|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rubric for Assessing Papers** | **Superior** | **Good** | **Sufficient** | **Failure** |
| **Argument & Analysis** | Clear statement of the thesis and main conclusion of the paper. Thesis is well documented. Highly accurate and elegant. The argument is creative, compelling and elegant. Clearly breaks argument into relevant parts. | Thesis is obvious but not stated; the summary description is fairly accurate and has textual support. The argument is interesting and relevant. | Thesis is present but must be discovered, and is only somewhat relevant. The conclusion does little more than restate the problematic introduction.  Integrates some parts but other connections are muddy. | There is no coherent thesis.  Essay has no clear organizational pattern.  The argument is unclear, unsupported, and riddled with inaccurate statements. Parts simply reflect personal opinion rather than a reasoned argument. |
| **Sources** | Evidence is used from a wide range of sources, including lectures and course readings. Student also consults multiple scholarly books, websites, journal articles, etc. not explicitly discussed in class. | Evidence is used from many sources, but author relies heavily on a more limited set of sources. Effort has been made to go beyond material presented in class. | Uses only a few of the sources provided in class.  If outside sources are used, they are primarily non-scholarly (i.e., intended for a general audience) and/or web-based. | Poor use of sources in general; only minimally uses sources provided by instructor, and/or relies exclusively on non-scholarly outside sources. |
| **Clarity and Style** | All sentences are grammatically correct and clearly written. All information is accurate and up-to-date. Paper clearly has been spell-checked AND proofread, and contains no errors. | All sentences are grammatically correct and clearly written. All information is accurate and up-to-date. Paper clearly has been spell-checked AND proofread, and contains no more than a few minor errors, which do not adversely affect the reader’s ability to understand the essay. | A few sentences are grammatically incorrect or not clearly written. Several words are misused. Not all information is accurate and up-to-date. Paper contains several errors. Reader’s ability to understand essay may be compromised by these errors. | Paper is full of grammatical errors and bad writing. Many words are misused. Not all information is accurate and up-to-date. No evidence that the paper has been spell-checked or proofread, and contains numerous errors. Reader has a difficult time understanding essay because of errors. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rubric for Assessing Project** | **Superior** | **Good** | **Sufficient** | **Failure** |
| **Authenticity of theological reflection** | The argument is clear, well-founded, creative, compelling and elegant. The argument evokes a strong feeling of authenticity in several readers/viewers/or other people engaging it. | There is a clear theological statement in the project. Viewers/readers or other people engaging the project respond well to it. | Theological reflection is present but must be discovered, and is only somewhat relevant. Viewers/readers/ or other people engaging the project cannot tell if it is authentic. | There is no coherent theological reflection.  The project has no clear organizational pattern.  Readers/viewers/or other people engaging the piece feel manipulated. |
| **Authoritative engagement with resources** | Authority is built using a wide range of sources, including biblical content, elements from the faith tradition, and contemporary experiences. Student draws on resources – for example, scholarly books, websites, journal articles, television shows, films etc. not explicitly discussed in class. | Authority is built using several sources, but the student relies heavily on only one genre (biblical, traditional, etc.). Effort has been made to go beyond material presented in class. | The student relies on personal authority to carry the argument of the project.  If outside sources are used, they are primarily print-based. | Poor use of sources in general; only minimally uses sources provided by instructor, and/or relies exclusively on personal assertion. |
| **Creative agency** | The project is compelling, multi-sensory, and layered in approach. Care has been given with regards to editing and there is an openness to interpretation which invites participatory meaning-making. | The project is interesting, and can withstand more than one viewing/read/engagement. The student respects the genre of the project, and has clearly taken care in production. | The project is complete, makes a coherent point and some care has been expended in producing it. | The project appears sloppy and incoherent. It appears to function on one level only, constraining meaning rather than opening it up. |