

## Wikipedia Entry:

*Depth of Historical Research*

- Excellent: Your entry draws on very relevant, high-quality sources from a variety of perspectives.
- Good: Your entry draws on relevant, reputable sources demonstrated in your citations and outside links.
- Satisfactory: Your entry incorporates research from at least three different sources that meet Wikipedia's standards for evidence.
- Needs Improvement: Your work does not demonstrate your ability to identify and employ historical research to improve your entry.

*Use of Evidence:*

- Excellent: You use concrete, relevant examples, clearly cited throughout your entry.
- Good: You use specific examples to support your writing, clearly cited throughout.
- Satisfactory: You use examples to support your content but need additional sources and/or citations.
- Needs Improvement: Inadequate or inappropriate use of sources.

*Written Communication:*

- Excellent: Elegant writing. Each section demonstrates excellent paragraph-level composition. Clearly structured entry. No grammatical errors.
- Good: Good writing, clearly written paragraphs. Logical structure. No (or minimal) grammatical errors.
- Satisfactory: Clear structure. Minor writing issues that make the entry less effective.
- Needs Improvement: Communication of ideas undermined by writing issues.

*Digital Communication & Wikipedia Conventions:*

- Excellent: Encyclopedic, neutral tone. Comprehensive command of Wikipedia mechanics, including the use of internal links, footnotes, references list, & images.
- Good: Encyclopedic, neutral tone. Strong command of Wikipedia mechanics, including the use of internal links, footnotes, references list, & images.
- Satisfactory: Appropriate, neutral tone. Some understanding of Wikipedia mechanics, including the use of internal links, footnotes, references list, & images.
- Needs Improvement: Issues with tone and/or Wikipedia mechanics.

*Incorporation of Review Feedback:*

- Excellent: Your entry demonstrates a self-reflective ability to consider outside feedback and apply this knowledge to improve successive drafts.
- Good: Your Wikipedia entry demonstrates your openness to peer and faculty reviews and a thorough approach to improving your writing through revision.
- Satisfactory: Your final entry shows that you've made some improvements to improve the early drafts of your work.
- Needs Improvement: No or minimal incorporation of review feedback.

Wikipedia Entry:

*Project Memo:*

- Excellent: Thoughtful, reflective memo that demonstrates your historical thinking in explaining your choice of Wikipedia entry, initial issues with its coverage of Latin America, and your strategies for improving it while following Wikipedia's communication guidelines.
- Good: Candid memo that shows how you applied historical thinking in your approach to this assignment. Completely addresses the 6 questions.
- Satisfactory: While your memo addresses most of the 6 questions, you could be more detailed and/or reflective in your assessment of your work.
- Needs Improvement: Your memo does not fulfill the project guidelines, or is only superficial in its treatment of your work.

*Overall Quality:*

- Excellent: Your entry increases the coverage of a neglected aspect of Latin American history and culture on Wikipedia. Your outstanding work indicates that you have thought carefully about what is most important to include, and the best way to convey your information for this type of public history.
- Good: Your Wikipedia entry indicates a skilled approach to your historical research and writing, as well as improving the coverage of Latin American history.
- Satisfactory: Your Wikipedia entry indicates a proficient approach to your topic.
- Needs Improvement: Your Wikipedia entry does not meet the assignment criteria.

*Comments:*