



## Task and Process Evaluation Rubric

	Beginning (1)	Developing (2)	Accomplished (3)	Score
<b>Introduction</b>				
<b>Topic Instructional Value</b>	Does not relate to curriculum outcomes AND is not suitable for the specified age level	Does not relate to curriculum outcomes OR is not suitable for the specified age level	Suitable for use with the specified subject and age level	
<b>Motivational Effectiveness of Introduction.</b> <b>Engaging Opening</b>	The Introduction is not engaging. The introduction is purely factual, with no appeal to relevance or social importance	The Introduction is engaging and relates somewhat to the learner's interests and/or describes a compelling question or problem.	The introduction draws the reader into the lesson by relating to the learner's interests or goals and/or by engagingly describing a compelling question or problem.	
<b>Cognitive Effectiveness of the Introduction.</b> <b>Do the students understand what they will do?</b>	The introduction doesn't prepare the reader for what is to come, or build on what the learner already knows.	The introduction makes some reference to learner's prior knowledge and previews to some extent what the lesson is about.	The introduction builds on learner's prior knowledge and effectively prepares the learner by foreshadowing what the lesson is about.  The Introduction foreshadows new concepts and principles that will be learned in the WebQuest.	
<b>Task (The task is the end result of student efforts... not the steps involved in getting there.)</b>				
<b>Task/ Culminating Activity</b>	The Task does not define the product that the students will complete.  The criteria for the task are not indicated.	The Task defines an authentic product that the students will complete in teams. The task requires analysis. The product relates to the Focus/Essential Question and the objective being addressed. The product allows opportunity for application and original thinking. The product requires students to use technology.	The Task defines several authentic products that the students can choose from. The students will complete the product by working in teams. The task requires analysis and synthesis. The product relates to the Focus/Essential Question and the objective being addressed. The product allows opportunity for application and original thinking. The product requires students to use technology.	

<b>Process</b> (The process is the step-by-step description of how students will accomplish the task.)				
<b>Clarity of Process</b>	Process is not clearly stated. Students would not know exactly what they were supposed to do just from reading this.	Some directions are given, but there is missing information. Students might be confused.	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>Process/ instructional Activities</b>	The Process does not provide students with the opportunity to receive feedback from others.	The Process provides students with the opportunity to receive feedback from the teacher. The Process requires higher order thinking skills.	The Process provides students with the opportunity to receive feedback from the teacher and other students. The Process provides an opportunity for students to work individually and cooperatively in multiple groups. The Process requires higher order thinking skills.	
<b>Role Descriptions</b>	The Process does not identify the roles that students will choose from. Step by step instructions for each role are not provided.	The Process identifies the roles that students will choose from. Step by step instructions for each role are provided. Roles are "real-world." Roles require interdependent teamwork.	The Process identifies the roles that students will choose from. Roles provide multiple perspectives from which to view the topic. Step by step instructions for each role are provided. Roles are "real-world" and match the issues and resources. Roles require interdependent teamwork.	

### Overall Comment:

Adapted from:

Ozline.com & March, T. "Assessing Webquests." Ozline.com / Web and Flow, 26 June 2003.  
<http://www.ozline.com/webquests/rubric.html> (20 July 2003)

Bellofatto, L. & Bhol, N. & Casey, M. & Krill, M. & Dodge, B. "A Rubric for Evaluating Webquests." San Diego State University, 19 June 2001. <http://webquest.sdsu.edu/webquestrubric.html> (20 July 2003)

Willson, K. "Webquest Evaluation Rubric." Atlantic County ETTC, 12 April 2001.  
<http://www.etc.net/workshops/webquest/rubric.htm> (20 July 2003)