

## Molecular Biology Wiki Project Grading Rubric

The rubric below lists the various point distribution, criteria, and descriptions for each level below. This rubric is for assessing the Wiki project itself.

### Grading Criteria Part I: Content (Total of 80 Points)

Criteria	Exemplary	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Incomplete	Points
Theme (10 points)	10 points  The content has a unique main idea/purpose/theme and includes useful information. The purpose, theme, or main idea of the wiki is evident. There is a clear and indepth discussion of the particular molecule that was chosen	8 points  The purpose, theme, or main idea of the wiki is evident. There is a good discussion of the particular molecule that was chosen	7 points  The theme or main idea of the wiki is vague and does not create a strong sense of purpose. There is only adequate discussion of the particular molecule that was chosen.	0-6 points  The wiki lacks a clear purpose or central theme. There is no discussion of discussion of the particular molecule that was chosen.	
Information/ Primary Research/ Relevance (30 points)	30 points  The content is written clearly and concisely and points readers to high quality, up to date resources. The content is highly informative and provides essential information to the reader. The wiki showcases primary research on the topic of interest and contains at-least 15 peer-reviewed sources.	25 points  The content points readers to quality information resources. The content is informative and provides useful information to the reader. The wiki discusses primary research on a topic of interest and contains at-least 15 peer-reviewed sources	20 points  The content points readers to information that does not relate to the purpose or theme of the page. Information is incomplete or inaccurate. The wiki does not discuss primary research on the topic of interest and contains less than 15 peer-reviewed sources.	0-12 points  The content points readers to some information resources which are inaccurate or misleading or inappropriate for the intended audience. The wiki does not include a discussion of primary research and has no peer-reviewed sources.	
Cutting Edge (10 points)	10 points  The content thoroughly reflects cutting edge, current (within a year) research on the topic.	8 points  The content reflects research that is several years old.	7 points  The content reflects research that is over 5 years old.	0-6 points  The content reflects research that is over 10 years old.	

Criteria	Exemplary	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Incomplete	Points
Data and Evidence (20 points)	<p>20 points</p> <p>Thorough data and evidence on the topic is provided and explained in a clear fashion. Appropriate use of data (pictures, graphs, etc.) from primary sources is evident and relevant, and explained in a clear fashion</p>	<p>16 points</p> <p>A good portion of data and evidence on the topic is provided and explained, sometimes in a clear fashion. There is some use of data from primary sources and it is explained in a clear fashion.</p>	<p>14 points</p> <p>Data and evidence is not explained clearly, or is irrelevant to the topic. Evidence is presented but not explained. There is at least one table or other form of data presented from a primary sources.</p>	<p>0-10 points</p> <p>Either no data/evidence is displayed, or it is shown but not explained.</p>	
Connection to Molecular Biology (20 points)	<p>20 points</p> <p>A clear connection is made to one of the basic principles of DNA Replication, Transcription, and Translation. In addition there is a human disease connection made when appropriate.</p>	<p>16 points</p> <p>A connection is made to a basic principles of DNA Replication, Transcription, and Translation but in a confusing manner. In addition there is a human disease connection made when appropriate.</p>	<p>20 points</p> <p>A minor connection is made to a basic principles of DNA Replication, Transcription, and Translation but it is confusing and vague. Very little connection is made to a human disease or therapy.</p>	<p>0-12 points</p> <p>Little or no connection is made to a basic principles of DNA Replication, Transcription, and Translation. No connection is made to a human disease or therapy.</p>	

## Grading Criteria Part II: Wiki site composition (20 points total)

Criteria	Exemplary	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Incomplete	Points
Use of Multimedia	<p>6 points</p> <p>All of the photographs, graphics, sound, and/or video enhance the content and create interest.</p>	<p>4 points</p> <p>Most of the photographs, graphics, sound, and/or video enhance the content and create interest.</p>	<p>2 points</p> <p>A few of the photographs, graphics, sound, and/or video are inappropriate for the content and do not create interest.</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>The photographs, graphics, sound, and/or video are inappropriate for the content or are distracting decorations that create a busy feel and detract from the content. OR, No images or multimedia are used.</p>	
Fair Use Guidelines	<p>4 points</p> <p>Fair use guidelines are followed with proper use of citations throughout the wiki.</p>	<p>3 points</p> <p>Fair use guidelines are frequently followed and most non-original material uses proper citations.</p>	<p>2 points</p> <p>Sometimes fair use guidelines are followed and some non-original material uses proper citations.</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>Fair use guidelines are not followed. Non-original material is improperly cited</p>	
Navigation	<p>6 points</p> <p>All of the menus, navigation links and all internal links and sections of the wiki connect back to the home page.</p> <p>All external links to connecting sites are active and functioning.</p>	<p>4 points</p> <p>Most of the menus, navigation links and internal links to sections of the wiki connect back to the home page.</p> <p>Most of the external links to connecting sites are active and functioning.</p>	<p>2 points</p> <p>Some of the menus, navigation links and internal links to sections of the wiki connect back to the home page , but in other places the links do not connect to preceding pages or to the original page.</p> <p>Some of the external links to connecting sites are not active and functioning.</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>There are significant problems with menus, navigation links and internal links to sections of the wiki and few or no connections back to the preceding pages or to the original page.</p> <p>Many external links to connecting sites</p>	

Navigation	<p>6 points</p> <p>All of the menus, navigation links and all internal links and sections of the wiki connect back to the home page.</p> <p>All external links to connecting sites are active and functioning.</p>	<p>4 points</p> <p>Most of the menus, navigation links and internal links to sections of the wiki connect back to the home page.</p> <p>Most of the external links to connecting sites are active and functioning.</p>	<p>2 points</p> <p>Some of the menus, navigation links and internal links to sections of the wiki connect back to the home page , but in other places the links do not connect to preceding pages or to the original page.</p> <p>Some of the external links to connecting sites are not active and functioning.</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>There are significant problems with menus, navigation links and internal links to sections of the wiki and few or no connections back to the preceding pages or to the original page.</p> <p>Many external links to connecting sites are not active and functioning.</p>	
Layout and Text Elements	<p>6 points</p> <p>The typography is easy-to-read and point size varies appropriately for headings and text.</p> <p>Use of bullets, italics, bold, and indentations enhances readability.</p> <p>Format is consistent with the example format. The layout uses horizontal and vertical white space appropriately.</p> <p>The background, colors and layout are artful and consistent across the site and enhance the readability of the information presented.</p>	<p>4 points</p> <p>Sometimes the typography is easy-to- read, but in a few places the use of fonts, point size, bullets, italics, bold, and indentations for headings and subheadings detract and do not enhance readability.</p> <p>A few minor format inconsistencies decrease readers' accessibility to the content. The layout uses horizontal and vertical white space appropriately in most places.</p> <p>The background, colors and layout are consistent across the wiki and make it easy to read the information presented.</p>	<p>2 points</p> <p>The typography is difficult to read and uses too many different fonts, overuse of bold, bullets, italics or lack of appropriate indentations of text.</p> <p>Some formatting tools are under- or over- utilized and decrease the readers' accessibility to the content.</p> <p>There are several format inconsistencies throughout the wiki. The layout uses horizontal and vertical white space inappropriately in some places. The background, colors and layout are distracting and make it difficult to read the</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>The text is extremely difficult to read due to inappropriate use of fonts, point size, bullets, italics, bold and indentations for headings and sub-headings and body text.</p> <p>Many formatting tools are under- or over- utilized and decrease the readers' accessibility to the content. There are numerous format inconsistencies throughout the wiki.</p> <p>The layout uses</p>	

