has no misspellings or grammatical errors. | |
| Eye Contact | Student reads all of report with no eye contact. | Student occasionally uses eye contact, but still reads most of report. | Student maintains eye contact most of the time but frequently returns to notes. | Student maintains eye contact with audience, seldom returning to notes. | |
| Elocution | Student mumbles, incorrectly pronounces terms, and speaks too quietly for students in the back of class to hear. | Student's voice is low. Student incorrectly pronounces terms. Audience members have difficulty hearing presentation. | Student's voice is clear. Student pronounces most words correctly. Most audience members can hear presentation. | Student uses a clear voice and correct, precise pronunciation of terms so that all audience members can hear presentation. | |
| Total Points: | | | | | |

Récupéré du site de la North Carolina State University :
<http://www.ncsu.edu/midlink/rub.pres.html>

Travail de recherche

Grille inspirée des dimensions proposées par Lovitts (2005, p.100)

| Components | Criteria | Yes (satisfactory) | No (unsatisfactory) |
|---------------------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Introduction | The introduction includes a problem statement | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The introduction makes clear the research question to be addressed | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The introduction describes the motivation for the study | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The introduction describes the context in which the question arises | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The introduction summarizes the dissertation's findings | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The introduction discusses the importance of the findings | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The introduction provides a roadmap for readers | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Literature Review | The review is comprehensive and up to date | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The review shows a command of the literature | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The review contextualizes the problem | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The review includes a discussion of the literature that is selective, synthetic, analytical, and thematic | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Theory | The theory that is applied or developed is appropriate | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The theory that is applied or developed is logically interpreted | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The theory that is applied or developed is well understood | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The theory that is applied or developed aligns with the question at hand | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | In addition, the author shows comprehension of the theory's strengths | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | In addition, the author shows comprehension of the theory's limitations | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Methods | The methods applied or developed are appropriate | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The methods applied or developed are described in detail | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The methods applied or developed are in alignment with the question addressed and the theory used | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | In addition, the author demonstrates an understanding of the methods' advantages and disadvantages | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | In addition, the author demonstrates how to use the methods | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Results or Analysis | The analysis is appropriate | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The analysis aligns with the question and hypotheses raised | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The analysis shows sophistication | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The analysis is iterative | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The amount and quality of data or information is sufficient | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The amount and quality of data or information is well presented | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The amount and quality of data or information is intelligently interpreted | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The author also cogently expresses the insights gained from the study | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The author also cogently expresses the study's limitations | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Discussion or Conclusion | The conclusion summarizes the findings | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The conclusion provides perspective on the findings | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The conclusion refers back to the introduction | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The conclusion ties everything together | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The conclusion discusses the study's strengths and weaknesses | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The conclusion discusses implications and applications for the discipline | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | The conclusion discusses future directions for research | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

D'après le tableau récupéré du site de la Virginia Commonwealth University School of Medicine:
<http://www.medschool.vcu.edu/media/medschool/documents/Characteristics.doc>

Travail en équipe

| Composantes Critères | Satisfaisant | En progrès | A améliorer |
|--|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Organisation du travail · Responsabilité · Gestion des conflits | Aide à planifier le travail. <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Participe aux décisions, au travail de recherche, à l'attribution des tâches, à la gestion des conflits, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Accepte volontiers le partage des tâches. <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Collaboration - Participation · Autonomie · Motivation · Rétroaction | Est autonome. <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Aide et encourage les autres. <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Propose des solutions. <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Fournit une critique constructive. <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Participe à l'amélioration du climat de travail. <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Ouverture- Respect · Accepte la critique · Améliore le travail | Sait écouter. <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Est ouvert aux idées des autres. <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Respecte les autres. <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Accepte la critique. <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Améliore volontiers le travail à la suite des critiques. <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Réalisation du travail · Soin · Efficacité · Ponctualité · Assiduité · Respect des échéances, des consignes, etc. | Exécute le travail demandé avec efficacité <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Est ponctuel. <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Est assidu. <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Respecte l'échéancier, les délais. <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Respecte les consignes, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Remarques et suggestions d'amélioration | | | |

« Nous encourageons une autoanalyse réalisée par chacun des membres de l'équipe ou par l'ensemble de l'équipe. Pour ce faire, nous prôtons une appréciation qualitative selon une échelle ne comportant que trois niveaux (satisfaisant, en progrès et à améliorer) et non une évaluation chiffrée; cela a pour effet de réduire l'impact d'une mésestimation due à la complaisance ou, au contraire, à l'animosité entre membres de l'équipe.»

Référence: Prigent, Bernard & Kozanitis (2009:178)