|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rubric for Assessing Class Participation** | **Superior** | **Good** | **Sufficient** | **Failure** |
| **Reasoning** | Raises thoughtful questions which emerge from the assigned reading and presentations; is charitable to others in discussing issues. | Most positions are supported by evidence in the readings; comments and ideas generally contribute to class understanding of the material and concepts; is charitable to others. | Class contributions most often are based on personal opinion/anecdotes or fuzzy thinking. Comments suggest difficulty in following complex lines of argument; student’s arguments are convoluted and hard to follow. | Frequently resorts to extraneous comments which fail to connect in any recognizable way to the reading or lecture; illogical comments without substantiation are frequent; not charitable to others. |
| **Listening** | Deepens the discussion by drawing on other readings, or comments from others; Offers in depth analysis of complicated theological terms and ideas that aid in understanding. | Usually listens well to others as evidenced by clarifying questions, making connections to earlier readings and lectures; responds to comments of others in ways that open and deepen conversation | Has difficulty consistently listening well as evidenced by repetition of questions asked earlier or extraneous comments unrelated to the topic. Is occasionally distracted by electronic media. | Frequently appears distracted; distracted by computer or cell phone; shows no evidence of listening or understanding the comments of others; is absent from the discussion boards (where used) |
| **Reading** | Student has carefully read and understood the readings, followed up on footnotes and outside sources and comes to class prepared with questions and critiques. | Student has read and understood all assigned material as evidenced by prepared questions. Contributes regularly and well. | Student has read most of the material but demonstrates little thought or misunderstanding some main points. Work demonstrates inconsistent preparation. Contributions are infrequent & inconsistent. | Unable to understand basic concepts and is frequently unprepared as evidenced by inability to respond to foundational questions or contribute. Consistently does not contribute. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rubric for Assessing Paper** | **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 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.  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. |
| **Sources** | Evidence is used from a wide range of sources, including course reading and personal experience. Student also consults multiple resources 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). | 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 contains no errors. | All sentences are grammatically correct and clearly written. All information is accurate and up-to-date. Paper contains no more than a few errors. | 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. | Paper is full of grammatical errors and bad writing. Many words are misused. Not all information is accurate and up-to-date. The contains numerous 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. |