**ENGL 1100: Portfolio Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Excellent (5)** | **Very good (4)** | **Adequate (3)** | **Developing (2)** | **Insufficient (1)** |
| **Inquiry****(SLO 1)** | The projects demonstrate an exceptional ability to create, identify, and engage in significant questions that effectively drive the discussions in the projects.  | The projects demonstrate, with only minor lapses, a strong ability to create, identify, and engage in significant questions that mostly drive the discussions in the projects. | The projects demonstrate an inconsistent ability to create, identify, and engage in questions that inconsistently drive the discussions in the projects.  | The projects demonstrate a limited ability to create, identify, and engage in questions that somewhat drive the discussions in the projects.  | The projects do not demonstrate a college-level ability to create, identify, and engage in questions that drive the discussions in the projects.  |
| **Purpose, Audience, and Context****(SLO 2, 5)** | The projects demonstrate exceptional awareness of purposes, audiences, and contexts.  | The projects demonstrate, with only minor lapses, steady awareness of purposes, audiences, and contexts.  | The projects demonstrate an inconsistent awareness of purposes, audiences, and contexts.  | The projects demonstrate a limited awareness of purposes, audiences, and contexts.  | The projects do not demonstrate a college-level awareness of purposes, audiences, and contexts.  |
| **Critical Engagement with and Use of Evidence****(SLO 6)** | The projects demonstrate an exceptional ability to rhetorically engage and integrate a variety of appropriate sources to support the central claims. | The projects demonstrate, with only minor lapses, a strong ability to rhetorically engage and integrate a variety of appropriate sources to support the central claims.  | The projects demonstrate an inconsistent ability to rhetorically engage and integrate a limited number of appropriate sources to support the central claims.  | The projects demonstrate a limited ability to rhetorically engage and integrate sources to support the central claims.  | The projects do not demonstrate a college-level ability to rhetorically engage and integrate sources to support the central claims.  |
| **Expression and Organization****(SLO 3, 4, 7)** | Organization rhetorically enhances the development of the central claims. Sentences and paragraphs are logically connected with a minimum of grammar and punctuation errors. Projects demonstrate effective revising and editing. | Organization rhetorically enhances, with only minor lapses, the development of the central claims. Sentences and paragraphs are connected with a few lapses in transition and explanation. Grammar and punctuation errors are rare but obvious but do not interfere in meaning of communication. Projects demonstrate revising and editing. | Organization inconsistently enhances the development of the central claims. The documents clearly convey meaning, but contain some sentence-level errors that impede flow. Grammar and punctuation errors occur regularly and may interfere in meaning of communication. Projects demonstrate some revising and editing. | The projects lack clear organization and development of central claims. Sentences and paragraphs are not clearly developed or logically connected and often impede flow. Grammar and punctuation errors largely interfere in meaning of communication. Projects demonstrate very little revising and editing. | The projects do not demonstrate college-level organization and development. Sentences and paragraphs lack academic development, revision, and editing. |
| **Formatting and Citation****(SLO 8)** | The projects follow standard formatting and documentation guidelines. Attributions are completely and meet the appropriate style guidelines (APA, Chicago, CSE, or MLA).  | The projects generally follow formatting and documentation guidelines. Errors in the appropriate style guidelines (APA, Chicago, CSE, or MLA) are negligible and do not affect the integrity of the work.  | The projects inconsistently follow formatting and documentation guidelines. Errors in the appropriate style guidelines (APA, Chicago, CSE, or MLA) occur regularly.  | The projects randomly follow formatting and documentation guidelines. Errors in the appropriate style guidelines (APA, Chicago, CSE, or MLA) compromise the integrity and honesty of the projects. | The projects show little to no adherence to formatting and documentation guidelines. Plagiarism may be evident. |