**Assessment Grid for BA in Christian Ministry**

**Terms Assessed: fall 2019 (201), spring 2020 (203), fall 2020 (211), spring 2021 (213),**

**summer 2021 (215), fall 2021 (221), spring 2022 (223), fall 2022 (231)**

**Jury Members: Tommy Doughty, Greg Wilton, Sandy Vandercook**

**Date: July 31, 2023**

***Program Learning Objective #1:*** *Biblical Interpretation--The graduate will interpret and communicate the Bible accurately.*

***Alignment to Mission****: Proclamation*

***Alignment to ATS/NASM/CACREP Goals (if applicable):*** *n/a*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measures (means of program assessment)** | **Criteria for Success (benchmark set last cycle)** | **Results (report, summarize, reflect)—disaggregate by location and semester** | **Use of Results (make action plan to reach criteria, set new criteria if needed, AND discuss success of previous cycle’s action plans)** |
| **DIRECT MEASURES** |
| ***Direct Measure 1***Senior Seminar final paper using the Biblical Interpretation Assessment Rubric\*\* | no previous benchmark as the new measure was adopted FA21 | OVERALL—2.82* FA19—2.71 (*nola 2.24; onl 3.17*)
* SP20—2.93 (*nola 2.75; onl 3.1*)
* FA20—2.73 (*nola 2.56; onl 2.63,*

*lciw 3.0*)* SP21—3.02 (*nola 3.4; onl 2.75*)
* FA21—NONE
* SP22—2.41 (*nola2.12; onl 2.69*)
* FA22—3.1 (*nola 2.42, onl 3.13;*

*Whit 4.0; span onl 2.85*) | Recommendations:1. The previous (2020) jury action plan was to use the Biblical Interpretation Assessment Rubric for the senior paper, so that action plan was achieved. However, recommendation 2 below reflects that this direct measure no longer works for the purpose of this program.2. The Senior Seminar paper is no longer the best artifact for this SLO since students may not write a senior thesis with a strong biblical interpretation focus. We recommend collecting the exegesis papers from Intro to Preaching, Teaching Methods, and Interpreting the Bible and assessing them with the Biblical Interpretation Assessment Rubric.3. The BA in Christian Ministry program has been revised and renamed as the BA in Church Ministry. The jury agreed to keep this SLO and the revised direct measure (see recommendation 2 above) for the BA in Church Ministry. |
| Reflection:1. The scores for online sections seem higher. Possible reason—the professor intentionally reaches out to students multiple times per semester to ensure progress on the paper and to provide feedback on progress.2. The spring 22 scores are noticeably lower than the other semesters. For that semester, the teacher transitioned out of our institution mid-semester, which could explain the lower scores.3. The Whitworth score of 4.0 is an anomaly, which likely is attributed to the fact that the teacher (an adjunct) assessed the artifacts. All other assessments were completed by an on-campus faculty member. |
| **INDIRECT MEASURES** |
| ***Indirect Measure 1***Faculty-generated Local Test Questions given with the ETS Proficiency Profile Exam  | average score of sampled students of 81.5% | **NOT MET**OVERALL—71.69 (-9.81% from previous)* FA19—66.45 (*nola 74.17, online 56.66, extensions 73.33, prisons 61.66*)
* SP20—77.44 (*no disaggregated data*)
* FA20—no data
* SP21—68.02 (*nola 68.96, online 63.33, extensions 78.89, prisons 60.88*)
* FA21—67.67 (*no disaggregated data*)
* SP22-- SP 22—no data 78.89 (*nola 86.11, online 71.67, extensions 71.67*)
* FA22—test no longer given
 | Recommendations:1. Because the surveys/questions are no longer being used, we recommend using items 1, 2, and 9 from the following course evaluations for our indirect measures:Interpreting the BibleIntroduction to PreachingIntroduction to Teaching2. The BA in Christian Ministry program has been revised and renamed as the BA in Church Ministry. The jury agreed to keep this SLO and the revised indirect measure (see recommendation 1 above) for the BA in Church Ministry. |
| Reflection1. These scores for on-campus students were noticeably higher than online or extension center scores. Most likely, faculty on campus are more aware of the main concepts related to the faculty-generated local questions. 2. Since we no longer give the EPP test, which was the venue for asking these faculty-generated questions, we are moving to using course evaluations as an indirect measure. |
| ***Indirect Measure 2***BACM Student Satisfaction Survey | average score of 3.6 on a 4-point scale | **NOT MET**OVERALL—3.33 (-0.27% from previous)* FA19—3.5 (*nola 3.46, online 3.07, extension 3.63, prisons 3.82*)
* SP 20—no data
* FA20—no data
* SP 21—3.45 (*nola 3.35, online 3.23, extensions 3.58, prisons 3.64*)
* FA21—3.03 (*no disaggregated data*)
* SP22—no data
* FA22—test no longer given
 | Recommendations:See recommendations for Indirect Measure 1. |
| Reflection1. This survey is not mandatory, so we may not be getting the best data. 2. Since we no longer deploy this survey, we are moving to using course evaluations as an indirect measure. |

