

UNLV University Libraries Lance & Elena Calvert Undergraduate Research Award Scoring Rubric

| Reflective Essay (20 pts) | Accomplished (14-20 pts) | Competent (7-13 pts) | Developing (1-6 pts) | Score & Comments |
|---------------------------|--|---|---|------------------|
| | <p>Search strategies are explicitly described addressing such aspects as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifying types of information needed Finding aids used to locate particular types of resources (e.g., primary sources, unpublished materials, specific versions/ editions, discipline specific materials) Efforts made to obtain needed but not locally available information (e.g., through ILL, LINK+) Utilization of flexible and creative search terms (e.g. use of controlled vocabularies & thesauri) Adjustments to search strategies in response to relative success/failure of prior search strategies Specific investigative techniques unique to a discipline (e.g., musical analysis, historical research) <p>Clearly describes and</p> | <p>Search strategies described generally; may be exemplified as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describes a physical route but not a conceptual one Identifies standard finding aids & services (e.g., librarians & databases) but omits other appropriate resource (e.g., special collections, ILL) Relevant sources not locally available are identified, but not acquired. Alternative sources used without justification Uses keyword searches and other 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 <p>Articulation of criteria for evaluation of sources</p> | <p>Search strategies omitted or very general, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not describe transferable or reproducible strategies Does not display evidence of appropriate search strategies and services Does not identify appropriate finding aids & tools for given context. Limits search to general tools (e.g., Academic Search Premier or Google searches). No discussion of seeking sources beyond locally available materials. Has no clear methodology for gathering disciplines specific information <p>Does not clearly identify criteria for evaluating</p> | |

UNLV University Libraries Lance & Elena Calvert Undergraduate Research Award Scoring Rubric

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>consistently utilizes an array of criteria for the evaluation & selection of source materials such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Topical relevance • Authority /credibility • Scope/ coverage • Accuracy • Currency • Context of source's creation & potential impact on resulting information (e.g., historical era, position of the author, publication venue) • Particular viewpoints or performance / application practices encountered in print sources, recordings performances, models, etc. <p>Distinguishes own new interpretation or original contribution from the writings & ideas of others.</p> <p>Portrays efforts to account for pertinent knowledge/ information encountered in the research process, even if it challenges student's value system or counters their thesis argument.</p> | <p>incomplete or unclear, or they are inconsistently used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses various evaluation criteria but may miss important criteria for sources used. • Expresses limited understanding of the potential impact on information that results from the context of its creation. • Limited discussion of varying viewpoints or interpretations found in print sources, recordings, performances, models, etc. <p>Identifies own ideas & assumptions but does not distinguish from or relate to contributions of others.</p> <p>Discusses differing positions on an issue as presented in the literature, but there is no effort to reconcile these.</p> | <p>information sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May implicitly use evaluation criteria such as topical relevance without explicitly articulating this approach or may use criteria regardless of relative importance for sources. • No discussion of context as an influence on the creation of information or its utility. • No discussion of differing viewpoints in interpretation or performance/ application practices. <p>Does not articulate or evaluate own assumptions. No analysis of ideas encountered in the literature.</p> <p>Utilizes only sources that are consistent with original thesis, assertions, or point of view. No discussion of conflicting information.</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

UNLV University Libraries Lance & Elena Calvert Undergraduate Research Award Scoring Rubric

| Bibliography (15 pts) | Accomplished (11-15 pts) | Competent (6-10 pts) | Developing (1-5 pts) | Score & Comments |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|---------------------------------|
| | <p>Uses the wide range of resource types appropriate to the discipline and to the information need (e.g., primary & secondary sources, scholarly & popular literature, data, books, articles, critical or performance editions, original compositions, arrangements, transcriptions, sound or video recordings, models, plans, computer models).</p> <p>Consistently provides accurate, complete citations to sources in format/style appropriate to the discipline</p> | <p>Cites different types of resources appropriate to the project, but does not evidence great depth or breadth</p> <p>Sources cited in standard format but contain errors or some missing elements</p> | <p>Scope of source types is limited to conventional formats not necessarily most appropriate for the discipline or project. Uses basic general knowledge resources (e.g., Web sites, newspaper articles), rather than subject specific sources.</p> <p>Sources not cited in standard and consistent way. Numerous errors and/or omissions of citation elements</p> | |
| Supporting Letter (5 pts) | Accomplished (4-5 pts) | Competent (3 pts) | Developing (1-2 pts) | Score & Comments |
| | <p>Explains how project addresses significant questions within the discipline & clearly articulates the stakes.</p> <p>If appropriate, indicates that questions formulated relate to the purpose, development and presentation of a musical, theatrical or choreographed performance, or of a design/build project</p> | <p>Indicates that the student's argument takes familiar path with some originality OR that the argument is original but stakes are low</p> <p>Indicates that questions formulated relate to the purpose of a performance, or of a design/build project but do not follow through with questions addressing development & presentation.</p> | <p>Points to little or no originality in topic/ approach or indicates that the question is no or low stakes</p> <p>Does not discuss whether questions formulated address purpose, development and/or presentation of a performance or design/build project.</p> | |

UNLV University Libraries Lance & Elena Calvert Undergraduate Research Award Scoring Rubric

| | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| | <p>Clearly explains relevance of project to the assignment.</p> <p>Clearly identifies and evaluates disciplinary dimensions of student's work, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • argumentation style/ approach • investigative methods • sources selected & how utilized | <p>Identifies a connection between project & assignment but with some ambiguities or reservations</p> <p>Provides limited information about appropriateness of argumentation, methods and/or sources utilized</p> | <p>Does not identify extent to which project responds to assignment</p> <p>Does not explain disciplinary dimensions of student's work or assess quality of sources utilized</p> | |
| Project (10 pts) | Accomplished (8-10 pts) | Competent (4-7 pts) | Developing (1-3 pts) | Score & Comments |
| | <p>Clearly communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources in support of the argument or thesis and/or in a manner that supports project purposes (e.g., recital programs and program notes, or design/build projects such as models and samples).</p> <p>Quotations and acquired ideas are well selected and integrated conceptually & rhetorically with applicant's argument.</p> <p>Formulates questions relating to the purpose, development, and</p> | <p>Selects appropriate content to support project purposes or thesis, but content is poorly organized and some claims or assertions lack references.</p> <p>Occasional use of inappropriate quotes or quotes poorly integrated into argument</p> <p>Formulates questions relating to the purpose of the presentation</p> | <p>Information from sources is poorly organized and integrated, or insufficient to support project or thesis. May include unsupported claims or assertions or otherwise uses information inappropriately.</p> <p>Poor selection of quotes (e.g., fail to address point in question)</p> <p>Does not identify questions relating to the purpose,</p> | |

UNLV University Libraries Lance & Elena Calvert Undergraduate Research Award Scoring Rubric

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| | presentation of a musical, theatrical or choreographed performance, or of a design/build project. | 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. | development, or presentation of a musical, theatrical or choreographed performance, or of a design/build project. | |
|--|---|--|---|--|

Finding aid: Any information resource intended to help a reader find further resources on a topic, by an individual, etc. e.g., encyclopedias, research databases, bibliographies, handbooks.

Research strategy: Any deliberate, structured attempt...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 methodologies employed for creating new information. May be used interchangeably with literature review.¹

¹ Definitions and selected indicators adapted from UW Library Research Award for Undergraduates: Evaluation Rubric.
http://guides.lib.washington.edu/data/files3/84491/Research_Award_rubric.pdf