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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **A. CONTENT: The program/plan . . .** | **30%** |
| is very comprehensive, accurate, timely, addresses thoroughly the question with depth of understanding, and integrates relevant theories, concepts, and principles. | 5 |
| is reasonably comprehensive and integrates some relevant theories, concepts, and principles. | 4 |
| is fairly comprehensive and integrates few relevant theories, concepts, and principles. | 3 |
| shows some basic understanding of the topic on a superficial level. | 2 |
| does not show basic understanding of the topic. | 1 |

 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **D. CHRISTIAN WORLDVIEW: The program/plan . . .** | **10%** |
| integrates an excellent Christian worldview and follows a high moral standard.  | 5 |
| integrates a good Christian worldview and follows a good moral standard. | 4 |
| integrates some Christian worldview and follows a good moral standard. | 3 |
| integrates limited Christian worldview.  | 2 |
| integrates a very limited Christian worldview. | 1 |

 |
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **B. CRITICAL THINKING: The program/plan . . .**  | **20%** |
| displays clear, independent reasoning, supported with facts from multiple perspectives. Arguments are convincingly sustained.  | 5 |
| displays sound and convincing reasoning but demonstrates some limitations in critical thinking.  | 4 |
| is sound and convincing but a number of recurring critical thinking limitations are evident. | 3 |
| shows that critical thinking is somehow attempted, but is very limited. | 2 |
| does not show any evidence of critical thinking. | 1 |

 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **E. FEASIBILITY OF APPLICATION: The program/plan . . .** | **10%** |
| demonstrates an excellent link between theory and practice, with a high probability of success in the chosen context.  | 5 |
| proposes sound solutions that can work well.  | 4 |
| provides some good ideas that can work well. | 3 |
| provides few good ideas that can work well. | 2 |
| shows no practical application.  | 1 |
|  |  |

 |
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **C. ORGANIZATION OF IDEAS: The program/plan . . .** | **10%** |
| shows that structure and order effectively highlight the key ideas and supporting details; the reader is able to move through the text easily. | 5 |
| shows that structure and order highlight the key ideas and supporting details: the reader is able to move through the text quite easily. | 4 |
| shows that the overall organization is fairly effective; some key ideas and supporting details are not properly placed. | 3 |
| shows that the overall organization is poor; the structure and order are not easily visible. | 2 |
| shows no logical structure.  | 1 |

 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **F. LANGUAGE USAGE: The program/plan . . .** | **10%** |
| uses correct English exceptionally well and follows the format and style of scholarly writing. | 5 |
| generally uses correct English and follows the format and style of scholarly writing but has some easily visible language usage issues. | 4 |
| uses good English and follows the format and style of scholarly writing but has some recurring language issues.  | 3 |
| consistently shows issues in language usage and in the format and style of scholarly writing.  | 2 |
| is hardly understandable due to recurring major language and formatting and style issues. | 1 |

 |
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **G. LITERATURE: The program/plan . . .** | **10%** |
| is supported by a rich repertoire of credible\* and recent literature from leading thought leaders and experts in the discipline. | 5 |
| is supported by an adequate number of credible\* and recent literature from leading thought leaders and experts in the discipline. | 4 |
| is supported by an adequate number of literature, some of which are not credible\* and recent. | 3 |
| is supported by a limited number of literature. | 2 |
| is supported by a very limited number of literature. | 1 |

 |

\**Credible* as used in this rubric means trustworthy and cited accurately.
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