

Discussion Board Rubric – Initial Post

Research-Based Practices & Tutorials

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’s prompt requires application, analysis, and/or synthesis of course materials.

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

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

<p>Language</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vocabulary use is precise and reflects course language. • Syntax is appropriate for course level/audience. • Sentence structures are varied. • Text is concise and clear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vocabulary is general and does not utilize course terminology enough. • Syntax choices reflect college-level language skills, but not necessarily a sense of audience. • Sentence structures are choppy and/or repetitive. • Text is wordy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vocabulary is basic and there are misspelled words and typos. • Syntax is neither control nor a sense of audience. • Sentences are structured incorrectly and/or sloppily. • Text is too wordy with inappropriate abbreviations for academic writing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vocabulary is basic and there are an egregious number of misspelled words and typos. • Syntax and structure reflect a lack of exposure to academic texts. • There are an abundance of incomplete sentences. • Text is unedited.
------------------------	--	--	--	--

Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Researched materials meet instructor standards and are appropriate for the course content and academic level. • Source integration is grammatically and logically effective. • Parenthetical and bibliographical references are complete and meet instructor standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Researched materials meet instructor standards and are appropriate for the course content and academic level. • Source integration is grammatically correct and attempts to demonstrate connections between student's ideas and source author's. • Parenthetical and bibliographical references are complete and meet instructor standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Researched materials are not appropriate for the course content and academic level. • Source integration is awkward and authorship distinctions are unclear. • Parenthetical and bibliographic references are present, but do not completely follow system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Researched materials are inadequate or absent. • Sources are quoted without connectivity and proper language mechanics. • Parenthetical and bibliographic references are non-existent and/or incomplete.
------------------	---	---	---	--

Updated: 04.2021