

NHS4001: Grading Rubric for ePortfolio and Individual Posts

The grading rubric gives you a general indication of how your individual posts and ePortfolio may be graded in USR, based on common scenarios presented by student writing. As different scenarios may occur and in different combinations, your instructor may award grades based on criteria not established in this rubric.

A/A+	The writing employs narrative effectively, demonstrates an interesting and profound subject of reflection, and has well-structured, well-sustained and rigorously supported arguments. The post shows how the subject of reflection is relevant to its author and how they establish new ways of thinking (either for the author or for readers). All artifacts serve as concrete, specific, and appropriate evidence which is used to substantiate the insights that the reflective writing offers. The student has chosen all artifacts purposefully, excerpted them economically, and drawn from concrete experiences, final products, and reflection upon processes. These traits demonstrate variety and in-depth engagement. With regard to the portfolio, the student has established a compelling overall narrative that critically engages with their university education. Usually, this narrative is introduced in the compilation post (and sometimes an additional “about me” post). It is clear from the content of individual posts and their organization within the portfolio how the narrative is being sustained.
A-	Much the same as for A/A+, yet there may be minor problems such as logical issues in the argumentation and analysis, or occasional lapses in the overall message/argument. However, such stumbles do not substantially detract from the post’s overall strength. In other words, the post still shows that the student has thought very carefully about the subject of reflection and can otherwise make the post profound and interesting. In addition, the portfolio narrative is interesting and well-conceptualized. Finally, while there are some broad indications of how individual posts are supposed to fit into the narrative, the student establishes connections competently, despite some looseness.
B+	The posts include reflective writing that is focused and purposeful. The student has selected experiences in a well-conceived manner that facilitates the subject of the reflection. Artifacts largely serve as concrete, specific, and appropriate evidence that supports claims which a post makes about the experiences. Generally, the argument is sound and well-structured to support the main claim about the reflection. With regard to each post, the B scale is largely differentiated from the A scale in that the project does not show sustained critical engagement, and/or lacks the highest levels of intellectual consciousness or awareness. With regard to the portfolio, the narrative demonstrates an attempt to integrate individual posts. Yet there is noticeable looseness and/or inconsistency in executing the portfolio’s main message(s). Still, the narrative tries to engage in reflection is somewhat critically and intellectually conscious.

B	Similar to B+. However, the reflective writing loses focus at times and may work with a subject of reflection that is not clearly articulated. Similarly, the subject of reflection exhibits the potential to engage with critical aspects of university learning but does not directly do so. The student has not balanced artifact use with analysis. Thus, they may discuss and/or analyse some artifacts in some depth, yet discuss and/or analyse others less fully. The portfolio narrative, while interesting, is rushed and generalized, often a result of allowing posts of discrepant topics to fit.
B-	Work awarded this grade meets minimum requirements. For instance, this grade records signs that a post or student has moved beyond description, and recollection of experiences, in a post or portfolio. The post or portfolio largely hints, though, at an analysis rather than performing one. The subject of reflection deals with rather mundane, unspecific, and generic matters (e.g., “how I learned to value hard work”). It shows little signs of engaging with critical issues. Comparably, the portfolio narrative deals with a generic subject of reflection rather than material that demonstrates deeper or more profound reflection on the writer’s education. However, the posts do show some attempt to support the portfolio narrative.
C+/C	Posts that earn this grade are characterized by writing that lacks focus. There may be some signs of engagement and analysis of events and experiences, but they are overwhelmed by prose that is largely descriptive. These posts will often state insights rather than substantiating them. Furthermore, such posts do not exhibit signs of self-reflexivity. They meet the required number of artifacts and experiences but the prose does not adequately explain the artifacts, analyse them, or suggest how they are related to the experiences. For the portfolio, the student does not organize logically, or present content in a way that supports the larger narrative that the portfolio claims to be based on. To put that thought differently, the compilation post sets forth a promise that is not well supported by some or all of what follows.
D	The post lacks analysis and is written like a diary entry. The writing lacks focus and is substantially driven by an attempt to recall or remember events and experiences, rather than to meaningfully engage with them. The organization is confusing to the reader. Minimum requirements for the posts are not met: for example, the number of experiences or artifacts falls below the minimum. For the portfolio, apart from requirements not met in individual posts, larger components such as the compilation post (or any of the three other posts) are missing.
F	Non-submission of work, or plagiarism has been detected. Plagiarism cases will further require disciplinary intervention from the NUS College academic team. Please consult this resource on what we consider as plagiarism: Gordon Harvey, Writing with Sources: A Guide for Students, 3rd ed. (Indianapolis and Cambridge: Hackett, 2017), chapter 3, “Misuse of Sources”. Alternatively, you may also consult: https://usingsources.fas.harvard.edu/what-constitutes-plagiarism