University of Toronto	Libraries Patricia	and Peter Shanno	n Wilson Undergra	duate Research	Prize Evaluation	Rubric
Application #:						
Citation Style:						

Research process	Developing (1 point per item)	Proficient (2 points per item)	Accomplished (3 points per item)	Score
Overall search strategies	Search strategies are general and not fully described nor shape the research topic	Search strategies are more sophisticated, but the way those strategies shape the topic and further research is not articulated in the reflection essay	Search strategies are highly sophisticated, well developed, thoroughly described, and clearly contribute to the shaping of the topic and further research	
Reseach tools	Uses only search tools such as the library catalogue and/or search engines	• 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 databases)	Displays awareness of all potential finding aids appropriate to the inquiry, including library resources (e.g., Special Collections, interlibrary loan, or subject-specific databases)	
Search techniques	Limited search techniques described, does not mention modifying searches	Evidence of basic search techniques; modifies searches iteratively; identifies new keywords including synonyms, related terms, variant spellings; uses subject headings; follows footnotes & references; however, approaches may be limited in flexibility or creativity	Evidence of advanced search techniques and in-depth digging, including modified searches and search limits; identifies key authors and works; follows footnotes & references iteratively; uses of flexible and creative vocabularies	
Research services and supports	Library services and other information supports not used	Library and information services/resources, such as asking a librarian or consulting reference sources, may be used, but others that might be appropriate may not have been consulted	Extensive use of library and information services, including consulting with reference librarians, subject specialists, professors, TAs, and peers	

Challenges and roadblocks	No description of responses to research roadblocks and/or challenges	Roadblocks/challenges are acknowledged but not dealt with or resolved	Explicitly acknowledges and responds to roadblocks and challenges in research results	
Choice and use of sources	Developing (1 point per item)	Proficient (2 points per item)	Accomplished (3 points per item)	Score
Types and formats	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)	Reflects a wider range of types and formats of sources (e.g., primary and secondary sources, formats beyond articles), but formats that might be appropriate to the discipline may not have been fully explored	Sources display rich variety of types and format appropriate to the discipline	
Depth and breadth	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)	Uses a wider range of references from a variety of disciplines, and perspectives, but may have gaps in coverage	Uses references from multiple perspectives (when appropriate), pursuing comprehensive coverage (e.g., date range, culturally, geographically, etc.)	
Evaluation	Does not identify criteria for evaluating sources	Criteria for evaluation of sources incomplete or unclear	Articulates a well-constructed criteria for evaluating the authority and quality of sources	

Bibliography	Developing (1 point per item)	Proficient (2 points per item)	Accomplished (3 points per item)	Score
	Sources are not cited in a standard and consistent way. Numerous errors and/or omissions of citation elements	Sources cited in standard format but contain errors or some missing elements	Cites all materials correctly in a standard format as stated on the application	
Quality of writing in reflective essay	Developing (1 point per item)	Proficient (2 points per item)	Accomplished (3 points per item)	Score
	Poorly written; does not illustrate any reflection on the research process	Writing occasionally lacks clarity or emphasis on the research process and in-depth reflection	Well-written, and clearly articulates the research process, providing detailed reflection	

TOTAL SCORE: /30

## **NOTES:**