

Wikipedia Editing Assignment: Marking Rubric

	Marks					
Area	39-	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80+
Amount of content created.	Added a sentence.	Added a couple of sentences.	Added a short paragraph.	Added a substantial paragraph.	Added two paragraphs.	Added two substantial paragraphs.
Grasp of ideas and theories.	No comprehension of topic. Key points incorrect or missing.	Fundamental aspects of topic covered in content.	Good overview of topic covered in content. Some relevant detail.	Thorough coverage of topic with details.	Strong explanation of the subject, clear grasp of issues shown through structure as well as content.	Outstanding explanation of the topic, well structured and with carefully selected details and references to fit into a bigger picture.
Writing with an audience in mind.	Content does not make sense.	Content generally makes sense, but unclear in places due to grammar, jargon, lack of explanation, or lack of wikilinks.	Key points are conveyed clearly. A few minor instances of poor grammar, jargon, lack of explanation or lack of wikilinks.	Well-written content. The level of technical detail in is well balanced against the ability of non-experts to understand those details.	Thoughtful use of language to ensure that readers have a clear understanding of the topic, with clearly explained technical details and some links to further information on basic terms or more complex aspects.	Excellent, clear writing. The level of detail is ideally suited to the type of article being edited, and thoughtfully made wikilinks give useful further reading for readers needing more explanation or further reading.

Sources used & referenced.	No sources mentioned.	A couple of sources mentioned in text, without clear information for others to trace them.	A couple of sources used, and references provided for others to find and use them.	Multiple sources used and properly referenced in footnotes.	Sources thoughtfully selected as the most appropriate to the topic, and fully referenced.	Open Access sources where possible. Curation of the Further Reading &/or External Links sections.
Neutral point of view.	Uses "peacock terms" or "weasel words" several times.	One or two "peacock terms" or "weasel words".	No "peacock terms" or "weasel words", but slightly uneven coverage of topic.	Key points covered using neutral language.	Key information on topic provided, and references carefully chosen to give balance.	Key information provided, using balanced sources. Careful explanation of any contentious matters concerning the article topic.
Engagement with wiki-community.	No attempt to engage.	Attempts to engage with others, though not ideally placed.	Brief statement on the article talk page, which does not convey planned changes very clearly.	Clear statement on the article talk page, signed with username, explaining proposed changes.	Clear signed statement explaining changes and giving justification for the changes.	Clear signed statement of changes and reasons. Courteous discussion with another Wikimedian.