

**SCTR 26 • Gender in Early Christianity
Research Paper Evaluation Rubric**

(The total project is 40 pts: this 25 pts, and the Research Cluster paper and presentation accounts for the other 15 pts)

Objective	Unacceptable	Marginal	Acceptable	Exemplary	Score
Quality and Control of Argument	Paper reads like a list of citations with no conceptual thread governing their presentation. Synthesis and analysis of material lacking.	There is a thesis or descriptive agenda for the paper set out in the introduction, but the paper doesn't deliver on its promises. Synthesis and analysis of material lacking.	Thesis or flow of argument sometimes gets lost, or argument follows the sources too heavily.	Your voice (thesis or descriptive agenda) controls the flow of the paper. The argument is original and insightful, moving beyond any given source to a perspective informed but not dictated by the sources used.	16%
Comprehension and Integration of Sources	Discussion of quotations or references indicates poor comprehension of them. References not fully discussed or integrated in your argument. Serious problems with citations in notes and/or bibliography. Sources are not professional and/or do not go far beyond required class readings.	Comprehension of sources is adequate, but there are some problems in how you've integrated them in your paper, such as lack of appropriate correlation to your argument or inadequate citation. Some sources are not professional/peer-reviewed.	Good selection, comprehension and citation of the sources, but the integration into your argument could be improved.	Excellent selection and critical comprehension of sources. Citations never overtake paragraph, but are well introduced and their implications for your argument are discussed clearly. All source references and quotations are cited properly in notes.	16%
Quality of Integration and Reflection	One of the four sections is negligible, and one or more others are thin. Gender analysis is inadequate. Archaeological and Christian literary evidence are not well integrated with each other or with the wider research issue, or the Christian text is missing entirely. Neither of the reflection sections is well developed.	All four sections are present but thin. Gender analysis is spotty. Archaeological and Christian literary evidence are not well integrated with each other or with the wider research issue. One or other of the reflection sections is not fully developed.	All four sections present and adequate. Gender analysis may be a little thin in spots, or connection to wider research issue is not fully developed. Reflection sections are strong.	All four sections are present and strong. The archaeological and literary evidence are analyzed in terms of gender, and are appropriately applied to the wider research issue. The reflection on methods discusses the strengths and weaknesses of each method for gender reconstruction. The reflection on beliefs is mature and thoughtful.	20%
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.	16%
Format and Style	Failure to conform paper to Style Sheet.	Some serious problems in notes, bibliography, margins, or type face size.	Minor problems in notes, bibliography, type, or margins.	Paper conforms to Style Sheet.	12%
Timely Submission of All Stages	Stages of paper chronically late or incomplete.	A few stages late or incomplete.	One stage submitted late or incomplete.	All stages submitted on time and complete.	20%