*\*Note: The LC faculty voted to amend the assessment plan on 11.10.21, so the measures on this grid reflect the revised assessment plan, which is added to the end of this document in Appendix A.*

*\*\*See Appendix B for the assessment rubrics specific to the three SLOs.*

***Program Learning Objective #2:*** *Service and Leadership--The graduate will demonstrate the ability to serve, lead, and equip churches through pastoral, worship, and educational ministries.*

***Alignment to Mission:*** *Servanthood, Mission*

***Alignment to ATS/NASM/CACREP Goals (if applicable):*** *n/a*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measures (means of program assessment)** | **Criteria for Success (benchmark set last cycle)** | **Results (report, summarize, reflect)—disaggregate by location and semester** | **Use of Results (make action plan to reach criteria, set new criteria if needed, AND discuss success of previous cycle’s action plans)** |
| **DIRECT MEASURES** |
| ***Direct Measure***Lesson Plan/Sermon Brief Rubric (using Teaching Methods and Intro to Preaching) | 76% of sampled students will score an average of 2.0 or higher on the rubric | **MET**OVERALL—94.6% (+18.6 from previous) (IP 99.25%, TM 90%) 3.09Intro to Preaching 3.13 * FA19: 97% 3.17

 *(hardee 90%, nola 100%,*  *Jackson 100%)* * SP20 ---
* FA20 ---
* SP21: 100% 2.88

