**Evaluation for Portfolio 3: Argument/SOGC & Annotated Bibliography**

**Name:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ARGUMENT** | **Missing/**  **Incomplete** | **Not**  **Satisfactory** | **Satisfactory** | **Good** | **Excellent** |
| **Argument:** Argument takes an arguable stance on a particular issue and supports that position with evidence that is appropriate for both the issue and the audience. Audience is intentionally chosen and clearly considered. Argument is **valid**, **productive**, and **ethical** in its composition, claims, and sources. Argument considers a counterargument or alternative viewpoints. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Form/Design**: The design of the argument is coherent and visually appealing. Form has been intentionally selected for the audience, and materials, layout, and design have been used effectively for rhetorical purposes. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Sources:** 7-10 sources are used in the argument, and they are reputable, timely, and appropriate to the issue and audience. They are used well and ethically. All sources have been cited in ways appropriate to the format of the argument. One source is scholarly, and one has been published in the last year. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Drafting and Revision:** Complete drafts are submitted on time. Revision demonstrates attention to peer and teacher feedback. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **SOGC** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Rhetorical Goals:** The audience, the sources, and the argument are discussed in regard to what the argument is specifically trying to accomplish and do, beyond just the requirements of the project. How the goals were (or were not) accomplished through rhetorical choices is also discussed. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Rhetorical Choices:** Specific rhetorical, material, methodological, and technological choices are explained as they relate to the rhetorical goals and the audience. Also catalogued are choices that may not have been conscious, made when certain formats/genres, materials, and technologies were chosen for the project. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Process:** The design and creation process is articulated and put in conversation with the rhetorical goals and choices of the argument. Also discussed is why this plan and design was pursued, as well as the successes and failures of the argument. All actors, human and nonhuman, are catalogued. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Drafting and Revision:** Complete drafts are submitted on time. Revision demonstrates attention to peer and teacher feedback. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Workshop Participation:** Peer response shows attention to assignment criteria and each writer’s intention. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Sources:** 7-10 sources are annotated in a 200-250 word annotations that follow the requirements on the assignment sheet. All sources used in the argument are annotated, and all annotated sources are used in the argument. One source is scholarly; one was published in the last year. The annotations are preceded by a bibliographic entry in MLA format. The entire bibliography is formatted in MLA format. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Drafting and Revision:** Complete drafts are submitted on time. Revision demonstrates attention to peer and teacher feedback. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Workshop Participation:** Peer response shows attention to assignment criteria and each writer’s intention. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **In-Class Work:** All process work for this portfolio has been completed thoughtfully and on time. |  |  |  |  |  |

**Grade:  
Comments:**