Table 1. Rating Definitions

Portfolio Demonstrates:	1. Fails to meet expectations	2. Minimally meets expectations	3. Meets expectations	4. Exceeds expectations	Comments
formal elements based on disciplinary expectations.	Fails to organize projects visually based on disciplinary expectations. Visuals elements, if used, do not meet disciplinary expectations.	Demonstrates moments of appropriate visual organization based on disciplinary expectations. Visuals, if used, meet disciplinary expectations at times.	Demonstrates appropriate visual organization based on disciplinary expectations, but includes moments when there may be lapses or inappropriate choices. Visuals, if used, often meet disciplinary expectations.	Demonstrates appropriate visual organization consistently and appropriately. Visuals, if used, always meet disciplinary expectations.	
rhetorical specificity that student projects were written for specific audiences, purposes, and contexts based on disciplinary expectations.	Fails to demonstrate rhetorical specificity.	Demonstrates moments of rhetorical specificity, but not consistently (e.g., within a project, audience might shift, etc.)	Demonstrates rhetorical specificity, but includes some moments when there may be lapses or inappropriate choices.	Demonstrates rhetorical specificity consistently and appropriately. Projects demonstrate control of disciplinary expectations.	
source use appropriate and ethical ways of documenting sources based on disciplinary expectations.	Fails to appropriately and ethically document sources based on disciplinary expectations. Does not use reputable sources and does not draw upon disciplinary scholarship.	Demonstrates numerous errors in documentation. Some sources are reputable. Projects draw upon some appropriate disciplinary scholarship.	Demonstrates some errors in documenting sources. Most sources are reputable. Projects draw upon mostly appropriate disciplinary scholarship.	Demonstrates few to no errors in documenting sources. All sources are reputable. Projects draw upon appropriate disciplinary scholarship.	

Reflection Demonstrates:	1. Does not meet expectations	2. Minimally meets expectations	3. Meets expectations	4. Exceeds expectations	Comments
That writing is purposeful and varies according to context.	Fails to engage in critical reflection of rhetorical choices in the course's assignments	Demonstrates occasional awareness the role of rhetorical choices in the course's assignments	Demonstrates frequent awareness of the role of rhetorical choices in the course's assignments	Demonstrates a sophisticated awareness of the role of rhetorical choices, perhaps going so far to even acknowledge the rhetorical situation of the reflective analysis	
That writing is a complex, nonlinear process.	Fails to engage in critical reflection of writing process.	Briefly describes process.	Describes process and begins to reflect on its role in the final product.	Fully describes writing process, reflects on its role in the final product, and exhibits apt metacognition.	
That writing often builds on the work of others and that strategies for location and criteria for evaluating information vary according to context.	Fails to engage in critical reflection of source material.	Demonstrates minimal reflection concerning the role others' work played in individual arguments or assignments.	Demonstrates frequent awareness of role research and others' ideas played in shaping specific arguments or assignments.	Demonstrates a sophisticated awareness the role others' work played in individual arguments or assignments. Reflection acknowledges the nuances of credibility and validity.	