

## Website: Rubrics for Evaluation

Disclaimer: The rubrics provided here will be used to grade various aspects of the website, however, there is a lot of variation in terms of the specific requirements for each website. These depend on the object of your website (for example, not all websites need a page with technical information) and they depend on the scholar to whom you realistically have access.

To this day (after five semesters of assigning this project) no group has ever received a grade for the website that was lower than a B+. These high results demonstrate that most problems can be ironed out with effort and that teamwork overall is really beneficial.

	A	B	C	D	F
<p>Aesthetic Appearance of the Website</p>	<p>The homepage fits the size of the average computer screens, all other pages are linked to the homepage. All links work. The homepage is beautiful. It includes a background design and possibly borders. The designs derive from the culture which is the subject of the investigation and they are tasteful. The fonts are of an appropriate size, they are well placed on the page and easy to read. The background and the writing do not interfere with each other. The homepage includes an image, either a photograph or a drawing,</p>	<p>The description of the website appearance is very similar to that of an "A" website. The website's overall appearance is very good, but there are one or two noticeable features that could have been improved easily. Everything works properly, all the information is there, but the effort that went into aesthetic choices could have been stepped up a notch.</p>	<p>The description of the website appearance is very similar to that of an "A" website, but there are some real problems with it. Either the overall aesthetic appearance was really not carefully considered, the page is not very nice or inviting, or the choices made, given the particular object of the site, are bizarre. Or everything looks fine, but there are technical problems that are not acceptable. For example, the fonts chosen are inadequate, or the background interferes with the text.</p>	<p>The website is unacceptable for live internet posting. It is basically together, but it was assembled in such a manner that it is either fairly useless (links don't work or don't make sense), or the website is so unattractive that it would downgrade the overall quality of the larger project. There are real flaws in terms of particular content pages. They are either missing or non-existing. This particular</p>	<p>The website is not workable, it is not complete. It is so bad that there is no point in trying to salvage it in the future by another set of students. It would be much better to start from scratch.</p>

	something that quickly communicates what this website is about.		Some links don't lead anywhere. There are things missing.	objects' website is salvageable by a future group of students.	
Technical Aspects of the Website	All of the technical aspects of the website work and they meet the specifications that were provided. All problems have been resolved with the assistance of the tech supervisor (Casey). The background files are neatly organized and named in a logical manner.	The website basically meets all the standards that were set at the beginning of the semester and students, with technical assistance were able to solve almost all of the technical problems. There are, however, still some technical aspects that are not functioning. A link might not lead anywhere; there might be a missing file; the homepage is too large. The background files are well organized, but perhaps not perfect.	There are a lot of technical flaws on this website. The students understood the basic set of problems and made attempts to solve them, but they gave up at some point. Links don't work; images might be too large or do not open up; there are missing files. The background files are a mess and the overall organization of the website's background files is difficult to comprehend.	There are too many technical flaws. Not much works smoothly. The students might have sought help, but they did not follow through on advice.	The whole thing is a mess. Nothing works properly. The students did not seek help with their technical problems.
Photos and Illustrations	The website involves photographs that show the entire object and photographs that draw attention to all important details, including back views, views of insides, images of flaws. The resolution of the photographs and size of the images meets the	The photographs are all in place and are of a high enough quality to be useful, but they are not necessarily great. Technically the photographs still meet the requirements for resolution and size. There is an adequate number of detail shots. The whole	The photographs presented are inadequate. They are still useful to have, but they guide the viewer only minimally. Either the quality is too low, or there are not enough images. There are no enlargements provided. The overall	The photographs of the objects are totally inadequate both in terms of quality (poorly lit, blurred, badly cropped) and in terms of number of details. Their overall presentation as a group was not	There are no photographs, or what is presented is no more than one or two snapshots.

	<p>specifications that were given. The lighting of objects was carefully considered and was used to best advantage given the conditions of the lab that was made available. Enlarged views of photographs are made available. The students provide some sort of context shots, either photographs provided by a scholar with proper permissions, or drawings of such context photos. Where it was deemed useful students provided well drawn, clear diagrams to help explain technical processes.</p>	<p>arrangement of the photographs, their enlargements, is fine, but it could have been better. The students provide at least one context photo or illustration, but again the quality is not as high as those provided by an "A" website. Where it is useful the students provided diagrams to explain technical processes, but their value in terms of actually facilitating understanding is limited.</p>	<p>arrangement is not great. Various photographs distract from each other, because they are too closely spaced. There are no context photos or illustrations. There are no diagrams to facilitate the understanding of technical processes, even though such diagrams would have been helpful.</p>	<p>thought through.</p>	
Maps	<p>The map information provided to the map maker (also Casey) is accurate. A basic drawing of the outline of country and the culture's territory was provided to the map maker. The final website has a page for the map.</p>	<p>The map information provided to the map maker is basically fine, but the map maker had to struggle with some of the information to be turn out a decent product.</p>	<p>The map is of poor quality because the information provided to the map maker was either inaccurate or the quality of the basic outline of countries and regions was really sloppy.</p>	<p>The map is non-existent or consists of a scanned map to which KU has no rights, or it is copied from someone else's website.</p>	<p>There is no map.</p>
Quality of the Research	<p>The quality of the research is excellent. The</p>	<p>The quality of the research is really good.</p>	<p>The research did not rely exclusively on</p>	<p>The research is flawed and the</p>	<p>The research relied exclusively</p>

