

Suggested Kialo Discussion Rubric, Focus on Participation (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>All or almost all claims make unique points that develop the discussion. Some claims expand the discussion into new, interesting areas. There are very few or no duplicate claims. Linked claims, if made, tie related arguments together.</p> <p>Claims are spread around many different areas of the discussion.</p>	<p>Most claims make points that develop the discussion. There may be a few duplicates of claims from other branches. Most linked claims, if made, tie related arguments together.</p> <p>Claims are spread around several different areas of the discussion. One area may receive noticeably more attention.</p>	<p>Most claims make points that develop the discussion. There may be several duplicates of claims from the same or other branches. Linked claims, if made, may not make a clear connection between arguments.</p> <p>Most or all claims may be concentrated in just one area of the discussion.</p>	<p>Most claims are irrelevant and do not develop the discussion, or most claims are duplicates of other claims.</p>
Engagement with others' ideas	<p>When responding to others' claims, there is a clear and committed effort to understand others' ideas. Responses to others' claims are always relevant and engage with others' ideas in good faith.</p>	<p>When responding to others' claims, there is a clear effort to understand others' ideas. Responses to others' claims are always or almost always relevant. Responses usually reflect a good faith effort to engage with others' ideas, though they may occasionally misrepresent them.</p>	<p>When responding to others' claims, there is a minimal effort to understand others' ideas. Several responses to others' claims may be irrelevant, showing an inattention to others' ideas. Several responses may misrepresent others' ideas.</p>	<p>When responding to others' claims, there is little or no effort to understand others' ideas. Responses to others' claims are mostly irrelevant and/or consistently misrepresent others' ideas.</p>
Clarity	All or almost all claims are clearly expressed and easy to understand.	Most claims are clearly expressed and easy to understand.	Most claims are generally understandable, but sometimes only with effort.	Most claims are difficult or impossible to understand.

Optional criteria

Learning Outcome	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Approaching expectations	Below expectations
Collaboration*	<p>There are ample comments on others' contributions, which work to improve the quality of the discussion.</p> <p>There is an active effort to seek others' input on claims, and it is put to use in a collaborative manner when offered.</p>	<p>There are several comments on others' contributions, which work to improve the quality of the discussion.</p> <p>There is some effort to seek others' input on claims, and responses to input are collaborative.</p>	<p>There are some comments that provide feedback on others' contributions. Some of these comments may be unclear, or they do not provide meaningful input toward improving claims.</p> <p>Comments may tend to be more "reactive" (responding to someone else) than proactive, and/or they may be more "check-the-box" than genuinely collaborative.</p>	<p>There are no comments that provide feedback on others' contributions, or comments harm the quality of the discussion by being irrelevant and/or disrespectful.</p>
Topic knowledge	<p>Claims show a deep knowledge of the discussion topic. Claims accurately reference a wide range of information about the topic.</p> <p>Claims are always or almost always grounded in fact and logic. Where claims are nonfactual and/or illogical, their presence furthers the discussion by providing an opportunity to rebut common arguments or beliefs.</p>	<p>Claims show a substantial knowledge of the discussion topic. Claims reference a range of generally accurate information about the topic, although some inaccuracies may be present.</p> <p>Claims are generally grounded in fact and logic. 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>Claims show an emerging knowledge of the discussion topic. Claims generally contain accurate information, but it may be limited in scope, or there may be some significant inaccuracies.</p> <p>Claims are often grounded in fact and logic, but some nonfactual and/or illogical claims may be made.</p>	<p>Claims show very little or no knowledge of the discussion topic.</p>
Usage of sources	<p>Claims that require factual support link to relevant, verifiable information from a trustworthy source.</p> <p>The important information from a source is quoted or explained in the quotation box.</p>	<p>Most claims that require factual support link to relevant, verifiable information from a trustworthy source. A few sources may not be high quality, but they are not untrustworthy.</p> <p>Important information from a source is usually quoted or explained in the quotation box. Some of these quotations/ explanations may be too long to easily find the important information.</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>There is an attempt to quote or explain important information from sources within the quotation box.</p>	<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.</p>
Grammar and punctuation	<p>There are virtually no errors in grammar or punctuation.</p>	<p>There may be a few slight errors in grammar or punctuation.</p>	<p>There may be a number of notable errors in grammar or punctuation, but these do not make the claim incomprehensible.</p>	<p>Frequent and/or serious errors in grammar or punctuation may severely impact the claims' comprehensibility.</p>

* We recommend using this criterion only for discussions that are expected to run over more than one supervised class period (e.g. as a homework task).