

## University of Toronto Libraries Undergraduate Research Prize Evaluation Rubric

Application #: \_\_\_\_\_

Citation Style: \_\_\_\_\_

Research process	Developing (1 point per item)	Proficient (2 points per item)	Accomplished (3 points per item)
Search strategy and techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Search strategies may be very general, such as using only simple keyword searches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Search strategies may now be somewhat more sophisticated, using subject-specific terminology but the way those strategies shape the topic and further research may not be articulated in reflection essay</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Search strategies will be thoroughly described, being highly sophisticated, well developed and clearly contributed to the shaping of the research topic, and using subject-specific terminology</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No description of responses to failure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roadblocks are acknowledged but not approached critically</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will explicitly acknowledge responds to dead-ends and gaps in research results</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses basic tools such as the library catalogue and search engines</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies basic or general finding aids (e.g. research guides), but omits other appropriate aids and services in context (e.g. Special Collections, interlibrary loan, or journal databases)</li> <li>• Modifies searches iteratively; identifies new keywords including synonyms, related terms, variant spellings; uses subject headings; follows footnotes &amp; references</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Displays awareness of all potential finding aids appropriate to the inquiry, including library resources (e.g. Special Collections, interlibrary loan, or subject-specific databases)</li> <li>• Evidence of advanced search techniques including modified searches and search limits; identifies key authors and works; follows footnotes &amp; references iteratively; uses of flexible and creative vocabularies</li> </ul>
Library and research services and supports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Library services and other supports not used</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Library services and resources, such as asking a librarian or consulting reference sources, may be used, but others that might be appropriate may not have been consulted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extensive use of library services, including consulting with reference librarians, subject specialists, as well as professors and peers</li> </ul>

<b>Choice and use of sources</b>	<b>Developing (1 point per item)</b>	<b>Proficient (2 points per item)</b>	<b>Accomplished (3 points per item)</b>
Types and formats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sources cited tend to be predominantly of one type and/or format (e.g. secondary sources only, primary data obtained from secondary sources, or exclusive use of articles)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reflects a wider range of types and formats of sources (e.g. primary and secondary sources, wide date range, applicable to the discipline)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sources display rich variety of types and format appropriate to the discipline</li> </ul>
Depth and breadth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uses references from familiar sources but lacks in its range of perspectives and coverage (e.g. sources are older than they should be, or all drawn from a narrow range of dates)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uses a wider range of references from a variety of sources, disciplines, and perspectives, but may have gaps in coverage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uses references from multiple perspectives, pursuing comprehensive coverage (e.g. date range, culturally, geographically, etc.)</li> </ul>
Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not identify criteria for evaluating sources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Criteria for evaluation of sources incomplete or unclear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Articulates a well-constructed criteria for evaluating the authority and quality of sources</li> </ul>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>Developing (1 point per item)</b>	<b>Proficient (2 points per item)</b>	<b>Accomplished (3 points per item)</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sources are not cited in a standard and consistent way. Numerous errors and/or omissions of citation elements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sources cited in standard format but contain errors or some missing elements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cites all materials correctly in a standard format as stated in the application</li> </ul>

<b>Quality of writing in reflective essay</b>	<b>Developing (1 point per item)</b>	<b>Proficient (2 points per item)</b>	<b>Accomplished (3 points per item)</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poorly written; does not illustrate any reflection on the research process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Writing occasionally lacks clarity or emphasis on the research process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Well-written, and clearly articulates the research process</li> </ul>

**TOTAL SCORE:                    / 30**

**NOTES:**