**PH.D. Biblical Interpretation and Theology**

**RESEARCH Grading Rubric**

Name of Student: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_/100

Name of Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Percentage: \_\_\_\_%

Please indicate the assessment of the student’s demonstration of skills and qualities in each area by:

1. selecting the number (from 0-4) corresponding to the rating you believe most appropriately
reflects his or her performance;
2. adding a brief comment, whenever possible (and at least one per section: A, B, C, etc.),
to clarify your rating and to provide further detail about your observation; and
3. adding the scores for each section and calculating a percentage score.

**Scale**:

 4 = Excellent = superior qualities

 3 = Very good = above average qualities

 2 = Good = average qualities

 1 = Limited = below average, inconsistent quality

 0 = Poor = inadequate, unacceptable

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| A. TOPIC SELECTION & RATIONALE |
| 1. The chosen topic is **worthy of study**, having both **academic** value (serving to contribute to the field of study) and **practical** value (in the service of humanity, the work of the local church, or the kingdom of God). Originality of thesis is evaluated.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The student has given the topic an **interesting and understandable title**, and has offered a **clear and cogent rationale** for its selection.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| The student has stated the research goal (question, hypothesis, issue or argument) with a burden of proof, i.e., in a way that its outcome is objectively measurable. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The student has clearly described the scope and limits of the study, clarified any necessary terms, issues, or assumptions and explained his/her approach and methodology. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments: |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| B. RESEARCH & ORGANIZATION (including LITERATURE REVIEW) |
| 1. The student has chosen and demonstrated a **research method** that is **adequate** to access the data and to accomplish the stated goals.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The structure and organization of the paper reveals a **scope** of investigation that is **comprehensive** of the chosen topic, with the depth of investigation expected of doctoral candidates.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| The student demonstrates that he or she knows how to gather appropriate resources, evaluate the material, and glean significant information relevant to his or her topic.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The student has demonstrated an awareness of the contemporary literature related to the topic and has summarized and evaluated it accurately, noting nuances. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The outline is clear and cogent. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments: |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| C. CRITICAL THINKING SKILLS (including HISTORY OF INTERPRETATION) |
| The student understands the history of interpretation related to the topic and has summarized accurately the various views through time. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Drawing from the past and present, the student begins his/her argument by laying a foundation of the current **state of the research** on the topic.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The student has shown evidence of **critical assessment**, which evaluates the **merits and deficiencies** of opposing viewpoints.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| The student employs higher levels of thinking (cf. Bloom’s Taxonomy: e.g., application > analysis > synthesis > evaluation) and the Canons of Criticism (completeness, relevance, accuracy, consistency, and method [logic]). |  |  |  |  |  |
| The student has demonstrated critical thinking skills by:  • developing a legitimate thesis and arriving at a conclusion that is consistent with his/her research, • presenting evidence in a coherent and compelling manner, and  • defending the thesis over against opposing and competing viewpoints. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments: |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| D. WRITING, VERBAL EXPRESSION, ACADEMIC FORM (OVERALL) |
| 1. The writing of the paper is mechanically sound with regard to **word use** and **selection, gender-inclusive language, spelling, punctuation, capitalization, grammar,** and **syntax**.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| The student writes in a clear, unencumbered style so that meaning is clearly understood. |  |  |  |  |  |
| There is coherent and logical development of thought:• well-constructed paragraphs **clearly announce subjects**; and**• transitional paragraphs** between sections and chapters that facilitate the reader in terms of flow of thought.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The student has constructed all the requisite **parts** of the paper in a manner that conforms to **Turabian** (academic style).
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The student has cited research sources (both in the **footnotes and bibliography**) in a manner that conforms to **Turabian** academic style.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments: |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| E. BIBLICAL KNOWLEDGE & INTERPRETATIVE SKILLS |
| 1. The student has conducted his/her investigation so as to provide interaction with **relevant biblical material**, which supports, guides, and corroborates his/her conclusion.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| The student has interpreted biblical material using sound exegetical, hermeneutical, and redemptive-historical approaches, demonstrating adequate expertise also in the biblical languages. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The student’s interpretation has drawn from a breadth and depth of  • primary sources (including Scripture\_\_\_\_[[1]](#footnote-1), ancient \_\_\_\_,  historical \_\_\_, and contemporary \_\_\_ sources), and • **secondary sources** (Journals \_\_\_\_ and Commentaries \_\_\_\_). |  |  |  |  |  |
| The student’s interpretation has drawn from the best of relevant • reference works (including those on the original languages\_\_\_\_,  dictionaries/encyclopedia/atlases \_\_\_\_, history, archeology, etc. \_\_\_\_), and • **specialized studies** (theologies, introductions \_\_\_\_ and monographs \_\_\_\_). |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The student has made an **application** of the conclusion of the study (in the service of humanity, the work of the local church, or Christ’s kingdom).
2. The student demonstrates awareness of the interplay between hermeneutics, exegesis, biblical theology, and systematic theology through his/her analysis, synthesis, evaluation, and methodology.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments: |

1. These blanks are for the reviewer’s convenience in tallying the number of sources in the Bibliography of each genre. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)