# Keck Science Assessment Rubric for Information Literacy in Student Work

**Learning Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Developed</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Attribution**   | Shows a sophisticated level of understanding for when and how to give attribution.  
• Documents sources consistently and completely  
• Uses in-text citation and notes correctly and consistently  
• Cites non-textual sources consistently  
• Names and labels figures and/or graphs clearly and completely. | Attribution indicates understanding of the rationale for and various mechanisms of citation.  
• Documents sources throughout with occasional errors or inconsistencies.  
• Uses in-text citation and notes with occasional errors or inconsistencies  
• Cites non-textual sources with relative consistency  
• Usually names and labels figures and/or graphs clearly and completely. | Missteps in attribution interfere with the argument or point to fundamental misunderstandings.  
• Frequently documents sources incorrectly or leaves out some citations.  
• Frequent errors and inconsistencies in-text citation and notes  
• Does not consistently cite non-textual sources  
• Names and labels figures and/or graphs inconsistently. | Use of evidence and citation is poor, making it difficult to evaluate the argument or sources.  
• Displays fundamental and consistent errors in source documentation  
• Does not include or contain significant inconsistencies in-text citation and notes  
• Does not name, title, or cite non-textual sources  
• Does not name or label figures and/or graphs. |

**Evaluation of Sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Developed</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Source materials employed demonstrate expertise and sophisticated independent thought.  
• Demonstrates sophisticated awareness of universe of literature and community of scholarship  
• Uses a variety of appropriate and authoritative sources  
• Always distinguishes between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion)  
• Does not over- or under-rely on the ideas of others or the work of a single author  
• Demonstrates a thorough critical exploration and knowledge of theories and sources selected | Source materials are adequate and appropriate but lack variety or depth.  
• Explores supporting sources and community of scholarship but might overlook important avenues  
• Sources are used support claim(s) but may not be the most authoritative source to make claim  
• Usually distinguishes between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion)  
• May over- or under-rely on the ideas of others or the work of a single author  
• Demonstrates a preliminary critical exploration and knowledge of theories and sources selected | Source materials used are inadequate.  
• Exhibits weak awareness of universe of literature or other sources that could strengthen claim(s) or argument(s)  
• Relies on too few or largely inappropriate sources  
• Does not consistently distinguish between types of sources (e.g., primary v. secondary, scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion)  
• Clearly selected sources out of convenience  
• Demonstrates little critical exploration and knowledge of theories and sources selected | Source materials are absent or do not contribute to claim(s) or argument(s).  
• No evidence of awareness of universe of literature or other sources that could strengthen claim(s) or argument(s)  
• When included, sources are too few or badly inappropriate  
• No distinction between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion)  
• Does not explore outside sources or present evidence when called for  
• No evidence of critical exploration and knowledge of theories and sources selected |

---

Rubric content adapted for the Claremont Colleges by Char Booth, Sara Lowe, Natalie Tagge, and Sean Stone from an instrument originally developed at Carleton College - see http://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2011/csil-carleton-forensic-librarians-and-reflective-practices/.  
This rubric version (2012/13) was revised Summer-Fall of 2012 and finalized 8 November 2012.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Highly Developed 4</th>
<th>Developed 3</th>
<th>Emerging 2</th>
<th>Initial 1</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication of Evidence</td>
<td>Evidence is integrated and synthesized expertly to support claims.  *Consistently presents evidence to support claim(s) and argument(s)  *Synthesizes and contextualizes evidence appropriately for audience  *Uses evidence instrumentally towards rhetorical goals  *Distinction between own ideas and ideas of others is consistently clear</td>
<td>Proficient synthesis and integration of evidence.  *Generally employs evidence to support claim(s) and argument(s)  *May present some evidence without context  *Frequently demonstrates using evidence instrumentally toward rhetorical goals  *Distinction between own ideas and ideas of others is usually clear</td>
<td>Weak attempts at synthesis or integration.  *Sporadically uses evidence to support claim(s) or argument(s)  *Frequently fails to put sources into context (e.g. “The World Bank says...”)  *Usually does not demonstrate using evidence instrumentally toward rhetorical goals  *Consistently blurs distinction between own ideas and ideas of others</td>
<td>No evidence of attempt at synthesis or integration.  *Claim(s) or argument(s) lack necessary evidence  *Fails to contextualize quotes and evidence  *No demonstration of using evidence instrumentally toward rhetorical goals  *No distinction between own ideas and ideas of others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Optional:
This thesis is a particularly representative example of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very robust bibliography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear and consistent citations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chose appropriate sources to support claims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources are well-integrated and synthesized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows awareness of depth of scholarship in area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egregious errors in bibliography, in-text citations, notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or no attribution of non-textual elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate source(s) used to support claim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources not integrated or synthesized (e.g., “patch writing” or excessive block quoting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources lack breadth or depth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over/Undercited claims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: _____________________________________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elaboration (optional):

Rubric content adapted for the Claremont Colleges by Char Booth, Sara Lowe, Natalie Tagge, and Sean Stone from an instrument originally developed at Carleton College - see http://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2011/csil-carleton-forensic-librarians-and-reflective-practices/.

This rubric version (2012/13) was revised Summer-Fall of 2012 and finalized 8 November 2012.