 *(sfl 100%)* * FA21: 100% 3.03

 *(angola 100%, nola 100%* *Monroe 100%)* * SP22 ---
* FA22: 100% 3.43

 *(nola 100%, onl 100%,* *kti 100%)* Teaching Methods 3.04* FA19: 100% (*nola 100%,, onl 100%, Jackson 100%, s’port 100%, sga 100%*) 3.1
* SP20: 10% (*sfl span 100%)* 2.73
* FA20 ---
* SP21: 100% (*onl 100%)* 3.27
* FA21 ---
* SP22: 100% (*nola 100%, flex 100%)* 3.63
* FA22: 50% (*onl 100%, sfl French 0%*) 2.47
 | Recommendations:1. The previous action plan for the SLO was to eliminate an additional artifact, which was done. 2. The jury determined that using the benchmark set last cycle is not the best use of the data. Instead, the overall rubric scores would be a better use of the data. The overall rubric scores, noted in red in column 3, show an overall score of 3.09, which is the recommended benchmark moving forward. 3. The BA in Christian Ministry program has been revised and renamed as the BA in Church Ministry. The jury agreed to keep this SLO and the revised direct measure (see recommendation 2 above) for the BA in Church Ministry. Additionally, the jury determined to add one direct measure to SLO 2 for the BA in Church Ministry: the final paper for Discipleship Strategies. A team of instructors will create the rubric to be used to assess the paper. |
| Reflection:1. The jury determined that this direct measure is a good choice to assess this SLO. 2. The benchmark of 76% at 2.0 seems not to provide clear assessment data since most students achieve a score of 2.0.  |
| **INDIRECT MEASURES** |
| ***Indirect Measure 1*** Faculty-generated Local Test Questions given with the ETS Proficiency Profile Exam  | average score of sampled students of 81.5% | **NOT MET**OVERALL—71.69 (-9.81% from previous)* FA19—66.45 (*nola 74.17, online 56.66, extensions 73.33, prisons 61.66*)
* SP20—77.44 (*no disaggregated data*)
* FA20—no data
* SP21—68.02 (*nola 68.96, online 63.33, extensions 78.89, prisons 60.88*)
* FA21—67.67 (*no disaggregated data*)
* SP22-- SP 22—no data 78.89 (*nola 86.11, online 71.67, extensions 71.67*)
* FA22—test no longer given
 | Recommendations:1. Because the surveys/questions are no longer being used, we recommend using items 1, 2, and 9 from the following course evaluations for our indirect measures:Interpreting the BibleIntroduction to PreachingDiscipleship Strategies2. The BA in Christian Ministry program has been revised and renamed as the BA in Church Ministry. The jury agreed to keep this SLO and the revised indirect measure (see recommendation 1 above) for the BA in Church Ministry. |
| Reflection:1. These scores for on-campus students were noticeably higher than online or extension center scores. Most likely, faculty on campus are more aware of the main concepts related to the faculty-generated local questions. 2. Since we no longer give the EPP test, which was the venue for asking these faculty-generated questions, we are moving to using course evaluations as an indirect measure. |
| ***Indirect Measure 2***BACM Student Satisfaction Survey | average score of 3.6 on a 4-point scale | **NOT MET**OVERALL—3.33 (-0.27% from previous)* FA19—3.5 (*nola 3.46, online 3.07, extension 3.63, prisons 3.82*)
* SP 20—no data
* FA20—no data
* SP 21—3.45 (*nola 3.35, online 3.23, extensions 3.58, prisons 3.64*)
* FA21—3.03 (*no disaggregated data*)
* SP22—no data
* FA22—test no longer given
 | Recommendations:See recommendations for Indirect Measure 1. |
| Reflection:1. This survey is not mandatory, so we may not be getting the best data. 2. Since we no longer deploy this survey, we are moving to using course evaluations as an indirect measure. |

***Program Learning Objective #3:*** *Historical and Theological Interpretation****--****The graduate will interpret and communicate theological and historical truth accurately.*

***Alignment to Mission****: Proclamation*

***Alignment to ATS/NASM/CACREP Goals (if applicable):*** *n/a*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measures (means of program assessment)** | **Criteria for Success (benchmark set last cycle)** | **Results (report, summarize, reflect)—disaggregate by location and semester** | **Use of Results (make action plan to reach criteria, set new criteria if needed, AND discuss success of previous cycle’s action plans)** |
| **DIRECT MEASURES** |
| ***Direct Measure 1***Senior Seminar final paper using Theological and Historical Assessment Rubric | no previous benchmark as the new measure was adopted FA21 | OVERALL—2.84* FA19—2.73 (*nola 2.24; onl 3.17*)
* SP20—2.87 (*nola 2.75; onl 3.1*)
* FA20—3.05 (*nola 2.56; onl 2.63,*

*lciw 3.0*)* SP21—2.95 (*nola 3.4; onl 2.75*)
* FA21—NONE
* SP22—2.25 (*nola2.12; onl 2.69*)
* FA22—3.21 (*nola 2.42, onl 3.13;*

