

Name: _____

/ 25

Objective	Unacceptable	Marginal	Acceptable	Exemplary	Score
Comprehension and Integration of Evidence	Your coverage of the archaeological information from your site is very thin and inaccurate. You do not always cite your sources when depending on others' ideas, and your citations are incomplete. Your discussion of the artifact and its historicity is thin.	Your coverage of the archaeological information on your site does not go beyond the original Camino page, and has some inaccuracies. Your footnotes are incomplete. You discuss the related artifact but don't integrate it well with the site you discussed, and/or you don't evaluate its historicity.	You add a few elements to the archaeological evidence presented on your original Camino page, and the evidence is accurate. You cite your professional sources correctly. You address questions of the historicity of your associated artifact.	You build on your initial Camino page by supplementing and presenting a complete picture of the archaeological and literary evidence. You cite your sources accurately and completely. You discuss and evaluate the historicity of the artifact accurately.	6
Integration and Comparison of Methods	You do not succeed in stepping away from description of evidence to the analysis of the methods used to interpret the evidence.	You don't address the links between the archaeological evidence and biblical texts about the site (or scholarship on those texts). You don't successfully identify the methods your authors are using. Your comparisons of the results of the methods for reconstructing the historical Jesus are thin. Your comparative analysis of the methods for their assumptions, strengths, and weaknesses addresses each separately, but not together.	You tie the archaeological evidence well to relevant biblical texts and scholarship, but don't fully address whether your biblical scholars do the same. You do not always identify the methods your authors are using. You offer solid comparisons of the results of methods for reconstructing Jesus, and your analysis of the assumptions, strengths and weaknesses of the methods to each other is adequate.	You tie the archaeological evidence clearly to relevant biblical texts and biblical scholarship, noting whether biblical scholars themselves integrate the two. You accurately identify the methods your sources are utilizing, and you compare the results of the methods carefully in terms of how well they help us to reconstruct the historical Jesus. You analyze the assumptions, strengths and weaknesses of the methods to each other.	7
Clarity of Expression	Poor grammar and spelling seriously impede effective communication.	Grammar and spelling are a problem, but your ideas are nevertheless apparent.	Occasional grammar and spelling problems, but good variation in sentence styles.	No grammar and spelling errors. Good variety of sentence styles.	6
Format and Style	Failure to conform paper to Style Sheet.	Some serious problems in notes, bibliography, margins, or type face size.	Margins, type face and general format fine; some problems with note or bibliography style.	Paper conforms to Style Sheet.	3
Punctuality	Both the hard and soft copies are significantly late.	Either the hard or soft copy is submitted well after the deadline, or both are submitted a little late.	Either the hard or soft copy is submitted a little late.	Both the hard and soft copies are submitted on time.	3