

Scale	Basic	Beginning	Developing	Competent	Mature	Exemplary
Rhetorical Awareness Response to the situation and context of the class forum, recognizing the purpose of extending discussion, the need for a collegial register and tone with classmates and Georgia Tech community	Overlooks two or more aspects of the situation or assignment, and thus does not fulfill the task	Overlooks at least one aspect of the situation or assignment and thus compromises effectiveness	Attempts to respond to all aspects of the situation or assignment, but the attempt is incomplete	Addresses the situation or assignment in a complete but perfunctory or predictable way	Addresses the situation completely, with unexpected insight	Addresses the situation in a sophisticated manner that could advance professional discourse on the topic
Stance Position in response to the prompt, attention to the relevance and implications of that position to other members of the forum	Involves an unspecified or confusing argument; significance is not evident	Makes an overly general argument; significance is difficult to discern, or not appropriate to the rhetorical situation	Makes a simplistic or implicit argument, or multiple arguments that have no clear connection to one another; gestures towards significance, but does not fully develop it	Makes an explicit and straightforward argument that does not oversimplify the problem or question; explores at least one implication of the argument in depth	Makes a complex, unified argument that clearly articulates a position or stance; explores multiple implications of the argument	Offers an inventive, expert-like argument that clearly articulates a sophisticated position/stance; explores multiple implications of the argument in a compelling manner
Development of Ideas Use of sound-related evidence to support the position taken; the analysis that justifies the evidence given	Claims requiring support are not backed by necessary evidence; lacks analysis of major pieces of evidence; content is not substantive	Evidence and/or analysis is weak or contradictory; does not account for important evidence that could support or disprove the argument	Evidence provides minimal but necessary support to each point; attempted analysis is not sufficient to prove the argument	Evidence and analysis are substantive; they support the argument and related claims, but are mostly predictable	Evidence fully supports and proves the argument and all related claims; evidence is always paired with compelling analysis	Evidence and analysis are precise, nuanced, fully developed, and work together to enhance the argument,
Organization Reference to either the prompt or the posts they respond to, relevance of evidence, written introduction of audio posts, furthering forum discussion	Lacks unity in constituent parts; fails to create coherence among constituent parts; contains major argumentative holes or fallacies	Uses insufficient unifying statements; uses few effective connections; some logical moves necessary to prove the argument are absent	Uses some effective unifying claims, but a few are unclear; inconsistently makes connections between points and the argument; employs simplistic organization	States unifying claims with supporting points that relate clearly to the overall argument and employs an effective but mechanical scheme	Asserts and sustains a claim that develops logically and progressively; adapts typical organizational schemes for the context; achieves substantive coherence	Artifact is organized to achieve maximum coherence and momentum; connections are sophisticated and complex when required
Conventions Expectations for grammar, mechanics, style, citation	Involves errors that risk making the overall message distorted or incomprehensible	Involves a major pattern of errors	Involves some distracting errors	Meets expectations, with minor errors	Meets expectations in a virtually flawless manner	Exceeds expectations and manipulates conventions to advance the argument
Design for Medium Appropriateness and function of links or embedded images, videos, sounds	Lacks features necessary or significant for the genre; uses features that conflict with or ignore the argument	Omits some important features; distracting inconsistencies in features; uses features that don't support argument	Uses features that support the argument, but some match imprecisely with content; involves minor omissions or inconsistencies	Supports the argument with features that are generally suited to genre and content	Promotes engagement and supports the argument with features that efficiently use affordances	Persuades with careful, seamless integration of features and content and with innovative use of affordances