English Composition I: Achieving Expertise MOOC

Rubrics for the portfolio assessment

June 24-26, 2013

Assessment Leader: Ed White
MOOC Professor: Denise Comer

The overall purpose of this portfolio reading is to seek answers to the following questions:

- *How many of the students completing the course have achieved the learning objectives of the course and to what degree?*
- *Can we document any improvement in the writing of students who have completed the course, most particularly in the abilities to 1. Develop an argument and 2. Provide evidence for that argument.*

The following were the English Composition I learning objectives:

- Summarize, analyze, question, and evaluate written and visual texts
- Argue and support a position
- Recognize audience and disciplinary expectations
- Identify and use the stages of the writing process
- Identify characteristics of effective sentence and paragraph-level prose
- Apply proper citation practices
- Discuss how to transfer and apply your writing knowledge to other writing occasions

Students who completed this 12-week course will have compiled a portfolio of their work, which will include most of the following:

- Reflective Cover Letter written at the end of the course introducing readers to their portfolio by making an argument about their progress on the course learning goals and using as evidence cited passages from their coursework.
- Draft and Final Version of Project 1: Critical Summary of Daniel Coyle's "The Sweet Spot"
- Draft and Final Version of Project 2: Image Analysis of their chosen area of expertise
- Draft and Final Version of Project 3: Case Study in their chosen area of expertise
- Final Version of Project 4: Op-Ed about expertise in their chosen area

In addition, you might find that students will refer in their cover letter to the following:

- Peer Comments on Drafts (Received and Provided)
- Forum Contributions
- Short-Answer Reflective "Quizzes" on Projects 1 and 2

Your job will be to record three different scores for each portfolio you read:

1. *A holistic score for the overall quality of the portfolio, based on a careful reading of the reflective cover letter, supplemented by skimming the cited passages in the portfolio to find the passages cited in the cover letter in order to verify or discredit* the claims made in the letter *(6-point scale);*
2. *An analytic score for improvement in understanding how to develop an argument (3-point scale); and*
3. *An analytic score for improvement in understanding how to provide evidence for that argument (3-point scale),*

Each portfolio will be read independently by two different raters, with a third rater reading in cases where holistic scores of the first two raters are more than one point apart. We are hoping that our initial scores will show sufficient levels of agreement that we have relatively few third readings; for our data to be useful, we need to reach a consensus that will be highly reliable. At the same time, we need to work with enough deliberate speed to complete the task in the time we have available.

THE 6-POINT SCALE FOR THE HOLISTIC READING

Think of the 6-point scale as two halves:
- a top half of 4, 5, or 6 representing different levels of success and
- a lower half of 1, 2, and 3 representing different levels of lack of success.

A portfolio reflective letter, with its supporting evidence, scoring 5 demonstrates understanding of the goals and makes a demonstrated argument about the achievement of those goals; one scoring 2 fails to do this. The other scores serve as a minus or plus. Thus a score of 4 is successful, but marginally so, a kind of 5-. A score of 6 is exceptionally successful, a kind of 5+. You are not to grade each item in the portfolio but rather base your grade on the cover letter, its use of evidence from the portfolio, complemented by a response to the portfolio as a whole.

Only one whole number, without pluses or minuses, can be entered on the SCORE line. Your score will be added to the other reader's score to obtain a grade for the writer's portfolio. Thus, the top score is 12 and the bottom score is 2.

Score of 6: The reflective letter summarizes, understands, and reflects on course goals. It will make clear claims about the writer's development in relation to the course goals, provide specific evidence in support of those claims, and be well organized and well written, though you should not expect it to be perfect. It may have a few minor unconventional features of written English, such as vocabulary, sentence construction, etc., but these do not interfere with the communication of the writer's ideas. When you check the claims made in the letter against the

cited passages in the body of the portfolio, they in fact support the claims. Evidence is integrated effectively. Citations are mostly correct.

Score of 5: This reflective letter summarizes, understands, and reflects on course goals. It may have a few unconventional features of written English, such as vocabulary, sentence construction, etc., but these do not interfere with the communication of the writer's ideas. It offers an organized argument about the degree to which the writer has met those goals. It is clear and well written. Evidence is cited clearly and integrated effectively. The claims in the letter are mostly supported by the passages cited. Citations are mostly correct.

Score of 4: This reflective letter shows understanding of some of the course goals, and there is some reflection about the goals or the course. It offers some argument(s) about the writer's experience of some of the course goals. It may have a few unconventional features of written English, such as vocabulary, sentence construction, etc., but these do not for the most part interfere with the communication of the writer's ideas. It is for the most part clearly written. Evidence is integrated effectively some of the time, and supports the writer's claims some of the time. Citations are present and mostly correct although the cited passages are not always supportive of the claims made.

Score of 3: This reflective letter shows only a superficial understanding of the course goals and gives a limited summary of them. It may have some unconventional features of written English, such as vocabulary, sentence construction, etc., that interfere with the communication of the writer's ideas. It offers little by way of argument. Evidence is only occasionally integrated effectively, and/or not much evidence is used. Citations are often incorrect or not present.

Score of 2: This letter pays little attention to the course goals or shows little understanding of them. It may also contain some unconventional features of written English, such as vocabulary, sentence construction, or other features that interfere with the communication of the writer's ideas. It offers little by way of argument. Evidence is for the most part not integrated effectively, and/or very little evidence is used; the essay depends on generalities without many or any citations from the portfolio.

Score of 1: This letter has misunderstood the nature of the assignment or the goals of the course. It may present unconventional features of written English, such as vocabulary, sentence construction, or other features that interfere with the communication of the writer's ideas. It offers no argument. Evidence is not integrated effectively, and/or no evidence is used. Citations are incorrect or absent.

THE 3-POINT SCALES

These scales are designed as a rough measure of improvement in two areas:

- Understanding how to develop an argument; and
- Understanding how to provide evidence for that argument.

We are interested to learn whether and how students' writing shifted from earlier in the course to later in the course along those two domains. For these analytic scores, review the student's writing across the course (early drafts, final projects, and self-reflection) to ascertain what, if any, growth has occurred.

Score of 3: There is noticeable and important improvement.

Score of 2: There is some improvement.

Score of 1: There is no discernible improvement.