

ART 441 – WEB DESIGN

Rubric: WordPress Portfolio Website

HOW THIS RUBRIC WORKS

This rubric rewards visible UX thinking, technical competence, and professional production workflows. Scores are based on what you can show (process evidence + decisions), not just a polished final screen.

- Each category lists evidence expectations. If evidence is missing, the score in that category is capped even if the final result looks strong.
- All claims must be verifiable (no fabricated testing, performance metrics, or plugin/theme capabilities).
- If AI tools are used, the AI Use Note must be transparent and within the assignment's allowed scope.

PLANNING + UX FOUNDATIONS (15 PTS)

What is assessed:

- Sketches and wireframes demonstrate a clear information architecture, recruiter-friendly navigation, and task-focused page structure.
- Sitemap / navigation plan is coherent and aligns with portfolio goals.
- UX principles are applied intentionally (hierarchy, cognitive load, conventions).

Evidence expected:

- Sketches (photo/scan) + wireframes in Figma (or equivalent) + IA notes.
- A short rationale describing what the site prioritizes and why.

Exemplary (13–15): Meets all evidence expectations with strong judgment, clear rationale, and high-quality execution.

Proficient (10–12): Meets most expectations; minor weaknesses in clarity, consistency, or documentation.

Developing (6–9): Some requirements met, but gaps in process evidence, UX reasoning, or technical consistency limit effectiveness.

Insufficient (0–5): Major requirements missing, unverified claims, or work is not functional/launch-ready.

VISUAL DESIGN + UI SYSTEM (20 PTS)

What is assessed:

- Visual hierarchy, typography, spacing, and consistency support scanning and readability.
- A simple, reusable component system (type scale, buttons, cards, spacing rules) is applied consistently.
- Design choices align with the student's positioning and target employers.

Evidence expected:

- UI system notes (type scale, spacing rules, color choices) and at least one example component.
- Evidence of iteration (before/after screens or version history).

Exemplary (18–20): Meets all evidence expectations with strong judgment, clear rationale, and high-quality execution.

Proficient (14–17): Meets most expectations; minor weaknesses in clarity, consistency, or documentation.

Developing (8–13): Some requirements met, but gaps in process evidence, UX reasoning, or technical consistency limit effectiveness.

Insufficient (0–7): Major requirements missing, unverified claims, or work is not functional/launch-ready.

WORDPRESS BUILD QUALITY (15 PTS)

What is assessed:

- Theme use is intentional (not a one-click demo). Layout decisions are owned and customized.
- Appropriate plugins are selected and configured responsibly (performance and security considered).

- Content is structured cleanly (projects/case studies, about, contact).

Evidence expected:

- Theme name + rationale; plugin list with purpose (1 line each).
- Screenshots of key settings or a short build note describing what was customized.

Exemplary (13–15): Meets all evidence expectations with strong judgment, clear rationale, and high-quality execution.

Proficient (10–12): Meets most expectations; minor weaknesses in clarity, consistency, or documentation.

Developing (6–9): Some requirements met, but gaps in process evidence, UX reasoning, or technical consistency limit effectiveness.

Insufficient (0–5): Major requirements missing, unverified claims, or work is not functional/launch-ready.

RESPONSIVE + ACCESSIBILITY (15 PTS)

What is assessed:

- Mobile layout is thoughtfully designed (not an afterthought).
- Type sizes, spacing, and tap targets are usable on mobile.
- Accessibility basics are addressed (contrast, headings, link states).

Evidence expected:

- Mobile screenshots for major pages and at least one responsive breakpoint check.
- A short accessibility checklist (what you verified).

Exemplary (13–15): Meets all evidence expectations with strong judgment, clear rationale, and high-quality execution.

Proficient (10–12): Meets most expectations; minor weaknesses in clarity, consistency, or documentation.

Developing (6–9): Some requirements met, but gaps in process evidence, UX reasoning, or technical

consistency limit effectiveness.

Insufficient (0–5): Major requirements missing, unverified claims, or work is not functional/launch-ready.

