# Rubrics for Online Learning
Revised 8/1/2013

## Discussion Rubric

**Protocols**

1. Your first discussion post should be created by Thursday at 10pm.
2. Respond to at least two original postings from other students no later than Sunday at 10pm.
3. Use the netiquette guidelines provided to ensure civil discourse.
4. Grading of the participation will be based on the discussion rubric.
5. Some weeks the discussions will take place in a debate format where you will take the side of "pro" or "con" depending on where your name falls in the alphabet [(A-K) or (L-Z]. Your position will be assigned for each debate discussion.

## Discussion Rubric

| Criteria | Excellent | Good | Acceptable | Unacceptable |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Quality of Comment | Has read the assignment and offers critical comments based on the text, news, or other Course readings | Has read the assignment and can offer critical comments | Shows knowledge of assigned readings but not a thorough understanding | Has not read the text Does not refer to text, newspapers, or support comments |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Supporting Documentation | Exhibits command of assigned materials and makes reference to other readings or posts. | Has a thorough command of the text and offers insightful comments | Shows knowledge of some readings, but doesn't exhibit a thorough understanding. Supports the points of others | Does not refer to the text or connect with Statements of others |
| Ability of postings to move discussion forward | Two or more responses add significantly to the discussions (e.g., identifying important relationships, offering a fresh perspective or critique of a point' offers strong supporting evidence. | At least one posting adequately adds to the discussion Offers evidence that somewhat supports the position | At least one posting that restates the discussion points but doesn't add to it. Does not offer evidence to support the position. | Postings have questionable relationship to discussion question and/or readings; they are non-substantive. Postings do nothing to move discussion forward. |
| Points | 9 to 10 | 6 to 8 | 3 to 5 | 0 to 2 |

Developed by Toni-Michelle Travis, Larisa Olesova, Susan Campbell, George Mason University (2012)

# Rubric for Five-Page Paper

**Protocols:  Paper should be a Word document, double-spaced, with one-inch margins using Times Roman or Times New Roman 12 pt. font.**

| Criteria | Excellent | Good | Acceptable | Unacceptable |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Introduction | Fully developed statement of the problem | Adequately developed statement of the problem | Partially developed statement of the problem | Does not have a clear statement of the problem. |
| Supporting documentation | At least 7 to 10 references | At least 4 to 6 references | One to three references | No scholarly articles (from |

|  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | from Scholarly articles (from university databases or reputable blogs) and/or books fully cited in a standard format using a style guide (e.g. Chicago, APA, MLA, etc.) | from some scholarly articles (from university databases or reputable blogs), and/or books. Fully cited in a standard format using a style guide (e.g. Chicago, APA, MLA, etc.) | from scholarly articles (from university databases or reputable blogs) and/or books; in addition to popular sources and/or newspapers. Fully cited in a standard format using a style guide (e.g. Chicago, APA, MLA, etc.) | university databases or reputable blogs) and/or books or poor citations |
| Writing skills—clarity, proper grammar | Free of errors in grammar, sentence structure, and word usage | 1-2 errors in grammar, sentence structure, and/or word usage | 3-5 errors in grammar, sentence structure, and/or word usage | More than 5 errors in grammar, sentence structure, and/or word usage |

| Application/Synthesis | Critically analyzes sources, clearly examines possible solutions and clearly supports the position taken | Adequately analyzes sources, solutions not completely formulated, and/or partially supports the position taken | Does a fair job of analyzing sources, solutions have limited applicability and/or minimal support of the position taken | Factual errors. Lacks critical analysis of sources and possible solutions and/or no support of the position taken |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Points | 9 to 10 | 6 to 8 | 3 to 5 | 0 to 2 |

Developed by Toni-Michelle Travis, Larisa Olesova, Susan Campbell, George Mason University (2012)

