

Criteria for Evaluating Interdisciplinary Research and Writing Final Project

NAME _____

	D-F	C	B	A	Total Pts.
Thesis/Research Question 3%	No clearly defined thesis or research question.	Research question is not clear. Terms are poorly defined.	Purpose of investigation and research questions are clearly stated. Terms are defined and explained.	Purpose of investigation and research questions are clearly stated and consistently maintained.	
Final Outline and Abstract 7%	Exposition of topic in outline and abstract fails to maintain focus on research issue.	Exposition of topic in outline and abstract somewhat maintains focus on research issue.	Exposition of topic in outline and abstract maintains focus on research issue.	Exposition of topic in outline and abstract consistently maintains focus on research issue.	
Overall Cohesiveness of Presentation and use of Information to Support Statements (Arguments) [Includes chart of the disciplines] 15%	Lack of cohesive exposition of subject leading from issue through research to conclusion(s). Evidence is not related to argument.	Somewhat cohesive exposition of subject leading from issue through research to conclusion(s). Evidence is inadequate and does not clearly support major argument.	Generally effective, cohesive exposition of subject leading clearly and logically from issue through research to conclusion(s). Evidence supports major argument but is inadequate.	Effective, cohesive exposition of subject leading clearly and logically from issue through research to conclusion(s). Evidence clearly supports major argument and is sufficient.	
Organization 10%	Lack of structure and incoherent schema.	Structure of plan of investigation is poorly developed.	Structure of plan of investigation is properly defined but needs further development.	Structure of plan of investigation is coherent and successfully developed.	
IDS Assessment 28%*** ***See explanation below.	Some or all of the 4 aspects in the IDS Assessment are not addressed.	Some or all aspects are not successfully integrated to produce new interdisciplinary understandings	All 4 aspects are to some degree integrated to produce new interdisciplinary understandings	All 4 aspects are successfully integrated to produce new interdisciplinary understandings and draw appropriate conclusions.	

Use of Sources [includes Repko data chart] 14%	Articles and related information are not relevant to the topic.	Articles, chapters of books, and other scholarly information to be used are inadequate.	Scholarly information is relevant to the subject of the investigation but not sufficient.	Scholarly information clearly supports the topic to be investigated and is sufficient.	
Bibliography & Footnotes 15%	Student fails to correctly and consistently acknowledge, organize and correctly cite primary and secondary sources .	Student to some degree acknowledges, organizes and correctly cites primary and secondary sources .	Student generally acknowledges, organizes and correctly cites primary and secondary sources according to Chicago Manual and NJ Manual	Student correctly and consistently acknowledges, organizes and cites primary and secondary sources according to Chicago Manual and NJ Manual.	
Grammar 4% [PLUS OPTIONAL 5% for Writing Center]	Frequent ungrammatical sentence structure.	Many grammatical errors in paragraphs.	Some errors in grammatical structures and/or erroneous usage.	Accurate sentence structure and flawless narrative.	
Mechanics 4%	Many errors in spelling, punctuation, and/or capitalization.	A number of errors in spelling, punctuation, and/or capitalization.	A few errors in spelling, punctuation, and/or capitalization.	Accurate spelling, punctuation, and capitalization.	

This rubric contains several elements devised by Professor Allen F. Repko.

**Writing Center includes proof of visit, any corrections to paper, and one page narration of experience and lessons learned.

******INTERDISCIPLINARY ASSESSMENT 28% OF PROJECT**

Drawing on Disciplinary Sources

Positive Source Elements:

- Primary sources are included.
- Sources include more than 25% recent publications, dated within the last five years of the project's completion.
- A range of (more than one) perspectives from within the (at least one) discipline are included.

Major Negative Source Elements:

- Inappropriate types of sources are used (e.g. bogus Web sites).
- Inappropriate use of sources (e.g. misinterpretation, overextending).
- Over-reliance on one or two sources.
- Sources are misquoted or quoted out of context.
- Perspectives essential to the case being made are missing.

Minor Negative Source Elements:

- Inappropriate quotations are included.
- Sources are paraphrased inappropriately.
- Over-reliance on quotations.
- Key contexts identified in the literature(s) are missing.
- Not enough sources are included.

Scoring System for Drawing on Disciplinary Sources

Score of 1: Contains 1 or more major negative source elements regardless of the number of positive elements.

Score of 2: Contains 2 or more minor negative source elements regardless of the number of positive elements or Contains 0 of the 3 positive source elements.

Score of 3: Contains 1 of the 3 positive source elements and 1 of the minor negative source elements.

Score of 4: Contains 1 of the 3 positive source elements and none of the negative source elements or Contains 2 of the 3 positive source elements and 1 of the minor negative source elements.

Score of 5: Contains 3 positive source elements and 1 of the minor negative source elements.

Score of 6: Contains 2 of the 3 positive source elements and none of the negative source elements.

Score of 7: Contains all 3 of the 3 positive source elements and none of the negative source elements.

Critical Argumentation

Positive Elements:

Defining the Problem (Category 1)

- The problem or issue under investigation has been clearly stated.
- The scope of the problem is clearly defined.

Support for Each Major Assertion (Category 2)

- Empirical evidence is cited to support major assertions.

- “Textual” evidence is cited to support major assertions.
- Theory or theoretical principles are used to support major assertions.
- Direct experience and observation are used to support major assertions.

