

Webpage Critique Questions, Part II

Format of the website as a whole

Are the graphics and layout of the material pleasing to the eye? Organized in such a way that it is easy to see what is most important? (layout and hierarchy of importance)

Is the text easy to read or not? (font size) Do the visited and unvisited links easy to read against the background? (link color)

Why have images been included? Do they fit the content of the page (i.e., ancient images on Part 1 and modern images on Part 2)?

Has each webpage been given a title? (i.e., the title box is located in the gray area at the top of the page in Dreamweaver) Does the title include a hierarchy of information, such as Metamorphoses Project: Circe, Part 1 Analysis? (page identification)

When was the site last updated? What sources have the creators used? (establishing the authority and reliability of the information)

What have the creators done to make the website consistent from page to page, in terms of layout, location of navigation, placement of images, titles, location of sources?

Content of Part 2 summary page

What have you learned from this website that you did not previously know? How can you tell who are the creators “talking” to, or writing for?

Do the summaries of the modern versions of the myths provide you with enough information to get a complete sense of the adaptation, or are they incomplete? Do the summaries make you want to continue learning more and to read the analysis?

Are there typos and/or misspellings? Is the grammar correct? Is the punctuation correct?

Content of Part 2 analysis

What is the modern version of the myth being analyzed?

In your own words, what is the author’s main point of his or her analysis?

Outline the paper. What is the main point of each paragraph? Are there enough references to the modern work to support the main point of the paragraph? Is the main point explained so that you understand it?

What is the author's conclusion? Does it fit the thesis? Are there additional ideas that the author should consider?

Has the author shown *how* the modern version has changed the ancient story and *why* it was changed?

If the analysis is on one page, are there some logical breaking points where the author should divide it into more than one page, or should it stay as one page?