

Task Description: All students in WRT 104 will submit a final portfolio worth 40% of their final grade. Each portfolio will open with a reflective introduction and include three revised, edited, and polished projects from the semester’s work. Without the instructor’s explicit permission, none of the three entries can be new work. The reflective introduction “introduces readers to your collection of writing and . . . explains your choices in compiling the portfolio” (*Portfolio Keeping* 44). Each of the projects is expected to meet the criteria of the original assignment or the features of each genre as outlined in *The Norton Field Guide to Writing*. Each piece in the portfolio is expected to demonstrate the writer’s care and competence.

	EXEMPLARY	PROFICIENT	UNACCEPTABLE
Reflective Introduction	The reflective introduction demonstrates the writer’s insights and thoughtfulness about his or her learning in this course and/or makes connections across projects and/or to other courses. The introduction offers a variety of support for claims about what the writer has learned, including evidence from the working folder or previous drafts. The writer addresses in detail why entries were chosen and/or how they were revised for the portfolio. The writer uses terms from the course content or materials comfortably or expertly (i.e., genre, audience, revision). The introduction successfully prepares readers for the rest of the portfolio.	The reflective introduction demonstrates some thoughtfulness about the writer’s learning in the course; it offers support for claims about what the writer has learned and may make at least one connection to other learning. The writer addresses why entries were chosen or how they were revised for the portfolio. The writer uses terms from the course content or materials competently (i.e., genre, audience, revision). The introduction competently prepares readers for the rest of the portfolio.	The reflective introduction offers only one or two examples of the writer’s learning or makes broad, unsupported, or generic claims about the class. The writer addresses only briefly why entries were chosen or how they were revised for the portfolio. The writer does not use terms from the course content or materials, or uses the terms in unusual contexts. The introduction appears disconnected from the rest of the portfolio.
Rhetorical Knowledge	The writer has made apt decisions for each entry in terms of audience, purpose, and voice. The target audience for each piece is appropriate or consistent; in every entry, the purpose is clearly stated and fulfilled, and the voice in each case contributes to fulfilling the purpose.	The writer has made apt decisions in terms of audience, purpose, and voice with only one or two lapses. The target audience for each piece is generally appropriate or consistent; the purpose is stated and fulfilled, and the voice contributes to fulfilling the purpose.	The writer has not made apt decisions in terms of audience, purpose, and voice, or there are several lapses. The target audience for more than one piece is inappropriate or inconsistent; the purpose is difficult to determine or sometimes unfulfilled; the voice may or may match up to the purpose.

<p>Understanding of Genres</p>	<p>Each of the three project entries illustrates a command of the intended genre and/or fulfills the criteria for the original assignment. For each genre represented, the writer has explicitly and implicitly demonstrated the features of the genre and has used those features to good effect (e.g., in analyzing a text, the writer has used evidence from the text effectively to achieve the goals of the piece).</p>	<p>Of the three project entries, at least one is very successful in illustrating a command of the intended genre or the criteria for the assignment; the other two entries may be on target but less polished. The features of each genre are present but are not manipulated to the best effect (e.g., in analyzing a text, the writer has tried using evidence from the text to achieve the goals of the piece but with mixed success).</p>	<p>Only one of the three project entries illustrates a command of the intended genre, or the criteria for the original assignment are fulfilled in only one entry. The writer has misunderstood or misrepresented key features of two of the three assigned genres.</p>
<p>Conventions & Craft</p>	<p>The reader has no questions about sources or documentation; there are minimal errors in usage, grammar, punctuation, or mechanics—none that impede meaning.</p>	<p>The reader may have one or two questions about sources or documentation; there are a few errors in usage, grammar, punctuation, or mechanics that may impede meaning.</p>	<p>The reader has a number of questions about sources or documentation; there are a number of errors in usage, grammar, punctuation, or mechanics that impede meaning.</p>