Table 1 below provides the results of our study.

Trait	Non-Adjudicated reliability using Cronbach's Alpha	Adjudicated Reliability Using Cronbach's Alpha	Non- Adjudicated Reliability Using Pearson's R	P Met Using One- Tailed Value?	Adjudicated Reliability Using Pearson's R	P Met Using One- Tailed Value?
Writing and Editing (N=16)	.656	.761	.490	Yes p=.027 (p<.01)	.615	Yes p=.006 (p<.01)
Document Design (N =16)	.602	.736	.430	Yes p=.048 (p<.05)	.587	Yes p=.008 (P<.01)
Rhetoric (N= 17)	.656	.656	.494	Yes .022 (p<.05)	.494	Yes p=.022 (P<.05)
Problem Solving (N =17)	.221	.680	.128	No (p=.312)	.523	Yes p=.016 (p<.05)
Collaboration (N=14)	.631	.887	.462	Yes p= .048 (p<.05)	.797	Yes p=.000 (p<.01)
Inter- Personal Communication (N=13)	923	.419	330	No (p=.135)	.278	No (P=.17)
Specialized Expertise (N=16)	.691	.795	.528	Yes (p<.05)	.660	Yes p=.003) (p<.01)
Technology (N=16)	024	.5	012	No (p=.428)	.335	No P=.335
Overall Score (N=17)	.730	.842	.580	Yes (p<.01)	.727	Yes p=.000 (p<.01)

The ability of the readers to discern levels of competency in student writing and editing, in document design, in rhetoric, in collaboration, and in specialized expertise all achieved acceptable to high levels of correlation and met the 95% confidence interval, thus allowing us to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that the readers were making similar judgments on the portfolios. The adjudicated Cronbach Appha for the overall score (.824) was especially strong. Indeed, of these six variables, five were able to be captured by our readers before adjudication; only the problem solving variable achieved the necessary level of significance by means of adjudicated scoring (.494). However, two variables—interpersonal communication and the use of technology—were not able to be read with consistency. The Cronbach's alpha for the adjudicated scores were low (.49 and .5, respectively) and both failed to achieve the 95% confidence interval demanded by the use of Pearson's R (P = .17; p = .335).