

# A Rubric for Evaluating WebQuests

WebQuest format can be applied to a variety of teaching situations. If you take advantage of all the possibilities inherent in the format, your students will have a rich and powerful experience. This rubric will help you pinpoint the ways in which your WebQuest isn't doing everything it could do. **If a page seems to fall between categories, feel free to score it with in-between points.**

	Beginning	Developing	Accomplished	Score
<b>Overall Aesthetics</b> (This refers to the WebQuest page itself, not the external resources linked to it.)				
<b>Overall Visual Appeal</b>	0 points There are few or no graphic elements. No variation in layout or typography. OR Color is garish and/or typographic variations are overused and legibility suffers. Background interferes with the readability.	2 points Graphic elements sometimes, but not always, contribute to the understanding of concepts, ideas and relationships. There is some variation in type size, color, and layout.	4 points Appropriate and thematic graphic elements are used to make visual connections that contribute to the understanding of concepts, ideas and relationships. Differences in type size and/or color are used well and consistently. See <a href="#">Fine Points Checklist</a> .	
<b>Navigation &amp; Flow</b>	0 points Getting through the lesson is confusing and unconventional. Pages can't be found easily and/or the way back isn't clear.	2 points There are a few places where the learner can get lost and not know where to go next.	4 points Navigation is seamless. It is always clear to the learner what all the pieces are and how to get to them.	
<b>Mechanical Aspects</b>	0 points There are more than 5 broken links, misplaced or missing images, badly sized tables, misspellings and/or grammatical errors.	1 point There are some broken links, misplaced or missing images, badly sized tables, misspellings and/or grammatical errors.	2 points No mechanical problems noted. See <a href="#">Fine Points Checklist</a> .	
<b>Introduction</b>				
<b>Motivational Effectiveness of Introduction</b>	0 points The introduction is purely factual, with no appeal to relevance or social importance OR The scenario posed is transparently bogus and doesn't respect the media literacy of today's learners.	1 point The introduction relates somewhat to the learner's interests and/or describes a compelling question or problem.	2 points The introduction draws the reader into the lesson by relating to the learner's interests or goals and/or engagingly describing a compelling question or problem.	

# A Rubric for Evaluating WebQuests

<b>Cognitive Effectiveness of the Introduction</b>	0 points The introduction doesn't prepare the reader for what is to come, or build on what the learner already knows.	1 point The introduction makes some reference to learner's prior knowledge and previews to some extent what the lesson is about.	2 points The introduction builds on learner's prior knowledge and effectively prepares the learner by foreshadowing what the lesson is about.	
<b>Task</b> (The task is the end result of student efforts... not the steps involved in getting there.)				
<b>Connection of Task to Standards</b>	0 points The task is not related to standards.	2 point The task is referenced to standards but is not clearly connected to what students must know and be able to do to achieve proficiency of those standards.	4 points The task is referenced to standards and is clearly connected to what students must know and be able to do to achieve proficiency of those standards.	
<b>Cognitive Level of the Task</b>	0 points Task requires simply comprehending or retelling of information found on web pages and answering factual questions.	3 points Task is doable but is limited in its significance to students' lives. The task requires analysis of information and/or putting together information from several sources.	6 points Task is doable and engaging, and elicits thinking that goes beyond rote comprehension. The task requires synthesis of multiple sources of information, and/or taking a position, and/or going beyond the data given and making a generalization or creative product. See <a href="#">WebQuest Taskonomy</a> .	
<b>Process</b> (The process is the step-by-step description of how students will accomplish the task.)				
<b>Clarity of Process</b>	0 points Process is not clearly stated. Students would not know exactly what they were supposed to do just from reading this.	2 points Some directions are given, but there is missing information. Students might be confused.	4 points Every step is clearly stated. Most students would know exactly where they are at each step of the process and know what to do next.	
<b>Scaffolding of Process</b>	0 points The process lacks strategies and organizational tools needed for students to gain the knowledge needed to complete the task. Activities are of little significance to one another and/or to the accomplishment of the task.	3 points Strategies and organizational tools embedded in the process are insufficient to ensure that all students will gain the knowledge needed to complete the task. Some of the activities do not relate specifically to the accomplishment of the task.	6 points The process provides students coming in at different entry levels with strategies and organizational tools to access and gain the knowledge needed to complete the task. Activities are clearly related and designed to take the students from basic knowledge to higher-level thinking. Checks for understanding are built in to assess whether students are getting it. See: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Process Guides</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">A Taxonomy of Information Patterns</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Language Arts Standards and Technology</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">WebQuest Enhancement Tools</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Reception</a>, <a href="#">Transformation</a> &amp; <a href="#">Production</a> Scaffolds</li> </ul>	

# A Rubric for Evaluating WebQuests

<b>Richness of Process</b>	0 points Few steps, no separate roles assigned.	1 point Some separate tasks or roles assigned. More complex activities required.	2 points Different roles are assigned to help students understand different perspectives and/or share responsibility in accomplishing the task.	
<b>Resources</b> (Note: you should evaluate all resources linked to the page, even if they are in sections other than the Process block. Also note that books, video and other off-line resources can and should be used where appropriate.)				
<b>Relevance &amp; Quantity of Resources</b>	0 points Resources provided are not sufficient for students to accomplish the task. OR There are too many resources for learners to look at in a reasonable time.	2 point There is some connection between the resources and the information needed for students to accomplish the task. Some resources don't add anything new.	4 points There is a clear and meaningful connection between all the resources and the information needed for students to accomplish the task. Every resource carries its weight.	
<b>Quality of Resources</b>	0 points Links are mundane. They lead to information that could be found in a classroom encyclopedia.	2 points Some links carry information not ordinarily found in a classroom.	4 points Links make excellent use of the Web's timeliness and colorfulness. Varied resources provide enough meaningful information for students to think deeply.	
<b>Evaluation</b>				
<b>Clarity of Evaluation Criteria</b>	0 points Criteria for success are not described.	3 points Criteria for success are at least partially described.	6 points Criteria for success are clearly stated in the form of a rubric. Criteria include qualitative as well as quantitative descriptors. The evaluation instrument clearly measures what students must know and be able to do to accomplish the task. See <a href="#">Creating a Rubric</a> .	
<b>Total Score</b>				<b>/50</b>

Original WebQuest rubric by [Bernie Dodge](#).

This is Version 1.03. Modified by Laura Bellofatto, Nick Bohl, Mike Casey, Marsha Krill, and Bernie Dodge and last updated on June 19, 2001.