

Exegesis Project with Integrative “Narrative” Component

(Preamble: SEE the guideline, “Researching and Writing an Exegesis Paper.” Then come back here.)

A paper will be 3000 words in length. A digital project will be 30 minutes or less. It will be a thesis project, with the entire work arguing a single, coherent claim. The *body* of the work will be exegetical, oriented rigorously toward the meaning of the passage for its likely author(s), and for the community to who the passage was first addressed (so, *not* history-of-interpretation/reception, and *not* meaning of the text for modern communities). The work will follow Lester’s Rule of Engagement (see syllabus), and will ground its claims in public, shared evidence, and in a line of reasoning.

	Excellent: 100%	Competent: 80%	Developing: 60%	
Topic.	The topic fits the project parameters well, including a length 91-105% words/minutes assigned. (not including initial translation or footnotes).	The topic fits the project parameters passably or with minor revision. Or, length falls between 80-90% words/minutes assigned.	The topic fits the project parameters poorly. Or, length exceeds 106% words assigned or falls short of 80% words/minutes assigned. Automatic Base Grade of D.	5
Clarity of focus	The work has a clearly stated thesis that is rigorously adhered to in the body of the work.	The work lacks a clearly stated thesis but shows some central organizing idea.	The work lacks a clearly stated thesis and a central organizing idea cannot be easily inferred.	10
Factual accuracy.	The work’s content is factually accurate.	The work’s content is almost entirely accurate.	The work’s content is of mixed accuracy or is often inaccurate.	10

A.

Brooke Lester, 2010; rev. 2012.

(Some elements drawn from flow chart created by Christopher Heard, Pepperdine U.: <http://drchris.me/higgaion/?p=368>)

Exegesis Project with Integrative “Narrative” Component

(Preamble: SEE the guideline, “Researching and Writing an Exegesis Paper.” Then come back here.)

A paper will be 3000 words in length. A digital project will be 30 minutes or less. It will be a thesis project, with the entire work arguing a single, coherent claim. The *body* of the work will be exegetical, oriented rigorously toward the meaning of the passage for its likely author(s), and for the community to who the passage was first addressed (so, *not* history-of-interpretation/reception, and *not* meaning of the text for modern communities). The work will follow Lester’s Rule of Engagement (see syllabus), and will ground its claims in public, shared evidence, and in a line of reasoning.

	Excellent: 100%	Competent: 80%	Developing: 60%	
Engagement with course materials.	The work is thoroughly engaged with course readings, lectures, and discussions.	The work is reasonably well engaged with course materials, but at points either depends on inappropriate materials, or else ignores relevant materials.	The work is only minimally engaged with course materials.	10
Engagement with course methods.	The work uses methods taught and modeled in our shared coursework, grounding its claims in shared public evidence and a line of reasoning, and using specific approaches like form criticism, etc.	The work occasionally fails to ground its claims in shared public evidence and a line of reasoning, or fails to use specific approaches like form criticism, etc.	The work is inadequately grounded in the methods taught and modeled in our coursework.	10
GENRE TOTAL: 45 pts.				45

A.

Brooke Lester, 2010; rev. 2012.

(Some elements drawn from flow chart created by Christopher Heard, Pepperdine U.: <http://drchris.me/higgaion/?p=368>)

Exegesis Project with Integrative “Narrative” Component

(Preamble: SEE the guideline, “Researching and Writing an Exegesis Paper.” Then come back here.)

A paper will be 3000 words in length. A digital project will be 30 minutes or less. It will be a thesis project, with the entire work arguing a single, coherent claim. The *body* of the work will be exegetical, oriented rigorously toward the meaning of the passage for its likely author(s), and for the community to who the passage was first addressed (so, *not* history-of-interpretation/reception, and *not* meaning of the text for modern communities). The work will follow Lester’s Rule of Engagement (see syllabus), and will ground its claims in public, shared evidence, and in a line of reasoning.

	Excellent: 100%	Competent: 80%	Developing: 60%	
Level of critical analysis.	The work is analytical, with only an appropriate amount of summarizing.	The work shows analysis, while yet being weighted too heavily toward summary.	The work is mostly summarizing, lacking a significant level of analysis.	5
Clarity of warrants.	Warrants for claims are very clear, with lines of reasoning explicated thoroughly.	Warrants for claims are usually clear. Lines of reasoning are usually explicated thoroughly.	Warrants for claims are often unclear. Lines of reasoning often lack thorough explication.	5
Alternate or opposing viewpoints.	Alternate or opposing viewpoints are almost always taken into account.	Alternate or opposing viewpoints are usually taken into account.	Alternate or opposing viewpoints are frequently not taken into account.	5
Relevant data.	Work treats a reasonably large subset of the relevant data.	Work treats an adequate subset of the relevant data, with definable gap or gaps.	Work fails to treat a reasonably large subset of the relevant data, with numerable definable gaps.	5
CONTENT TOTAL: 20 pts.				20

A.

Brooke Lester, 2010; rev. 2012.

(Some elements drawn from flow chart created by Christopher Heard, Pepperdine U.: <http://drchris.me/higgaion/?p=368>)

Exegesis Project with Integrative “Narrative” Component

(Preamble: SEE the guideline, “Researching and Writing an Exegesis Paper.” Then come back here.)

A paper will be 3000 words in length. A digital project will be 30 minutes or less. It will be a thesis project, with the entire work arguing a single, coherent claim. The *body* of the work will be exegetical, oriented rigorously toward the meaning of the passage for its likely author(s), and for the community to who the passage was first addressed (so, *not* history-of-interpretation/reception, and *not* meaning of the text for modern communities). The work will follow Lester’s Rule of Engagement (see syllabus), and will ground its claims in public, shared evidence, and in a line of reasoning.

