Web Project Deliverable 04: Group Project Assessment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Part 1** | | **Part 2** | | | |
|  | **Task**  **Compliance** | **Solution** | **Competence** | **HTML Validation** | **Organization** | **Language and Communication** |
| **Excellent** | Fully addresses all aspects of the assignment description. Stays on task throughout. | Identifies and describes a highly relevant and clear problem. Problem clearly stated and the proposed solution is highly relevant, appropriate and feasible. | Displays evidence of advanced technical web design knowledge, insight and competence. The work appears to be highly advanced and / or innovative. | All pages validate to at least **90%** according to http://checkers.eiii.eu/ | Organization is fully clear, logical, appropriate and effective for the topic. Content is well structured and laid out. Website is a single cohesive piece of work in style and presentation. In other words, the site has one consistent theme. | Presentation of ideas extremely clear and coherent. |
| **Very Good** | Fully addresses all aspects of the assignment description. Some small digressions. | Identifies and describes a relevant and clear problem. Problem clearly stated and the proposed solution is relevant, appropriate and feasible. | Displays evidence of a good level of technical web design knowledge insight and competence. The work appears to be advanced and / or innovative. | All pages validate to at least **80%** according to http://checkers.eiii.eu/ | Organization is clear, logical, appropriate and effective for the topic. Content is well structured and laid out. Website is a single cohesive piece of work in style and presentation. | Presentation of ideas clear and coherent. |
| **Good** | Addresses the assignment but may not fully develop all parts of the assignment description or contains multiple digressions. | Identifies and provides an essentially clear problem. Problem is generally clear and the proposed solution is essentially relevant, appropriate and feasible. | Displays evidence of good web design insight and shows good technical knowledge, The work shows touches of creativity and innovative thinking. | All pages validate to at least **70%** according to http://checkers.eiii.eu/ | Organization is appropriate and effective for the topic but occasionally fragmented or unclear. Content is well structured and laid out. Website is largely cohesive in style and presentation. | Presentation of ideas generally clear and coherent. |
| **Fair** | Addresses parts of the assignment, but does not address the project description directly. Obvious digressions throughout the assignment. | Identifies a largely relevant problem but the problem is somewhat vaguely defined. The proposed solution is not entirely relevant, appropriate or feasible given the problem description. | Displays evidence of fairly good web design insight and shows fairly good knowledge of the subject. Some key technical aspects misunderstood or incomplete. Occasional attempts at creative / innovative thinking. | All pages validate to at least **60%** according to http://checkers.eiii.eu/ | Organization is not entirely appropriate or effective for the topic. Content is occasionally poorly structured, with design issues. Parts of the website are fragmented. | Presentation of ideas is occasionally unclear. |
| **Poor** | Lacks focus, with no evidence of addressing the assignment description itself. | Identifies a largely relevant problem but the problem is insufficiently detailed or unclear. The proposed solution is not appropriate or feasible. | Displays evidence of sufficient web design insight and shows sufficient knowledge of the subject. Key technical aspects are misunderstood, ncomplete or missing. Little or no innovative thinking evident. | All pages validate to at least **50%** according to http://checkers.eiii.eu/ | Shows evidence of significant issues with choice and implementation of appropriate structure, which makes content difficult to follow. Considerable issues with structure and logical flow. | Presentation of ideas unclear and confusing. |
| **Very Poor** | Does not address the assignment description. Off-topic throughout the assignment. Work does not meet the minimum criteria expected. | Inappropriate/poorly described problem. The proposed solution is irrelevant, inappropriate or infeasible given the problem. Work does not meet the minimum criteria expected | Lacks evidence of web design knowledge or insight above that expected of a novice. Work does not meet the minimum criteria expected. | Any page validates at **40%** or lower according to http://checkers.eiii.eu/ | Entire website is fragmented and shows little or no evidence of systematic organization and structure. Work does not meet the minimum criteria expected. | Only basic and elementary meanings are conveyed; sometimes indecipherable. Work does not meet the minimum criteria expected. |