# Exemplary Research Multimodal Composition Award: Evaluation Rubric

## Carl B. Ylvisaker Library (Concordia College, Moorhead)

| *Multimodal Composition* | Exemplary (25 to 35 points) | Proficient (15 to 24 points) | Developing (0 to 14 points) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 35 points possible<br><br>Examples<br><br>Project: Poster, Audio, Video…<br><br>Files: mp4, jpg, png, pdf… | ▪ Develops a significant question or issue within a discipline and frames that issue in a new way<br>▪ Locates and positions claims within the broader scholarship (source use / framing)<br>▪ Production quality is appealing; not cluttered and easy to 'read'; utilizes principles of Gestalt in use of graphics, headings, colors, and white space to provide sequential information from introduction to conclusion (production)<br>▪ Thoroughly and concisely presents introduction, hypothesis/thesis, research methods, results, analysis, and conclusion in a well-organized manner<br>▪ Citations are consistent and reasonably locatable by information included in project<br>▪ Composition is well-written and free of grammatical and syntactical errors (revision/editing) | ▪ Develops a significant question or issue within a discipline but may not take into account the full complexity of the topic<br>▪ Locates and positions claims with the broader scholarship (source use / framing) is adequate<br>▪ Production quality is adequate; organization was adequate but could improve effectiveness through better use of graphics, headings, colors, 'sound' and white space<br>▪ Adequately presents introduction, hypothesis/thesis, research methods, results, analysis, and conclusion; organization needs improvement<br>▪ Citations are consistent with some errors, making it difficult to locate sources.<br>▪ Composition has minor grammatical and syntactical errors | ▪ Develops a familiar question or issue and follows a familiar path with some originality<br>▪ Locates and positions claims with the broader scholarship (source use / framing) is inadequate<br>▪ Production quality is not appealing; lacks organization; needs work to improve visual/sound appeal through better use of graphics, headings, colors, and white space<br>▪ Does not sufficiently present introduction, hypothesis/thesis, research methods, results, analysis, and conclusion and is not well-organized<br>▪ Citations are not consistent with major errors, making it difficult to locate sources.<br>▪ Composition has many grammatical and syntactical errors |
| *Annotated Bibliography* | Exemplary (10 to 15 points) | Proficient (5 to 9 points) | Developing (0 to 5 points) |
| 15 points possible | ▪ Annotations include an original summary that demonstrates an understanding of the author's intent, argument, and purpose of the source<br>▪ Citations observe the discipline specific style correctly and consistently (APA, MLA, Chicago, IEEE, etc.)<br>▪ Annotations are well-written and free of grammatical and syntactical errors | ▪ Annotations include an original summary that demonstrates a minor understanding of the author's intent, argument, and purpose of the source<br>▪ Citations observe the discipline specific style with some errors (APA, MLA, Chicago, IEEE, etc.)<br>▪ Annotations include minor grammatical and syntactical errors | ▪ Annotations do not include a summary that demonstrates an understanding of the author's intent, argument, and purpose of the source<br>▪ Citations observe with discipline specific style with major errors (APA, MLA, Chicago, IEEE, etc.)<br>▪ Annotations include many grammatical and syntactical errors |

| Research Process Essay | Exemplary (35 to 50 points) | Proficient (20 to 34 points) | Developing (0 to 19 points) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 50 points possible | ▪ Displays dynamic knowledge and/or learning of the topic explored; indicates a thorough understanding of library research appropriate to an undergraduate level<br><br>▪ Displays dynamic knowledge and/or use of communication technology in publishing their scholarship<br><br>▪ Search strategies thoroughly and clearly described, including search terms and resources consulted and an acknowledgment of and response to dead-ends and information gaps<br><br>▪ Displays an awareness of and creative use of multiple appropriate finding aids<br><br>▪ Evidence of use of flexible and creative vocabularies and advanced search techniques<br><br>▪ Displays clear criteria for evaluation of sources | ▪ Displays some learning of the topic explored; indicates a good understanding of library research appropriate to an undergraduate level<br><br>▪ Displays knowledge and/or use of communication technology in publishing their scholarship<br><br>▪ Search strategies generally described, but does not completely address challenges faced<br><br>▪ Displays an awareness of and creative use of some appropriate finding aids, but may miss a critical tool<br><br>▪ Evidence of some awareness of creative vocabulary and advanced search techniques<br><br>▪ Describes some clear criteria for evaluation of sources, but may be incomplete | ▪ Displays minimal understanding of the topic examined; indicates a limited understanding of library research<br><br>▪ Displays limited knowledge and/or use of communication technology in publishing their scholarship<br><br>▪ Search strategies generally described, but does not address challenges faced<br><br>▪ Identifies basic or general finding aids but omits appropriate discipline-specific tools<br><br>▪ Displays awareness of simple search techniques but not advanced<br><br>▪ Criteria for source evaluation is unclear or incomplete |