|  | **Excellent** | **Good** | **Satisfactory** | **Needs Improvement** | **Inadequate** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Responsive Design** | The website is fully responsive across all devices and screen sizes. CSS is effectively used to ensure seamless adaptation of layout and content. | The website is mostly responsive, with minor issues on certain devices or screen sizes. CSS adaptation is generally effective but may have some inconsistencies. | The website shows basic responsiveness but has notable issues on various devices or screen sizes. CSS adaptation is limited and may not provide an optimal viewing experience. | The website lacks responsiveness, with significant issues across devices and screen sizes. CSS adaptation is minimal, resulting in a poor viewing experience on many devices. | The website is not responsive and does not adapt to different devices or screen sizes. CSS use is inadequate. |
| **User-friendly Interface** | The interface is highly intuitive and user-friendly, with clear navigation menus, well-organised content sections, and interactive elements that enhance user engagement. | The interface is generally intuitive and user-friendly, with clear navigation menus and organized content sections. Some interactive elements may lack polish. | The interface is somewhat intuitive and user-friendly but may be confusing for some users. Navigation menus and content sections need improvement for clarity. Interactive elements are limited. | The interface lacks intuitiveness and user-friendliness, making navigation difficult for users. Navigation menus and content sections are disorganised. Interactive elements are minimal or ineffective. | The interface is not intuitive or user-friendly, hindering navigation and user engagement. |
| **Dynamic Content** | Dynamic content is seamlessly implemented using JavaScript and PHP, enhancing user experience with features such as client-side form validation, dynamic page elements, and server-side scripting for form submissions. | Dynamic content is implemented effectively using JavaScript and PHP, with some minor issues or limitations. Most features work as intended, providing a satisfactory user experience. | Dynamic content implementation is basic, with noticeable limitations or errors in JavaScript and PHP functionality. Some features may not work reliably, affecting user experience. | Dynamic content implementation is inadequate, with significant errors or limitations in JavaScript and PHP functionality. Many features do not work properly, diminishing user experience. | Dynamic content is not effectively implemented, with critical errors or omissions in JavaScript and PHP functionality, rendering key features unusable. |
| **Overall Presentation** | The website demonstrates excellent design and functionality, exceeding expectations in both aesthetic appeal and user experience. | The website presents itself well, with a cohesive design and functional elements that meet expectations for aesthetic appeal and user experience. | The website has a decent presentation but lacks polish in design and functionality, requiring some improvements to enhance aesthetic appeal and user experience. | The website's presentation is below average, with noticeable flaws in design and functionality that detract from its overall appeal and usability. Significant improvements are needed. | The website's presentation is poor, with numerous flaws in design and functionality that make it unappealing and difficult to use. Substantial revisions are necessary for improvement. |
| **Documentation and Code Quality** | The code is well-documented, following best practices and standards for readability, maintainability, and efficiency. Comments provide clear explanations of code logic and functionality. | The code is adequately documented, following some best practices and standards for readability, maintainability, and efficiency. Comments provide basic explanations of code logic and functionality. | The code lacks sufficient documentation and may not adhere to best practices and standards for readability, maintainability, and efficiency. Comments are sparse or unclear in explaining code logic and functionality. | The code is poorly documented and does not follow best practices or standards for readability, maintainability, and efficiency. Comments are absent or inadequate in explaining code logic and functionality. | The code is undocumented and poorly structured, making it difficult to understand and maintain. Comments are absent, leaving code logic and functionality unclear. |
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