# Ten-Page Final Paper

**Protocols:  Paper should be a Word document, double-spaced, with one-inch margins using Times Roman or Times New Roman 12 pt. font.**

| Criteria | Excellent | Good | Acceptable | Unacceptable |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Introduction | Fully developed statement of the problem | Adequately developed statement of the problem | Partially developed statement of the problem | Does not have a clear statement of the problem. |
| Supporting documentation | At least 7 to 10 references from Scholarly articles (from university databases or reputable blogs) and/or books fully cited in a standard format using a style guide (e.g. Chicago, APA, MLA, etc.) | At least 4 to 6 references from some scholarly articles (from university databases or reputable blogs), and/or books. Fully cited in a standard format using a style guide (e.g. Chicago, APA, MLA, etc.) | One to three references from scholarly articles (from university databases or reputable blogs) and/or books; in addition to popular sources and/or newspapers. Fully cited in a standard format using a style guide (e.g. Chicago, APA, MLA, etc.) | No scholarly articles (from university databases or reputable blogs) and/or books or poor citations |

| Writing skills—clarity, proper grammar | Free of errors in grammar, sentence structure, and word usage | 1-2 errors in grammar, sentence structure, and/or word usage | 3-5 errors in grammar, sentence structure, and/or word usage | More than 5 errors in grammar, sentence structure, and/or word usage |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Application/Synthesis | Critically analyzes sources, clearly examines possible solutions and clearly supports the position taken | Adequately analyzes sources, solutions not completely formulated, and/or partially supports the position taken | Does a fair job of analyzing sources, solutions have limited applicability and/or minimal support of the position taken | Factual errors. Lacks critical analysis of sources and possible solutions and/or no support of the position taken |
| Points | 9 to 10 | 6 to 8 | 3 to 5 | 0 to 2 |

Developed by Toni-Michelle Travis, Larisa Olesova, and Susan Campbell, George Mason University (2012)

# Rubric for Excellent Presentations

Presentations are important in the conflict field--you need to explain your ideas and convince your audience.

| Levels of Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Criteria | Exceptional production | Fully successful assessment | Demonstrating weekness | Not acceptable |
| Focus on purpose | A clear purpose aligned with the assignment guidelines. | Ideas are clearly related to the approved topic. | Lacking a clear single purpose or straying from that purpose. | Free flow of ideas, not well organized, or off the subject. |
| Depth of thought | New ideas that challenge misconceptions, and evidence-based. | Content based on original thinking derived from conflict theory or experience in practice. | Reliance on old ideas or lacking in evidence. | Content not original and not related to the approved topic. |
| Clarity of communicating | Engaging presentation demonstrating exceptional speaking or teaching ability. | Content as precise and to the point as possible while including significant substance. Complex thoughts can be presented simply. | Errors on presentation materials, poor speaking habits, or disorganized. | Too long, material straying from the subject, poor ideas and lack of organization. |
| Quality of Presentation | Professional quality materials, well-organized talk, and visual evidence for spoken points. | The presentation should be professionally done, as if presenting at a conference associated with your practice. | Flashy, wordy, or busy presentation materials that distract the audience. | Unorganized or not understandable. |
| Points | 9-10 | 6-8 | 3-5 | 0-2 |

Developed by Rob Ericson, George Mason University (2013)

# Rubric for Excellent Written Papers

Writing is an essential form of conflict resolution communication--please seek outside help if writing in English is a weakness.

| Criteria | Exceptional results | Fully successful assessment | Demonstrating weakness | Not acceptable |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Focus on purpose** | Complete understanding and focus on the purpose, while demonstrating creativity. | Ideas are clearly related to the subject and our discipline. | Missing the purpose or massaging the purpose to fit preconceived ideas. | Writing not related to conflict theory or practice. |
| **Depth of thought** | Evidence-based ideas synthesizing material in new ways. | Writing based on original thinking derived from conflict theory or experience in practice. | Indications that ideas have been reused without improvement. | Free flow of ideas, not well organized, or off the subject. |
| **Clarity of communicating** | Flawless writing of professional quality. | Writing edited to be as short and to the point as possible while including significant substance. Complex thoughts can be presented simply. | Too long, material straying from the subject, poor grammar and lack of organization. | Steam-of-consciousness writing, or not consistent with graduate-level work. |
| **Organization** | A clear thesis, introduction, closing, at least three significant ideas, and reader-focused. | Creative, engaging, clear, purposeful, and convincing. | Unorganized with no apparent purpose; missing a thesis statement of some form. | Lacking organization; not on par with a standard five-paragraph essay. |
| **Points** | 9-10 | 6-8 | 3-5 | 0-2 |

