# Rubric for Evaluating Discussion Board Posts[[1]](#footnote-1)

**Category One: Cognitive**

*Emphasis on learner’s critical thinking, problem solving, creative thinking, knowledge construction, and argumentation*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor |
| Understanding , comprehending , and grasping |  |  |  |  |
| Thinking, reflection, and reasoning |  |  |  |  |
| Analyzing and summarizing |  |  |  |  |
| Original, creative, novel, and new |  |  |  |  |
| Clarity |  |  |  |  |
| Relevance |  |  |  |  |
| Argument and evidence to support argument |  |  |  |  |

**Category Two: Mechanical**

*Focus on the assessment of language use, grammar and spelling, organization, writing style, and use of citations and references*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor |
| Grammar, spelling, and punctuation |  |  |  |  |
| Organization, structure, and expression |  |  |  |  |
| Writing and composition style |  |  |  |  |
| Citation and reference |  |  |  |  |

**Category Three: Procedural**

*Focus on learner’s presence, contribution effort, and conduct in the discussion board.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor |
| Meeting deadline |  |  |  |  |
| Promptness |  |  |  |  |
| Etiquette and protocol |  |  |  |  |

**Category Four: Interactive**

*Focus on interactions between learners on the discussion board*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequently | | | Occasionally | | | Rarely | Never | |
| Response, reply and answer to other people’s posts |  | |  | | | |  |  | |
| Participation |  | |  | | | |  |  | |
| Group collaboration |  | |  | | | |  |  | |
| Feedback and encouragement |  | |  | | | |  |  | |
|  | | Excellent | | | Good | Fair | | | Poor |
| Depth of discussion | |  | | |  |  | | |  |

1. The rubric is adapted from Penny & Murphy (2009), Rubrics for designing and evaluating online asynchronous discussions. *The British Journal of Education Technology*, 40 (5), 804-820. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)