

Rubric for wiki page.

Scoring criteria	Area for improvement (0–5 points)	Developing (6–10 points)	Proficient (11–15 points)	Exemplary (16–20 points)	Student score
<b>Qualities of models (predictive, quantifiable, realistic, theory laden, explanatory)</b>	One or two qualities of models are addressed. Overall quality of the model is lacking usefulness as a communication tool.	Two to four qualities of models are addressed. Effort has been made to make the model useful but the model stills requires a great deal of previous knowledge to be useful.	All qualities of models are addressed. Model is sufficiently useful as a communicative tool and requires little previous knowledge of the content.	All qualities of models are addressed. Model is an excellent communicative tool and requires little or no previous knowledge of the content.	
<b>Evidence-based argument</b>	Argument is hypothetical or shows no evidence of formal citations or specific details of a real-world example.	Argument is based on a real-world example but logical connections are not made or specific details are not mentioned.	Argument is based on a real-world example and cites specific details but has no formal citations.	Argument is based a real-world example, includes formal citations, and directly mentions specific details that support the model.	
<b>Evaluation of others</b>	Constructive criticism was not specific or so simple as to be ineffective. May demonstrate somewhat disrespectful wording. Criticism was either all positive or all negative.	Constructive criticism was simple with minimal specifics. Criticism was not disrespectful but was not thoughtful either. Criticism was either all positive or all negative.	Constructive criticism was detailed and specific. Criticism was respectful and presented in a thoughtful manner. Criticism was a mix of positive and negative.	Constructive criticism was exceptionally thoughtful, specific, and detailed. The intent to be constructive is clearly evident in both positive and negative comments.	
<b>Organization and presentation of wiki</b>	Wiki page is poorly organized. There is no evidence of thought given to aiding the viewer in understanding or navigating the page.	Wiki is somewhat organized but does not help the viewer understand or navigate the content of the page.	Wiki is organized and helps the viewer understand the content and navigate the page.	Wiki page is well organized with correctly used headings. Widgets or images are used and aid the viewer in understanding and navigating the content of the page.	
<b>Revision process</b>	No evidence of revision is present.	Revision was made but does not reflect all of the constructive criticism that was provided.	Revision was made and reflects all of the constructive criticism.	Revision is excellent and reflects all of the constructive criticism that was provided.	
<b>Total score</b>					