

Category (Possible Score)	No Evidence	Does not Meet Standard	Nearly Meets Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Self-Score	Instructor Score
<b>Title (2)</b>	Absent 0	Evidence of one. 0	Evidence of two. 1	Evidence of three. 1	Title, author names, and contact info for authors. Neatly finished with no errors. 2		
<b>Introduction (10)</b>	Absent, no evidence 0	There is no clear introduction, main topic, or outline of content. 1 - 5	The introduction is either: 1. Too sketchy. Gives an inadequate overview, Or: 2. Too detailed, info later repeated 6 - 7	The introduction overviews the group project and previews the wiki page(s) structure 8	The introduction overviews the project, work done, and organization of the wiki page(s). An effective summary. Gives enough detail to interest the reader. 9 - 10		
<b>Organization and Development (10)</b>	No evidence of structure.	Little evidence of structure or organization. 2 - 5	Organization of ideas not fully developed. Two or more pages, sections, or sub-sections missing or out of order. 6 - 7	Sub-pages, sections, sub-sections, and/or lists present, but their use not perfected. 8	Logical sequencing of ideas. Uses sub-pages, sections, sub-sections, and/or lists to order, present, and develop ideas. In each section, one or more paragraphs develop each idea. 9 - 10		
<b>Engineering Design (33)</b>	The writer has no clue what they are talking about. 0 - 42%	One, possibly two design points addressed. 45 - 58%	Sketchy: left out required design points. Did not work on this as much as you should have, and it shows. 61 - 79%	All the necessary points are covered, but discussion lacks adequate detail. 82 - 88%	Provides what was explicitly asked for. The function of each piece is demonstrated to the reader in adequate, but not overwhelming, detail. 91 - 100%		
	1.						
	2.						
	3.						
	4.						
	5.						
	6.						

Category (Possible Score)	No Evidence	Does not Meet Standard	Nearly Meets Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Self-Score	Instructor Score
<b>Word Usage and Format (15)</b>	Not applicable	Many, distracting errors in grammar, spelling, sentence structure, word usage, significant figures, tables, and figures. Unacceptable at the graduate level. <u>1-8</u>	With some grammatical errors. Figures are too small and/or under-labeled, although they are usually of acceptable quality and focus. Incoherent tables. Inconsistent fonts and headings. Could be improved by being more meticulous. <u>9-11</u>	Almost no errors in punctuation, capitalization, spelling, sentence structure, word usage, significant figures, and presentation of figures and tables. No broken hyperlinks. <u>12-13</u>	Punctuation, capitalization, spelling, sentence structure, word usage, and significant figures all correct. Clear, consistent fonts and headings. Good wiki processing skills. Figures and tables presented in correct format. No broken or empty hyperlinks. <u>14-15</u>		
<b>Conclusions (10)</b>	Absent <u>0</u>	Incomplete and/or not focused. <u>4-6</u>	The conclusion does not adequately restate the main findings. <u>7</u>	The conclusion restates the main findings. <u>8</u>	Effectively restates the main findings and benefit to the reader. <u>9-10</u>		
<b>Hyperlinks and References (5)</b>	Absent <u>0</u>	With many errors or only 1 hyperlink provided. <u>1-2</u>	With some errors and only 2 hyperlinks provided. <u>3</u>	With few errors, at least 3 hyperlinks to content outside the USU domain <u>4</u>	All citations and references listed in ASCE format with no errors. Include at least 4 hyperlinks to content or work outside the USU domain. <u>5</u>		
<b>Group Participation (10)</b>	Not applicable.	Wiki page(s) appear to be the work of only one group member. <u>1-3</u>	One or more group members disproportionately author content <u>4-7</u>	All group members author content. <u>8</u>	All group members significantly contribute to author content as reflected by use logs on History page(s). <u>9-10</u>		
<b>TOTAL (100)</b>							