	<p>students used exclusively scholarly sources and captured the most pertinent and up to date literature. It is clearly evident that the material listed in the bibliography was well understood and considered. The research involved not only book research, but also very good attempts to solicit source materials from experts in the field or from archives. Where it was necessary students searched for similar objects in catalogs of various collections. All sources are cited properly using a standard citation method.</p>	<p>The students used scholarly sources, but perhaps included some material that is not wrong, but a bit outdated. The students relied to some extent on textbooks or tertiary sources. The overall presentation of the research is not as well organized, concise, or precise as that of an "A" website, but the result is still really quite good. The effort to obtain material from a scholar for inclusion on the website was good regardless of outcome. Sources are all cited, but there are small flaws in the bibliography.</p>	<p>scholarly sources but derives from texts that were not written by experts in the field. The students have included information obtained from other websites or relied very heavily on textbooks. However, the basic information is still correct. Sources are all cited, although there may be quite a few small mistakes in these citations and bibliography.</p>	<p>information provided in inaccurate. There are references to things that are not verifiable; some of the information provided misconstrues the information in scholarly text. The students relied on texts that were not written by experts. Most of the material came from websites. Sources are not cited accurately and not as amply as they should be. The students devised their own citation method rather than using a standard method.</p>	<p>on websites. Some paragraphs were plagiarized. The students do not convey accurate information. The students did not cite their sources, or they cited some of the sources, but not those from which text was copied.</p>
<p>Quality of the Writing</p>	<p>The texts are well written and well edited. Each article on the website provides an introduction, the text, and a short conclusion. The body of the text is well organized.</p>	<p>The texts are well composed and generally are similar to those of an "A" webpage, but there are small grammatical or spelling mistakes even in the last draft. The text is</p>	<p>The text provides adequate information, but it is poorly written. There was no or little effort at composing the essays. The information is just listed.</p>	<p>This text is poorly written. It lacks in overall composition and is full of grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. The</p>	<p>Nobody really can decipher what this is about.</p>

	<p>Thoughts flow from one to another nicely. There are no grammatical mistakes, nor any spelling mistakes. The language is sophisticated, i.e., the vocabulary is not limited to the verbs “to have” and “to be” and the students are using appropriate technical vocabulary derived from reading the scholarship.</p>	<p>basically acceptable, but it lacks the elegance of a well crafted text. Perhaps it does not flow as easily as it could, or perhaps the vocabulary is too rudimentary in places. It is still clear that efforts were made to compose essays and that editing occurred.</p>	<p>The text either lacks in terms of organization, overall composition, or in terms of the vocabulary. It reads a bit like texts written by high school students. Or, if the composition of the text is just fine, this text is too full of errors to be acceptable as a “B” level text. Editing has not really occurred.</p>	<p>vocabulary is rudimentary.</p>	
<p>Alternate Pages, e.g. MP3 sound files and/or video files</p>	<p>Where students were successful in obtaining permission to reproduce field photographs, video clips, or sound files, their sources are adequately acknowledged, the scholars are credited. The scholar’s specification as to use of the materials and captions was followed. Written permission for use of such material was obtained. <b>The feature that allows visitors to the website to download images was disabled for these particular</b></p>	<p>The students were able to obtain extra source materials of one kind or another, but there are some problems with the presentation of that material, either technical, in terms of permission letters, or appropriateness.</p>	<p>There are no extra source materials. The effort made to obtain such material was really minimal and the students have no documentation of such effort.</p>	<p>There are no such extra materials and there is no evidence that the students ever tried to obtain such materials.</p>	<p>The students don’t know what this is about.</p>

	<b>materials.</b>					
Webauthor Page	<b>The webauthor page is optional</b> , but creative use of this space is much appreciated and always appropriate.	same	Same	same	same	same
Contact with Scholars	Experts in the field were identified by the students. The final version of the scholar letter was sophisticated. The students made all the necessary attempts to contact a scholar and to establish a working relationship. <b>The degree of success in itself is not measured, since scholars are under no obligation to cooperate with us. The degree of effort and the degree of professionalism is measured.</b>	A real effort to contact scholars via mail, email or via an office visit was made, and the quality of that effort was completely adequate.	The effort to contact a scholar was minimal or the letters that were sent out were of poor quality.	No effort was made to contact a scholar.	Huh? The students don't have a clue. They never heard about this requirement.	
Quality of the Teamwork	The teamwork was flawless. All members of the team communicated with each other and with the instructor throughout the semester. Students were able to come to a	The teamwork almost worked flawlessly. Students made a real effort to communicate with each other and everybody was more or less on board.	The teamwork was problematic. Communication was flawed. Perhaps someone on the team had problems letting go of sole control or felt	The teamwork was a catastrophe. Students either were so unengaged that it caused a real problem for those students that did try	There was no team effort. The various team members barely know of each other.	

	<p>consensus where various options presented themselves. The work generally demonstrates that all team members had input and provided critical feedback to each other. Where quarrels arose, students were able to work them out. The focus of the group throughout was on the quality of the learning experience and the quality of the end product, not on individual's power struggle or on a grade.</p>	<p>Contributions made to the overall effort were a bit lopsided, but other team members made up for any slacking on the part of one particular member. This may have required some negotiations, but students were able to solve their issues with minimal input from the instructor.</p>	<p>particularly superior, bringing everybody else down. Perhaps one team member did not communicate or did not do his or her share of the work. The work was done by two or three members. The students who were fully engaged in the project were unable to work things out with members of the team who were slacking. Emotional problems arose that required major input from the instructor, but these were overcome.</p>	<p>to get the work done, or the emotional issues were so great that students went their own way and stopped trying to engage with other team members. Emotional problems were not overcome. Students were disrespectful towards each other.</p>	
--	---	---	---	---	--