Scoring Rubric

CSUSM Library Award for Undergraduate Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity

Reflective Essay - 20 points
Bibliography - 15 points
Submission - 10 points
Supporting Letter - 5 points
--
Total possible: 50 points

Reflective Essay (20 pts)		
Accomplished	**Competent**	**Developing**
Clearly articulates and consistently uses **an array of criteria for the evaluation & selection** of source materials such as: ● Relevance ● Authority/credibility ● Scope/coverage ● Accuracy ● Currency ● Context of source's creation ● Particular viewpoints	Articulation of **criteria for evaluation & selection** of sources is incomplete/unclear or inconsistently used. ● Expresses limited understanding of the source's context. ● Limited discussion of varying viewpoints or interpretations.	Does not clearly identify **criteria for evaluating or selecting** sources. ● May use evaluation criteria without articulating this approach or may use criteria regardless of its importance. ● No discussion of context as an influence on the creation of information or its utility. ● No discussion of differing viewpoints or interpretation.
Search strategies are described addressing such aspects as: ● Identifying types of information needed	**Search strategies** described generally; examples follow: ● Identifies standard finding aids & services (e.g., librarians & databases) but omits other appropriate resources	**Search strategies** omitted or very general, for example: ● Does not display evidence of appropriate search strategies and services.

• Various research tools and sources used (books, articles, websites, etc.) • Persistence and initiative in gaining access to appropriate sources • Use of flexible and creative search terms and strategies • Adjustments to search strategies in response to success/failure • Articulation and utilization of specific investigative techniques unique to a discipline (e.g., musical analysis, historical research)	• Relevant sources not locally available are identified, but not acquired. • Uses simple search strategies (e.g., check boxes for peer reviewed literature) • No discussion of responses to failure. • Investigative methods appropriate to the discipline described but not utilized	• Does not identify appropriate finding aids & tools for given context. • No discussion of seeking sources beyond locally available materials. • Has no clear methodology for gathering discipline-specific information
Distinguishes own **original contribution** from existing scholarship and creative works.	Identifies own ideas & assumptions but does not distinguish from or relate to contributions of others.	Does not articulate or evaluate own assumptions. No analysis of ideas encountered in the scholarship.
Demonstrates an awareness and investigation of different viewpoints, even if it **counters their thesis argument.**	Discusses differing positions on an issue as presented in the literature, but without an effort to reconcile these conflicting ideas.	Utilizes only sources that are consistent with original thesis, assertions, or point of view. No discussion of conflicting information.

Bibliography (15 pts)		
Accomplished	**Competent**	**Developing**
Uses wide range of resource types appropriate to the discipline (e.g., primary & secondary sources, scholarly & popular literature, data, books, articles, critical/performance editions, original compositions, arrangements, transcriptions, sound or video recordings, models, plans, computer models).	Cites different types of resources appropriate to the project, but does not show great depth or breadth.	Scope of source types is limited to conventional formats which are not necessarily the most appropriate for the discipline or project. Uses basic general knowledge resources (e.g., websites, newspaper articles), rather than subject-specific sources.
Consistently provides accurate, complete citations to sources in format/style appropriate to the discipline.	Sources cited in standard format but contain errors or some missing elements.	Sources not cited in standard and consistent way. Numerous errors and/or omissions of citation elements.

Submission (based on type) (10 pts)		
Accomplished	**Competent**	**Developing**
Clearly communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources in support of the argument, thesis, or hypothesis/research question in a manner that supports project purposes - AND/OR -	Selects appropriate content to support project purposes, thesis, or hypothesis/research question but content is poorly organized and some claims or assertions lack references.	Information from sources is poorly organized and integrated, or insufficient to support project, thesis, or hypothesis/research question. (i.e., unsupported claims or assertions)
Quotations/acquired ideas are well selected and integrated conceptually & rhetorically - AND/OR -	Occasional use of inappropriate quotes/ideas; or quotes/ideas are poorly integrated into argument	Poor selection of quotes/ideas (e.g., fail to address point in question)
Formulates questions relating to the purpose, development, and presentation of a musical, theatrical or choreographed performance, or of a design/build project.	Formulates questions relating to the purpose of the presentation of a musical, theatrical or choreographed performance, or of a design/build project, but does not follow through with questions addressing the development and presentation.	Does not identify questions relating to the purpose, development, or presentation of a musical, theatrical or choreographed performance, or of a design/build project.

Supporting Letter (5 pts)		
Accomplished	**Competent**	**Developing**
Explains how project addresses significant questions within the discipline & clearly articulates the stakes.	Indicates that the applicant's argument takes familiar path with some originality OR that the argument is original but stakes are low.	Points to little or no originality in topic / approach or indicates that the question is no or low stakes.
Clearly identifies and evaluates disciplinary dimensions of applicant's work, such as: ● argumentation style/ approach ● investigative methods ● sources selected & how utilized	Provides limited information about appropriateness of argumentation, methods and/or sources utilized.	Does not explain disciplinary dimensions of applicant's work or assess quality of sources utilized.