Wikipedia Contribution and Reflection Rubric

	Advanced (5 pts)	Target (4-3 pts)	Developing (2-1 pts)	Unacceptable (0 pts)	TOTAL
Content and Accuracy of Contribution (25%)	Contributions demonstrate a high level of insight and understanding. Content, links, files, media and images are relevant and enhance the topic. No errors, reflecting clear understanding of various forms of expression (multimedia) and careful editing.	Contributions include essential and accurate knowledge about the topic. Content has relevant links or images and the links or images may be referred to. Less than three errors in grammar, syntax, and punctuation. Occasional poor choice of word.	Contributions are simple, but demonstrate some level of understanding. 1-2 factual errors. Entries are short and for the most part relevant to the topic. Some sections of content are cut and paste or show superficial writing. Between three-five errors in grammar, syntax, or punctuation.	Contributions lack insight, depth, and/or are superficial. Entries are short and frequently irrelevant to the topic. Several factual errors. Language not appropriate for audience. More than five errors in spelling or grammar.	___ out of 5
Organization and Format of Contribution (25%)	Content is well organized, using appropriate headings, images, and bulleted lists when necessary. Adheres to all Wikipedia formatting requirements. All work is accurately cited following Wikipedia requirements.	Content is organized, and arranged in a logical order. Headings are added using the appropriate heading styles. Consistent approach to the design. Adheres to Wikipedia formatting requirements in all but one occasion. One or two issues with reference list and/or citations in text.	Content is logically organized for the most part. The wiki page(s) have limited structure or flow. Mostly consistent approach to the design. Wikipedia formatting requirements are not always followed. Three or more issues with reference list and/or citations in text.	No clear or logical organization. Text entered with limited or no formatting enhancements. Lacks structure or flow. Wikipedia formatting requirements are not followed. Many issues with reference list and/or citations in text.	___ out of 5
Reflection (50%)	Reflection includes thorough analysis of content contribution, results of editing as of December 1, and evaluation of experiences. All team members' reflections are identified separately. Reflections are thoughtful and include discussion of what it is like to be part of a collaborative generation of knowledge.	Reflection includes sufficient analysis of content contribution, results of editing as of December 1, and evaluation of experiences. Team members' reflections are identified. Reflections are thoughtful and indicate solid understanding of collaborative process.	Reflection includes some analysis of content contribution, results of editing as of December 1, and evaluation of experiences. Team members' reflections are not identified; some team members may be absent. Reflections indicate some understanding of collaborative process.	Reflection is missing one or more of the three required elements. Some team members' reflections are absent. Reflections indicate little understanding of collaborative process.	___ out of 10
TOTAL SCORE	20 Points possible				