George Mason University
Students as Scholars Product Rubric

This rubric was developed for the *Students as Scholars* initiative at George Mason University. The mission of *Students as Scholars* is to foster a culture of student scholarship through increased participation in and celebration of scholarly activities. Student learning will be enhanced through a process of scholarly inquiry, where scholarship is valued as a core practice of the Mason student experience. At Mason, student scholarship is the process of generating and sharing knowledge or creative works.

This rubric is designed to evaluate the *product* of an undergraduate research or creative project. Efforts have been made to use language that is inclusive of diverse disciplines, methods, and projects. Intended products include projects from Research and Scholarship Intensive (RS) Courses; and individualized scholarly experiences such as the Undergraduate Research Scholars Program (URSP), and faculty-mentored independent research and creative projects. Products may include written documents, poster presentations, oral presentations or performances, artistic expressions, and interviews. Columns represent a student's intellectual and skill development in their respective discipline or field, and can be used to assist the student in this development.

OSCAR Outcome to be Assessed: Students will communicate knowledge from an original scholarly or creative project.

Instructions to Reviewers: This double-sided sheet contains two rubrics. External reviewers should use the holistic rubric on this side, which assigns a rating for overall performance, using the criteria on the reverse side as a guide. Mentors and course faculty should use the second side, which features an analytic rubric that articulates levels of performance for each criterion.

Student Name:⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯   **Mentor Name:**⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯

Project:⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯   **Semester:**⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯

Reviewer Name and Date:⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯

Holistic rating: *Please rate the overall presentation or performance using the following criteria as a guide.*

❑ **Expert**	❑ **Proficient**	❑ **Emerging**	❑ **Novice**
Use appropriate evidence, presentation modes and/or argument strategies to skillfully communicate meaning to a specified audience; communicate with clarity and fluency and in a virtually error-free presentation.	Use mostly appropriate evidence, presentation modes, and/or argument strategies to communicate meaning to a specified audience; design a presentation that is clear and has few errors.	Use some appropriate evidence, presentation modes, and/or argument strategies to communicate meaning to a specified audience; design a presentation with limited clarity and/or some errors.	Use approaches or include errors that limit or obscure relevance and impede understanding.

Reviewer Comments:

George Mason University
Students as Scholars Product Rubric

	Expert	Proficient	Emerging	Novice
Articulation of Problem, Purpose, or Focus	❑ Question, hypothesis, or position is articulated and defended in the context of the problem or purpose; and/or ❑ A central purpose, focus, or essence of the work or performance is highly evident	❑ Question, hypothesis, or position is stated clearly and context of the problem or purpose is apparent; and/or ❑ A central purpose, focus, or essence of the work or performance is evident	❑ Question, hypothesis, or position is stated clearly; and/or ❑ A purpose or focus of the work can be determined	❑ Question, hypothesis, position, purpose, or focus is not visible or stated clearly
Scholarly Context	❑ Comprehensively places problem/question in appropriate scholarly context (scholarly literature, theory, model, or genre)	❑ Sufficiently places problem/question in appropriate scholarly context (scholarly literature, theory, model, or genre)	❑ Partially places problem/question in scholarly context; some critical elements are missing, incorrectly developed, or unfocused	❑ Scholarly context for the problem/question may be apparent but is not sufficiently demonstrated
Application of Scholarly Method/Technique to Project Design	❑ Method/technique is appropriate for question or purpose ❑ Data/sources/evidence are expertly presented ❑ All elements of method/technique are fully developed and articulated	❑ Method/technique is appropriate for question or purpose ❑ Data/sources/evidence are adequately presented ❑ Critical elements of method/technique are adequately developed; subtle elements are unclear or missing	❑ Method/technique loosely supports the question or purpose ❑ Data/sources/evidence are partially presented ❑ Critical elements of method/technique are partially developed	❑ Method/technique is not appropriate for question or purpose ❑ Data/sources/evidence are minimally or not presented ❑ Critical elements of method/technique are minimally developed
Analysis or Interpretation	❑ Evidence supports a mature, complex, and/or nuanced analysis of the problem ❑ Interpretation is explicitly linked to theoretical framework or scholarly model	❑ Evidence supports an adequately complex analysis of the problem ❑ Interpretation is adequately linked to theoretical framework or scholarly model	❑ Evidence supports a limited analysis of the problem ❑ Interpretation is partially linked to theoretical framework or scholarly model	❑ Evidence supports very limited analysis of the problem ❑ Interpretation is minimally linked to theoretical framework or scholarly model
Implications/Impact	❑ Implications, consequences, and/or questions raised by the project are thoroughly explored ❑ Limitations are fully articulated	❑ Implications, consequences, and/or questions are adequately explored ❑ Limitations are adequately articulated	❑ Implications, consequences, and/or questions are partially explored ❑ Limitations are partially articulated	❑ Implications, consequences, and/or questions are minimally supported or unarticulated ❑ Limitations are minimally or not articulated
Quality of Delivery	❑ Presentation or performance is of superior quality ❑ Delivery is free of technical errors	❑ Presentation or performance is of high quality ❑ Delivery has few technical errors	❑ Presentation or performance is of acceptable quality ❑ Delivery has some technical errors	❑ Presentation or performance is of low quality ❑ Delivery has frequent technical errors