

### ONLINE DISCUSSION RUBRIC

Dr. Michael A. Milton, James Ragsdale Chair of Missions and Evangelism, Erskine Theological Seminary

Criterion (Score 0 if element is absent)	Value #1: Below Expectations 75 Points	Value #2: Meets Expectations 85 Points	Value #3: Exceeds Expectations 100 Points	Score
<b>1. Frequency</b>	Participates 1-2 times on the same day.	Participates 2-3 times but postings are not distributed during the module-week.	Participates 2-3 times during the module-week.	/100
<b>2. Mechanics</b>	Less than 100 words with numerous writing errors.	Less than 100 words.	Post is 100-200 words with no writing errors.	/100
<b>3. Initial Assignment Post</b>	Posts adequate assignment with superficial thought and preparation; doesn't address all aspects of the assignment.	Posts well developed assignment that addresses all aspects of the assignment; fuller development of ideas is needed.	Posts well developed assignment that fully addresses and develops all aspects of the assignment.	/100
<b>4. Response Posts</b>	Posts superficial contribution to discussion (e.g., agrees or disagrees); does not enrich discussion.	Elaborates on an existing posting with additional comments or observation.	Demonstrates analysis, synthesis, and/or evaluation of others' posts; builds on prior posts to stimulate further discussion.	/100
<b>5. Content</b> (Critical Thinking and Theological Reflection (connects issue with Scripture; applies the Scriptural truth to assess, diagnose, and spiritual direction to the people in the reference and/or, more generally, to others))	Statements based on personal opinion only. Statements are based on empty citations: citation information is given as support for an assertion, but no information is provided about the content of the cited work or how or why the cited work/author supports the assertion made. Factual errors: the cited work does not actually support the assertion made in the assignment and/or is described inaccurately.	Statements are supported with appropriate evidence. Appropriate evidence includes an interpretation of empirical data, description of arguments and evidence presented in a scholarly source that supports the assertion (with appropriate citation of the source). Evidence provided in support of an argument is described and interpreted correctly.	Statements supported with evidence (as described in meets expectations). Statements are supported with multiple sources of evidence based on primary sources. When relevant, opposing positions are considered and arguments discounting these positions are supported with relevant scholarly evidence. Synthesizes evidence to draw new, relevant, logical inferences.	/100
<b>6. Research and References</b>	Post is experiential, lacking citations.	Incorporates some references from module texts and personal experience.	Demonstrates research by citing module texts, articles, or media.	/100
<b>7. Community and Etiquette</b>	Responses are polite enough but fail to engage others' ideas.	Responses are friendly, polite, factual but not helpful for promoting discussion.	Responses engage another's ideas, and are friendly, polite, and helpful (promote discussion).	/100
<b>8.</b> Note: Failure to post during a module is a zero score. Posting after the module is completed (when community engagement over the topic is impossible) is 10 points off of the cumulative total.	<b>TOTAL</b>			/700

**Examples of postings that demonstrate areas of critical thinking and theological reflection:**

- "Thank you for your insights. I noted two major theological concepts between your observations and this week's lecture. First, . . ." (analysis)
- "I appreciated your discussion of ways to enhance local church missionary involvement. I see this happening in our denomination . . ." (synthesis)
- "The author of this week's online PDF reading demonstrated principles related to the Great Commission . . ." (evaluation)

**Rubric Score to Grades**

1. Each value is weighted at 100%.
2. EXCELLENT: 630-700 (630 = 90%)      GOOD: 595-629 (595 = 85%)      ACCEPTABLE: 525-594 (525 = 75%)
3. Below 75% requires a re-submission until standard of at least 75% is met.

Thanks to Dr. Barbara Frey at the University of Pittsburg for her "Rubric for Asynchronous Discussion Participation," from which this theological discussion rubric is created.