

# UCSB Library Award for Undergraduate Research - Humanities & Fine Arts Rubric

## Research Narrative (45%)

Criteria	Excellent (8-10 points)	Competent (5-7 points)	Developing (4 and under)
<b>Research Strategy</b>	Documents a complex "pivot" - refined search strategy after discovering new terminology or "silences" in a collection.	Uses a variety of databases and sources; uses basic filters or date ranges.	Uses general "keyword" searches in the main library discovery tool only.
<b>Information Literacy</b>	Critically evaluates the "authority" of sources; synthesizes diverse/conflicting voices into an original argument.	Balanced use of primary and secondary sources; identifies author bias or historical context.	Argument lacks organization and complex synthesis.
<b>Library Use</b>	Proactively uses the expanse of library resources to form a comprehensive idea of materials available for research.	Uses general collections combined with information from other providers (other UC libraries, other external providers and institutions).	Uses general library collections only.
<b>Ethics &amp; Attribution</b>	Demonstrates careful reading of the initial sources, transparently incorporating sources into the argument, and cites sources correctly.	Attributes and references specific authors, provides the origin of source(s).	Inconsistent citations; misses credit for images or creative works.

## Project (25%)

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Excellent (8-10 points)</b>	<b>Competent (5-7 points)</b>	<b>Developing (4 and under)</b>
<b>Clarity of Presentation</b>	Grammar and punctuation are correct throughout. Coherent and consistent argumentation.	Some argumentation lacks clarity or direction. Grammar and punctuation are correct.	Grammar and punctuation errors. Needs improvement in forming a coherent argument.
<b>Research Methodologies</b>	Research reflects appropriate methodologies.	Research does not reflect an appropriate methodology or methodologies.	No clear methodology applied to research.
<b>Use of Sources</b>	Use of synthesis, direct quotes, and original analysis are well-balanced.	Sources support claims, but integration may rely too heavily on direct quotes rather than analysis.	Claims are unsupported by data; sources lack clear connection to the argument.

## Bibliography (30%)

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Excellent (8-10 points)</b>	<b>Competent (5-7 points)</b>	<b>Developing (4 and under)</b>
<b>Citation Style &amp; Formatting</b>	Citation style is appropriate to the discipline and is consistently followed.	Citation style is not the most appropriate for the discipline, but it is consistently followed.	A uniform citation style is not followed, citations are formatted inconsistently.
<b>Breadth and Type of Sources</b>	Sources are from a variety of content and format types appropriate to the project, and are reflective of expert library use.	Sources are from a limited range of content or format types, depth of library use is unclear.	Demonstrates little or no evidence of library use.
<b>Source Use</b>	All or most of the sources listed in bibliography are directly cited in the project.	Some of the sources listed are directly cited in the project.	Few or none of the sources are directly cited in the project.