|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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.  |