

Grade	Site design	Artifacts' significance	Theoretical positioning	Clarity of Claim	Evidence	Structure	Citations and prose	Total
A	Site has a clear identity; contributors are clearly identified; very easy to navigate; easily consumable visuals	Clearly articulates the cultural significance of the artifact and connects that significance to broader themes. [1] [2] [3]	Clearly positions the artifact in terms of theories we've discussed in this course; connects to broader themes. [1] [2] [3]	Claims are clear, easily identifiable and innovative [1] [2] [3]	Very close readings of digital artifact. Concise, clear, rich summaries of theory. Very clear relation of theory to digital artifact. [1] [2] [3]	Logical flow, in service of identifiable argument; Clearly identifiable structure that carries the reader through the argument; Transitions in service of a broader argument; Very strong topic sentences [1] [2] [3]	-Excellent grammar, punctuation and diction. -Minimal to no spelling errors, no run-on-sentences or comma splices. [1] [2] [3]	
A-/B+	Site has an identity; contributors are identified; easy to navigate; consumable visuals	Clearly articulates the cultural significance of the artifact [1] [2] [3]	Clearly positions the artifact in terms of theories we've discussed in this course. [1] [2] [3]	Claims are clear and easily identifiable [1] [2] [3]	Close readings of digital artifact. Concise, clear summaries of theory. Clear relation of theory to digital artifact. [1] [2] [3]	Logical flow, but relation to argument not always clear; structure that carries the reader through the argument; A few weak transitions; Generally strong topic sentences [1] [2] [3]	-Strong grammar, punctuation and diction, despite lapses. -May have run-on sentences or comma splices. [1] [2] [3]	
B/B-	Site has unclear identity; contributors are discernable; no impediments to navigation; some distracting visuals	States the cultural significance of the artifact a [1] [2] [3]	Positions the artifact in terms of theories we've discussed in this course [1] [2] [3]	Claims are either clear or easily identifiable [1] [2] [3]	Summary readings of digital artifact. Clear summaries of theory. Some relations of theory to digital artifact. [1] [2] [3]	Weak flow; relation to argument sometimes clear; some structure that carries the reader through the argument; many weak transitions; some strong topic sentences [1] [2] [3]	-Weak grammar, punctuation and diction, lapses. - Many run-on sentences or comma splices [1] [2] [3]	
C+/C	Site has no clear; contributors are not discernable; some impediments to navigation; many distracting visuals	Hints at the cultural significance of the artifact [1] [2] [3]	Hints at how the artifact relates to theories we've discussed in this course [1] [2] [3]	Claims are implied but not clear or identifiable [1] [2] [3]	Vague readings of digital artifact. Vague summaries of theory Limited relation of theory to digital artifact. [1] [2] [3]	Very weak flow; relation to argument generally unclear; little structure that carries the reader through the argument; mostly weak transitions; few strong topic sentences [1] [2] [3]	-Big problems in sentence structure, grammar and diction. [1] [2] [3]	
C-/D	Site has not been collaboratively styled	Does not articulate the cultural significance of the artifact [1] [2] [3]	Does not position the artifact in terms of theories we've discussed in this course. [1] [2] [3]	No claims made [1] [2] [3]	No close readings of digital artifact. No summaries of theory. No relation of theory to digital artifact. [1] [2] [3]	No flow; relation to argument unclear; no structure that carries the reader through the argument; weak transitions; no strong topic sentences [1] [2] [3]	Prose renders argument unintelligible [1] [2] [3]	
F	PLAGARISM/ DID NOT TAKE INTO ACCOUT NOTES FROM PREVIOUS ASSIGNMENTS							