

APPENDIX 3: : Example of Assessment Criteria for Posts

Dip Nandi, Shanton Chang and Sandrine Balbo, "A Conceptual Framework for Assessing Interaction Quality in Online Discussion Forums" (paper presented at Ascilite, Auckland, 2009): 670.

CONTENT	Criteria	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<b>Clarification</b>	Regurgitation of information	A clear explanation of available information	Explaining available information using clear examples	Articulating information to expand on ideas presented
<b>Justification</b>	No justification of points	Justification based on personal opinion	Justification using existing cases, concepts and theories	Justification using existing cases, concepts or theories and providing clear discussion of implications	
<b>Interpretation</b>	Misrepresentation of information	Basic paraphrasing of information	Clear interpretation of information	Critical discussion of available information	
<b>Application of knowledge (relevance)</b>	No application or discussion of relevance to questions asked	Application of knowledge to questions asked	Application of knowledge including discussion using relevant examples	Knowledge is critically applied and may include discussion of limitations	
<b>Prioritisation</b>	No prioritisation of information or knowledge	Some basic comparison of information	Ability to prioritise information and knowledge	Ability to prioritise information and knowledge based on criteria that learner has established	
<b>Breadth of knowledge</b>	Narrow and limited knowledge	Some indication of a wider view of the topics discussed	Presenting a wider view of the topics discussed by showing a good breadth of knowledge	Ability to point out other perspectives, including drawing from other fields of study	
INTERACTION QUALITY	<b>Critical discussion of contributions</b>	No engagement with other learner's contributions	Some basic discussion about other learner's contributions	Consistent engagement with other learners' contribution and acknowledgement of other learners' comments on own contributions	Contribution to a community of learners, with consistent engagement and advancement of each others ideas
	<b>New ideas from interactions</b>	No evidence of new ideas and thoughts from interaction	Some new ideas developed as a result of interaction	Some solutions and new ideas as a result of interactions	Collaborative approach to solution seeking and new ideas developed
	<b>Sharing outside knowledge</b>	No sharing of outside knowledge	Sharing generic information that is easily available from outside sources	Sharing real-world examples that may not be immediately obvious to other learners	Sharing real life knowledge, personal experience and examples of similar problems/solutions
	<b>Using social cues to engage other participants</b>	No engagement with others in the discussion forum	Answering some basic question posed by facilitator or other learners	Engaging with the work and discussion of other learners	Engaging and encouraging participation with fellow discussants in the forum
OBJECTIVE MEASURES (this category is subject to facilitator's expectations)	<b>Participation rates</b>	None or less than 2 posts per week	Between 2 to 5 posts per week	Between 5 to 10 good quality posts per week	More than 10 good quality posts per week
	<b>Consistency of participation</b>	Rarely posts with occasional activity	Occasional activity	Consistent activity	Consistent and productive activity