|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grading Rubric for Project 1** | | | |  |
|  | **Levels of Achievement** | | |  |
| **Criteria** | **Exemplary**  **6** | **Proficient**  **4** | **Competent**  **2** | **Not yet**  **Competent**  **0** |
| **Rationale for selection of website to review** | Rationale is clear and concise. | Rationale is generally clear and concise. | Rationale is either unclear on rambling. | Rationale is neither clear nor concise.  Very hard to follow. |
| **Rationale for selection of evaluation criteria.** | Rationale is clear and concise. | Rationale is generally clear and concise. | Rationale is either unclear on rambling. | Rationale is neither clear nor concise.  Very hard to follow. |
| **Quality of evaluation criteria** | Excellent; widely accepted for health websites; valid and reliable. | Excellent, but not generally used for health websites | May be appropriate, although validity or reliability not established. | Not appropriate for this type of website. |
| **Application of evaluation criteria** | Effective application of criteria. | Criteria generally used appropriately. | Criteria not always used appropriately. | No criteria used. |
| **Interpretation of results** | Interpretation of evaluation is accurate, clear and concise. | Your description of the results is clear, but your interpretation needs strengthening. | Portions of your description or your interpretation of the results are unclear. | Both your description and interpretation of the results are unclear or incorrect. |
| **Presentation of evaluation** | Well written with minimal grammar or spelling errors | Mostly well written with some grammar or spelling errors. | Some writing issues (comprehension) and a number of grammar or spelling errors. | Poorly written with grammar and spelling errors throughout. |