# WEBQUEST EVALUATION

|  | RUDIMENTARY (1 point) | AVERAGE (3 points) | ABOVE AVERAGE (6 points) | SCORE |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| OVERALL VISUAL APPEAL | Graphics are poor quality. Multimedia is not relevant to project. Font makes project difficult to read. | Pleasing to the eye. Some clever visual elements. | Contains high-res graphics and informative multimedia. Fonts easy to read. Layout is clear. Looks like fun something evaluator would want to learn from. | 6 |
| INTRODUCTION | Stated fact that students need to know something. No interactive material. | Introduction to project is vague. Some interactive material. | Engaging introduction with a clear purpose. Introduces interactive material. | 6 |
| TASK | Task is vaguely detailed. Student and evaluator unclear about assignment. | Task is somewhat clear but needs more development. Student still has some questions. | Task is clear to both student and evaluator. Directions exhibit understanding that this format may be new for majority of students. | 6 |
| PROCESS | Not quite sure what the steps are that students should follow. No individual roles for students to take. | Some steps are explained but may still confuse students. Roles are assigned, but may be unclear. | Every step is clearly explained in terms that students can understand. Roles are clever and allow students to truly role play. | 6 |
| RESOURCES | Few online resources used. Most are low quality that do not connect directly to the topic. | Some online resources that are informative but may not be directly related to topic. | Rich depth in online and print resources. Links are high quality with relevant information and posed questions that require critical thinking to answer. | 6 |
| EVALUATION | It is unclear how students will be evaluated or the objectives are not able to be measured. | Student criteria for success is somewhat described. | Clear rubric explains levels of success so that students can easily and accurately self-evaluate. | 5 |

# WEBQUEST EVALUATION

| | RUDIMENTARY (1 point) | AVERAGE (3 points) | ABOVE AVERAGE (6 points) | SCORE |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| OVERALL VISUAL APPEAL | Graphics are poor quality. Multimedia is not relevant to project. Font makes project difficult to read. | Pleasing to the eye. Some clever visual elements. | Contains high-res graphics and informative multimedia. Fonts easy to read. Layout is clear. Looks like fun something evaluator would want to learn from. | |
| INTRODUCTION | Stated fact that students need to know something. No interactive material. | Introduction to project is vague. Some interactive material. | Engaging introduction with a clear purpose. Introduces interactive material. | |
| TASK | Task is vaguely detailed. Student and evaluator unclear about assignment. | Task is somewhat clear but needs more development. Student still has some questions. | Task is clear to both student and evaluator. Directions exhibit understanding that this format may be new for majority of students. | |
| PROCESS | Not quite sure what the steps are that students should follow. No individual roles for students to take. | Some steps are explained but may still confuse students. Roles are assigned, but may be unclear. | Every step is clearly explained in terms that students can understand. Roles are clever and allow students to truly role play. | |
| RESOURCES | Few online resources used. Most are low quality that do not connect directly to the topic. | Some online resources that are informative but may not be directly related to topic. | Rich depth in online and print resources. Links are high quality with relevant information and posed questions that require critical thinking to answer. | |
| EVALUATION | It is unclear how students will be evaluated or the objectives are not able to be measured. | Student criteria for success is somewhat described. | Clear rubric explains levels of success so that students can easily and accurately self-evaluate. | |