**INQ 300 Project Rubric – Roanoke College based on AAC&U VALUE rubrics rev 2014**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TRAITS** | **Below Basic, Rating = 1** | **Basic, Rating = 2** | **Proficient, Rating = 3** | **Advanced, Rating = 4** | **Rating = 5** |
| *Problem Definition* | Final topic too broad, too narrow, or inappropriate. Problem definition and scope too broad, unattainable or inappropriate | Problem definition generally appropriate but with some limitations in scope or feasibility. Strong faculty guidance needed to before moving forward | Problem focused, manageable & relevant; student able to modify as needed as project progresses | Problem definition and scope clearly defined and feasible. Project is creative, focused, and potentially significant. | Masters level work |
| *Knowledge & Research* | Information from irrelevant or poor quality sources; limited points of view or approaches | Information from relevant , quality sources; limited points of view or approaches | Presents in-depth information from relevant sources with a range of points of view or approaches | Synthesizes in-depth information from relevant sources with a range of points of view or approaches with clarity and depth | Masters level work |
| *Process & Execution* | Followed a process that was inappropriate or inadequate (e.g. too broad or overly ambitious); unable to identify appropriate sources or next steps, Did not seek timely help or does not follow guidance. | Followed an appropriate process; often required assistance to identify appropriate sources or next steps; does not recognize gaps or problems. Attempts to meet benchmarks but significant lapses due to issues under student control. May require substantial assistance to recover. | Followed an appropriate process; usually able to identify appropriate sources or next steps with minor assistance; recognizes when gaps or problems exist even if assistance is needed to resolve these. Meets benchmarks with only occasional lapses. Student able to recover with minimal disruption. | Process skillfully executed and adapted; able to identify sources and next steps; able to recognized and respond to gaps or problems. Benchmarks s consistently met. Adjusts to issues beyond student control to keep the project on track. | Masters level work |
| *Analysis* | Lists evidence but is not organized or is unrelated to focus | Organizes evidence; organization not effective in revealing important patterns, differences, similarities | Organizes evidence to reveal important patterns, differences, and similarities related to focus | Organizes and synthesizes evidence to reveal insightful patterns, differences, and similarities related to focus | Masters level work |
| *Conclusions* | Conclusion is ambiguous, illogical, or unsupported by evidence  Conclusion based in opinion, not evidence | Conclusion supported by some evidence but still too general or beyond the scope of this inquiry and evidence | Conclusion reasonable and well supported by inquiry evidence | Conclusion is nuanced or insightful. Support from evidence is clear and argued expertly and articulately | Masters level work |
| *Group Work* | Shares ideas or opinions but these are often so obvious that they contribute little. Attitude suggests team is a low priority. | Solid contributor. Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by restating the views of other members and/or asking questions for clarification. | Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others | Behaviors for Rating 3 plus articulates the merits of alternative ideas or proposals. Notes when someone is not participating and invites them to engage. | Superior leadership and facilitation |

\*\*\*\*\*\*Zero rating on group work should be given for students whose work is poor and behaviors have a negative effect on the group.