**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC**

NeoCity Academy

Assignment: Students will complete an “Inquiry Proposal Form” in support of their research proposal, appending to it any applicable supporting documents (e.g., surveys, questionnaires, IRB or ethics approvals).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard** | **Success Criteria** | **Proficiency Rating** |
| Above Proficient | Proficient | Nearing Proficient | Below Proficient | Not Enough Evidence or Incomplete |
| LO 1.5D | Employing Ethical Research Practices. (C.f., EK 1.5D1, EK 1.5D2, and EK1.5D3 on *CED* p. 18) | The Inquiry Proposal Form reflects a thorough and complete consideration of any ethical considerations which must be completed prior to the implementation of the study **and** has already begun the applicable review and approval processes. | The Inquiry Proposal Form reflects a thorough and complete consideration of any ethical considerations which must be completed prior to the implementation of the study. | The Inquiry Proposal Form reflects some initial consideration of ethical considerations necessary prior to implementation of study; however, these reflections and the underlying reasons for their necessity remain underdeveloped. | The Inquiry Proposal Form misidentifies or overlooks necessary ethical considerations to be made prior to the implementation of the study. |  |
| LO 1.1D | Articulating the purpose and significance of the scholarly inquiry | The purpose of the scholarly inquiry is clearly articulated with reference **both** to the relevant field of study **and** to any other associated stakeholders.  | The purpose of the scholarly inquiry is clearly articulated with reference to the relevant field of study. | The purpose of the scholarly inquiry appears idiosyncratic, insufficiently connected to the relevant field of study. | The purpose of the scholarly inquiry is vague and disconnected from any relevant field of study. |  |
| LO 1.1E | Developing and revising a focused research question/project goal | The research question or project goal builds on the question articulated in the preceding research statement assignments, reflecting an incorporation of peer and advisor feedback, as well as continued engagement with the scholarly literature. | The research question or project goal builds on the questions articulated in the preceding research statement assignments, providing a sufficiently narrow, yet open-ended topic of inquiry. | The research question or project goal remains too broad feasibly to be studied within the constraints of the AP Capstone course. However, student provides additional details on context, method, literature, etc. that give clues as to how the project might be focused. | The research question is overly general and unfeasible. The Inquiry Proposal Form does not appear to build on the previous research statement assignments. |  |
| LO 1.2A | Retrieving, questioning, organizing, and using prior knowledge about a topic | The focused research statement reflects a conscious engagement with specific studies in the field, using these studies to define a gap with clarity and purpose. | The focused research statement reflects a plausible engagement with the scholarly literature, proposing a gap which is plausible if, as yet, in need of further detail. | The focused research statement appears disconnected from the extant literature of the field but presents a plausible gap in knowledge worthy of study. | The research question is unfocused or else fails to identify a gap in knowledge that will lead to an original contribution. |  |
| LO 1.5C | Demonstrating perseverance through setting goals, managing time, and working independently on a long-term project. | The proposed timeline is detailed, marking specific dates and tasks to be completed in support of their paper’s completion. | The proposed timeline is detailed, marking general dates and tasks to be completed in support of their paper’s completion | The proposed timeline is insufficiently detailed, failing to identify specific tasks or general completion dates for the work that will support the paper’s completion | Student timeline is indiscernibly vague and offers little to no guidance for the study to come. |  |
| LO 3.1A | Identifying, comparing, and interpreting multiple perspectives on or arguments about an issue | The research proposal identifies and describes more than three research projects associated with the student’s own. | The research proposal identifies and describes three research projects associated with the student’s own. | The research proposal identifies and describes three research projects associated with the student’s own but fails adequately to explain these studies questions, theses, methods, or findings. | The research proposal identifies and describes fewer than three research projects associated with the student’s own. |  |
| LO 3.2A | Evaluating alternate, opposing, or competing perspectives or arguments by considering their implications and limitations. | The gap in research is clearly defined through a survey of extant literature, reflecting multiple theoretical perspectives **and** identifying their strengths and weaknesses. | The gap in research is clearly defined through a survey of extant literature reflecting multiple theoretical perspectives. | It is unclear whether the proposed gap in research is a consequence of genuine limits of knowledge in the field or merely a limit of the student’s knowledge. | The proposed gap reflects no engagement with relevant scholarly literature. |  |
| LO 4.1B | Selecting and consistently applying an appropriate disciplinary or interdisciplinary approach to form a scholarly argument or aesthetic rationale. | The proposal selects a method capable of yielding the evidence necessary to support the student’s hypothesis **even** including preliminary findings or analogous studies seeking to address the same gap. | The proposal selects a method capable of yielding the evidence necessary to support the student’s hypothesis. | The proposal selects a method whose connection to the proposed line of argumentation is only tentatively plausible. | The proposal fails to demonstrate how the selected method will support the ultimate line of reasoning. |  |
| LO 5.1A[R] | Planning and producing a cohesive academic paper, considering audience, context, and purpose. | Proposal reflects an awareness of scholarly audience (i.e., field of study) **and** other stakeholders associated with the topic of inquiry. | Proposal reflects an awareness of scholarly audience (i.e., field of study). | Proposal articulates a plausible topic of inquiry but does not situate this topic within any specific field(s) of study. | Proposal articulates a topic of inquiry that does not cohere and/or fails to address any specific field of study. |  |
| LO 5.1F | Defending inquiry choices and final product with clarity, consistency, and conviction | Proposal identifies a specific method, acknowledging limits but justifying it vis-à-vis other possible methods for pursuing the topic | Proposal identifies a specific method and acknowledges limits **or** justifies it vis-à-vis other possible methods for pursuing the topic. | Proposed method is vaguely defined or unjustified. | Proposed method does not align with the specific topic of inquiry. |  |
| Rubric Score | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Percentage Score | 100 | 93 | 78 or 82 | 66 | 50 |  |