

Giovale Library Undergraduate Research Awards Judges' Rubric

	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished
Reflection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Applicant fails to articulate process by which topic was developed *Search strategies omitted or very general *Does not identify appropriate <i>finding aids</i> and tools *Does not identify criteria for evaluating information sources *Does not display evidence of knowledge or learning related to the process of exploration and discovery *Does not display evidence of use of appropriate search strategies and services *Does not employ transferable or reproducible strategies *Indicates a basic understanding of <i>library research</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Topic or question is adequate but could be improved by more refinement or an assigned topic was only minimally developed *Search strategies described generally (suggest a physical route, but not a conceptual one) No description of responses to failure *Identifies basic or general <i>finding aids</i> and library services such as librarians and reference books, but omits other appropriate aids and services (e.g. interlibrary loan, or journal databases) *Criteria for evaluation of sources incomplete *Displays awareness of simple strategies but not advanced *Indicates a deeper understanding of <i>library research</i> and adequate skills required for appropriate undergraduate level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Topic or question is thoughtfully developed and accurately reflects time and resources available *Search strategies explicitly described, including unmet challenges, information gaps, and responses to failure *Displays awareness of all potential <i>finding aids</i> appropriate to the inquiry *Displays clear criteria for evaluation of sources selected *Displays dynamic knowledge and/or learning of the information universe explored. *Evidence of use of controlled vocabularies, advanced search techniques, resource sharing, reference, and consultation services *Indicates a thorough understanding of <i>library research strategies</i> appropriate to undergraduate level.

Bibliography	<p>*Sources used appear to be generated exclusively from general knowledge tools (e.g. Google or Academic Search Premier), not in-depth disciplinary tools (e.g. CINAHL or U.S. Census datasets, etc.)</p> <p>*Sources are repetitive and unvaried (e.g. all newspaper articles or all from one perspective or school of thought)</p> <p>*May cite sources, but not in a standard or consistent way</p> <p>*Sources are not relevant to topic or are not used to inform project.</p>	<p>* Uses some variety of basic sources (books, websites, articles) but falls short of complete breadth and depth</p> <p>*Sources meet assignment requirements in number and genre, but may lack breadth and some may lack rigor, currency as appropriate, or relevance</p> <p>*Cites sources in a standard or consistent way</p>	<p>*Sources display rich variety in appropriateness and format</p> <p>*Sources may include less common formats such as maps, AV materials, archives, government documents or interviews</p> <p>*Sources display awareness of the need to dig beneath the surface of information to find difficult but illuminating materials (ex. finding resources in unexpected disciplines, following a trail of scholarship through bibliographies, etc.)</p> <p>*Cites sources in a standard or consistent way</p>
Faculty assessment of project	<p>*Project does not respond to assignment parameters</p> <p>*Student's work does not demonstrate understanding of disciplinary methods and conventions</p> <p>*Sources do not appropriately or thoroughly support argument</p>	<p>*Project meets assignment parameters</p> <p>*Project generally follows methodology and conventions of discipline</p> <p>*Sources selected adequately support argument</p>	<p>*Project exceeds assignment parameters</p> <p>*Project follows, challenges, or enhances methodology and conventions of discipline</p> <p>*Sources selected and used compare to professional work in the field</p>

Project	<p>Little or no originality in topic or question</p> <p>Poorly written, obscuring quality of research and claims</p>	<p>Argument takes familiar path with some originality</p> <p>Writing lacks some clarity or emphasis, partially obscuring quality of research and claims</p>	<p>Project addresses significant questions within a discipline</p> <p>Well-written, clearly identifying convergence of research and argument</p>
---------	--	---	--

GLOSSARY:

Research strategy: Any deliberate, structured attempt, either individually or collaboratively, to develop a plan for a research project or to search a finding aid. This may include identifying and accessing background or reference sources, identifying appropriate databases for specific purposes, consulting librarians, instructors, or other experts to gather leads for further discovery, developing a list of terms and concepts related to the line of inquiry, etc.

Library research: i.e. Information, or information-based, research. Distinguished from lab, field, survey, or other research methodology employed for creating new information.

Finding aid: Any information resource intended to help a reader find further resources on a topic. May include encyclopedias, research databases, bibliographies, handbooks, text-books, etc.

Controlled vocabularies: Technical or specialized vocabularies used by a discipline or a disciplinary database to describe topics, concepts, theories and the like related to the work done by professionals in a field. (e.g. instead of using the keyword ACTH in Psychology using the subject term Corticotropin.)

Adapted from the University of Washington Libraries' *Library Research Award for Undergraduates Evaluation Criteria*
http://www.lib.washington.edu/researchaward/award_recipients/EvaluationCriteria.pdf