

Information Literacy Rubric

Student Learning Outcome Assessment

Student Name: _____

Faculty Name: _____

Term: _____

	Highly Developed 4	Developed 3	Emerging 2	Initial 1	Score
Attribution	<p><i>Shows a sophisticated level of understanding for when and how to give attribution.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p><i>Attribution indicates understanding of the rationale for and various mechanisms of citation.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p><i>Missteps in attribution interfere with the argument or point to fundamental misunderstandings.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequently documents sources incorrectly or leaves out some citations. • Frequent errors and inconsistencies with in-text citation and notes. • Does not consistently cite non-textual sources. • Names and labels figures and/or graphs inconsistently. 	<p><i>Use of evidence and citation is poor, making it difficult to evaluate the argument or sources.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displays fundamental and consistent errors in source documentation. • Does not include or contains significant inconsistencies with 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	<p><i>Source materials employed demonstrate expertise and sophisticated independent thought.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p><i>Source materials are adequate and appropriate but lack variety or depth.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p><i>Source materials used are inadequate.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p><i>Source materials are absent or do not contribute to claim(s) or argument(s).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	
Communication of Evidence	<p><i>Evidence is integrated and synthesized expertly to support claims.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p><i>Proficient synthesis and integration of evidence.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p><i>Weak attempts at synthesis or integration.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p><i>No evidence of attempt at synthesis or integration.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	