

# INQUIRY AND ANALYSIS VALUE RUBRIC

*for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)*



The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

## Definition

Inquiry is a systematic process of exploring issues, objects or works through the collection and analysis of evidence that results in informed conclusions or judgments. Analysis is the process of breaking complex topics or issues into parts to gain a better understanding of them.

## Framing Language

This rubric is designed for use in a wide variety of disciplines. Since the terminology and process of inquiry are discipline-specific, an effort has been made to use broad language which reflects multiple approaches and assignments while addressing the fundamental elements of sound inquiry and analysis (including topic selection, existing knowledge, design, analysis, etc.) The rubric language assumes that the inquiry and analysis process carried out by the student is appropriate for the discipline required. For example, if analysis using statistical methods is appropriate for the discipline then a student would be expected to use an appropriate statistical methodology for that analysis. If a student does not use a discipline-appropriate process for any criterion, that work should receive a performance rating of "1" or "0" for that criterion.

In addition, this rubric addresses the **products** of analysis and inquiry, not the **processes** themselves. The complexity of inquiry and analysis tasks is determined in part by how much information or guidance is provided to a student and how much the student constructs. The more the student constructs, the more complex the inquiry process. For this reason, while the rubric can be used if the assignments or purposes for work are unknown, it will work most effectively when those are known. Finally, faculty are encouraged to adapt the essence and language of each rubric criterion to the disciplinary or interdisciplinary context to which it is applied.

## Glossary

*The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.*

- **Conclusions:** A synthesis of key findings drawn from research/evidence.
- **Limitations:** Critique of the process or evidence.
- **Implications:** How inquiry results apply to a larger context or the real world.

# INQUIRY AND ANALYSIS VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)



## Definition

Inquiry is a systematic process of exploring issues/objects/works through the collection and analysis of evidence that result in informed conclusions/judgments. Analysis is the process of breaking complex topics or issues into parts to gain a better understanding of them.

*Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.*

|   | Capstone<br>4   | Milestones   |  | Benchmark<br>1   |
|---|---|--|--|--|
|   |   | 3  | 2  |  |
| <b>Topic selection</b>                            | Identifies a creative, focused, and manageable topic that addresses potentially significant yet previously less-explored aspects of the topic.  | Identifies a focused and manageable/doable topic that appropriately addresses relevant aspects of the topic.   | Identifies a topic that while manageable/doable, is too narrowly focused and leaves out relevant aspects of the topic. | Identifies a topic that is far too general and wide-ranging as to be manageable and doable.  |
| <b>Existing knowledge, research, and/or views</b> | Synthesizes in depth information from relevant sources representing various points of view/approaches.  | Presents in depth information from relevant sources representing various points of view/approaches.  | Presents information from relevant sources representing limited points of view/approaches.                             | Presents information from irrelevant sources representing limited points of view/approaches. |
| <b>Design process</b>                             | All elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are skillfully developed. Appropriate methodology or theoretical frameworks may be synthesized from across disciplines or from relevant sub-disciplines. | Critical elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are appropriately developed however more subtle elements are ignored or unaccounted for. | Critical elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are missing, incorrectly developed or unfocused.         | Inquiry design demonstrates a misunderstanding of the methodology or theoretical framework.  |
| <b>Analysis</b>                                   | Organizes and synthesizes evidence to reveal insightful patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus.  | Organizes evidence to reveal important patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus.  | Organizes evidence but the organization is not effective in revealing important patterns, differences or similarities. | Lists evidence but it is not organized and/or is unrelated to focus.                         |
| <b>Conclusions</b>                                | States a conclusion that is a logical extrapolation from the inquiry findings.  | States a conclusion focused solely on the inquiry findings. The conclusion arises specifically from and responds specifically to the inquiry findings. | States a general conclusion that, because it is so general, also applies beyond the scope of the inquiry findings.     | States an ambiguous, illogical or unsupported conclusion from inquiry findings.              |
| <b>Limitations and implications</b>               | Insightfully discusses in detail relevant and supported limitations and implications  | Discusses relevant and supported limitations and implications  | Presents relevant and supported limitations and implications   | Presents limitations and implications, but they are possibly irrelevant and unsupported      |