

Rubric for Asynchronous Discussion Participation

Name: <i>Hori Hindsday-Clarkston</i>		Date Graded: <i>9/9/11</i>	Week #: 1	Substantive Post Due: <i>8/26/11 @ 11:59pm</i>	Substantive Post Date: <i>8/27/11</i> Time: <i>10:34</i> AM/PM	<i>6 peers to post</i>
				Responses Due: <i>8/28/11 @ 11:59pm</i>	Last Response Post Date: _____ Time: _____ AM/PM	<i>Total Score: 11/18</i>
# RESPONSES Students Responded to:	Substantive Post meets minimum 200 word requirement:		Comments: <i>Your substantive post generated good discussion. If you have not seen the responses, please go back to week #1 and review the responses. I like how you restated each section of the assignment - makes it clear that ea. part of assignment was addressed. Your substantive post reflects an effort to apply principles from course textbook - good!! What was the date of the Advance article? Was the FROG initiative successful? If an extension is needed to complete posts due to unexpected events,</i>			
<i>0</i> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <i>401</i>					
Any post-deadline response entries?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO		# of Days Participating: _____			

Criteria	Unacceptable 0 Points	Acceptable 1 Point	Good 2 Points	Excellent 3 Points	Points
Frequency <i>(excluding Substantive Post)</i>	Participates not at all.	Participates only one (1) day	Participates on two (2) different days	Participates on three (3) or more different days	<i>1*</i>
Initial Assignment Posting <i>(Substantive Post)</i>	Posts no assignment.	Posts adequate assignment with superficial thought and preparation; doesn't address all aspects of the task.	Posts well developed assignment that addresses all aspects of the task; lacks <u>full development of concepts.</u>	Posts well developed assignment that fully addresses and develops all aspects of the task.	<i>3*</i>
Follow-Up Postings	<u>Posts no follow-up responses to others.</u>	Posts shallow contribution to discussion (e.g., agrees or disagrees); does not enrich discussion. Responds to 1 or 2 other students.	Elaborates on an existing posting with further comment or observation. Responds to 1 or 2 other students' posts.	Demonstrates analysis of others' posts; extends meaningful discussion by building on previous posts. <u>Responds to a minimum of 3 other students' posts.</u>	<i>0 Requirement listed in syllabus</i>
Content Contribution	Posts information that is off-topic, incorrect, or irrelevant to discussion.	Repeats but does not add substantive information to the discussion.	Posts information that is factually correct; lacks full development of concept or thought.	Posts factually correct, reflective and substantive contribution; advances discussion.	<i>2* → will be in future & responses to evaluate</i>
References & Support	Includes no references or supporting experience.	Uses personal experience, but no references to readings or research.	Incorporates one reference from literature. May lack relevance. May lack proper APA format in citing.	Uses relevant reference(s) to literature, readings, or personal experience, to support comments.	<i>3* APA? Year of article</i>
Clarity & Mechanics	Posts long, unorganized or rude content that may contain multiple errors or may be inappropriate.	Communicates in friendly, courteous and helpful manner with some errors in clarity or mechanics.	Contributes valuable information to discussion with minor clarity or mechanics errors.	Contributes to discussion with clear, concise comments formatted in an easy to read style that is free of grammatical or spelling errors.	<i>2* → will be in future & responses to evaluate</i>

** leniency applied since clear evaluator criteria not communicated until this grade posting.*