

Criteria

Scales

Introduction & Conclusion 10%

The paper contains a succinct and suitable introduction and conclusion. The introduction clearly introduces the key theme(s) and orients the reader to the significance and structure of the ensuing discussion. The conclusion synthesizes the main points or arguments of the paper, and summarizes the findings and significance.

Your introduction(s) and conclusion(s) are exemplary according to the definition of this criterion.

Your introduction(s) and conclusion(s) are ideal. (See the definition of this criterion.)

Your introduction(s) and conclusion(s) demonstrate a good understanding of the requirements for them. (See the definition of this criterion.)

Your introduction(s) and conclusion(s) demonstrate partial understanding of the requirements for them. (See the definition of this criterion.)

Your introduction(s) and conclusion(s) demonstrate a flawed understanding of the requirements for them. (See the definition of this criterion.)

Your introduction(s) and conclusion(s) demonstrate almost no understanding of the requirements for them. (See the definition of this criterion.)

Your Introduction(s) and conclusion(s) are either missing or they demonstrate no understanding of the requirements for them. (See the definition of this criterion.)

Content 40%

The paper demonstrates an in-depth and nuanced understanding of the topic. It reveals an appreciation of the strengths and weaknesses of major schools of thought, and engages constructively and critically with biblical texts and scholarly sources, as is appropriate for the nature of the paper. The paper is written in original wording, appropriately paraphrasing and quoting other sources (the Bible and academic literature). Quotes are short, carefully selected for relevance, and contain text that is not easily paraphrased.

The content of your paper is exemplary according to the definition of this criterion.

The content of your paper is ideal. (See the definition of this criterion.)

The content of your paper demonstrates good knowledge and understanding of the topic. (See the definition of this criterion.)

The content of your paper demonstrates adequate knowledge and partial understanding of the topic. (See the definition of this criterion.)

The content of your paper demonstrates limited knowledge and flawed understanding of the topic. (See the definition of this criterion.)

The content of your paper demonstrates almost no knowledge or understanding of the topic. (See the definition of this criterion.)

The content of your paper demonstrates no knowledge or understanding of the topic. (See the definition of this criterion.)

Development & Argumentation 25%

The paper articulates a clear topic or thesis, is well organized and structured, and sustains a coherent and persuasive argument. The paper provides relevant and sufficient facts, definitions, concrete details, quotations, and examples to develop the topic. The paper effectively uses linking devices to join the major sections together, clarifying the relationships between claims and reasons, between reasons and evidence, and between claims and counterclaims.

Your development and argumentation of the topic are exemplary according to the definition of this criterion.

Your development and argumentation of the topic are ideal. (See the definition of this criterion.)

Your development and argumentation of the topic demonstrate a good understanding of the requirements for them. (See the definition of this criterion.)

Your development and argumentation of the topic demonstrate a partial understanding of the requirements for them. (See the definition of this criterion.)

Your development and argumentation of the topic demonstrate a flawed understanding of the requirements for them. (See the definition of this criterion.)

Your development and argumentation of the topic demonstrate almost no understanding of the requirements for them. (See the definition of this criterion.)

Your paper demonstrates no development or argumentation of the topic. (See the definition of this criterion.)

Writing & Presentation 10%

The paper is well written, including spelling, grammar, punctuation, word choice, sentence formation, paragraph structure and coherence. The writing is formal, not colloquial, and it clearly and concisely expresses the information to the reader. Presentation is clean, consistent and readable.

Your writing and presentation is exemplary according to the definition of this criterion.

Your writing and presentation is ideal. (See the definition of this criterion.)

Your writing is good. The reader can understand your paper without difficulty. (See the definition of this criterion.)

Your writing is sufficient for the reader to understand most of it. (See the definition of this criterion.)

Your writing is poor to the point of being unclear in meaning. (See the definition of this criterion.)

Your writing is inadequate. It conveys little meaning to the reader. (See the definition of this criterion.)

Your writing is incomprehensible. (See the definition of this criterion.)

Referencing 15%

The paper demonstrates coherence and consistency in referencing sources by means of in-text citations from the Bible and academic literature, and a list of works cited. Ample citations are provided that acknowledge the source of all information in the paper except that which originated with the student, and the full reference for each citation is provided in the list of works cited. Citations and bibliography entries contain all the relevant parameters (e.g. author, date, etc.) using a consistent style reference.

Your referencing is exemplary according to the definition of this criterion.

Your referencing is ideal. Almost all your sources are acknowledged and consistently formatted. (See the definition of this criterion.)

Your referencing is generally good enough for the reader to trace your sources but has a few inconsistencies and/or omissions. (See the definition of this criterion.)

You acknowledge most of your source materials correctly but your referencing has some errors, omissions, or inconsistencies that make it difficult to trace them. (See the definition of this criterion.)

Your paper omits many references and/or formats them inconsistently. The reader cannot always trace the source of the information presented. (See the definition of this criterion.)

Your paper demonstrates almost no knowledge of the referencing requirements. The reader would have great difficulty in tracing your source materials. (See the definition of this criterion.)

References are entirely absent or incoherently formatted. The reader cannot trace the source material using your references. (See the definition of this criterion.)