Reflection (Category 3)

- Self-conscious reflections on the limitations of the author’s approach.
- Self-conscious reflections on the merits of the author’s approach.

Meta-level Analysis (Category 4)

- Identifies shortcomings and limitations of at least one theory, school of thought, or disciplinary approach.
- Identifies some insights or merits of at least one theory, school of thought, or disciplinary approach.
- The explanatory power of theories is addressed –what the theory ‘buys you’ vis à vis other theories

Negative Elements• There is evidence of a misunderstanding of key concepts.

- The thesis is superficial or obvious.
- Irrelevant facts or arguments are presented.
- Assertions are presented in an illogical order.
- Writing is marred by significant grammatical and mechanical errors.
- Ideas are presented in an inappropriate context.
- Fallacious reasoning misses subtle but important points.
- Analysis is underdeveloped or insufficient.
- The scope of the problem is too broad or too narrow.

Scoring System for Critical Argumentation

Score of 1: Contains elements from 0 or 1 of the 4 categories of positive source elements regardless of the negative source elements, or 3 or more of the negative source elements regardless of the positive source elements.

Score of 2: Contains at least one from 2 of the 4 categories of positive source elements and 1 negative element, or 2 negative source elements.

Score of 3: Contains at least one from 2 of 4 categories of positive source elements and none of the negative source elements

Score of 4: Contains at least one from 3 of 4 categories of positive source elements and 1 of the negative source elements.

Score of 5: Contains at least one from all 4 categories of positive source elements and 1 of the negative source elements.

Score of 6: Contains at least one from 3 of 4 categories of positive source elements and none of the negative source elements.

Score of 7: Contains at least one from all 4 categories of positive source elements and none of the negative source elements.

Multidisciplinary Perspectives

Positive Source Elements:

- Identifies aspects of the object of study as being addressed by more than one disciplinary perspective.
- Demonstrates an understanding of how each discipline would approach the object of study.

- Considers the object of study from more than one disciplinary perspective.
- Identifies how at least one term is used differently in different disciplines within the context of the problem.
- Identifies how different disciplinary terms are used to describe similar concepts.
- Sources are drawn from two or more disciplines.

Scoring System for Multidisciplinary Perspectives

Score of 1: Contains none of the positive source elements.

Score of 2: Contains 1 of the 6 positive source elements.

Score of 3: Contains 2 of the 6 positive source elements.

Score of 4: Contains 3 of the 6 positive source elements.

Score of 5: Contains 4 of the 6 positive source elements.

Score of 6: Contains 5 of the 6 positive source elements.

Score of 7: Contains all 6 of the positive source elements.

Interdisciplinary Integration

Creating Common Ground (Category 1)

- Presents a clear rationale for taking an interdisciplinary approach.
- Assumptions from more than one discipline are made explicit and compared.
- Compares and/or contrasts disciplinary perspectives.
- The problem is explicitly defined in neutral terms that encourage contributions from more than one discipline.
- Creates a common vocabulary that can be applied to the object of study.

New Holistic Understanding (Category 2)

- One or more novel metaphors are presented.
- A preexisting metaphor is used or applied in a novel way.
- One or more novel models are presented.
- A preexisting model is used or applied in a novel way.
- A new theoretical interpretation or understanding is presented which explicitly draws on more than one discipline.

Application of the New Holistic Understanding (Category 3)

Note: If credit was not given for any category 2 items, then credit is possible only for the last point (Interdisciplinary Theory).

- The new metaphor, interpretation, or model is applied to a new situation or phenomenon.
- The new metaphor, interpretation or model is applied in a novel way to an established “text,” situation or phenomenon.
- The new metaphor, interpretation, or model is explicitly tested through observation, data collection, or lived experience and reflection.
- The new metaphor, interpretation, or model is used in a significant way to guide inquiry.
- The new metaphor, interpretation, or model is tested by using it to solve a problem.
- Interdisciplinary theory is used to assess the approach taken.

Scoring System for Interdisciplinary Integration

Score of 1: Contains elements from none the 3 categories of positive source elements.

Score of 2: Contains elements from only 1 of the 3 categories (creating common ground, new holistic understanding, and application of new holistic understanding).

Score of 3: Contains elements from only 2 of the 3 categories (creating common ground, new holistic understanding, and application of new holistic understanding).

Score of 4: Contains 1 of 5 elements of category 1 (creating common ground), and at least one element from category 2 (new holistic understanding), and at least one from category 3 (application of new holistic understanding).

Score of 5: Contains 2 of 5 elements of category 1 (creating common ground), and at least one element from category 2 (new holistic understanding), and at least one from category 3 (application of new holistic understanding).

Score of 6: Contains 3 of 5 elements of category 1 (creating common ground), and at least one element from category 2 (new holistic understanding), and at least one from category 3 (application of new holistic understanding).

Score of 7: Contains 4 or 5 of 5 elements of category 1 (creating common ground), and at least one element from category 2 (new holistic understanding), and at least one from category 3 (application of new holistic understanding).

This assessment instrument is derived from the article Christopher R. Wolfe and Carolyn Haynes, "Interdisciplinary Writing Assessment Profiles", *Issues in Integrative Studies*, 21, found at <http://www.units.muohio.edu/aisorg/pubs/InterdisWritingProfile.pdf>.