

Rubric for Student Resume (HTML Project)

This rubric evaluates the structure, content, accessibility, and clarity of a general student resume written in HTML. The focus is on creating a semantic, accessible, and well-organized document that is compatible across browsers. Each criterion is graded on a 4-point scale:

- **4 = Excellent:** Fully meets expectations with no errors.
 - **3 = Good:** Meets most expectations with minor errors.
 - **2 = Needs Improvement:** Partially meets expectations but has significant issues.
 - **1 = Poor:** Fails to meet expectations or is incomplete.
-

Criteria

1. HTML Structure and Organization

- **4:** Proper use of semantic tags (e.g., `<header>`, `<section>`, `<footer>`) to create a clear, logical structure. All sections (e.g., personal information, objective, education, skills, and experience) are well-organized.
 - **3:** Most sections are organized with semantic tags, but some tags may be misused or missing.
 - **2:** Minimal use of semantic tags; the structure is unclear or difficult to follow.
 - **1:** No semantic tags; content is presented in a disorganized or chaotic manner.
-

2. Completeness of Content

- **4:** All essential resume sections (e.g., Header, Objective, Education, Skills, Projects, Work/Volunteer Experience, Extracurricular Activities) are present and contain relevant, detailed information.
 - **3:** Most sections are present, but one or two may lack detail or relevance.
 - **2:** Several sections are incomplete or missing, affecting the overall quality.
 - **1:** Content is significantly incomplete or missing key sections.
-

3. Accessibility

- **4:** Follows best practices for accessibility, including:
 - Proper semantic tags.
 - Logical heading hierarchy (e.g., `<h1>` for the main name, `<h2>` for section titles).
 - Descriptive text where applicable.

- **3:** Accessibility is mostly addressed but contains minor issues, such as inconsistent heading levels or unclear grouping.
 - **2:** Limited attention to accessibility; important practices like semantic tags or heading hierarchy are not fully implemented.
 - **1:** No accessibility considerations; the document is difficult to navigate for assistive technologies.
-

4. Readability and Compatibility

- **4:** Clean and readable HTML code, properly indented and commented. Compatible across modern browsers with no errors.
 - **3:** Mostly clean and readable code but may contain minor formatting or compatibility issues.
 - **2:** Code is difficult to read due to poor formatting or lacks compatibility with some browsers.
 - **1:** Code is messy, unreadable, or contains significant errors that affect compatibility.
-

5. Appropriate Use of Tags

- **4:** Uses appropriate tags for all content, such as:
 - `<h1>` for the main heading.
 - `` or `` for lists.
 - `<p>` for paragraphs.
 - **3:** Mostly uses appropriate tags but may include a few misused or unnecessary elements.
 - **2:** Frequently misuses tags or uses non-semantic elements (e.g., `<div>` or `` instead of meaningful semantic tags).
 - **1:** Tags are largely inappropriate or absent, with reliance on non-semantic or outdated elements.
-

6. Document Metadata

- **4:** Includes essential metadata, such as:
 - `<!DOCTYPE html>`
 - `<html lang="en">`
 - `<meta charset="UTF-8">`
 - `<meta name="viewport">`
 - `<title>` (with a relevant title for the resume).
 - **3:** Includes most essential metadata but may omit one or two key elements.
 - **2:** Minimal metadata is included, with important omissions affecting compatibility.
 - **1:** Metadata is missing or incorrect.
-

7. Clarity of Purpose

- **4:** The resume's purpose is clear, presenting the student's information, skills, and achievements in a way that aligns with general resume conventions and expectations.
 - **3:** The purpose is mostly clear, but one or two sections may feel out of place or incomplete.
 - **2:** The purpose is partially conveyed but lacks focus or includes irrelevant content.
 - **1:** The purpose is unclear or misaligned with the project goals.
-

Grading Example

Criterion	Points
HTML Structure and Organization	4
Completeness of Content	3
Accessibility	4
Readability and Compatibility	3
Appropriate Use of Tags	4
Document Metadata	4
Clarity of Purpose	4
Total Points	26/28