

# English 282: Multimodal Composition for the Web

## Web Site Revision Grading

The class identified the following criteria for assessing web site revisions. Overall, students agreed that strong projects strategically use selected modes and design elements to address a clearly defined rhetorical situation. Moreover, they critically analyze revision choices and demonstrate the group's ability to apply textbook concepts and peer/instructor feedback.

### Information, Navigation, and Design Criteria

The revised site as a whole:

- Improves, eliminates, or addresses current site's shortcomings as identified by the group
- Clearly engages defined audiences, purposes, and/or contexts
- Strategically employs selected modes
- Features intuitive navigation that logically categorizes site pages
- Incorporates consistent color scheme, fonts, images, and basic layout
- Presents a visually appealing design that purposefully uses emphasis, contrast, organization, alignment, and proximity
- Conveys the group's key words
- Includes all required assignment components

### Rhetorical Awareness Criteria

The "About This Revision" page:

- Clearly distinguishes the revised site's academic context
- Insightfully analyzes the current site's rhetorical situation, strengths, and weaknesses
- Persuasively explains how the revised site effectively engages the rhetorical situation—particularly how it better serves the purposes and audiences defined by the group—improves the user experience, operates more efficiently, and looks more aesthetically pleasing
- Provides compelling evidence for analysis of current and revised site

### Group Process Criteria

The site and self/group assessment demonstrate that:

- The group has taken peer and instructor feedback into consideration when composing and revising the site
- Group members have fulfilled contract requirements
- Groups have effectively defined tasks, divided labor, and solved problems

- Each group member has contributed to the success of the project
- Each group member offers a complete, thoughtful, well-supported evaluation of the strengths, weaknesses, and contributions of himself/herself and fellow group members

## Grade Sheet

Group members will receive an individual grade that combines evaluation of the individually authored self/group assessment (20 points) and the collaboratively authored site revision (80 points). I will use the following grade sheet to assess performance on the criteria we outlined.

Failure to submit required drafts and participate in in-class peer review will result in a 10-point deduction from the final project grade, as the ability to consider and revise from feedback is an essential component of the course. Late final drafts will receive a 10-point deduction per day late, including weekends and holidays.

INFORMATION, NAVIGATION, DESIGN CRITERIA	STRONG	GOOD	ADEQUATE	POOR	MISSING
Improvement on current site					
Rhetorical situation engaged					
Choice and use of modes					
Navigation					
Appealing, consistent design					
Key words conveyed					
Completeness					
<b>RHETORICAL AWARENESS CRITERIA</b>					
Site context described					
Supported analysis of current site					
Supported analysis of revised site					
<b>GROUP PROCESS CRITERIA</b>					
Feedback addressed					
Contract requirements fulfilled					
Tasks, labor, and problem-solving					
Contribution					
Self and group assessment					

## **Point Ranges**

- 88-100 points: A range (3.5-4.0)
- 63-87 points: B range (2.5-3.4)
- 38-62 points: C range (1.5-2.4)
- 18-37 points: D range (.7-1.4)
- 0-17 points: F range (0-.6)