Information Literacy: Five Critical Habits of Mind Rubric – Claremont Colleges Library (2013-14)

Learning Outcome	Level of Achievement			
	Highly Developed 4	**Developed** 3	**Emerging** 2	**Initial** 1
Inquiry	*Expert articulation of information need.* • Assignment parameters or project requirements correctly and completely interpreted • Constructs highly effective research strategy (e.g., keywords, source bases) demonstrating sophisticated original thought • Clear and original thesis or intent	*Satisfactory articulation of information need.* • Assignment parameters or project requirements interpreted correctly with occasional errors • Research strategy contains some flaws (e.g., misses obvious keyword synonyms or major databases) but is sound overall • Thesis or intent is clear but lacks originality	*Partial articulation of information need.* • Multiple or significant errors in interpretation of assignment parameters or project requirements • Research strategy contains multiple or major errors (e.g., irrelevant keywords or inappropriate source bases) • Thesis or intent difficult to understand	*Poor to no articulation of information need.* • Fundamental errors in assignment interpretation or project requirements • Poor to no research strategy (e.g., no keywords or source bases) • No thesis or intent expressed
Attribution	*Shows a sophisticated level of understanding for when and how to give attribution.* • 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.	*Attribution indicates understanding of the rationale for and various mechanisms of citation.* • 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.	*Missteps in attribution interfere with the argument or point to fundamental misunderstandings.* • 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.	*Use of evidence and citation is poor, making it difficult to evaluate the argument or sources.* • 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	*Source materials employed demonstrate expertise and sophisticated independent thought.* • Demonstrates sophisticated awareness of universe of literature and community of scholarship • Uses a variety of appropriate and authoritative sources	*Source materials are adequate and appropriate but lack variety or depth.* • 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	*Source materials used are inadequate.* • 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	*Source materials are absent or do not contribute to claim(s) or argument(s).* • 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

	• 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	•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	• 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	• 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	*Evidence is integrated and synthesized expertly to support claims.* • 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	*Proficient synthesis and integration of evidence.* • 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	*Weak attempts at synthesis or integration.* • 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	*No evidence of attempt at synthesis or integration.* • 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
Insight	*Expert understanding of social, legal, economic, and ethical aspects of information creation, use, and access.* • Sophisticated understanding of open (e.g., open access, freely available internet) v. institutionally provided resources • Expert knowledge of universe(s) of scholarship related to academic discipline(s) • Comprehensive knowledge of resources available after graduation	*Satisfactory understanding of social, legal, economic, and ethical aspects of information creation, use, and access.* • Adequate understanding of open (e.g., open access, freely available internet) v. institutionally provided resources that lacks recognition of nuance • General knowledge of universe(s) of scholarship related to academic discipline(s) • Proficient knowledge of resources available after graduation	*Weak understanding of social, legal, economic, and ethical aspects of information creation, use, and access.* • Basic understanding of open-access v. institutionally provided resources (e.g., open access, freely available internet) • Limited knowledge of universe(s) of scholarship related to academic discipline(s) • Some knowledge of resources available after graduation	*No understanding of social, legal, economic, and ethical aspects of information creation, use, and access.* • No evidence of understanding of open-access v. institutionally provided resources (e.g., open access, freely available internet) • No evidence of knowledge of universe(s) of scholarship related to academic discipline(s) • No evidence of knowledge of resources available after graduation

Information Literate Habits of Mind Rubric Scoring Sheet - Claremont Colleges Library

Identification

Student Name or Identifier _____   Evaluator _____   Term/Year _____   Faculty _____

Assignment

A.   Does the assignment ask students to use evidence outside of assigned course content? *(check one)*

☐ Required   ☐ Allowed   ☐ Discouraged   ☐ No explicit mention   ☐ Assignment not available   ☐ N/A

B.   This work is a: _____ (e.g., worksheet, research paper, thesis, report, summary, argument, analysis, reflection, media project, other)

Quality of attribution, evaluation, and communication of IL (see rubric for details):

	Highly Developed (4)	Developed (3)	Emerging (2)	Initial (1)	Comments	Totals
Inquiry						
Attribution						
Evaluation of Sources						
Communication of Evidence						
Insight						

OPTIONAL   **Sum:** ☐

Student work provides a particularly representative example of the following *(check any that apply)*:

☐ Expert articulation of information need   ☐ Egregious errors in bibliography, in-text citations, notes

☐ Very robust bibliography   ☐ Inappropriate source(s) used to support claim

☐ Chose appropriate sources to support claims   ☐ Sources not integrated or synthesized (e.g., "patch writing" or excessive block quoting)

☐ Sources are well-integrated and synthesized   ☐ Sources lack breadth or depth

☐ Shows awareness of depth of scholarship in area   ☐ Over/Undercited claims

Other _____   ☐ Shallow understanding of social, legal, etc. aspects of information creation, use, & access

Information Literate Habits of Mind Rubric/Scoring Sheet Codebook - Claremont Colleges Library

Identification
Fill out any available details regarding student work.

Assignment

A. Expectations about use of evidence outside of assigned course reading or other materials provided by professor (use N/A in the case of thesis or other work without defined assignment parameters).

B. Assignment type allows us to determine how to evaluate works that fall outside the "standard" research paper (e.g. a report, thesis, summary, argument, analysis, reflection, media project, or other type of work)

Qualities of inquiry, attribution, evaluation, communication, and insight of Information Literacy

- **Inquiry** refers to how well the student develops a successful research strategy and relevant thesis, including interpreting assignment parameters.
- **Attribution** refers to how well and consistently the student cites the ideas of others, including non-traditional sources (like lectures, emails, DVD commentaries) and images/figures.
- **Evaluation** refers to the appropriateness or quality of source materials the student chooses to use to support their rhetorical goals (claims or arguments). This includes materials and sources in their bibliography (if available) as well as those used throughout the work. Do the sources, examples, and evidence selected match the purpose of the type of work and argument the student is creating? Is the student aware of the differences between primary and secondary sources, popular and scholarly sources, or fact and opinion? Have they selected the variety and quality of sources appropriate for their argument and work type?
- **Communication** refers to the use and integration of sources as well as the quality of composition, e.g., whether the student has integrated the evidence they're using and has done so in a way instrumental to their claim(s) and argument(s). Does the student paraphrase, summarize, synthesize, use quotes appropriately? Does the student frame quotations using authoritative sources? How are they using sources to ground their claims? This category also addresses how a student integrates their own ideas with those of others.
- **Insight** refers to how completely the student understands the social, legal, economic, and ethical aspects of information creation, use, access, and durability, e.g., the difference between open access and institutionally provided resources as well as what types information will be available to them after graduation.

OPTIONAL - This work is a particularly rich example of the following (check any that apply):
Check an item when the noted characteristics are present and should be flagged as interesting or rich examples for future analysis or conversation. If you see other rich examples, note them as "Other."