

# UCSB Library Award for Undergraduate Research - Social Sciences Rubric

## Research Narrative (45%)

Criteria	Excellent (8-10 points)	Competent (5-7 points)	Developing (4 and under)
<b>Research Strategy</b>	Documented development of a sophisticated research strategy and methodology appropriate to the project (consulting library services or experts, use of databases or collections, etc.).	Demonstrates growth in use of library resources appropriate to the project, but potential for development remains.	No evidence of search refinement; uses "natural language" rather than disciplinary terms.
<b>Information Literacy</b>	Sophisticated synthesis; addresses contradictions in data and justifies why one framework was chosen over another.	Evaluates the "currency" and "authority" of datasets and peer-reviewed journals.	Accepts information and data at face value. Limited application of critical lens.
<b>Library Use</b>	Proactively uses library resources or sought guidance to inform and complete research project. Is specific in mentioning resources consulted: research guides, workshops, librarians, library services, etc	Uses specialized tools or services such as subject-specific databases, software (e.g. SPSS) or datasets.	Minimal or unclear use of library resources (including only mentioning use of physical library space); little reflection of how library services relate to the research process.
<b>Research Ethics</b>	Demonstrates exemplary research ethics (e.g. notes ethical data collection and management, responsibly attributes labor and contributions, etc.)	Demonstrates attention to research ethics, including clear attribution of secondary data and theoretical frameworks. Areas of development remain.	Demonstrates weak or limited attention to research ethics.

## 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 mostly 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>Source Integration &amp; Evidence</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%)

Criteria	Excellent (8-10 points)	Competent (5-7 points)	Developing (4 and under)
<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 appropriately justified for the scope of the project.	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. May show evidence of inappropriate use of AI tools (e.g. hallucinated citations).
<b>Bibliographic Alignment</b>	All or most of the sources listed in the bibliography are accurately cited within the project text.	Most sources in the bibliography appear in the text, but there may be minor discrepancies between the list and the citations.	Disconnect between the bibliography and the project; sources are listed but not used or cited in the work.