UWHS Portfolio Rubric Draft (adapted from Emily Ehrlich’s Outcome Based Rubric) revised 1-27-17

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outstanding**: highly proficient demonstration of trait(s) associated with this outcome *(3.7-4.0 = high A- to 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+ = lowest passing score to earn “C” credit)* **Does not meet the outcome(s) requirement;** trait(s) are not demonstrated; the writing requires substantial revision on multiple levels. *(1.0-1.9 = earns course credit, but does not fulfill the “C” requirement”)* | Rating |
| **CRITICAL REFLECTION/COVER LETTER** |
| The commentary indicates which items in the portfolio demonstrate the course objectives, and has a compelling, metacognitive argument for how they do so  |  |
| 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 |
| The writing employs style, tone, and conventions appropriate to the demands of a particular genre and/or situation |  |
| The writer is able to demonstrate the ability to write for different audiences and contexts, both within and outside the university classroom |  |
| The writing shows clear understanding of audience, and various aspects of the writing (structure, appeals, tone, sentences, and word choice) address and are strategically pitched to that audience. |  |
| The effects of writing choices are clearly articulated and assessed.  |  |
| OUTCOME TWO: EVIDENCE AND USE OF TEXTS |
| Writing demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of source texts |  |
| Course texts are used in strategic, focused ways (for example: summarized, cited, applied, challenged, re-contextualized) to support the goals of the writing. |  |
| The writing is intertextual, meaning that a “conversation” between texts and ideas is created in support of the writer’s goals. |  |
| Multiple types of evidence gathered from various sources are used appropriately to support the writing goals. |  |
| Citation method identified for the assignment (e.g. MLA) is used correctly |  |
| OUTCOME THREE: CLAIMS AND ARGUMENTATION  |
| The argument is appropriately complex, based in a claim that emerges from and explores a line of inquiry. |  |
| The stakes of the argument, why what is being argued matters, are evident |  |
| The argument involves analysis, which is the close scrutiny and examination of evidence and assumptions in support of a larger set of ideas. |  |
| The argument takes into consideration counterclaims and multiple points of view as it generates its own perspective and position. |  |
| The argument utilizes a clear organizational strategy and effective transitions that develop its line of inquiry. |  |
| **OUTCOME FOUR: REVISING, EDITING, AND PROOFREADING**  |
| Errors of grammar, punctuation, and mechanics are proofread so as not to interfere with reading and understanding the writing. |  |
| Revisions respond to substantive issues raised by instructor and peers |  |
| Writing is constructed carefully and purposefully at the word and sentence levels |  |
| **FINAL SCORE (on a 4.0 scale)** |  |