Developed by Rob Ericson, George Mason University (2013)

# Rubric for Excellent Class Discussions

Discussions are an important part of this class--please use standard school and office courtesy and objectivity when posting comments; you should both listen and talk. The rubric explains levels of achievement.

| Criteria | Exceptional contributions | Fully successful assessment | Demonstrating weakness | Not acceptable |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Depth of thought | Original work derived from professional experience or vicarious application to real world situations | Postings are based on original thinking derived from conflict theory or experience in practice. | Standard answers derived from group-thinking processes. | Postings represent stream-of-consciousness approaches to thinking or are not clear, concise, and valid. |
| Relevance of ideas | Synthesis of ideas demonstrating new ways of thinking. | Ideas are clearly related to the subject as well as the conflict analysis and resolution profession. | Ideas stray from the subject without a clear link or are not relevant to our discipline. | Plagiarized or non-original ideas. |
| Efficiency of writing | Flawless writing of professional quality. | Writing edited to be as short and to the point as possible while including significant substance. | Incorrect grammar and not self-edited. | Writing appears to be rambling or more opinion than substance. |
| Respect for others | Pulling others into the conversation; demonstrating exceptional listening skills. | Edited to ensure thoughtfulness in criticism focused on the ideas, not the person. | Transmitting, but not listening. | Deliberately provocative statements and ideas that are "trumpeted" without listening to feedback. |
| Objectivity of agreement or disagreement | Resolving disagreements among others. | Ability to agree or disagree clearly related to the original posting and based on facts. | Not defending your position or attempting to win arguments with volume of responses. | Letting emotion overtake objectivity and not accounting for positive or negative feedback. |
| Timeliness of postings and responses | Postings early in the week; monitoring and | Original postings no later than | Often the last member to post; | Waiting too long to post, so classmates |

| Criteria | Exceptional contributions | Fully successful assessment | Demonstrating weakness | Not acceptable |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | responding to others quickly. | Saturday noon, peer comments by end of day on Saturday, and final responses by the end of the day on Sunday. | approaching the task with little enthusiasm. | don't have time to respond. |
| Points | 9-10 | 6-8 | 3-5 | 0-2 |

Developed by Rob Ericson, George Mason University (2013)

# Rubric for Excellent Blog Posts

| Criteria | Exceptional contributions | Fully successful assessment | Demonstrating weakness | Not acceptable |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Depth and uniqueness of thought | Original work derived from professional experience or vicarious application to real world situations | Postings are based on original thinking (different from earlier posts by your classmates) derived from conflict theory or experience in practice. | Standard answers derived from group-thinking processes.<br><br>Saying the same thing as a classmate, but in different words | Postings represent stream-of-consciousness approaches to thinking or are not clear, concise, and valid. Postings repeat your earlier posts and/or other students' posts |
| Relevance of ideas | Synthesis of ideas demonstrating new ways of thinking. | Ideas are clearly related to the subject as well as the conflict analysis and resolution profession. | Ideas stray from the subject without a clear link or are not relevant to our discipline. | Plagiarized or non-original ideas. |
| Efficiency of writing | Flawless writing of professional quality. | Writing edited to be as short and to the point as possible while including significant substance. | Incorrect grammar and not self-edited. | Writing appears to be rambling or more opinion than substance. |
| Points | 5 | 4 | 3-2 | 1-0 |

Adapted from Rob Ericson's "Rubric for Excellent Class Discussions," George Mason University (2013) by Susan Campbell, George Mason University (2013)

# Rubric for Welcome Message

A welcome message helps establish a comfortable environment for your students and is a step towards lessening the anxiety and isolation that a student may initially feel in an online course. [1]

| Criteria | Fully successful | Demonstrating weakness | Not acceptable |
|---|---|---|---|
| Credibility | Provides professional certifications that relate to the subject and evidence of successful experience with the subject. | Credentials do not clearly correspond with subject. Does not offer convincing evidence of background in subject. | Does not clearly establish credentials and experience with the subject. |
| Social Presence | Tone is informal, enthusiastic and creates a congenial environment. Creates impression that the instructor is approachable. Contains personal information designed to make a connection with students | Tone is somewhat formal and creates the impression of distance between the instructor and students. | Tone is formal. Does not include personal information. |
| Course Overview | Hits on major course learning outcomes. | Mentions only some of the course learning outcomes | Does not include all of the learning outcomes. |
| Points | 3 | 2 | 1 |

Developed by Susan Campbell, George Mason University (2013)

[1] Aragon, Steven R., (November 20, 2003) "Creating Social Presence in Online Environments"New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education Volume 2003, Issue 100, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/ace.119/pdf.

