

Media Studies 220  
Wiki Rubric

	<b>Superior</b>	<b>Strong</b>	<b>Competent</b>	<b>Weak</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<b>Individual (50%)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Writer completed a thoughtful, complex, and well-written review.</li> <li>• Writer completed a thoughtful vocabulary definition that is grounded in the class materials.</li> <li>• Writer contributed extensively to the geocache wiki entry.</li> <li>• Writer contributed several additional resources.</li> <li>• Writer provided extensive and/or urgent revisions to other's entries.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Writer completed a detailed review.</li> <li>• Writer completed a thoughtful vocabulary definition.</li> <li>• Writer contributed significantly to the geocache wiki entry.</li> <li>• Writer contributed more than one additional resources.</li> <li>• Writer provided some thoughtful and/or urgent revisions to other's entries.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Writer completed a review.</li> <li>• Writer completed a vocabulary definition.</li> <li>• Writer contributed to the geocache wiki entry.</li> <li>• Writer contributed additional resources.</li> <li>• Writer provided revisions to other's entries, but they are (perhaps) superficial contributions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Writer completed an incomplete review.</li> <li>• Writer completed an incomplete vocabulary definition.</li> <li>• Writer contributed little to the geocache wiki entry.</li> <li>• Writer provided an incomplete entry for additional resources.</li> <li>• Writer provides few revisions to other's entries.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Writer did not complete a review.</li> <li>• Writer did not complete a vocabulary definition.</li> <li>• Writer did not contribute geocache wiki entry.</li> <li>• Writer did not add additional resources.</li> <li>• Writer did not provide revisions to other's entries.</li> </ul>
<b>Collective (50%)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wiki gives a full and sophisticated picture of the class work this semester.</li> <li>• Content clearly related to class, research, and/or assignments, AND it is detailed as it thoughtfully engages the issues of the course.</li> <li>• Professional and elegant presentation (in terms of errors of usage etc).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wiki gives a full picture of the class work this semester.</li> <li>• Content is clearly related to class, research, and/or assignments.</li> <li>• Few to no lapses in professionalism/ significant errors in grammar/ mechanics/ usage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wiki gives an adequate picture of the class work this semester.</li> <li>• Content is related to class, research, and/or assignments.</li> <li>• Some lapses in professionalism/ significant errors in grammar/ mechanics/ usage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wiki gives a limited picture of the class work this semester.</li> <li>• Content is somewhat related to class, research, and/or assignments.</li> <li>• Significant lapses in professionalism/ significant errors in grammar/ mechanics/ usage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wiki is incomplete/superficially completed.</li> <li>• Content is often completely unrelated to class and/or writing.</li> <li>• Sloppy, unprofessional presentation; major errors in grammar/ mechanics/usage.</li> </ul>

Media Studies 220  
Wiki Rubric

Definitions: 11/20

Reviews: 15/20 (two Gattica entries?).. Only two reviews complete.

Geocaches 1 almost complete

Additional Materials: 0 additional resources.