|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Capstone (4) | Milestone (3) | Milestone (2) | Benchmark (1) |
| **Writing purpose and thesis** | States clearly a purpose that calls for an integrative approach and provides a clear rationale or justification for taking this approach. | States clearly a purpose that calls for an integrative approach. However, there is no justification or rationale for taking this approach. | Contains a discernible purpose, but it is not clear that this purpose calls for an integrative approach **OR** the purpose is not clearly stated. | Does not include an identifiable or clear purpose. |
| **Disciplinary Knowledge** | Includes a visible, well organized network of concepts, theories, perspectives, findings, and examples within one or more of the selected disciplines. Some insightful new examples, interpretations, or responses within the selected disciplines may be present. Sources are relevant, credible and integrated thoughtfully and purposefully. | Uses concepts and theories effectively according to disciplinary origins. Theories and generalizations are consistently supported with examples or findings from the disciplines involved. Relevant and credible sources are used, though the paper may have too many unnecessary sources, or is missing sources where they might be needed. | Uses disciplinary concepts, theories, perspectives, findings, or examples in simplistic, general, or mechanical ways. Key claims are sometimes not supported, or concrete disciplinary examples are disconnected from key claims. Some misconceptions and unwarranted use of jargon may be present. Sources used are pro-forma. | Does not include a discernible disciplinary knowledge base; ideas and information do not stem from any particular disciplinary perspective. Misconceptions exist and jargon is used with little evidence of understanding what it means. Non-credible sources are used and/or there is over-reliance on one or two sources. |
| |  | | --- | | **Disciplinary Methods** | | Employs methods, habits of mind, and validation criteria to construct knowledge in the selected disciplines. Effectively describes the constructed nature of disciplinary knowledge (e.g., the provisional nature of insights, the limits of generalizations, the multiplicity of interpretations). | Accurately employs methods, modes of thinking (e.g., ways to select evidence or construct causal accounts), and validation criteria to construct knowledge in the selected disciplines. | Shows awareness of or uses disciplinary methods and modes of thinking in one or more of the included disciplines, but employs them mechanically, superficially, or algorithmically. May be oversimplifications and misconceptions about methods. | Shows little to no awareness of the methods, habits of mind, and validation criteria by which knowledge is construed and verified in the disciplines. Opinions and information summaries are presented as matters of fact. |
| |  | | --- | | **Disciplinary Perspectives** | | Includes two or more relevant disciplines or fields. Selected disciplinary insights are clearly connected to the purpose of the work. No unrelated disciplinary insights appear, and no crucial perspectives are missing. | Includes two or more relevant disciplines or fields. Selected disciplinary insights are clearly connected to the purpose of the work. May include some tangential perspectives or miss relevant ones. | Includes two or more relevant disciplinary perspectives or fields, but the connections between the included disciplinary insights and the purpose of the work are superficial or unclear. Crucial disciplinary perspectives may be missing. | Shows no evidence that *disciplinary* perspectives are used to address the paper’s purpose. Multiple perspectives or point of view may be considered, but these do not represent *disciplinary* views and/or not clearly related to the paper’s purpose. |
| **Integrative Connections and Devices** | Takes full advantage of the opportunities presented by the integration of disciplinary insights and effectively advances the intended purpose. The integration may result in novel or unexpected insights; a novel or well-articulated integrative device brings disciplinary insights together in a coherent and effective way. | Makes a valid integration of disciplinary insights to generate understandings linked to the paper’s purpose. However, some obvious opportunities to advance the purpose of the paper are overlooked or undeveloped. An integrative device brings disciplinary insights together in a generally coherent and effective way. | Includes minor efforts at integration or presents a language of integration, but this language is used mechanistically to yield minimal advancement toward the intended purpose. Topic may be explored holistically and valid connections across disciplinary perspectives may exist, but the paper lacks coherent integration. | Attempts to make connections across different perspectives, but these are unrelated to the paper’s apparent purpose. Connections among disciplinary perspectives are unclear, and there is no obvious sense of integration. |
| **Balance between Disciplines** | Balances disciplinary insights to maximize the effectiveness of the paper with respect to the purpose of the work. | Balances disciplinary insights on substantive grounds with respect to the purpose of the work. | Attempts to balance perspectives, but builds this balance on artificial grounds rather than substantive ones. | Shows an imbalance in the way particular disciplinary perspectives are presented with respect to the purpose of the work. |
| **Reflection** | Shows consistent awareness of the strengths and limitations of the paper and its integrative approach. Alternative integrated approaches may be considered. | Includes sufficient comments on the strengths and/or limitations of the paper and its integrative approach, although the points made may be general or obvious. | Includes comments on the strengths and limitations of the paper and its integrative approach that appear mechanical or superficial. Ideas are presented at face value with little to no skepticism or reflection. | Does not consider the strengths and limitations of the paper; ideas are presented at face value. |
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