**Welcome Message Storyboard**

Create a storyboard for a welcome video. A storyboard is a visual depiction of what your video will contain. It may include drawings, digital images, descriptions, narration text, etc.

Instructions

1. Create a Word Document.

2. Insert a Table with two columns and 10 rows.

3. Enter "Video" and "Audio" as the column headings.

4. Under "Video" insert the image or text you want to appear on the screen in the form of a PowerPoint slide or describe yourself and what you'll be doing (include any props) if you plan to be on camera.

5. Under "Audio" insert the text for what you plan to say as the image or text is displayed.

Example: Storyboard for "Welcome" Video
(http://gmutvserver.gmu.edu/sdpgen/qt/ID001/welcome_video.mov) from online course
"Engagement and Interaction in Online Courses"

| Video | Audio |
|---|---|
| Image of two people talking (one says "Engagement" and the other says "Interaction) and image of a computer with "Engagement & Interaction" on the screen. | Designed for faculty members teaching their first online course—"Engagement and Interaction in Online Courses" addresses two important factors in the success of an online course. My name is Susan Campbell and I'll be teaching this course. Let me tell you a little about myself. |
| Image of instructor in between an outline of the United States and an outline of Ecuador | I'm a Washington native though I am part of two cultures. I'm half Ecuadorian and half American. I speak fluent Spanish. |
| Map of the world with dots indicating where the instructor has traveled. | When I'm not working, I enjoy reading, telling stories, traveling, and exploring. |
| An image of a timeline with "birth" on one end and "30 years" on the other. | For over 30 years, I've held positions where my roles have included Instructional Designer, Instructional Technologist, Training Manager, and/or Trainer. Most of these years were spent at George Mason University. I've been a guest instructor and lecturer in classes across disciplines and interact extensively with faculty. |
| A "Wordle" image of the departments and programs with which the instructor has worked as an instructional designer. | In my role as Instructional Designer, I've collaborated with faculty from Conflict Resolution, Math, Physics, Theater, Film Studies, Bioengineering, Public and International Affairs, Music, Business, and Social Work to develop successful online courses.  I've also worked with faculty in English, Communication, Psychology, History, Computer Science, Engineering, Chemistry, Biology, Geography, Women's Studies, Nursing, Health, Education, and Modern and Classical Languages to design and develop technology-integrated components of traditional courses. |

| Video | Audio |
|---|---|
| Three call-out images. One with "Delighted to meet you," a second with "You both have similar points, have you thought about…?" and a third with "…strong evidence supporting your opinion. Good job!" | In this course, you will learn strategies for establishing an instructor presence (for example, a warm welcome, a course tour, expectations, and feedback), creating a learning environment that encourages interaction between students, forming groups and creating group assignments, and creating discussion prompts and moderating discussions. |
| The text "Welcome" in a large font. | I'm happy you are joining me for this course where you'll learn strategies for engaging and interacting with your students online. |

Susan Campbell, George Mason University (2013)

**Assessment**

Below are links to resources to help design multiple-choice tests.

Key points covered are

1. Mapping questions to learning outcomes and learning objectives for the course.
2. Writing detractor questions (i.e., questions that are "incorrect").
3. Developing questions that do not just measure memorization.

http://testing.byu.edu/info/handbooks/betteritems.pdf

http://www.theideacenter.org/sites/default/files/Idea_Paper_16.pdf

http://jfmueller.faculty.noctrl.edu/toolbox/tests/whatshouldiassess1.htm#should

http://tep.uoregon.edu/resources/assessment/multiplechoicequestions/sometechniques.html