*Whit 4.0; span onl 2.85*) | Recommendations:1. The previous (2020) jury action plan was to use the Biblical Interpretation Assessment Rubric for the senior paper, so that action plan was achieved. However, recommendation 2 below reflects that this direct measure no longer works for the purpose of this program.2. The Senior Seminar paper is no longer the best artifact for this SLO since students may not write a senior thesis with a strong biblical interpretation focus. We recommend using Christian Doctrine Theological Reflection #2 assignments and assessing them with the Theological and Historical Assessment Rubric.3. The BA in Christian Ministry program has been revised and renamed as the BA in Church Ministry. The jury agreed to keep this SLO and the revised direct measure (see recommendation 2 above) for the BA in Church Ministry. |
| Reflection:1. The scores for online sections seem higher. Possible reason—the professor intentionally reaches out to students multiple times per semester to ensure progress on the paper and to provide feedback on progress.2. The spring 22 scores are noticeably lower than the other semesters. For that semester, the teacher transitioned out of our institution mid-semester, which could explain the lower scores.3. The Whitworth score of 4.0 is an anomaly, which likely is attributed to the fact that the teacher (an adjunct) assessed the artifacts. All other assessments were completed by an on-campus faculty member. |
| **INDIRECT MEASURES** |
| ***Indirect Measure 1*** 1. Faculty-generated Local Test Questions given with the ETS Proficiency Profile Exam  | Average score of sampled students of 81.5% | **NOT MET**OVERALL—71.69 (-9.81% from previous)* FA19—66.45 (*nola 74.17, online 56.66, extensions 73.33, prisons 61.66*)
* SP20—77.44 (*no disaggregated data*)
* FA20—no data
* SP21—68.02 (*nola 68.96, online 63.33, extensions 78.89, prisons 60.88*)
* FA21—67.67 (*no disaggregated data*)
* SP22-- SP 22—no data 78.89 (*nola 86.11, online 71.67, extensions 71.67*)
* FA22—test no longer given
 | Recommendations:1. Because the surveys/questions are no longer being used, we recommend using items 1, 2, and 9 from the following course evaluations for our indirect measures:Christian Doctrine2. The BA in Christian Ministry program has been revised and renamed as the BA in Church Ministry. The jury agreed to keep this SLO and the revised indirect measure (see recommendation 1 above) for the BA in Church Ministry. |
| Reflection:1. These scores for on-campus students were noticeably higher than online or extension center scores. Most likely, faculty on campus are more aware of the main concepts related to the faculty-generated local questions. 2. Since we no longer give the EPP test, which was the venue for asking these faculty-generated questions, we are moving to using course evaluations as an indirect measure. |
| ***Indirect Measure 2***BACM Student Satisfaction Survey | average score of 3.6 on a 4-point scale | **NOT MET**OVERALL—3.33 (-0.27% from previous)* FA19—3.5 (*nola 3.46, online 3.07, extension 3.63, prisons 3.82*)
* SP 20—no data
* FA20—no data
* SP 21—3.45 (*nola 3.35, online 3.23, extensions 3.58, prisons 3.64*)
* FA21—3.03 (*no disaggregated data*)
* SP22—no data
* FA22—test no longer given
 | Recommendations:See recommendations for Indirect Measure 1. |
| Reflection:1. This survey is not mandatory, so we may not be getting the best data. 2. Since we no longer deploy this survey, we are moving to using course evaluations as an indirect measure. |

Executive Summary

Based on the direct measures for the BA in Christian Ministry, students met the benchmarks for SLO 2—a strong direct measure. Although no previous benchmarks had been set for SLOs 1 and 3, students still performed at average levels (2.82 and 2.84 on a 4-point scale), indicating positive attainment of the SLOs. The indirect measures, for which none of the benchmarks were met, were not the best measures to use, as evidenced by the fact that we no longer employ them. In general, however, the jury determined that the program has fulfilled its purpose.

