

Capital University

THE JAMES L. AND E. MARLENE BRUNING UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH AWARD

*Selection Criteria: Integrative Research*¹

Student Name²:

Student Project Title:

Reviewer Name:

Date:

After completing the rubric on the other side, the evaluator should provide narrative comments below that will assist in resolving tie scores.

¹ Adapted and significantly changed from rubric available at <http://www.web.virginia.edu/iaas/assessment/assessrubrics.htm>

² Student must satisfy eligibility requirements and be nominated by a faculty mentor as identified in THE JAMES L. AND E. MARLENE BRUNING UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH AWARD, Eligibility Requirements and Nomination Procedure.

Please, check the appropriate statement for each row.

	Novice 0 points	Apprentice 1 point	Expected 2 points	Expert (working at or beyond graduate level) 3 points	Score
Background	___ Purpose not stated	___ Purpose unclear	___ Purpose stated clearly	___ Sophisticated purpose	___
	___ Context absent, no literature cited	___ Literature cited, not connected to study	___ Literature cited, connected to study	___ Sophisticated literature review	___
	___ No thesis stated	___ Thesis unclear	___ Thesis stated clearly	___ Includes rationale for thesis	___
	Comments:				
Body	___ Does not identify concept or theme	___ Identifies concept or theme	___ Relates concept or theme to literature	___ Sophisticated discussion of theme	___
	___ Topic not connected to larger issue	___ Connects topic to larger issue	___ Makes original connections	___ Demonstrates mature connections	___
	___ Deals only with a single perspective	___ Presents others' perspectives in literature	___ Presents own & others' perspectives	___ Analyzes own & others' perspectives	___
	___ Lack examples supporting thesis	___ Provides examples but lacks detail	___ Examples and quotations support thesis	___ Sophisticated use of examples, quotes	___
	___ Does not evaluate evidence	___ Attempts to evaluate evidence	___ Critically evaluates evidence	___ Sophisticated evaluation of evidence	___
Comments:					
Discussion	___ Conclusions not provided	___ Conclusions superficial or lack support	___ Conclusions connected to results	___ Connects conclusions to literature	___
	___ Contribution not identified	___ Contribution not connected to literature	___ Contribution to literature identified	___ Mature analysis contribution	___
	Comments:				
Acumen	___ Unable to answer questions	___ Answers questions, not always correct	___ Answers questions correctly	___ Sophisticated answers to questions	___
	___ No creativity of thought evident	___ Limited creativity in designing project	___ Shows creativity in designing project	___ Much creativity in project design	___
	Comments:				
Message	___ No clear structure	___ Clear structure	___ Clear structure, effective transitions	___ Clear structure, interesting story	___
	___ No regard for audience evident	___ Overuses jargon; limited explanations	___ Clear explanations of advanced concepts	___ Adapts explanations to audience	___
	Comments:				
Communication	___ Poor eye contact, distracting gestures	___ Good eye contact, few distracting gestures	___ Good eye contact, no distracting gestures	___ Professional mannerisms	___
	___ Monotonous or overuse of verbal fillers	___ Attempts to vary voice, few verbal fillers	___ Demonstrates enthusiasm	___ Fosters enthusiasm in audience	___
	___ Over relied on AV aids	___ Use of visual aids not always effective	___ Uses visual aids effectively	___ Professional use of visual aids	___
	Comments:				