

Assessment Rubric for Interdisciplinary Learning in an Integrative Experience

	Naïve (1)	Novice (2)	Apprentice (3)	Master (4)
1. Does the work include selected concepts and methods from two or more disciplinary traditions relevant to the purpose of the work?	The work shows no evidence of <i>disciplinary</i> concepts or methods used to address the work's purpose, <i>or</i> multiple concepts or methods are considered but do not represent <i>disciplinary</i> insights and/or are not clearly related to the work's purpose.	The work includes 2 or more relevant disciplinary concepts and methods, but connections between disciplinary insights and the purpose of the work are superficial or unclear <i>and/or</i> crucial disciplinary concepts and/or methods are missing.	The work includes concepts or methods from 2 or more relevant disciplines or fields; disciplinary insights are clearly connected to the purpose of the work. Disciplinary insights that are tangential to the purpose may be present, or relevant perspectives missed.	The work includes concepts or methods from 2 or more relevant disciplines or fields; disciplinary insights are clearly connected to the purpose of the work. No unrelated disciplinary insights appear and no crucial perspectives are missing.
2. Is there an integrative device or strategy (e.g., a model, metaphor, or analogy)?	The work explores the topic in a holistic way but connections are unclear and there is no obvious sense of integration.	The work explores the topic in a holistic way, making valid connections across disciplinary or field perspectives; however, insights from different perspectives are not integrated coherently or effectively.	An integrative device clearly brings disciplinary insights together in a generally coherent and effective way.	A novel, imaginative, or well-articulated integrative device is used to bring disciplinary insights together in a coherent and effective way.
3. Is there a sense of balance with regard to how disciplinary perspectives are brought together to advance the purpose of the work?	The work is imbalanced in the way disciplinary perspectives are presented (e.g. particular disciplinary perspectives are disproportionately weighted for no obvious reason).	The work attempts to balance perspectives but on artificial rather than substantive grounds (e.g., giving equal weight to disciplinary perspectives irrespective of their relevance to the issue).	Disciplinary insights are generally balanced on substantive grounds in light of the purpose of the work. However, one or more aspects of the argument may be weakly addressed.	Disciplinary insights are delicately balanced to maximize the effectiveness of the work in light of the purpose of the work. The integration is elegant and coherent.

	Naïve (1)	Novice (2)	Apprentice (3)	Master (4)
4. Do the conclusions drawn from the work indicate that understanding has been advanced by the integration of disciplinary views?	The work attempts to make connections across different perspectives but these are unrelated to the apparent purpose of the work.	Minor efforts at integration are present. Or a language of integration is present but is used mechanistically to yield minimal advancement toward the intended purpose.	The work makes a valid integration of disciplinary insights to generate understandings linked to the purpose of the work. However, some obvious opportunities to advance the purpose of the work are overlooked or undeveloped.	The work takes full advantage of the opportunities presented by the integration of disciplinary insights to advance its intended purpose both effectively and efficiently. The integration may result in novel or unexpected insights.
5. Does the student exhibit awareness of the limitations and benefits of the contributing disciplines?	There is no awareness of the differing contributing disciplines or fields or their benefits or limitations (e.g., the topic is only approached from a commonsense or very general standpoint).	There is awareness of which disciplines are being used but limited (or no) discussion of the limitations and/or merits of the disciplinary contributions. There may be some misconceptions about how the disciplines are being used.	The benefits and/or limitations of the differing contributing disciplines or fields are sufficiently and clearly discussed. Some of the points made may be general or obvious.	The benefits and/or limitations of the contributing disciplines or fields are discussed clearly, insightfully, and in relationship to one another (e.g. students not only describe individual contributions but highlight how views complement, balance, add empirical grounding or put into question insights from other disciplines included in the work).

SOURCE: www.skagit.edu/imageuploads/file2473.doc