

Undergraduate Discussion Rubric

Level of Achievement

Criteria	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent
Writing Quality	0.3 Points Utilizes poor spelling and grammar in most posts; posts appear "hasty"	0.6 Points Few grammatical or spelling errors are noted in posts	1 Points Consistently uses grammatically correct posts with rare misspellings
Relevant and Clarity of Post	0.3 Points Posts topics which do not relate to the discussion content; Does not express opinions or ideas clearly; Makes irrelevant remarks	0.6 Points Occasionally posts topics that are unrelated to discussion content or miss the main point; Opinions and ideas are somewhat unclear	1 Points 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	0.3 Points Posts an initial entry on the first day but does not respond to others' ideas; Expresses ideas in a somewhat hostile manner	0.6 Points Posts an initial entry on the first day and responds to others' ideas throughout the discussion; May occasionally lack collegiality	1 Points Posts an initial entry on the first day and responds to others' ideas throughout the discussion; Expresses ideas collegially
Knowledge and Understanding of the Course Content	0.3 Points Does not show understanding of course material and readings; Understanding lacks both breadth and depth	0.6 Points Understanding of course material and readings and lectures is imprecise or shallow; Understanding lacks either breadth or depth	1 Points Demonstrates accurate understanding of course material and readings; Understanding is both broad and deep
Critical Thinking	0.3 Points Arguments are poorly structured and incoherent; Does not attempt to substantiate claims with evidence; Does not engage critically with the issues	0.6 Points Arguments occasionally or partially lack structure or coherence; Some unsubstantiated claims; Critical engagement with the issues lacks depth	1 Points Develops systematic and logical arguments; Substantiates claims with evidence; Shows deeper critical engagement with the issues