

**Rubric for evaluation of student project websites**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Basic</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<b>Meeting the Contract Terms</b>	All terms of contract met or exceeded, including milestone deadlines, assigned workload, promised content, page categories and features, and tools used. Final Defense of Contract is well-organized and thoroughly articulated, with the rationale and outcomes for any changes in contract terms thoroughly explained.	Most terms of the contract were met or exceeded, including milestone deadlines, assigned workload, promised content, page categories and features, and tools used. Final Defense of Contract is organized and articulated, with explanations for any unmet terms and/or changes in contract.	Most terms of the contract were met, including milestone deadlines, assigned workload, promised content, page categories and features, and tools used. Defense of contract is adequately clear. Unmet terms are explained. A few of the contract terms may not have been met, although there is evidence of an attempt to meet the terms.	Several contract terms partially met or unmet, including milestone deadlines, assigned workload, promised content, page categories and features, and tools used. There may not be evidence of an attempt to meet these terms. Defense of contract is incomplete, unmet terms are not adequately explained.
<b>Content</b>	All required elements are present (specifics for each course can be listed here). All required pages, technology and features are included, and students have gone above and beyond the requirements to add features unique to/tailored for their site. The selected images and text help to tell the story of the project's subject. Demonstrates superior research and thoughtful analysis.	All required elements are present (specifics for each course can be listed here). All required pages, technology and features are included. The selected images and text are relevant and help to tell the story of the project's subject. Demonstrates competent research and thoughtful analysis.	Required elements, technology, and features are present, and an effort appears to have been made to provide a general story about the project's subject. Evidence of some research, with general explanations and some analysis.	Some required elements are missing. Some of the pages, technology, or features are not present. Little evidence of research, lack of clarity in the story narrative, some pieces of evidence are not relevant to the topic, images/photos not labeled or adequately explained.
<b>Usability and Navigability</b>	Images, videos and graphics are of an appropriate size and format so that pages load quickly. Tabs have been organized with the audience in mind, and allow visitors to move through the site with ease. All links work and information on the links loads quickly and easily.	Pages load in a reasonable amount of time, tabs are well-organized, and all links work. Generally a logical order and no noticeable problems with navigation of the site.	A few problems with slowly-loading pages, some tabs may need to be reordered for a logical progression through the site, and a link or two may not work properly.	Pages are slow to load, tabs are not adequately organized, and several links are broken.

<p><b>Quality of Research</b></p>	<p>Superior quantity and quality of research is evidence through the thorough and clear text and the selection of relevant documents, photographs, and artifacts on each page. All information, illustrations and videos are properly cited in the required format.</p>	<p>Quantity and quality of the research is adequate to provide evidence to support the narrative and assertions contained in the site. The narrative and images are tied together in an organized and well-considered fashion. Information, illustrations and videos are properly cited, with only a few small problems in the citations.</p>	<p>Quality and quantity of the research lacks depth in some places, although the materials still help to provide evidence supporting narrative and assertions. A few citations require more information or reorganization to meet standards of the format.</p>	<p>Quality and quantity of the research is deficient. Materials do not always support the narrative and assertions on the site. Citations are improperly formatted and do not always meet the standards of the format.</p>
<p><b>Quality of writing</b></p>	<p>The story is told in a compelling manner. The authors have paid close attention to their audience and have written the text to appeal to a broad public, without losing depth of analysis. The text is well-organized, so that the narrative flows logically and felicitously. The entire site (including image captions and citations) has been proofread for style, grammar and typographical errors.</p>	<p>The text is logically organized and clearly written. The text appeals to a broader public and exhibits competent analysis. The entire site (including image captions and citations) has been proofread for style, grammar and typographical errors.</p>	<p>The text is not always well-organized. The audience's needs are not always considered with regard to writing style, use of discipline-specific words, and other problems that make the story hard to follow. The site needs more detailed proofreading to catch stylistic, grammatical and typographical errors.</p>	<p>Little evidence of organization or thought to making the site accessible to the audience. Too many grammar, typo and syntax errors for college-level written work.</p>
<p><b>Layout/Design</b></p>	<p>Invites – perhaps even compels – the reader into the site with an appealing layout. The pages all have superior visual appeal, and digital technology is employed to make the layout both readable and easily navigable.</p>	<p>Visually appealing site that is easy to navigate. Effective use of digital technology to allow the audience easy access to materials.</p>	<p>Layout is sometimes unclear or even confusing, perhaps too complicated or “busy” for ease of navigation. Some parts of the project are not visually appealing.</p>	<p>Little evidence of consideration for appeal to the audience. Layout is disorganized, and the design is too complicated for visitors to navigate easily.</p>