



Criteria for Evaluating Interviews with Health Experts, Survivors, Celebrities, Parents or Peers

	Five points	Four points	Three points	Two points	One point
Selection of subject	Person was selected with a clear purpose that relates to a health/social topic that is of personal interest or relevant to previous studies. Person was carefully chosen for wisdom, expertise, experiences, human interest, knowledge of youth issues, celebrity, or other reasons related to the health topic.	Person was selected carefully and had a clear connection to the health topic.	The person was appropriate to the health topic. However, this was not identified by the student in their selection process.	The person had a connection to a health topic, but that connection was superficial or contrived.	The person was selected at last minute, without thought or planning. There was no clearly identified health topic underlying the choice of subject.
Research	Student conducted research on the person of the interview as well as the health topic that was going to be discussed, Questions were prepared in advance and were relevant to person and to the health topic. Questions were designed to bring out the wisdom, expertise, experiences or insights of the person related to the health issue.	Student conducted research on the person and the health topic. Questions were prepared in advance, but did not bring out the wisdom, experience, insights or expertise of the person.	Student conducted research on the health topic but not on the person to be interviewed.	Student conducted minimal research on person to be interviewed. The student had an inadequate understanding of the health topic and was therefore limited in the interview.	Student did not conduct research on person or the health topic
Set up and Approach for Interview	Student made request through correct channels, arranged time well in advance, informed the person in advance of purpose of interview, arranged for appropriate location, wrote to thank afterwards. The health-related purpose of the	Student made request through correct channels, arranged time well in advance, thanked person at interview. Student explained purpose only at beginning of interview. Permission to record the interview was asked only at the	The interview was arranged in advance but the purpose of the interview was never made clear, especially the connection to the health topic. Recording equipment was not planned for or used.	Student arranged interview at last minute, did not explain purpose of interview, did not thank the person.	Student had to be helped in arranging interview.

Teacher Evaluation Tool for Webquests

	interview was made clear to the person. Recording equipment was in place and permission granted from the person in advance	start of the interview.			
Questions and Answers	Questions were elaborate and varied; tailored to previous responses. Student was able to determine subject's interest or involvement with the health topic. Moral issues, social consequences, dilemmas, choices about the health topic were addressed in the questions.	Questions were varied, but did not necessarily relate to previous answers from subjects. The questions were able to determine the person's expertise, interest, experiences or convictions about the health topic.	Questions were basic. Interview did not vary from predetermined order and set of questions. The questions did not permit the person to demonstrate his/her expertise, experiences, insights or convictions about the health topic.	Questions were simplistic or inappropriate.	Questions were minimal, inappropriate and simplistic (e.g. yes/no type; one-word response)
Vocabulary	Vocabulary, especially related to the health topic, was used accurately with creative variety; reveals breadth of health knowledge.	Vocabulary was varied and accurate. The questions were able to help the person discuss the health topic in terms relevant to young people	Vocabulary was appropriate.	Vocabulary was limited or incorrect. Student did not use appropriate terms for health topic.	Vocabulary was very poor or inaccurate for topic
Delivery	Student delivery and appearance was effortless and smooth. The student was able to draw out the human interest, interesting facts, significant implications about the health topic from the person.	Student delivery of questions had no unnatural pauses. The student was able to have the person explain their expertise or describe their experience or interest with the health topic.	Student delivery of questions was halting and fragmentary with some unnatural pauses. The questions did not enable the person to explain or describe their involvement with the health topic.	Student delivery of questions was halting and fragmentary with excessive unnatural pauses. The health topic was not discussed in depth.	Student delivery of questions interfered with comprehension and distracted the person, the interview went off topic.
Reporting	The student's report (verbal, written, video or audio) was clear, concise and introduced both the person and the health	The report introduced the person and the health topic. The report conveyed the basics of the interview and why	The report did not introduce the person nor the health topic. Vocabulary and important concepts	The report was a simple almost verbatim account of the interview.	The student's report did not describe the health topic, nor why the person was selected. The report

Teacher Evaluation Tool for Webquests

	<p>topic as well as relevant vocabulary and concepts. The person's expertise, experience, convictions or involvement in the health issue was clearly stated and described in the report, The report was helpful in describing, explaining or helping us to understand the health topic and its implications on a large or human scale. The interview report was motivating to the audience.</p>	<p>the person was selected. Vocabulary and concepts were explained. The audience learned more about the health topic as a result of the report on the interview.</p>	<p>were not explained. The audience did not learn much about the person or the health topic.</p>		<p>was disorganized and missed the important points</p>
<p>Personal Reactions/ Reflections</p>	<p>Student reported and reflected on personal reactions to interview. Intriguing or perplexing issues were identified for the audience. The connections to their own experience, their health and the health of others was noted in the report. Similarities and differences with other health projects or activities or readings was noted. The report identified areas of agreement or disagreement with the person interviewed. Particularly interesting or powerful quotes from the person were noted.</p>	<p>Student provided personal reactions and reflections on the interview. The health implications were noted, but not in any depth. Agreements, disagreements and other reactions to the person's comments were noted and explained.</p>	<p>Student provided some reactions to the interview in the report. The health implications were noted only in a general way. The student's agreement/disagreement with the person's comments were noted, but not explained.</p>	<p>The personal reactions and reflections in the report were minimal and superficial. The health implications were not identified or discussed in the report.</p>	<p>No personal reactions, reflections or observations were made in the report.</p>