

## Web 2.0 Grading Rubric- Winter 2011 PED 307

Score  CRITERIA and STANDARDS	<b>Distinguished</b> An assignment in this category shows a <b>superior</b> command of the assignment and web 2.0 technologies.  It exhibits some or all of the following characteristics:	<b>Target</b> An assignment in this category shows an <b>adequate</b> command of the assignment and web 2.0 technologies.  It exhibits some or all of the following characteristics:	<b>Basic</b> An assignment in this category shows a <b>less than adequate</b> command of the assignment and web 2.0 technologies.  It exhibits some or all of the following characteristics:	<b>Unsatisfactory</b> An assignment in this category shows a <b>consistent pattern of weakness</b> in completing the assignment and web 2.0 technologies.  It exhibits some or all of the following characteristics:
Focus, Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ responds to the prompt</li> <li>○ appropriate to the audience</li> <li>○ single, distinct focus</li> <li>○ generally well-developed ideas, narrative or project.</li> <li>○ logical flow of ideas or events</li> <li>○ creative choice of Web 2.0</li> <li>○ sense of completeness</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ responds to the prompt,</li> <li>○ appropriate to the audience,</li> <li>○ focus not clear at every point,</li> <li>○ some main points underdeveloped,</li> <li>○ ideas may not be in the most effective order,</li> <li>○ Appropriate choice of Web 2.0</li> <li>○ sense of completeness.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ responds partially to the prompt but is off target in some way,</li> <li>○ may not show evidence of attentiveness to audience,</li> <li>○ focus on topic not consistently sustained,</li> <li>○ some lack of distinction between main ideas and details,</li> <li>○ order of ideas not effective,</li> <li>○ Generic or basic choice of Web 2.0</li> <li>○ The piece seems incomplete.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ evidence of attempt to respond to prompt,</li> <li>○ no evidence of attentiveness to audience,</li> <li>○ focus on topic not sustained,</li> <li>○ Inappropriate choice of Web 2.0</li> <li>○ piece is not complete.</li> </ul>
Elaboration, Support, Style of Web 2.0 choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ each main idea supported by details; narrative/project is brought to life by details,</li> <li>○ all details related to topic</li> <li>○ choice of details effective,</li> <li>○ Web 2.0 technology choice was explained/described using effective words, pictures, and provided appropriate meaning to the project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ each main idea supported by details, but details in some paragraphs may be sketchy; narrative details sufficient to flesh out events,</li> <li>○ all details related to topic</li> <li>○ some details not used effectively,</li> <li>○ Web 2.0 technology choice was adequately explained/described using effective words, pictures, and provided general meaning to the project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ uneven development; narrative details sketchy</li> <li>○ details may appear to be listed rather than integrated into coherent flow</li> <li>○ some details are irrelevant</li> <li>○ Web 2.0 technology choice was partially explained/described sometimes using effective words, pictures, and did not always provided appropriate meaning to the project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ half or more of main ideas not supported by details,</li> <li>○ half or more details may be irrelevant,</li> <li>○ Web 2.0 technology choice was not explained/described using effective words, pictures, and did not provided appropriate meaning to the project.</li> </ul>
Grammar, Usage, Mechanics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ sophisticated and consistent command of Standard English,</li> <li>○ free of spelling, capitalization, and usage errors,</li> <li>○ precise syntax,</li> <li>○ competence in coordination and subordination,</li> <li>○ Few, if any, errors in punctuation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ number and type of errors not sufficient to interfere with meaning,</li> <li>○ consistent command of Standard English,</li> <li>○ few, if any, spelling, capitalization, or usage errors,</li> <li>○ competence in coordination and subordination.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ number and type of errors may interfere with meaning at some points,</li> <li>○ weaknesses in command of Standard English</li> <li>○ some spelling, capitalization, or usage errors,</li> <li>○ some fragments or run-ons,</li> <li>○ some errors in punctuation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ number and type of errors obscure meaning,</li> <li>○ inadequate grasp of Standard English,</li> <li>○ frequent errors in spelling, capitalization, and usage,</li> <li>○ many run-ons or fragments,</li> <li>○ serious and frequent punctuation errors.</li> </ul>