

## Discussion Board Rubric – Initial Post

This assessment tool is designed to evaluate a student’s 300 word college-level discussion board post in response to an instructor’s prompt. This rubric also assumes that the instructor prompt requires application, analysis, and/or synthesis of course materials.

Objective	Excellent	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Incomplete
<b>Content</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers the instructor’s prompt in full.</li> <li>• Gives relevant examples from own experience.</li> <li>• Applies specified approach or theory innovatively.</li> <li>• Initial posting length meets requirement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers the instructor’s prompt in full.</li> <li>• Gives related examples from own experience.</li> <li>• Applies specified approach or theory correctly.</li> <li>• Initial posting length meets requirement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not address some elements of instructor’s prompt.</li> <li>• Gives an example, but reader struggles to understand it.</li> <li>• Ignores or uses incorrectly the required theory or approach</li> <li>• Initial posting length is too long and unfocused.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not address most elements of instructor’s prompt.</li> <li>• Gives an irrelevant example or one that cannot be understood.</li> <li>• Does not refer to required theory or approach.</li> <li>• Initial posting length is too short or hastily completed.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Critical Thinking</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates synthesis of general course topics.</li> <li>• Argument is well supported, contains depth of insight and original thinking.</li> <li>• Comments objectively on own situation or experience.</li> <li>• Inquiries reflect thoughtful, sustained, logical thinking.</li> <li>• Arguments incorporate logical analogies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates analysis of discrete topics.</li> <li>• Argument is supported with relevant ideas.</li> <li>• Comments objectively on own situation or experience.</li> <li>• Relies on others for initial inquiries and follows discussion momentum.</li> <li>• Arguments distinguish fact from opinion, but not opinion from supported argument.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides some evidence of analysis.</li> <li>• Provides evidence that is not directly relevant.</li> <li>• Attains some objectivity, but not consistent throughout answer.</li> <li>• Agrees vaguely with the majority.</li> <li>• Arguments blur fact and opinion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Post reflects unengaged thinking.</li> <li>• Post is an unsubstantiated opinion.</li> <li>• Posting does not contain original thinking and is irrelevant.</li> <li>• Presents own experiences as if they are universally shared.</li> <li>• Arguments are unsubstantiated commentary.</li> </ul>
---------------------------------	--	---	---	---

<b>Language</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vocabulary use is precise and reflects course learning.</li> <li>• Syntax is appropriate for course level / audience.</li> <li>• Sentence structures are varied.</li> <li>• Text is concise and clear.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vocabulary is general and does not utilize course terminology enough.</li> <li>• Syntax choices reflect college-level language skills, but not necessarily a sense of audience.</li> <li>• Sentence structures are choppy and/or repetitive.</li> <li>• Text is wordy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vocabulary is basic and there are misspelled words and typos.</li> <li>• Syntax s neither control nor a sense of audience.</li> <li>• Sentences are structured incorrectly and/or sloppily.</li> <li>• Text is too wordy with inappropriate abbreviations for academic writing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vocabulary is basic and there is an egregious number of misspelled word and typos.</li> <li>• Syntax and structure reflect a lack of exposure to academic texts.</li> <li>• There are an abundance of incomplete sentences.</li> <li>• Text is unedited.</li> </ul>
<b>Resources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Researched materials meet instructor standards and are appropriate for the course content and academic level.</li> <li>• Source integration is grammatically and logically effective.</li> <li>• Parenthetical and bibliographical references are complete and meet instructor standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Researched materials meet instructor standards and are appropriate for the course content and academic level.</li> <li>• Source integration is grammatically correct and attempts to demonstrate connections between student’s ideas and source author’s.</li> <li>• Parenthetical and bibliographical references are complete and meet instructor standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Researched materials are not appropriate for the course content and academic level.</li> <li>• Source integration is awkward and authorship distinctions are unclear.</li> <li>• Parenthetical and bibliographic references are present, but do not completely follow system.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Researched materials are inadequate or absent.</li> <li>• Sources are quoted without connectivity and proper language mechanics.</li> <li>• Parenthetical and bibliographic references are non-existent and/or incomplete.</li> </ul>