

Assessment

The gas we drink - Carbon dioxide in carbonated beverages

Assessment criteria

The assessment of this Task can be based on a number of student assessment tools. Note that formative assessment is more appropriate for practical activities and group work. Summative assessment here concerns mainly the theoretical concepts of: ions, ionic conductivity, electrolytes, electrolysis, ionic bonding, crystals and crystal structure.

The following tables provide criteria for further assessing the students' work. Each of tables 1 to 5 provides criteria for assessing separately each phase. Tables 6 and 7 list the criteria for assessing students' attitudes and interest toward the performed activities (Table 6), and toward the theoretical concepts and science in general (Table 7). Students can be asked to add their comments for improving the activity. Needless to comment that the proposed student assessment tools are mere suggestions. Teachers can include their own criteria for assessment.

Table 1 – Criteria for collective class assessment of previous student knowledge (**Phase 1**): (i) knowledge of gases and their properties and laws; (ii) knowledge about atmospheric pressure; (iii) knowledge about carbon dioxide and its properties. The execution of the Phase-1 experiments about gases is also evaluated.

| | | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| <i>Students' knowledge about gases and their properties</i> | The students had satisfactory knowledge | The students had limited knowledge | The students had problematic knowledge | The students had no knowledge |
| <i>Students' knowledge about atmospheric pressure</i> | The students had satisfactory knowledge | The students had limited knowledge | The students had problematic knowledge | The students had no knowledge |
| <i>Students' knowledge about carbon dioxide and its properties</i> | The students had satisfactory knowledge | The students had limited knowledge | The students had problematic knowledge | The students had no knowledge |
| <i>Execution of experiments about gases</i> | Excellent | Adequate | Limited | Poor |

Developers: Georgios Tsapalis & Constantinos Kampourakis

Institution: Department of Chemistry, University of Ioannina

Country: Greece

Table 2 – Criteria for assessing planning, execution and explanation of experimental activities of Phase 2.¹

| | | | | |
|--|-----------|----------|---------|------|
| <i>Explanation of escape of CO₂ from bottled beverage.</i> | Excellent | Adequate | Limited | Poor |
| <i>Study of effect of temperature on CO₂ solubility in beverage</i> | Excellent | Adequate | Limited | Poor |
| <i>Planning of experiment for measuring the volume of CO₂ in beverage</i> | Excellent | Adequate | Limited | Poor |

Table 3 – Criteria for assessing execution of the experimental activity of Phase 3 (measuring the volume of CO₂ in beverage).

| | | | | |
|---|-----------|----------|---------|------|
| <i>Execution of activity for measuring the volume of CO₂ in beverage</i> | Excellent | Adequate | Limited | Poor |
| <i>Discussion of experimental errors</i> | Excellent | Adequate | Limited | Poor |
| <i>Answers to questions</i> | Excellent | Adequate | Limited | Poor |

¹ Kempa (1986) has considered that the following qualities should be taken into account in schemes for the assessment of practical abilities: (a) recognition and formulation of a problem (NOT APPLICABLE HERE); (b) design and planning of experimental procedures (NOT APPLICABLE); (c) setting-up and execution of experimental work (manipulation); (d) observational and measuring skills (including the recording of data and observations); (e) interpretation and evaluation of experimental data and observations.

Table 4 – Criteria for assessing planning, execution of the experimental activity of Phase 4 (determining gas pressure inside a closed beverage can).

| | | | | |
|--|-----------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|
| <i>Type (1) of proposed experiment:</i> | Frequency | Proposed planning adequate | Proposed planning with some problems | Proposed planning poor |
| <i>Type (2) of proposed experiment:</i> | Frequency | Proposed planning adequate | Proposed planning with some problems | Proposed planning poor |
| <i>Type (3) of proposed experiment:</i> | Frequency | Proposed planning adequate | Proposed planning with some problems | Proposed planning poor |
| <i>Execution of experiment</i> | Excellent | Adequate | Limited | Poor |

Table 5 – Criteria for assessing in-class discussion during phase 5.

| | | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <i>Overall revision and evaluation of module by the students</i> | The students had responded successfully | The students had responded in part | The students had limited involvement | The students were not involved at all |
| <i>Discussion of experimental errors</i> | Excellent | Adequate | Limited | Poor |
| <i>Students' explanation of the CO₂ fountain</i> | Excellent | Adequate | Limited | Poor |

Table 6– Criteria for assessing students' attitudes and interest toward the performed activities.

| | | | |
|--|-------------|----------------|-------|
| <i>In class discussion about the properties of gases (Phase 1)</i> | High | Average | Low |
| <i>Experiments on properties of gases (Phase 2)</i> | High | Average | Low |
| <i>Experiments on properties of CO₂. (Phase 2)</i> | High | Average | Low |
| <i>Planning and execution of experiment on volume of CO₂ in beverage (Phase 3)</i> | High | Average | Low |
| <i>Planning and execution of experiment on pressure of CO₂ in beverage (Phase 4).</i> | High | Average | Low |
| <i>Discussion of experimental errors (Phases 3 and 4)</i> | High | Average | Low |
| <i>Demonstration of CO₂ fountain (Phase 5)</i> | High | Average | Low |
| <i>End-of-module discussion (Phase 5)</i> | High | Average | Low |
| <i>In comparison with traditional practical activities the activities were ...</i> | Much better | About the same | Worse |

Developers: Georgios Tsaparis & Constantinos Kampourakis

Institution: Department of Chemistry, University of Ioannina

Country: Greece

Table 7 – Criteria for assessing students' attitudes and interest toward the theoretical concepts and science in general.

| | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <i>The activities have contributed to increased knowledge and understanding about properties of gases</i> | Yes a lot | Yes a little | No |
| <i>The activities have contributed to increased knowledge and understanding about atmospheric pressure and gas pressure</i> | Yes a lot | Yes a little | No |
| <i>The activity has contributed to increased knowledge and understanding of science in general</i> | Yes a lot | Yes a little | No |
| <i>Arrange in order of importance/usefulness the following seven studies*</i> | Properties of gases | Properties of CO ₂ | Volume of CO ₂ in beverage |
| Pressure of CO ₂ in beverage | Understanding of carbonated beverages | CO ₂ fountain | Experimental errors |
| <i>Arrange in order of interest the following seven studies**</i> | Properties of gases | Properties of CO ₂ | Volume of CO ₂ in beverage |
| Pressure of CO ₂ in beverage | Understanding of carbonated beverages | CO ₂ fountain | Experimental errors |

* From 1 (most important/useful), to 7 (least important/useful).

** From 1 (most interesting), to 7 (least interesting).

Bibliography

Kempa R. (1986). *Assessment in science* (Ch. 5). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Developers: Georgios Tsapalis & Constantinos Kampourakis

Institution: Department of Chemistry, University of Ioannina

Country: Greece