

*Wikipedia Entry Lead:*

- Excellent: Your lead clearly & concisely explains the book's topic, emphasizing its context & wider significance. Ideas are developed & focused.
- Good: Your lead covers the book's topic thoroughly, but treatment may be less developed, or harder to see the interconnections between ideas. Appropriate length & content.
- Satisfactory: Your lead provides basic information about the book but need more elaboration. Some information may be inaccurate or misleading. Alternately, your lead may be slightly long for Wikipedia.
- Needs Improvement: Your lead does not adequately cover the main ideas of the book. Connections between ideas are confusing.

*Book Synopsis:*

- Excellent: You present an insightful overview of the book's historical approach, argument, & use of evidence.
- Good: You present a clear, accurate overview of the book's approach, argument, & evidence.
- Satisfactory: Your synopsis of the book's argument, approach, & evidence is too broad.
- Needs Improvement: Your synopsis of the author's argument, approach, & evidence misses a crucial element.

*Author Biography:*

- Excellent: You present a thoughtful scholarly biography, explaining the author's training, institutional affiliation, research expertise, & relevant scholarship.
- Good: You present a thorough contextualization of the author's training, institutional affiliation, & expertise.
- Satisfactory: You provide basic information about the author without much elaboration.
- Needs Improvement: Your consideration of the author's biography is insufficient or inappropriate.

*Evaluation of Critical Reception:*

- Excellent: You present a concise, insightful overview of scholarly reception of the book, integrating well-chosen quotations from at least two scholarly reviews.
- Good: You show a good understanding of how scholars have evaluated the book, integrating at least two well-chosen quotations.
- Satisfactory: You provide quotes from scholarly reviews but need to incorporate more context.
- Needs Improvement: You make minimal links or no evaluation of other scholars' research.

*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 some 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. Some 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, & categories. Detailed book infobox.
- Good: Encyclopedic, neutral tone. Strong command of Wikipedia mechanics, including the use of internal links, footnotes, references list, & categories. Complete book infobox.
- Satisfactory: Appropriate, neutral tone. Some understanding of Wikipedia mechanics, including the use of internal links, footnotes, references list, & categories. Partial book infobox.
- Needs Improvement: Issues with tone and/or Wikipedia mechanics.

*Overall Quality:*

- Excellent: Your presentation is thorough, clearly stated, & indicates that you have thought carefully about the best way to convey your information.
- Good: Your presentation indicates a competent approach to your research question.
- Satisfactory: Your presentation lacked one or two of the following elements: thoroughness, clarify, or sufficient background knowledge.
- Needs Improvement: Your presentation suggests an insufficient degree of preparation.

*Comments:*