The BA in Christian Ministry has been the “gold standard” degree in Leavell College, particularly since we had only one other major (Music) for many years. With the addition of new majors, the BA in Christian Ministry will cease as a major effective July 31, 2023 (the end of the 2022-2023 academic year). Thus, this assessment is the last assessment of that program. A new program, the BA in Church Ministry, is closely aligned with the BA in Christian Ministry, so the jury decided to modify the assessment measures used here for the new BA in Church Ministry.

Overall, the jury believes that Leavell College students have been served well by the BA in Christian Ministry, as evidenced by their desire to modify the assessment measures for use in the new BA in Church Ministry.

**Appendix A:**

**Leavell College**

**Revised Assessment Plan**

**Assessment Plan for New Curriculum**

(Approved by Leavell College Faculty 8/1/19

rev 11.10.21--effective beginning term 201)

**General Education Competencies (GECs)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **GEC** | **Direct Measure** | **Indirect Measure** |
| **EmbeddedAssignment** | **Instrument Usedto Assess** |
| #1—Critical Thinking | Senior Seminar | Critical Thinking Rubric | * ETS Proficiency Profile Exam (Graduates only)
* Student Satisfaction Survey (Graduates only)
 |
| #2—Oral Communication | Senior Seminar oral defense (videotaped) | Modified AAC&U Oral Presentation Rubric | * Student Satisfaction Survey (Graduates only)
 |
| #3—Written Communication | Senior Seminar | Written Communication Rubric | * ETS Proficiency Profile Exam (Graduates only)
* Student Satisfaction Survey (Graduates only)
 |
| #4—Quantitative Reasoning | Pass or Fail scores on selected items of the final exams. Selected items correspond to rubric criteria. | Leavell College Quantitative Literacy Rubric | * ETS Proficiency Profile Exam (Graduates only)
* Student Satisfaction Survey (Graduates only)
 |

**Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs)**

**AA**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PSLO** | **Direct Measure** | **Indirect Measure** |
| **EmbeddedAssignment** | **Instrument Usedto Assess** |
| #1—Biblical Interpretation | * Hermeneutics final paper
 | * Biblical Interpretation Rubric
 | * Faculty-generated Local Test Questions given with the ETS Profile Proficiency Exam (Graduates only)
* Student Satisfaction Survey (Graduates only)
 |
| #2—Service & Leadership | * Lesson Plan (Teaching Methods) or Sermon Brief (Intro to Preaching)
 | * Lesson Plan and Sermon Brief Assessment Rubric
 | * Faculty-generated Local Test Questions given with the ETS Profile Proficiency Exam (Graduates only)
* Student Satisfaction Survey (Graduates only)
 |
| #3—Theological & Historical Interpretation | * Christian Doctrine research paper
 | * Biblical Interpretation Rubric
 | * Faculty-generated Local Test Questions given with the ETS Profile Proficiency Exam (Graduates only)
* Student Satisfaction Survey (Graduates only)
 |

**BA**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PSLO** | **Direct Measure** | **Indirect Measure** |
| **Embedded****Assignment** | **Instrument Usedto Assess** |
| #1—Biblical Interpretation | * Senior Seminar
 | * Biblical Interpretation Rubric
 | * Faculty-generated Local Test Questions given with the ETS Profile Proficiency Exam (Graduates only)
* Student Satisfaction Survey (Graduates only)
 |
| #2—Service and Leadership | * Lesson Plan (Teaching Methods) or Sermon Brief (Intro to Preaching)
 | * Lesson Plan and Sermon Brief Assessment Rubric
 | * Faculty-generated Local Test Questions given with the ETS Profile Proficiency Exam (Graduates only)
* Student Satisfaction Survey (Graduates only)
 |
| #3—Historical and Theological Interpretation | * Senior Seminar
 | * Biblical Interpretation Rubric
 | * Faculty-generated Local Test Questions given with the ETS Profile Proficiency Exam (Graduates only)
* Student Satisfaction Survey (Graduates only)
 |

