

ELECTRONIC COMPOSING ASSESSMENT RUBRIC	Exemplary 6	Mature 5	Competent 4	Developing 3	Beginning 2	Basic 1 (0 = N/A)
	responds <i>creatively</i>, requiring little or no revision	responds <i>fully</i>, requiring only minor revision	responds <i>competently</i>, requiring limited revision	responds <i>inappropriately</i>, requiring focused revision	responds <i>incompletely</i>, requiring extensive revision	responds <i>naively</i>, requiring thorough revision
DO CONTENT-PURPOSE-AUDIENCE MERIT THE SPEED AND RICHNESS OF MULTIMODAL TREATMENT?						
CONTEXT PURPOSE POSITION AUDIENCE	rich, multilayered, integrated interface; user-oriented access and features; sophisticated interface strategies	consistent, accessible, relational layers (functions, media, channels, ports); clear design approach	workable interface; effective, user-friendly (if predictable) design strategy	at least one uncertainty about the overall interface or layer relationships; workable, template-style design; general or missing interface elements	poorly or unevenly implemented interface design; misleading or incomplete interface elements	confusing, trite, or dysfunctional interface; unfocused experience; shallow, repetitive, minimal layers; cumbersome or broken access
SUBSTANCE SCOPE DEPTH RELEVANCE FAIRNESS	stimulating, varied layers and layer relationships; multiuser design; complex sensorial, aesthetic experience; scrupulous attention to interface details; accurate selection and representation of media sources	coordinated and well-developed multisensory content; clear layer relationships and functions; personal content distinguishable from borrowed sources; fair representation of media sources	participatory (if predictable) design; minimal number of layers; reasonable interface features; sufficient content; reliable (if somewhat generalized) media representations	at least one participatory layer or interface element; trite or underdeveloped layers; discernible but limited design strategy; boilerplate or oversimplified content; some conflict between layers in content and use; some media source misrepresentation	thin, predictable interface; no interface strategy; some major issue in design, interactivity, or layer relationships; minimal, ambiguous, or distracting content; some mishandling of media sources	minimal content and user options; cultural insensitivity; inadequate, incomplete, or repetitive content; serious disjunction between layers; numerous inaccuracies and omissions in media source references
ORGANIZATION FOCUS STRUCTURE RELATIONSHIP EMPHASIS	engaging impression of interface integrity and originality; clear pattern of linear and hypertextual layers; inventive, user-friendly navigation; playful interface	clear impression of coherent, transparent interface design; identifiable, meaningful layers; purposeful chunking of layers and components	workable impression of interrelated (if conventional) layers and navigation; predictable layer relationships, placement, and functionality	multiple foci with no overarching relationship, or a layer not synchronized with overall experience; confusing interface component, layer, or point of entry	inappropriate or uncertain interface structure; maverick layers or interface components; minimal functionality	fragmented, cluttered, or bloated interface or code; unrelated layer experiences; flawed or missing functions, navigational options or point of entry
STYLE CONVENTIONS AESTHETICS VARIETY	sensitivity to interactive and navigational design conventions; scrupulous citation; awareness of media genres; design integrity; purposeful interface surprises, intricacies, ironies, or contrasts	clear interactive and navigational design; accurate citation of media sources; appropriate interface aesthetic; apt use of contrast to aid interest and hierarchy	consistent interface and navigational design; some attempt to cite media sources; minor inconsistencies in media usage; functional interface aesthetic; positive initial (if not overall) interface impression	inconsistent visual style in at least one major interface or navigational element; some omitted citations; a major interface miscue; boring, mechanical consistency	poorly implemented media conventions and aesthetics; careless and incomplete citations; problematic interface design; random or uncertain interface choices or contrasts	patchwork of interface components; no citations; excessive use of media transplants, copied code, and template designs without regard to their stylistic implications; cluttered interface
DELIVERY CONSISTENCY ENGAGEMENT ACCESSIBILITY LAYERING	judicious use of multiple media; attention to color, texture, size, and size, navigational design, digital transformations; scrupulous coding and documenting; Section 508 accessibility; gestalt; engaging interface, virtuality, interactivity	transparent media; standardized code; user-friendly layout, navigation, interface; easy accessibility (contrast, size, readability, speed, bandwidth, file size, image size); user-based pacing; coordinated media	standard media and code use; workable layout, navigation, interface; reasonable accessibility (contrast, size, readability, speed, bandwidth, file size, image size); balanced pacing; participatory, layered experiences, even if weakly implemented	a major, distracting inconsistency in media use or coding; alienating or distracting implementation of media; at least one major access barrier or interface miscue; poorly paced experience; distracting digital transitions	inconsistent or uncertain media choices; minimal or predictable media use; neglected media channel; poorly addressed accessibility; confusing interface, layer hierarchy, navigation, sequencing, object manipulations	distracting media combinations or applications; little or no attention to multisensory experiences; problematic legibility, readability, accessibility, interface design, interactivity