PORTFOLIO CONTENT + CASE STUDIES (15 PTS)

What is assessed:

- Project selection is curated and relevant to target roles.
- Case studies are scannable and specific (problem, constraints, role, process highlights, outcomes).
- Writing is professional, concise, and avoids vague filler.

Evidence expected:

- At least 3 strong projects with case-study structure (more is fine if curated).
- Captions/labels that clarify what the viewer is seeing and why it matters.

Exemplary (13–15): Meets all evidence expectations with strong judgment, clear rationale, and high-quality execution.

Proficient (10–12): Meets most expectations; minor weaknesses in clarity, consistency, or documentation.

Developing (6–9): Some requirements met, but gaps in process evidence, UX reasoning, or technical consistency limit effectiveness.

Insufficient (0–5): Major requirements missing, unverified claims, or work is not functional/launch-ready.

DEPLOYMENT + TECHNICAL SETUP (10 PTS)

What is assessed:

- Site is live on a public domain and loads reliably.
- Basic DNS/SSL concepts are applied correctly (working domain, secure connection).
- Performance basics are considered (image optimization, sensible plugin choices).

Evidence expected:

- Live URL + proof of deployment steps (brief checklist or screenshots).
- Notes on how assets were prepared for web (format/size decisions).

Exemplary (9–10): Meets all evidence expectations with strong judgment, clear rationale, and high-quality execution.

Proficient (7–8): Meets most expectations; minor weaknesses in clarity, consistency, or documentation.

Developing (4–6): Some requirements met, but gaps in process evidence, UX reasoning, or technical consistency limit effectiveness.

Insufficient (0–3): Major requirements missing, unverified claims, or work is not functional/launch-ready.

PROFESSIONALISM + PROCESS EVIDENCE (5 PTS)

What is assessed:

- Files are organized, labeled, and reviewable; naming is consistent.
- Evidence of iteration and decision-making is present.
- Submission is complete, client-ready, and easy to evaluate.

Evidence expected:

- Well-organized Figma pages or equivalent artifacts.
- A short change log or iteration notes.

Exemplary (5): Meets all evidence expectations with strong judgment, clear rationale, and high-quality execution.

Proficient (4): Meets most expectations; minor weaknesses in clarity, consistency, or documentation.

Developing (2–3): Some requirements met, but gaps in process evidence, UX reasoning, or technical consistency limit effectiveness.

Insufficient (0–1): Major requirements missing, unverified claims, or work is not functional/launch-ready.

AI USE COMPLIANCE + DISCLOSURE (5 PTS)

What is assessed:

- AI use (if any) stays within the assignment's allowed scope.
- AI Use Note is complete: tool(s), purpose, representative prompts/inputs, and what was changed by the student.
- Work demonstrates the student's authorship and understanding (no prompt-only submissions).

Evidence expected:

- AI Use Note attached with submission (or “No AI used” statement).

Exemplary (5): Meets all evidence expectations with strong judgment, clear rationale, and high-quality execution.

Proficient (4): Meets most expectations; minor weaknesses in clarity, consistency, or documentation.

Developing (2–3): Some requirements met, but gaps in process evidence, UX reasoning, or technical consistency limit effectiveness.

Insufficient (0–1): Major requirements missing, unverified claims, or work is not functional/launch-ready.

NON-NEGOTIABLES + INTEGRITY NOTES

- A site that is not publicly accessible cannot earn above Developing in Deployment + Technical Setup.
- If key deliverables are missing (wireframes, responsive evidence, or case-study content), related categories are capped at Developing.
- Fabricated sources, fake metrics, or invented testing results may result in a zero for the affected category and require resubmission.

SCORING GRID

Category	Pts Possible	Student Score
Planning + UX Foundations (sketches, wireframes, IA)	15	
Visual Design + UI System (typography, spacing, hierarchy)	20	
WordPress Build Quality (theme structure, plugins, content types)	15	
Responsive + Accessibility (mobile-first, readability, WCAG basics)	15	
Portfolio Content + Case Studies (clarity, writing, scannability)	15	
Deployment + Technical Setup (hosting, domain, DNS, SSL, performance)	10	
Professionalism + Process Evidence (iterations, file organization)	5	
AI Use Compliance + Disclosure (transparent + within policy)	5	
TOTAL	100	