	Excellent: 100%	Competent: 80%	Developing: 60%	
Variety of resources.	Varied sources are used, supporting a well-rounded treatment (for example: critical commentaries; journal articles; essays in edited books; dictionary articles; others).	Sources show adequate variety of kind, with definable gap or gaps.	Sources do not show adequate variety of kind.	5
Number of resources.	Enough sources are substantively used to support the topic (at least 15-20 independent resources).	Not quite enough independent sources are substantively used to support the topic (about 11-14).	Not enough independent sources are substantively used to support the topic (about 4-10).	5

A.

Brooke Lester, 2010; rev. 2012.

(Some elements drawn from flow chart created by Christopher Heard, Pepperdine U.: <http://drchris.me/higgaion/?p=368>)

Exegesis Project with Integrative “Narrative” Component

(Preamble: SEE the guideline, “Researching and Writing an Exegesis Paper.” Then come back here.)

A paper will be 3000 words in length. A digital project will be 30 minutes or less. It will be a thesis project, with the entire work arguing a single, coherent claim. The *body* of the work will be exegetical, oriented rigorously toward the meaning of the passage for its likely author(s), and for the community to who the passage was first addressed (so, *not* history-of-interpretation/reception, and *not* meaning of the text for modern communities). The work will follow Lester’s Rule of Engagement (see syllabus), and will ground its claims in public, shared evidence, and in a line of reasoning.

	Excellent: 100%	Competent: 80%	Developing: 60%	
Quality of resources.	All sources exhibit good academic quality: peer-reviewed, mostly recent, critical in their orientation.	Sources are generally of good academic quality, with some few non-peer-reviewed, badly dated, apologetic, expository/devotional, or substandard sources on which the line of argument does not strongly rely.	Non-peer-reviewed, badly dated, apologetic, expository/devotional, or substandard sources dominate, or the line of argument strongly relies upon such sources.	5
Formal correctness of citations.	Source citations are formally correct (Turabian for introductory course; Turabian or SBL Handbook for advanced courses).	Source citations are largely formally correct, with some inconsistency or some regular error.	Source citations are often formally incorrect.	5
RESOURCES TOTAL: 20 pts.				20

A.

Brooke Lester, 2010; rev. 2012.

(Some elements drawn from flow chart created by Christopher Heard, Pepperdine U.: <http://drchris.me/higgaion/?p=368>)

Exegesis Project with Integrative “Narrative” Component

(Preamble: SEE the guideline, “Researching and Writing an Exegesis Paper.” Then come back here.)

A paper will be 3000 words in length. A digital project will be 30 minutes or less. It will be a thesis project, with the entire work arguing a single, coherent claim. The *body* of the work will be exegetical, oriented rigorously toward the meaning of the passage for its likely author(s), and for the community to who the passage was first addressed (so, *not* history-of-interpretation/reception, and *not* meaning of the text for modern communities). The work will follow Lester’s Rule of Engagement (see syllabus), and will ground its claims in public, shared evidence, and in a line of reasoning.

	Excellent: 100%	Competent: 80%	Developing: 60%	
Writing mechanics.	Work averages less than one error per page/minute. Work shows organization: sections and paragraphs with topic sentences and summary transitions.	Work averages less than 2 errors per page/minute. Or, paragraphing and sectioning occasionally detract from organization or lack clear transitions	Work averages 2 or more errors per page/minute. Or, paragraphing and sectioning frequently confuse organization or lack clear transitions.	5
Round Trip Ticket.	The introduction and the theological/hermeneutical sections amount to a round trip ticket: beginning and ending with the urgent theological concerns brought to the passage by the writer, and clearly connected to the thesis and its defense.	Elements of a “round trip ticket” are present but largely implicit or somewhat confused. Or, elements of a “round trip ticket” are not clearly connected to the details of the thesis and its defense.	Elements of a “round trip ticket” are missing or hopelessly confused. Or, elements of a “round trip ticket” are not connected to the details of the thesis and its defense.	5

A.

Brooke Lester, 2010; rev. 2012.

(Some elements drawn from flow chart created by Christopher Heard, Pepperdine U.: <http://drchris.me/higgaion/?p=368>)

Exegesis Project with Integrative “Narrative” Component

(Preamble: SEE the guideline, “Researching and Writing an Exegesis Paper.” Then come back here.)

A paper will be 3000 words in length. A digital project will be 30 minutes or less. It will be a thesis project, with the entire work arguing a single, coherent claim. The *body* of the work will be exegetical, oriented rigorously toward the meaning of the passage for its likely author(s), and for the community to who the passage was first addressed (so, *not* history-of-interpretation/reception, and *not* meaning of the text for modern communities). The work will follow Lester’s Rule of Engagement (see syllabus), and will ground its claims in public, shared evidence, and in a line of reasoning.

	Excellent: 100%	Competent: 80%	Developing: 60%	
Integration.	The essay explicitly explores relevant connections to the details of other course work: history, theology and ethics, theory and practice of ministry, education, etc.	The essay explores connections to course work that are of uncertain relevance, or insufficiently detailed, or somewhat confused.	The essay fails to make adequate connections to the details of other course work.	5
PRESENTATION TOTAL: 15 pts.				15
SUM TOTAL				100

A.

Brooke Lester, 2010; rev. 2012.

(Some elements drawn from flow chart created by Christopher Heard, Pepperdine U.: <http://drchris.me/higgaion/?p=368>)