

ECMP 355 – WebQuest Assessment Rubric

	Unacceptable (1) Not a WebQuest	Low: (2) A Poor example of WebQuest	Medium: (3) A Solid Draft	High: (4) Excellent Example
Engaging Opening	No attempt made to appeal to learners.	Some attempt made to appeal to learners.	Honestly attempts to appeal to student interests.	Uses effective strategies that appeals to student interest.
The Question /Task	True Lower Level Question or Task. Not suitable for a WebQuest.	Fuzzy Question or Task. Perhaps what is asked for is a lower-level thinking objective.	The Question and Task target show higher order thinking skills, but may not be totally clear.	Clear Question and Task. These naturally flow from the introduction and signal direction for learning.
Background for Everyone	No attempt to access prior learning or build common background.	Some mention of addressing a common body of knowledge. (May not happen within the activity.)	A strong attempt to address a common body of knowledge however, the body is inappropriate to the learning objective.	Clearly calls attention to the need for a common foundation of knowledge and provides needed (Web?) resources.
Roles / Expertise	There are no roles created for the WebQuest. There is no interdependent teamwork involved.	Roles are artificial or not requiring interdependent teamwork.	Roles are clear. They may be limited in scope	Roles match the issues and resources. The roles provide multiple perspectives from which to view the topic.
Use of the Web	This activity could probably be done better without the Web.	Some resources reflect features of the Web that make it particularly useful.	Uses the Web to access at least some of the following: interactivity, multiple perspectives, current information, etc.	Uses the web to access all of the following: interactivity, multiple perspectives, current information, etc.
Transformative Thinking	No Transformative thinking. (This is not a WebQuest, but may be a good Treasure Hunt).	Some attempt at higher level thinking, although the attempt is ill-conceived.	Higher level thinking is required, but the process for students may not be clear.	Higher level thinking required to construct new meaning. Scaffolding is clearly provided to support student achievement.
Real World Feedback	No feedback loop included.	The learning product could easily be used for authentic assessment although this may not be mentioned.	Some feedback loop is included in the Web page. May include a rubric	The feedback loop is included and works well to authentically assess of direct feedback.
Conclusion	Lacking any authentic conclusion. WebQuest is left in limbo.	Minimal conclusion. No mention of student thinking or symmetry to intro.	Sums up the experiences and learning that was undertaken. Probably returns to the intro ideas.	Clear tie-in to the intro. Makes the students' cognitive tasks overt and suggests how this learning could transfer to other domains/issues.
Aesthetics	The look and feel of the product is minimally acceptable or unacceptable.	There needs to be a strong improvement in the look and feel of the product.	There needs to be a slight improvement in the look and feel of the product.	The product has an excellent overall look and feel.
Navigation	Navigation is unacceptably confusing and users tend to have difficulty.	Navigation is difficult to learn, but once attained, easy to use.	Navigation is easy, but occasionally one is lost.	Navigation of the Webquest is easy and intuitive.

Overall Comments: