Department of Psychology PSY 330



Moral Psychology and Cultural Values

4 Units

Fall, 2019

Meeting days: Tuesday/Thursday Instructor: Dr. Ross Oakes Mueller

Meeting times: 10:00-11:45am **Phone:** x2905

Meeting location: Ryan Learning Center 104

(or outdoor location, TBD, if announced on **E-mail:** RossOakesMueller@pointloma.edu

Canvas)

Credit Hours: 4 Units Office hours: Click Here to Schedule

Final Exam: Thursday, December 17th from

10:30am-1:00pm (do not buy a ticket home Office Location: Culbertson 213

before this date)

PLNU Mission

To Teach ~ To Shape ~ To Send

Point Loma Nazarene University exists to provide higher education in a vital Christian community where minds are engaged and challenged, character is modeled and formed, and service becomes an expression of faith. Being of Wesleyan heritage, we aspire to be a learning community where grace is foundational, truth is pursued, and holiness is a way of life.

Catalog Description

Introduction to the psychological study of morality, prosocial behavior, and character development, including a survey of historical and contemporary theories of morality. Includes a particular emphasis on the role of cultural norms and values, as well as an analysis of the ways in which such values are developed and transmitted in contemporary culture (e.g., media, academics, family, etc.).

Learning Outcomes

In taking this class, you can expect:

- 1. To learn the historical and contemporary psychological theories of moral development and moral motivation.
- 2. To learn to apply moral psychological theories to better enhance character development in real-life situations (e.g., parenting, education, preaching, discipleship, etc.).
- To better understand the differences in values across cultures, as well as factors that may contribute to such differences, and the implications that such differences have for a life of Christian discipleship.
- 4. To increase your ability to read, comprehend, and critically evaluate articles and studies published in psychological journals.
- 5. To learn to integrate multiple theories and findings into a single unified understanding of human character and morality.

The purpose of each class session is to highlight selected topics from the required readings and to supplement this material with related ideas. *Students are responsible for all assigned readings, whether or not discussed in class.* On a typical day, a 30-minute review of the material will be combined with a one-hour "graduate style" discussion. Each student is expected to have read the assigned reading for class discussion, and be prepared to think critically about and discuss the reading in class.

Course Credit Hour Information

In the interest of providing sufficient time to accomplish the stated Course Learning Outcomes, this class meets the PLNU credit hour policy for a 4-unit class delivered over 15 weeks. Specific details about how the class meets the credit hour requirement can be provided upon request.

Required Texts

Narvaez, D., & Lapsley, D.K. (Eds.) (2009). Personality, Identity, and Character: Explorations in Moral Psychology. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Coursepack of Articles to be purchased from University Readers.

Online articles available through links on Canvas.

Academic Accommodations

While all students are expected to meet the minimum standards for completion of this course as established by the instructor, students with disabilities may require academic adjustments, modifications or auxiliary aids/services. At Point Loma Nazarene University (PLNU), these students are requested to register with the Disability Resource Center (DRC), located in the Bond Academic Center. (DRC@pointloma.edu or 619-849-2486). The DRC's policies and procedures for assisting such students in the development of an appropriate academic adjustment plan (AP) allows PLNU to comply with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act. Section 504 (a) prohibits discrimination against students with special needs and guarantees all qualified students equal access to and benefits of PLNU programs and activities. After the student files the required documentation, the DRC, in conjunction with the student, will develop an AP to meet that student's specific learning needs.

The DRC will thereafter email the student's AP to all faculty who teach courses in which the student is enrolled each semester. The AP must be implemented in all such courses.

If students do not wish to avail themselves of some or all of the elements of their AP in a particular course, it is the responsibility of those students to notify their professor in that course. PLNU highly recommends that DRC students speak with their professors during the first two weeks of each semester about the applicability of their AP in that particular course and/or if they do not desire to take advantage of some or all of the elements of their AP in that course.

Course Requirements and Evaluation

Daily Reading Responses (15%) and Class Participation (15%)

By 8:00am on the morning of each class session you will turn in a **Daily Reading Response** on Canvas. This serves to help you prepare for each class discussion, and provides a record of your having read (and thought critically about) the material. It also allows me to read through your responses, and gauge your level of understanding prior to our discussion. Each response will be given a letter grade for its thoughtfulness and clarity. A-level papers will include a brief (one-paragraph) summary of the main ideas of the article, and 1-2 short paragraphs of thoughtful response. The best papers are those that either a) critically question one or more of the assumptions or conclusions of an article, or b) use the article as a jumping-off place for thinking about how moral development may be either enhanced or hindered by parents, friends, schools, churches, etc.

FURTHERMORE, each class you are **graded on your participation in class discussion**, ranging from D/F ("Could somebody get this guy some coffee? Stat!") to A/B (Actively contributing to the discussion in meaningful ways). If you miss a class, no credit will be given for class discussion, and you will only receive (partial) credit for your daily reading reflection if you *turn it in before the next class in which you are present* (i.e. turn in missing reflections prior to the *very next class* to receive credit).

Reading Summaries and Discussion Leader (30%)

During most sessions two students will assist the Professor in summarizing the assigned reading. Approximately once every other month (2 times throughout the semester) you will be a discussion leader or co-leader for one class period. As discussion leader you will:

- 1. Written Reading Summary (5/10%): Provide a written Reading Summary for each student in the class (format and length to be described in class), in which you will briefly overview the background, methods, and findings of the assigned article. You will also critique the article and suggest implications for the Christian life of virtue. This will likely require you to read the article 2-3 times to make sure that you understand it well ... so plan ahead.
- 2. <u>Class Presentation and Discussion Leading (3.5/7%)</u>: Spend the first 15-25 minutes of class outlining the main points of the reading (as in your written Reading Summary above). Then use your knowledge of the text to help lead discussion of the reading.

3. Wikipedia editing (1.5/3%): Here is your first chance for publication!!! Once you finish summarizing the article, you will incorporate your article summary into the Wikipedia entry for Moral Psychology. Students from this class have been updating the entry for Moral Psychology over the last ten years. In fact, the MAJORITY of the information on this website was entered and refined by students from previous PSY 330 classes! However, as you will see, some of the statements are a little confusing, or poorly written, or include less relevant information from the studies. For this portion of your assignment, you should: a) check to see if the main idea and findings of your article have been summarized in 2-4 well-written (and cited) sentences, under the proper heading (e.g., Moral Intuitions, Moral Emotions, etc.); b) if not, then summarize/cite the key findings of your study/article; c) if so, then edit what is written to make it more accurate/readable/concise/etc. The key is to provide the world's population with the most accurate information possible on your topic, without overwhelming them with irrelevant details from the study. We will discuss, in class, the method for creating a Wikipedia account and editing an entry. This is an exciting chance for you to personally change the way that the world understands Moral Psychology (and get yourself some easy points in the process!).

Each mini-presentation will be given a letter grade, and is worth either **10%** (1st Presentation) or **20%** (2nd Presentation) of your course grade. <u>See the attached grading rubric, for details.</u> (These are equivalent to unit exams in other classes). But there's more!!! Here is an OPPORTUNITY FOR EXTRA CREDIT:

1. Media Clips: An additional 5% will be added to each reading summary/discussion grade each time that you bring in media clips (electronic or photocopied) that are relevant to the discussion topic for that day (be aware, that as each summary/presentation is worth 20% of your grade, this one bonus grade on a single paper could bump your final grade up a partial grade level ... e.g., from a B+ to an A-). NOTE: In order to receive this extra credit, you must adequately explain such clips and their connection to the material, and they must ACTUALLY BE RELEVANT to the topic at hand.

