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APPENDIX A

Information literacy in student work rubric, Temple Health Sciences Libraries (version 2017/18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning outcome</th>
<th>Highly developed 4</th>
<th>Developed 3</th>
<th>Emerging 2</th>
<th>Initial 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Inquiry**      | Expert articulation of information need.  
• Constructs highly effective research strategy (e.g., keywords, sources) demonstrating sophisticated thought | Satisfactory articulation of information need.  
• Research strategy contains some flaws (e.g., misses obvious keyword synonyms or major databases) but is sound overall | Partial articulation of information need.  
• Research strategy contains multiple or major errors (e.g., irrelevant keywords or sources) | Poor to no articulation of information need.  
• Poor to no research strategy (e.g., no keywords or sources) |
| **Evaluation of evidence** | Source materials employed demonstrate expertise and sophisticated independent thought.  
• Uses appropriate and authoritative sources to support claims  
• Demonstrates a knowledge of evidence and sources selected | Source materials are adequate and appropriate but lack variety or depth.  
• Sources are used to support claim(s) but might not be the most authoritative source to make claim  
• Demonstrates a preliminary critical exploration and knowledge of evidence, and sources selected | Source materials used are inadequate.  
• Relies on largely inappropriate sources  
• Clearly selected sources out of convenience  
• Demonstrates little critical exploration and knowledge of sources selected | Source materials are absent or do not contribute to claim(s) or argument(s).  
• When included, sources are too few or badly inappropriate  
• No evidence of critical exploration and knowledge of 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 | Proficient synthesis and integration of evidence.  
• Generally employs evidence to support claim(s) and argument(s)  
• May present some evidence without context | 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. “says...”) | No evidence of attempt at synthesis or integration.  
• Claim(s) or argument(s) lack necessary evidence  
• Fails to contextualize evidence |
### Quality of attribution, evaluation, and communication of IL (see rubric for details):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highly developed (4)</th>
<th>Developed (3)</th>
<th>Emerging (2)</th>
<th>Initial (1)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication of evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sum:**

---
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