Assessment criteria and task descriptions, ENG 2506, portfolio examination

Excellent

This level of work is outstanding, showing evidence of extensive knowledge, understanding, and consistent/continuous engagement with the course subject matter in all components that constitute the examination portfolio.

- Extraordinary ability to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate a variety of texts/media artifacts within sustained arguments.
- Evidence of extensive reading and engagement with course material and additional materials.
- Frequent evidence of undoubted quality in the use of scholarly sources with a view to excavating academically sound work/substance from primary source texts/media and/or secondary as well as tertiary sources.
- Excellent presentation and writing. Contains insight and elements of originality.
- Thorough, productive, and germane response to and integration of revision notes/feedback received from class lecturer.
- Writing that has attained high professional standards. Understands and can easily use the *Chicago Manual of Style*, notes and bibliography form.
- Outstanding insight, weight, and sophistication and an ability to undertake advanced study with imagination, consistency, and tenacity.
- All components of the portfolio are present and accounted for, and have been thoroughly revised more than once.

Good

At this level of assessment, the student presents good arguments and displays solid engagement with the course subject matter based on an above-average range of reading and/or engagement with sources/media texts. Yet, there are issues with writing and/or source work and/or argument that would still need to be addressed. These, however, represent opportunities for the student to develop and ultimately acquire higher levels of scholarly skills.

- Weighs up and evaluates different arguments and identifies key issues in a germane fashion, and uses a range of examples to support their argument(s).
- Understands important arguments and ideas from the course reading and beyond. Content is always relevant and well-presented, and generally well-focused, but may lack either breadth or depth and/or generally more detailed analysis.
- Is mostly well-structured, revealing a clear logic and consistency in topic development/execution.
- Solid albeit not necessarily extensive/thorough response to and integration of revision notes/feedback received from class lecturer.
- Shows breadth of knowledge, but may show some limitations in primary/secondary source work (e.g. extracting and paraphrasing of relevant subject matter from sources).
- Well-written with few technical errors and/or mishaps in scholarly appropriate style/presentation. Provides references largely in line with the *Chicago Manual of Style*, notes and bibliography form.

- All components of the portfolio are included in its final version, and have been solidly revised while still showing room for improvement.

Average
Work in this range shows relevant though not necessarily consistent engagement with course subject matter. One or more components of the portfolio may be more descriptive than analytical, and, additionally, may show insufficient responses to feedback.

- Submitted work is based on more limited reading; over-reliance on provided course text or other basic course material.
- While the student's work may show insightful and even original engagement with primary texts/media artifacts, their written output in one or more of the portfolio components shows noticeably limited use of, engagement with, and integration of scholarly resources.
- Provides reasonably structured accounts, but with some signs of confusion and/or limited critical insights/analysis. May also contain errors of fact or interpretation.
- Submitted work may show inconsistent use of the *Chicago Manual of Style*, or a somewhat general lack of scholarly rigor/care.
- Some grammatical and spelling errors, or mishaps with the references.
- Limited and/or superficial response to and integration of revision notes/feedback received from class lecturer.
- One component of the portfolio may be incomplete, and/or multiple components were submitted for final assessment while displaying limited/sparse revision.

Poor
While work at this level of assessment may attest to the student's genuine interest for and tenacious engagement with the subject matter, their written output together with their scholarly source work shows multiple issues/deficiencies that undercut the student's enthusiasm/zeal.

- Portfolio components may engage with subject matter (primary texts/media artifacts/secondary sources) relevant to course topic but display a noticeable degree of inconsistency in the application basic scholarly skills.
- Submitted work draws on/refers to only a limited number of sources whose scholarly quality/suitability may also be questionable.
- Insufficient and/or incomplete response to and integration of revision notes/feedback received from class lecturer.
- Submitted work includes disorganized, ineffective and/or confused/confusing presentation of engagement with subject matter.
- A grade at the top of this range suggests a basic degree of competence and knowledge, but shows insufficient scholarly rigor/engagement with primary texts/media as well as secondary sources (incl. adherence to the *Chicago Manual of Style*)
- A grade at the bottom range shows—in addition to the above—significant limitations/weaknesses in language use that interfere with readability/presentation and/or comprehensibility.

- One component of the portfolio may be missing, or multiple components may be incomplete/inconsistent, showing the shortcomings of draft-level submissions.

Unacceptable
Work in this range may feature a failure to carry out the tasks assigned, serious writing problems, and/or other significant issues.

- No serious attempt to carry out the tasks assigned.
- Haphazard/inconsistent engagement with course subject matter.
- Little to no understanding or knowledge of the course and its themes.
- Negligible or wholly irrelevant contents.
- Lack of scholarly conduct/rigor.
- Inadequate referencing and frequent grammatical and spelling errors.
- Use of questionable/problematic sources/texts.
- No engagement with feedback/guidance provided by the course lecturer.
- A larger number of portfolio components are either incomplete or missing.