Morality and Values in the Media Project (35%)

Throughout the semester, keep your eyes and ears pealed for instances of values, morality, character development, moral dilemmas, etc. as they appear in TV, movies, books, plays, artwork, and music. Your final project will consist of a paper and presentation written about one such instance, and the ways in which it either illustrates or contradicts one or more theories of moral psychology. Specifically, your paper will involve identifying a film, book, TV show, news clip, etc. in which morality or values are either discussed or illustrated by the characters. You must then relate this example to one or more of the theories/articles that we have discussed in class.

The paper should be 6-8 pages long, and will involve a more in-depth investigation of one or more of the theories we have discussed. Specifically, you should include the following elements:

1) <u>describe the media source</u> upon which you are drawing, including a brief sketch of the relevant thoughts/actions/discussions of each key character; (1-2 pages)

- 2) <u>discuss one or more of the theories</u> that we have covered over the course of the semester (e.g., willpower, moral reasoning, moral identity, etc.), and be sure to demonstrate a thorough understanding of the material (this section should include at least 2 outside articles—feel free to ask me about recommended articles); (2-3 pages)
- 3) discuss the relationship between your chosen media "clip" and the theory, specifically: <u>diagnose</u> the ways in which the character either illustrates or violates the "virtues" of the theory (i.e. using the language of the theory, in what ways does the character possess vs. lack compassion and/or "moral character," 1-2 pages); and
- 4) using this theory, identify and describe <u>practical activities or interventions</u> would you prescribe for this person to help them become more compassionate and/or moral (for instance, according to this theory, what types of interventions might you suggest to help such a character develop morally; or, what might you suggest that teachers/parents/coaches/ministers/etc. do to help individuals develop into moral adults?) (1-2 pages)

Finally, you will <u>create a final PowerPoint presentation</u> for the class, which will include briefly discussing the theory/theories that you focused on (feel free to be creative in how you present this), setting-up and presenting the media clip (this could mean reading a passage, if you use a book), discussing the ways in which the theory(ies) relate to the media clip, and discussing the implications of the theory for one or more practical interventions that you would make into this character's life. This presentation can follow your paper quite closely, so the only trick will be to present it in a way that is interesting and engaging for the rest of the class. The overall presentation should be <u>between 13-17 minutes</u> including the media clip. Be sure to let me know what you will need from me as far as presenting the media clip. <u>See the</u> attached grading rubric, for details.

Act of Compassion (5%)

At some point in the first half of the semester, you and the rest of your classmates will plan a time when the entire class can get together for some sort of act of compassion or service. There are no limits to what this can be. I will leave it to your collective discretion both to generate and coordinate an activity in which we as a class can be of service to others. Your attendance at this activity will earn you full credit for this portion of your grade.

Attendance Policy (and contribution to your grade)

Because of the seminar-style nature of this course, regular attendance is absolutely essential. Indeed, each day in class you will earn up to ½% of your *final grade* for your participation. Thus, any absence that is not for a "University-sponsored event" (see below) will result in an F for that day. Furthermore, this course will strictly follow the PLNU attendance policy as specified in the University Catalog. Regular and punctual attendance at all classes is considered essential to optimum academic achievement. If you are absent from more than 10 percent of class meetings (3 days), you will receive a written report which may result in de-enrollment. If the absences exceed 20 percent (6 days), *even if you have not yet received a written report*, you will be de-enrolled without notice. If the date of de-enrollment is past the last date to withdraw from a class, you will receive the appropriate grade for your work and

participation. See <u>Academic Policies</u> in the (undergrad/graduate as appropriate) academic catalog. Please note the following key points and elaborations of the attendance policy.

- "There are no allowed or excused absences except when absences are necessitated by certain University-sponsored activities and are approved in writing by the Provost."
- You are not excused for being ill. Illness does not comprise an excused absence. You are not
 excused from class if you have a Doctor's appointment. You are not excused from class if you
 have a Doctor's excuse. The University allows you four absences for these (and other) situations
 outside your control.
- University-sponsored activities that are approved in writing by the Provost usually are for NAIA
 events for student athletes and occasionally field trips for other PLNU courses.
- When you are <u>absent</u> in this class <u>three times</u> (for any cause), a Notice of Deenrollment will be sent to the Vice Provost for Academic Administration. <u>Your fourth absence may result in</u> <u>deenrollment.</u>

Save your absences for situations that are outside of your control. Do not consider your allowable absences as the number of times that you can miss class without being deenrolled. If you become ill after you used your allowable absences you will be deenrolled from the course.

