**UWHS Portfolio Rubric**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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 SUPPORTINQUIRY (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 (re)visioning, (re) brainstorming, (re)writing and (re)thinking |  |
| *Purposeful refining and editing:* composition choices are refined, nuanced and edited for effective delivery to intended audience(s) in a manner consonant with the genre, situation and desired rhetorical effects and meanings |  |
| *Responding to and incorporating feedback:* the writing demonstrates giving, receiving, interpreting and incorporating constructive feedback |  |
| **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.

**Notes/Rationale/Context**

|  |
| --- |
| **Overall Impressions/Notes** |
| **CR** |
| **O1** |
| **O2** |
| **O3** |
| **O4** |
| **For the Norming Session:** *Consider questions you have. Things that were tricky or you are unsure about. Things you want feedback on or to pause over.* |

Portfolio rubric for 100-level English Courses

Expository Writing Program

**University of Washington**

### *Outstanding Portfolio 3.7-4.0*

This portfolio exhibits outstanding proficiency in all outcomes categories—academic argumentation, purposeful use of texts, rhetorical awareness, and revision, editing, and proofreading—outweighing its few weaknesses. The critical reflection clearly indicates which items in the portfolio demonstrate the course outcomes, and makes a compelling argument for how they do so. In so doing, it displays thorough and thoughtful awareness of the writer’s own writing, using evidence from the course outcomes, assignments, self-assessments, peer responses, and teacher responses by quoting or paraphrasing from these materials in support of its argument. The selected major assignment and shorter assignments offer an outstanding demonstration of all the course outcomes through a very highly proficient and skillful handling of the traits associated with them. The outstanding portfolio will likely demonstrate some appropriate risk-taking, originality, variety, and/or creativity.

### *Strong Portfolio 3.1-3.6*

The strong portfolio exhibits strengths clearly outweighing weaknesses, but may show somewhat less proficiency in one or two of the outcomes categories, perhaps strong in academic argumentation, purposeful use of texts, and rhetorical awareness, but slightly less in revision, editing, and proofreading. The critical reflection clearly indicates which items in the portfolio demonstrate the course outcomes, and makes an effective argument for how they do so. It also displays thoughtful awareness of the writer’s own writing, using evidence from the course outcomes, assignments, self-assessments, peer responses, and teacher responses by quoting or paraphrasing from these materials in support of its argument, but may not present as clear an argument for the choices as the outstanding portfolio. The selected major assignment and shorter assignments, although slightly less consistent in demonstrating the course outcomes, nonetheless offer a strong demonstration of effectiveness in many traits associated with the outcomes, handling a variety of tasks successfully. This portfolio engages the material and follows the assignments given, but may risk less than the outstanding portfolio.

### *Good Portfolio 2.5-3.0*

The good portfolio also exhibits strengths outweighing weaknesses, but may show less strength in two of the outcomes categories, perhaps strong in academic argumentation and purposeful use of texts, but less so in revision, editing, and proofreading and rhetorical awareness. The critical reflection indicates which items in the portfolio demonstrate the course outcomes, and makes an argument for how they do so, although the argument may display less thoughtful awareness of the writer’s own writing by using less evidence from the course outcomes, assignments, self-assessments, peer responses, and teacher responses in support of its argument. The selected major assignment and shorter assignments effectively demonstrate the course outcomes, but with less proficiency and control. The portfolio usually will not display the appropriate risk-taking and creativity of the strong and outstanding portfolios.

### *Acceptable Portfolio 2.0-2.4*

The acceptable portfolio is competent, demonstrating that the course outcomes are basically met, but the traits associated with them are not as fully realized or controlled. The writing can succeed in the academic environment. The strengths and weaknesses are about evenly balanced, but should be slightly stronger on academic argument and purposeful use of texts, as these represent key facets of academic writing. Some parts of the selected assignments may be underdeveloped, too general, or predictable, or leave parts of the outcomes unconsidered. While demonstrating knowledge of conventions, this portfolio typically will not display rhetorical awareness or control over revision, editing, and proofreading. The critical reflection indicates which items in the portfolio demonstrate the course outcomes, but may not make as effective an argument for how they do so, one based in evidence from the course outcomes, assignments, self-assessments, peer responses, and teacher responses. There may be moments of excellence, but in general the portfolio simply meets successfully the demands of the course outcomes.

### *Inadequate Portfolio 1.0-1.9*

A portfolio will be inadequate when it shows serious deficiencies in three of the four course outcomes, especially in academic argument, purposeful use of texts, and revision, editing, and proofreading (for example, revision is limited to correcting grammar or to adding or deleting sentence and phrase level changes.) Alternatively, this portfolio may be error free, yet does not adequately demonstrate the other outcomes. The critical reflection will be brief and may not indicate which items in the portfolio demonstrate the course outcomes or make an effective argument for how they do so. The portfolio indicates that the student may need more time to be able to handle the demands of both academic reading and writing as characterized in the course outcomes and associated traits.

### *Incomplete Portfolio 0.0-0.9*

A portfolio will be considered incomplete if no portfolio is submitted (0.0) or if the portfolio includes only part of the required work for the class, sometimes missing significant portions of the work of the course.