

Rubric for Asynchronous Discussion Participation

Name: <i>Hori Lindsay-Clarkston</i>		Date Graded: <i>9/10/11</i>	Week #: 2	Substantive Post Due: <i>9/2/11 @ 11:59pm</i>	Substantive Post Date: <i>9/1/11</i> Time: <i>8:33</i> PM	Total Score <i>15+1</i> / 18 89%	
				Responses Due: <i>9/4/11 @ 11:59pm</i>	Last Response Post Date: _____ Time: _____ AM PM		
RESPONSES # Students Responded to: <i>2</i> <i>Alicia Michael</i>		Substantive Post minimum 200 words: <i>495</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	Comments: <i>Very organized substantive posting. You were 1st to post this week! Shows initiative and risk taking ~ qualities of a leader. Each part of the assignment was not fully developed with evidence of learning from concepts presented in the text ~ good reference to transactional vs. transformational leadership, but lacked application when you noted you would "counsel" Erica. Responses were insightful, contributed to discussion.</i>				(1) + Bonus for 1st post
Subst. Post Deadline Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO		# of Days Participating: <i>1</i>					
Response Post Deadline Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO							

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>2*</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 full development of concepts.	Posts well developed assignment that fully addresses and develops all aspects of the task.	<i>2</i>
Follow-Up Postings	Posts no follow-up responses to others.	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. Responds to a <u>minimum of 3</u> other students' posts.	<i>3*</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.	2 <i>3*</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</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</i> <i>late posts + 4 pos</i>

*= Leniency in scoring applied since clear evaluative criteria not communicated until this grade posting. If criteria noted in syllabus, no leniency applied.