

Standard Kialo Discussion Rubric, Focus on Claim Quality (ages 14+)

Suggested criteria

Learning Outcome	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Approaching expectations	Below expectations
Claim target	Target number of claims reached or exceeded.	Target number of claims reached.	Target number of claims not quite reached.	Number of claims well below target.
Contribution to discussion	<p>Claims use specific evidence, a philosophical position, and/or logical reasoning.</p> <p>All or almost all claims make unique, insightful points that develop the discussion. There are very few or no duplicate claims.</p>	<p>Claims generally use specific evidence, a philosophical position, and/or logical reasoning.</p> <p>Most claims make new points that develop the discussion. There may be a few duplicates of claims from other branches.</p>	<p>Claims sometimes use evidence, a philosophical position, and/or logical reasoning. However, these may be somewhat unclear.</p> <p>Most claims make new points that develop the discussion. There may be several duplicates of claims from the same or other branches.</p>	Most claims are irrelevant and do not develop the discussion, or most claims are duplicates of other claims.
Placement of claims	All or almost all claims directly support or directly refute their parent claims. Linked claims, if made, tie related arguments together.	Most claims support or refute some part of their parent claims, but at times claims may be more generally related than directly responsive. A few claims might be best placed at a different location in the discussion. Most linked claims, if made, tie related arguments together.	Most claims somewhat support or refute some part of their parent claims. Claims' connection to the parent claim may be weak. Several claims might be best placed at a different level of the discussion. Linked claims, if made, may not make a clear connection between arguments.	Claims are regularly placed in unrelated locations.
Accuracy of claims	<p>All or almost all claims are factually accurate and/or logically plausible.</p> <p>Where claims are nonfactual and/or illogical, their presence furthers the discussion by providing an opportunity to rebut common arguments or beliefs.</p>	<p>Most claims are mostly factually accurate and/or logically plausible. Some slight errors may be present.</p> <p>Where claims are nonfactual and/or illogical, their presence usually furthers the discussion by providing an opportunity to rebut common arguments or beliefs.</p>	<p>Most claims are generally factually accurate and/or logically plausible. Some claims may contain significant errors.</p> <p>Where claims are nonfactual and/or illogical, attempts are sometimes made to rebut them.</p>	Most claims are not factually accurate or logically plausible.
Usage of sources	<p>Claims that require factual support link relevant, verifiable information from a trustworthy source.</p> <p>Relevant information from sources is neatly quoted or explained in the quotation box.</p>	<p>Claims that require factual support usually link relevant, verifiable information from a trustworthy source. There may be a few sources whose quality could be improved, but there are no clearly untrustworthy sources.</p> <p>Relevant information from sources is usually quoted or explained in the quotation box. Some sources may lack quotations/explanations, or they are too long to easily find the relevant info.</p>	<p>Some claims that require factual support link to relevant, verifiable information from outside sources. Some sources do not directly support their claims, sources may not be high quality, and/or there may be a number of untrustworthy sources.</p> <p>Relevant information from sources may be rarely or never included in the quotations box, or most quotations/explanations may not contain the relevant information.</p>	Claims that require factual support rarely link verifiable information from trustworthy sources, link information that does not support the facts in question, or link to sources that are clearly untrustworthy.
Quality of writing	<p>All or almost all claims are concise and easy to understand.</p> <p>There are virtually no errors in grammar or punctuation.</p>	<p>Most claims are easy to understand but may not be concisely stated.</p> <p>There may be a few slight errors in grammar or punctuation.</p>	<p>Most claims are generally understandable, but they may be overly long or lack clarity.</p> <p>There may be a number of notable errors in grammar or punctuation, but these do not make claims incomprehensible.</p>	<p>Most claims are difficult or impossible to understand.</p> <p>Frequent and/or serious errors in grammar or punctuation may severely impact the claims' comprehensibility.</p>

Optional criteria

Learning Outcome	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Approaching expectations	Below expectations
Balance of claims	<p>Thoughtful claims have been added to all sides of the discussion with more or less equal attention.</p> <p>Claims demonstrate a nuanced understanding of viewpoints on all sides of the discussion.</p> <p>Claim quality is consistent, regardless of the student's personal opinion.</p>	<p>Relevant claims have been added to all sides of the discussion, although one viewpoint may receive noticeably more attention.</p> <p>Claims demonstrate the ability to engage with multiple viewpoints.</p> <p>Claim quality is mostly consistent, regardless of the student's personal opinion.</p>	<p>There is an attempt to add claims to all sides of the discussion, but one viewpoint receives significantly more attention.</p> <p>Claims address multiple viewpoints but may misrepresent some of them.</p> <p>Claim quality may noticeably vary based upon the student's personal opinion.</p>	<p>There is no attempt to add claims to more than one side of the discussion, or claims consistently misrepresent a certain viewpoint.</p> <p>There is little or no effort to engage with the discussion outside of the student's personal opinion.</p>
Academic citations*	<p>Academic citations are always included where appropriate.</p> <p>All citations are formatted correctly.</p>	<p>Academic citations are almost always included where appropriate.</p> <p>Most citations are formatted correctly.</p>	<p>Academic citations are usually included where appropriate.</p> <p>At least some citations are formatted correctly or nearly correctly.</p>	<p>Academic citations are rarely or never included where appropriate, or most citations have serious errors in formatting.</p>
Thesis†	<p>Thesis is clear, concise, and sets up a genuine question of conflict in a balanced manner.</p>	<p>Thesis is clear and sets up a genuine question of conflict. Thesis may be wordier than necessary, and/or its wording may skew towards one side of the question.</p>	<p>Thesis may be somewhat unclear and/or may clearly skew towards one side of the question. Thesis may set up a question that is itself confusing, or hard to develop without more clarity than is provided.</p>	<p>Thesis is unclear and/or sets up a question that is not suited to genuine disagreement. The wording may express a strong viewpoint on the question at hand, or frame the question in a manner that makes it impossible to build on one or both sides of the discussion.</p>

*In addition to linking sources within their claims, students can also be instructed to provide properly formatted academic citations in the *Quote/Note* box.

†This criterion is only for Kialo discussions that students create from scratch, in which they must provide their own thesis.