



# Preview Rubric

## Project 2

Functionality	Excellent 10 points	Good 7.5 points	Fair 5 points	Poor 2.5 points	None 0 points	Criterion Score
API	Good use is made of the chosen API and the results are displayed on the page in a clear and useful way.	Content from the API is displayed on the page to mostly good effect.	Content from the API is displayed on the screen, but it's not easy to understand what it means.	Something is displayed on the screen that may or may not come from the API, but it doesn't make sense.	No content is coming from an API.	/ 10
Local Storage	Local storage is used to keep track of (if it makes sense) the last used search term and it is properly display and/or updated with each new search. There may be additional items stored in local storage.	Something is stored and retrieved from local storage, but something about it not well implemented.	Local storage only partially works... Potentially having issues with either saving the data or restoring it.	Local storage does not work, but we can see evidence in your code that you attempted to make it work.	There is no local storage functionality at all.	/ 10
Controls	A minimum of 3 controls (counting the search field and submit button only once) are present and fully functional.	3 or more controls are present, but they do not function as intended.	2 or fewer controls are present, but what's there works properly.	There's at least 1 control and it works.	There are no functional controls.	/ 10
Error-free	No JavaScript errors or exceptions are thrown by the app.	A small error is in evidence, but it does not effect the way that the app functions.	There is at least one error or exception thrown that negatively impacts the functionality of the app.	There are multiple errors that effect the functionality of the app.	The app has so many errors that it is unable to function.	/ 10

Technical Expectations	Precisely Correct 10 points	Mostly Correct 7.5 points	Somewhat Flawed 5 points	Seriously Flawed 2.5 points	Not done 0 points	Criterion Score
Code	The JavaScript and CSS (both stored externally) are neatly formatted, well commented, and follow required code standards such as use of let and const, querySelector(), D.R.Y, etc.	There is either embedded code, a poorly formatted or commented portion of code, or the use of var or getElementByld and the like.	There are multiple instances of either embedded code, a poorly formatted or commented portion of code, or the use of var or getElementByld and the like.	The code has no comments at all and or complete chaos in terms of it's formatting.	The code is either definitely not your own code or is technically unreadable due to a misconfiguration, etc.	/ 10

HTML & CSS	Excellent 4 points	Good 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 1 point	None 0 points	Criterion Score
Semantic structure	Meaningful semantic elements (<nav>, <header>, <footer>, <section>, <aside>, etc) and other elements (such as headings and lists) are used to organize and structure the content.	There are some key semantic elements in used such as <nav> and <main>, but that's about it. Headings and lists are used when appropriate.	Basic HTML structural code is present and generic tags such as <div> and <span> are used, but not really any semantic elements.	There's structure, but just rudimentary block elements such as paragraphs and lists.	No HTML, really.	/ 4
Valid	HTML validates	HTML validates with	HTML has one error	HTML has multiple	HTML fails	/ 4

Valid HTML	HTML validates perfectly, and any warnings are unavoidable.	HTML validates with warnings that should have been addressed.	HTML has one error that did not effect the display of the page.	HTML has multiple errors and/or warnings that (for the most part) don't effect the display of the page.	HTML fails validation and page display fails because of it.	/ 4
Valid CSS	CSS Validates with no errors or warnings.	CSS Validates with no errors and one or more warnings that should have been addressed.	CSS has one minor error that doesn't affect the page display.	CSS has more than one error and the display is affected as a result.	Validation fails completely.	/ 4

Look and Feel	Excellent 8 points	Good 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 2 points	None 0 points	Criterion Score
Visual Design	Has a very pleasing graphic design that looks nothing like the GIF Finder Homework's original design.	Has a passing resemblance to the GIF Finder exercise and/or has a couple of minor visual design problems that keep it from being very pleasing.	Either looks too similar to the GIF Finder or has one or more major detractors that should have been corrected.	This is basically GIF Finder with no customization.	There is no noticeable attempt to apply visual design to the project.	/ 8
Interaction Design	Interactive elements are well-labeled and work as expected. The user is kept aware of the state of the app & when they make an input error.	Either the interactive elements are slightly confusing in the way they are labeled or how they work OR the information given back to the user about the state of the app or errors they have made is lacking.	There are issues with both interactive element usability and with the error/state information .	Without carefully following written instructions, we might not have been able to figure out or understand how this project worked.	We have no idea how to use this project.	/ 8
Responsive Design	The app is fully responsive or at least, it works well in a 1024x768 pixel window. An appropriate technology such as Flexbox, Grid, or another CSS Framework is used to give the page an appropriate layout.	The design shows some signs of being responsive, but has minor issues when trying to view at narrower screen sizes (as small as 1024px)	There are layout problems that require scrolling or enlarging browser windows in order for the functionality to be used.	This app only works if the browser window is greater than 1024px wide.	No matter what we try, we can't get the page to layout and work properly.	/ 8

Submission	Both submitted on time. 8 points	Project not ready for critique. 4 points	GitHub content not submitted. 4 points	Neither submitted. 0 points	Criterion Score
Checkpoints deliverables	Both the proposal was submitted and the project was ready for critique.	We received your proposal, but your project was not ready for critique.	Your project was ready for critique, but we never received your project proposal	We never got your proposal and your project was not ready for critique.	/ 8

Other	Complete 6 points	Partial 3 points	None 0 points	Criterion Score
Documentation	The documentation page of your site includes a description of your overall process and resources/ tutorials used. It provides citations for all information, images, and other media used. It also includes information about any special efforts or features that you want us to notice.	Little information is given about your process, resources, or special features, however you did provide citations/links to content that was not your own.	You have no documentation page and/or did not provide citations to images that were obviously not your own.	/ 6

Total	/ 100
-------	-------

## Overall Score

<b>A</b> 90 points minimum	<b>B</b> 80 points minimum	<b>C</b> 70 points minimum	<b>D</b> 65 points minimum	<b>F</b> 0 points minimum
-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------

