

Discussion Question Rubric

Note: Scholarly resources are defined as evidence-based practice, peer-reviewed journals; textbook (do not rely solely on your textbook as a reference); and National Standard Guidelines. Review assignment instructions, as this will provide any additional requirements that are not specifically listed on the rubric.

Discussion Question Rubric – 100 Points

Criteria	Exemplary Exceeds Expectations	Advanced Meets Expectations	Intermediate Needs Improvement	Novice Inadequate	Total Points
Quality of Initial Post	Provides clear examples supported by course content and references. Cites three or more references, using at least one new scholarly resource that was not provided in the course materials. All instruction requirements noted. 40 points	Components are accurate and thoroughly represented, with explanations and application of knowledge to include evidence-based practice, ethics, theory, and/or role. Synthesizes course content using course materials and scholarly resources to support important points. Meets all requirements within the discussion instructions. Cites two references. 35 points	Components are accurate and mostly represented primarily with definitions and summarization. Ideas may be overstated, with minimal contribution to the subject matter. Minimal application to evidence-based practice, theory, or role development. Synthesis of course content is present but missing depth and/or development. Is missing one component/requirement of the discussion instructions. Cites one reference, or references do not clearly support content. Most instruction requirements are noted. 31 points	Absent application to evidence-based practice, theory, or role development. Synthesis of course content is superficial. Demonstrates incomplete understanding of content and/or inadequate preparation. No references cited. Missing several instruction requirements. Submits post late. 27 points	40

Peer Response Post	Offers both supportive and alternative viewpoints to the discussion, using two or more scholarly references per peer post. Post provides additional value to the conversation. All instruction requirements noted. 40 points	Evidence of further synthesis of course content. Provides clarification and new information or insight related to the content of the peer's post. Response is supported by course content and a minimum of one scholarly reference per each peer post. All instruction requirements noted. 35 points	Lacks clarification or new information. Scholarly reference supports the content in the peer post without adding new information or insight. Missing reference from one peer post. Partially followed instructions regarding number of reply posts. Most instruction requirements are noted. 31 points	Post is primarily a summation of peer's post without further synthesis of course content. Demonstrates incomplete understanding of content and/or inadequate preparation. Did not follow instructions regarding number of reply posts. Missing reference from peer posts. Missing several instruction requirements. Submits post late. 27 points	40
Frequency of Distribution	Initial post and peer post(s) made on three separate days. All instruction requirements noted. 10 points	Initial post and peer post(s) made on two separate days. 8 points	Minimum of two post options (initial and/or peer) made on two separate days. 7 points	All posts made on same day. Submission demonstrates inadequate preparation. No post submitted. 6 points	10

Organization	Well-organized content with a clear and complex purpose statement and content argument. Writing is concise with a logical flow of ideas 5 points	Organized content with an informative purpose statement, supportive content, and summary statement. Argument content is developed with minimal issues in content flow. 4 points	Poor organization and flow of ideas distract from content. Narrative is difficult to follow and frequently causes reader to reread work. Purpose statement is noted. 3 points	Illogical flow of ideas. Prose rambles. Purpose statement is unclear or missing. Demonstrates incomplete understanding of content and/or inadequate preparation. No purpose statement. Submits assignment late. 2 points	5
APA, Grammar, and Spelling	Correct APA formatting with no errors. The writer correctly identifies reading audience, as demonstrated by appropriate language (avoids jargon and simplifies complex concepts appropriately). Writing is concise, in active voice, and avoids awkward transitions and overuse of conjunctions. There are no spelling, punctuation, or word-usage errors. 5 points	Correct and consistent APA formatting of references and cites all references used. No more than two unique APA errors. The writer demonstrates correct usage of formal English language in sentence construction. Variation in sentence structure and word usage promotes readability. There are minimal to no grammar, punctuation, or word-usage errors. 4 points	Three to four unique APA formatting errors. The writer occasionally uses awkward sentence construction or overuses/inappropriately uses complex sentence structure. Problems with word usage (evidence of incorrect use of thesaurus) and punctuation persist, often causing some difficulties with grammar. Some words, transitional phrases, and conjunctions are overused. Multiple grammar, punctuation, or word usage errors. 3 points	Five or more unique formatting errors or no attempt to format in APA. The writer demonstrates limited understanding of formal written language use; writing is colloquial (conforms to spoken language). The writer struggles with limited vocabulary and has difficulty conveying meaning such that only the broadest, most general messages are presented. Grammar and punctuation are consistently incorrect. Spelling errors are numerous. Submits assignment late. 2 points	5
Total Points					100