**BAM**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PSLO** | **Direct Measure** | **Indirect Measure** |
| **Embedded****Assignment** | **Instrument Usedto Assess** |
| #1—Worship Leadership | * LCMV/LCMP performance juries
* LCMP1203 piano proficiency
* LCMR4010 (recital)
 | * Jury forms used by music department
 | * Faculty-generated Local Test Questions given with the ETS Profile Proficiency Exam (Graduates only)
* Student Satisfaction Survey (Graduates only)
 |
| #2—Service and Leadership | * LCMR4010 (recital)
* LCME4101 Worship Ministry Discipleship
 | * Jury forms used by music dept.
* New rubric specific to LCME4101
 | * Faculty-generated Local Test Questions given with the ETS Profile Proficiency Exam (Graduates only)
* Student Satisfaction Survey (Graduates only)
 |
| #3—Historical and Theological Interpretation | * LCGE4300 Senior Seminar
* LCMH4301 History

and Theology of Worship presentation | * Biblical Interpretation Rubric
* Grading rubric used for project
 | * Faculty-generated Local Test Questions given with the ETS Profile Proficiency Exam (Graduates only)
* Student Satisfaction Survey (Graduates only)
 |

**Appendix B:**

**Leavell College**

**Assessment Rubrics**

**for BACM**

**LEAVELL COLLEGE** Course Name and Number \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION RUBRIC** Term\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Location \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

SLO: The graduate will interpret and communicate the Bible accurately.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION CRITERIA** | **4 – Excellent** | **3 - Good** | **2 – Meets Requirements** | **1 – Needs Improvement** | **0 – Inadequate\*** |
| The student identifies the original, historical context of the passage. | Has identified the historical context of the passage. | Has given attention to the historical context of the passage. | Shows some awareness of the historical context of the passage. | Shows limited awareness of the historical context but lacks specificity as it relates to the passage. | Utilization of proof texting. |
| The student identifies the theological maxims of the passage. | Has identified the theological maxims in the passage.  | Has given attention to the theological maxims of the passage. | Shows some awareness of the theological maxims in the passage.  | Shows limited awareness of the theological maxims but lacks specificity as it relates to the passage.  | Displays broad lack of awareness of the theological maxims in the passage.  |
| The student demonstrates a consistent modern application. | Has made the application between ancient and modern contexts.  | Has identified elements of the relationship between ancient and modern contexts. | Shows some awareness of the relationship between ancient and modern contexts. | Shows limited awareness of the relationship between ancient and modern contexts. | Ignores the relationship between ancient and modern contexts.  |
| The student identifies a spiritual/transformational component of the passage. | Has made the spiritual connection between the passage and the believer.  | Has an awareness for the spiritual connection needed between the passage and the believer. | Shows some awareness of the spiritual connection between the passage and the believer. | Shows limited awareness of the spiritual connection between the passage and the believer. | Ignores the spiritual connection between the passage and the believer. |
| Comments |  |  |  |  |  |

**LEAVELL COLLEGE** Course Name and Number \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**LESSON PLAN/SERMON BRIEF** Term\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Location \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ASSESSMENT RUBRIC**

