

Name Grading Rubric for Discussion Boards

Description Karen Lynden is a Business Instructor, at the Rowan-Cabarrus Community College, whose course won an Exemplary Course Program award. The attached grading rubric for Discussion Boards includes criteria such as Promptness and Initiative, Mechanics of Writing, Relevance of Post, Creating Community and Critical Thinking/Analysis. For those using this for evaluations, the levels of achievement are Below Expectations, Proficient and Exemplary which are worth 0, 1 or 2 points respectively for a potential total of 10 points.

Rubric Detail

	Levels of Achievement		
Criteria	Below Expectations	Proficient	Exemplary
Promptness and Initiative	<p>0 Points</p> <p>No posting credit at all for postings outside of the date range.</p>	<p>1 Points</p> <p>Contributes but doesn't meet the requirement of responding to two peer postings, and /or posts all requirements on the same day of the week.</p>	<p>2 Points</p> <p>Posts original contribution, responds to at least two peers postings, and posts on at least two different days of the week.</p>
Mechanics of Writing	<p>0 Points</p> <p>Poor spelling and grammar in posts; format is extremely hard to read would be deemed as unprofessional documentation by common business standards.</p>	<p>1 Points</p> <p>An error in spelling and grammar, yet overall format is clear.</p>	<p>2 Points</p> <p>Submissions are grammatically correct, posts with rare misspellings, format is easy to read/ professional delivery</p>

	Levels of Achievement		
Criteria	Below Expectations	Proficient	Exemplary
Relevance of Post	<p>0 Points</p> <p>Posts topics which do not relate to the discussion; remarks are not backed up by a reference; rehashes or summarizes other postings; unclear connection to topic; minimal expression of opinions or ideas.</p>	<p>1 Points</p> <p>Most posts are short in length and offer no further insight into the topic; opinions and ideas are stated clearly with occasional lack of connection to topic, and/or provides limited citations (from text, website, etc) for the community to reference.</p>	<p>2 Points</p> <p>Consistently posts topics related to assigned topic; cites at least one but preferably several credible references related to topic (text, website, or other credible / scholarly references); expresses opinions and ideas in a clear and concise manner with obvious connection to topic.</p>
Creating Community	<p>0 Points</p> <p>Argumentative or abrasive. No peer interaction.</p>	<p>1 Points</p> <p>Displays an effort to become involved with group; interacts with others. This category is concerned with quality of interactions.</p>	<p>2 Points</p> <p>Frequently attempts to motivate the group discussion; presents creative approaches to topic, can differ or counter peers points with diplomacy, if applicable. Refers to peer contributions. Creates community in the discussion. This category is concerned with quality of interactions.</p>
Critical Thinking/Analysis	<p>0 Points</p> <p>Makes errors in interpreting topics; opinion based comments only; superficial commentary.</p>	<p>1 Points</p> <p>Accurately interprets topic; uses main points of information from resources/ references; may repeat the ideas of other but attempts to offer new insight; response does not provoke significant new thinking or further discussion.</p>	<p>2 Points</p> <p>Interprets topic in accurate and insightful ways. Uses information thoughtfully, in a ways that are factually relevant and accurate; postings shows analysis, might offer alternatives or creative viewpoints based on concrete evidence.</p>

[View Associated Items](#)

Print

Close Window