**UWHS Portfolio Rubric Draft (October 2017)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outstanding**: highly proficient demonstration of trait(s) associated with this outcome *(3.7-4.0 = high A- to high A-)***Effective:**  proficient demonstration of trait(s) associated with this outcome, but could be improved with some revision *(3.1-3.6 (= solid B to low A-)***A Good Start/Developing:**  on the way to a proficient demonstration of this trait, but needs work. Instructor may need to infer some connections that aren’t sufficiently explicit. *(2.5-3.0 = lowest B- to B)***Minimal demonstration** of trait(s) associated with this outcome: needs significant revision. *(2.0-2.4 = C to C+; 2.0 is the lowest grade to earn “C” (composition) credit or “S” if student has chosen to be graded S/NS)***Does not meet the outcome(s) requirement;** trait(s) are not demonstrated; the writing requires substantial revision on multiple levels. *(0.7-1.9 = earns course credit, but does not fulfill the “C” requirement)* | Rating |
| **CRITICAL REFLECTION/COVER LETTER** |
| *Rationale and choice of coursework:* The commentary indicates which items in the portfolio demonstrate the course objectives, and has a compelling, metacognitive argument for how they do so  |  |
| *Metacognition and development:* The commentary displays a thorough and thoughtful awareness of the writer’s own development, using evidence from the course objectives, assignments, self-assessments, peer responses, and teacher responses by quoting and/or paraphrasing from these materials in support of its argument.  |  |
| OUTCOME ONE: RHETORICAL AWARENESS AND CAPACITY  |
| *Understanding the writing context and rhetorical situation:* The writing demonstrates an awareness of rhetorical situation and how its elements affect the composition and distribution of the text. |  |
| *Strategic coordination of rhetorical knowledge for purpose and effect:* The writing coordinates, negotiates and experiments with various aspects of composing–such as genre, content, conventions, style, language, organization, appeals, media, timing, and design–for rhetorical effects tailored to the writing’s audience, purpose, and situation. |  |
| OUTCOME TWO: ENGAGING IN RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS TO GENERATE AND SUPPORT INQUIRY (Invention and Process)  |
| *Reading and understanding texts and contexts (or, Research Round 1)*: the writer reads, analyzes, and synthesizes a diverse range of texts and understands the situations in which those texts are participating  |  |
| *Crafting research questions that emerge from and respond to conversations and contexts*: the writer uses reading and writing strategies to craft research questions that explore and respond to complex ideas and situations  |  |
| *Targeted research using multiple types of sources (or, Research Round 2)*: the writer gathers, evaluates, and makes purposeful use of primary and secondary materials that appropriately engage the research question and which are appropriate for the writing goals, audience, genre, and context |  |
| *Putting sources/ideas/ information in conversation with each other*: the writer creates a “conversation”—identifying and engaging with meaningful patterns across ideas, texts, experiences, and situations |  |
| *Citing sources*: the writer uses citation styles appropriate for the genre and context  |  |
| OUTCOME THREE: COMPLEX CLAIMS AND ARGUMENTATION  |
| *Complex argument within focused line of inquiry:*  The argument emerges from a clearly defined research question, line of inquiry and research process, and considers, incorporates and responds to differents point of view. |  |
| *Evidence effectively supports argument:* The text closely scrutinizes the evidence, claims, and assumptions used in different arguments to explore and support the clearly signaled line of inquiry. |  |
| *Stakes and consequences:* the line of inquiry accounts for the impact (stakes and consequences) of various arguments on diverse audiences and in ongoing and evolving conversations and contexts |  |
| *Rhetorically purposeful organization:* the design and organization of the text responds to the demands of the genre, situation, audience, and purpose |  |
| **OUTCOME FOUR: TO DEVELOP STRATEGIES FOR REVISING, COLLABORATING, REFINING** |
| *Re-seeing earlier drafts:* the writing demonstrates successful and substantial revision |  |
| *Effective grammatical choices:* errors of grammar, punctuation, and mechanics are proofread and edited so as not to interfere with reading and understanding the writing. |  |
| *Responding to and incorporating feedback:* giving, receiving, interpreting and incorporating constructive feedback |  |
| *Making purposeful choices at smaller scales:* refining and nuancing composition choices at the word and sentence level for the intended audience and situation |  |
| **FINAL SCORE (on a 4.0 scale)** |  |

Note: This rubric is based on the new (as of 2017-18) EWP Outcomes, using a table-format developed by UWHS teacher Emily Ehrlich. The initial assessment language and discussion added at the beginning of the rubric was developed by the UWHS English staff in collaboration with UWHS teachers, based on a combination of EWP portfolio assessment terms and assessment language more typical of secondary models and requirements.