**Portfolio grade: consensus 3.4-3.6 (EWP staff: 3.5-3.7)**

Critical reflection: 3.3-3.7; the majority were in the "strong" range (3.1-3.6) with six above and four below.  CR1 (detailed, good examples, clear sense of outcome) and CR3 (inter-outcome awareness) were seen as strongest reflections.  CR2 a bit weaker - lots of examples and sources, but less fully developed analysis of the use of sources.  CR4 - aware of higher and lower order skills and issues and good use of examples.  Intro and conclusion didn't add much, but individual reflections are detailed.  CR fulfills the requirements but there are a few errors and no risks, and doesn't talk much about audience and metacognition.

Outcome 1: 3.3-3.8 for EWP/UWHS staff; Substantial majority of 567 grad students put it in "strong", with four above and five below.  Good sense of genres and control of tone/style; Unclear what magazine this is (@refugees in long-distance relationships without access to skype).  Attentive to genre and clear about choices in writer's memo and CR (which some take into account in grading for the outcome).

Outcome 2: range 3.0-to 3.7 for UWHS/EWP staff; on the border of strong/outstanding (3.6) for 567 TAs (13 in "strong," 13 in "outstanding" and a couple "good").  Some uncertainty about goal ('evaluating homelessness'?) and para 2 seems like a second opening paragraph.   Claim could be slightly more effective in setting up her argument about housing first, but effective intertextuality and clarity about how/why the writers uses sources for her own ends.

Outcome 3: range 2.6-3.7 for UWHS/EWP staff, substantial majority of 567 TAs gave it "outstanding" for outcome 3 (16) vs. 8 "strong" and 4 "good."  (As is so often the case, outcome three has the widest range.)  The writer used the same MP for outcomes 2 and 3; not surprisingly, as the argument wasn't quite clear, the stakes aren't quite clear either, but solid work and consensus put this outcome higher than staff had seen it.

Outcome 4: 3.3-3.8 for UWHS staff; majority of 567 teachers give it a "strong" (13) with seven "outstanding" and three "good."  I don't have clear notes about how much revision was evident in what was submitted