SLO: The graduate The graduate will demonstrate the ability to serve, lead, and equip churches through pastoral, worship, and educational ministries.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **LESSON PLAN/SERMON BRIEF CRITERIA** | **4 – Excellent** | **3 - Good** | **2 – Meets Requirements** | **1 – Needs Improvement** | **0 – Inadequate\*** |
| **Objectives** | **All** objectives are clearly articulated according to the defined structure and are aligned to the respective elements. | **51-75%** of the objectives are clearly articulated according to the defined structure and are aligned to the respective elements. | **26-50%** of the objectives are clearly articulated according to the defined structure and are aligned to the respective elements. | **<=25%** of the objectives are clearly articulated according to the defined structure and are aligned to the respective elements. | **None** of the objectives are clearly articulated according to the defined structure and are aligned to the respective elements. |
| **Elements** | **All** elements are written according to the defined structure and are **aligned** to their respective elements. | **51-75%** of the elements are written according to the defined structure and are **aligned** to their respective elements. | **26-50%** of the elements are written according to the defined structure and are **aligned** to their respective elements. | **<=25%** of the elements are written according to the defined structure and are **aligned** to their respective elements. | **None** of the elements are written according to the defined structure and are **aligned** to their respective elements. |
| **Transition**  | The transition is imaginative and is an effective bridge between elements. | The transition is thoughtful and generally serves as an effective bridge between elements. | The transition is awkward and does not effectively bridge between elements. | The transition is either missing or does not bridge between elements. | No transitions are given. |
| **Language, Visuals, and Object Lessons** | Language, visuals, and object lessons are imaginative, memorable, and compelling and enhance the lesson or sermon. Language is appropriate to target audience. | Language, visuals, and object lessons are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language is appropriate to target audience. | Language, visuals, and object lessons are mundane and commonplace and partially support the effectiveness of the lesson or sermon. Language is appropriate to target audience. | Language, visuals, and object lessons are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the lesson or sermon. Language is not appropriate to target audience. | Appropriate language, visuals, and object lessons do not appear in the lesson or sermon.  |
| **Biblical and Doctrinal Integrity of Passage** | The passage has been exegeted and taught appropriately **throughout each** of the elements. | The passage has been exegeted and taught appropriately throughout**51-75%** of the elements. | The passage has been exegeted and taught appropriately throughout**26-50%** of the elements. | The passage has not been exegeted or taught appropriately throughout **<=25%** of the elements. | The passage has not been exegeted or taught appropriately throughout **ANY** of the elements. |
| **Mechanics** | No grammar, spelling or format errors. | **1 to 2** grammar, spelling, or format errors (combined). | **3 to 4** grammar, spelling, or format errors (combined). | **> 4** grammar, spelling, or format errors (combined). | Excessive grammar, spelling, or format errors (combined). |

**LEAVELL COLLEGE** Course Name and Number \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**THEOLOGICAL/HISTORICAL INTERPRETATION RUBRIC** Term\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Location \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

SLO: The graduate will communicate historical and theological truth accurately.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **T&H INTERPRETATION CRITERIA** | **4 – Excellent** | **3 – Good** | **2 – Meets Requirements** | **1 – Needs Improvement** | **0 – Inadequate** |
| The student comprehends major doctrines and their relation to one another. | - Provides clear definitions, arguments, and application of doctrine | - Provides clear definitions and application of doctrine with fair supporting argumentation | - Provides fair definitions and application of doctrine with little supporting argumentation | - Provides weak definitions of doctrine with little application or supporting argumentation | - Lacks clarity of thought and communication |
| The student values the proclamation of accurate Christian truth. | -Expresses doctrine coherently within a Christian worldview | -Expresses doctrine with minor inaccuracies but within a consistent Christian worldview | -Expresses doctrine with minor inaccuracies within a sometimes inconsistent worldview | -Shows some connection to the Christian worldview with major lapses in accuracy or coherence | -Shows no connection to the Christian worldview |
| The student utilizes sound biblical interpretation to defend doctrinal positions. | - Provides pertinent biblical references and context for support consistent with the entire biblical narrative | - Provides biblical references for support with some attention to context or the entire biblical narrative | - Provides biblical references for support with weak connection to the entire biblical narrative  | - Provides biblical references as proof texts with no attention to context | - Provides no biblical references for support |
| The student displays awareness of major historical developments in doctrinal positions. | - Critiques major definitions, arguments, and implications of historical Christian teachings | - Identifies major definitions, arguments, and implications of historical Christian teachings | - Identifies some definitions and arguments of historical teachings with weak attention to their implications | - Lacks awareness of major historical Christian teachings including terminology or arguments | - Lacks attention to historical Christian teachings outside one’s own position |
| Comments: |  |  |  |  |  |