



# Undergraduate Discussion Rubric

## Description

This rubric can be used for guiding undergraduate discussions for the course "[Genomics, Ethics, and Society](#)."

## Body

Criteria	Levels of Achievement		
	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent
Writing Quality	<b>0.3 Points</b> Utilizes poor spelling and grammar in most posts; posts appear "hasty"	<b>0.6 Points</b> Few grammatical or spelling errors are noted in posts	<b>1 Points</b> Consistently uses grammatically correct posts with rare misspellings
Relevance and Clarity of Post	<b>0.3 Points</b> Posts topics which do not relate to the discussion content; Does not express opinions or ideas clearly; Makes irrelevant remarks	<b>0.6 Points</b> Occasionally posts topics that are unrelated to discussion content or miss the main point; Opinions and ideas are somewhat unclear	<b>1 Points</b> Consistently posts topics related to discussion topic; Gets to the heart of the matter; Expresses opinions and ideas in a clear and concise manner
Contribution to the Learning Community	<b>0.3 Points</b> Posts an initial entry on the first day but does not respond to others' ideas; Expresses ideas in a somewhat hostile manner	<b>0.6 Points</b> Posts an initial entry on the first day and responds to others' ideas throughout the discussion; May occasionally lack collegiality	<b>1 Points</b> Posts an initial entry on the first day and responds to others' ideas throughout the discussion; Expresses ideas collegially

Criteria	Levels of Achievement		
	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent
<b>Knowledge and Understanding of Course Content</b>	<b>0.3 Points</b> Does not show understanding of course material and readings; Understanding lacks both breadth and depth	<b>0.6 Points</b> Understanding of course material and readings and lectures is imprecise or shallow; Understanding lacks either breadth or depth	<b>1 Points</b> Demonstrates accurate understanding of course material and readings; Understanding is both broad and deep
<b>Critical Thinking</b>	<b>0.3 Points</b> Arguments are poorly structured and incoherent; Does not attempt to substantiate claims with evidence; Does not engage critically with the issues	<b>0.6 Points</b> Arguments occasionally or partially lack structure or coherence; Some unsubstantiated claims; Critical engagement with the issues lacks depth	<b>1 Points</b> Develops systematic and logical arguments; Substantiates claims with evidence; Shows deeper critical engagement with the issues

## Rights

Use of Materials on the OEC

## Resource Type

Assessment Tools

## Topics

Evaluation and Assessment

## Discipline(s)

Teaching Ethics in STEM