Ferpa Policy

In compliance with federal law, neither PLNU student ID nor social security number should be used in publicly posted grades or returned sets of assignments without student written permission. This class will meet the federal requirements by distributing all grades and papers individually (via Canvas). Also in compliance with FERPA, you will be the only person given information about your progress in this class unless you have designated others to receive it in the "Information Release" section of the student portal. See Policy Statements in the (undergrad/ graduate as appropriate) academic catalog.

Final Examination Policy

Successful completion of this class requires taking the final examination **on its scheduled day**. The final examination schedule is posted on the <u>Class Schedules</u> site. No requests for early examinations or alternative days will be approved.

PLNU Copyright Policy

Point Loma Nazarene University, as a non-profit educational institution, is entitled by law to use materials protected by the US Copyright Act for classroom education. Any use of those materials outside the class may violate the law.

PLNU Academic Honesty Policy

Students should demonstrate academic honesty by doing original work and by giving appropriate credit to the ideas of others. Academic <u>dis</u>honesty is the act of presenting information, ideas, and/or concepts as one's own when in reality they are the results of another person's creativity and effort. A faculty

member who believes a situation involving academic dishonesty has been detected may assign a failing grade for that assignment or examination, or, depending on the seriousness of the offense, for the course. Faculty should follow and students may appeal using the procedure in the university Catalog. See <u>Academic Policies</u> for definitions of kinds of academic dishonesty and for further policy information.

Z Score

Grade	Percentage Score	Z-Score	Cumulative %	% Receiving Grade	
Α	93-100%	1.33	0.0918	9.2%	
A-	90-92%	1	0.1587	6.7%	15.9%
B+	88-89%	0.67	0.2514	9.3%	
В	84-87%	0.33	0.3707	11.9%	
B-	80-83%	0	0.5	12.9%	34.1%
C+	77-79%	-0.33	0.6293	12.9%	
С	70-76%	-1	0.8413	21.2%	
C-	65-69%	-1.33	0.9082	6.7%	40.8%
D+	62-64%	-1.67	0.9525	4.4%	
D	55-61%	-2	0.9772	2.5%	
D-	50-54%	-2.33	0.9901	1.3%	
F	49% or below	<-2.33	1	1.0%	9.2%

A minimum of 50 % is needed to pass the course.

Week	<u>Date</u>	Day	Assigned Reading (Due)	<u>Topic</u>
	<u>The</u>	Psyc	hological Study of Morality and	Compassion
Week 1	9/5/19	Th	Syllabus; Case Study	What is morality? What's the problem?
Week 2	9/10/19	T	Kohlberg (1984). Moral stages and moralization. (pp. 183-205) AND Kohlberg (1977) Moral development: A review of the theory	Moral reasoning the first great solution.

<u>Week</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Day</u>	Assigned Reading (Due)	<u>Topic</u>
		Moı	rality as Reasoning but about	: WHAT?
	0/12/10	Th	Colley Damon Killon & Hart (1000)	Are there different kinds of
	9/12/19	Th	Colby, Damon, Killen & Hart (1999).	
			The development of extraordinary moral commitment	moral exemplars?
			moral communent	
Week 3	9/17/19	Т	Gilligan & Attanucci (1988) Two	How should we think about care
WCCKS	3,17,13	'	Moral Orientations: Gender	vs. justice?
			Differences and Similarities	vs. justice:
	9/19/19	Th	Schwartz (2012) An overview of the	Are there even MORE types of
	0, 20, 20		Schwartz theory of basic values	morality?
			,	
		Am	I really reasoning? Or am I just	feeling?
		7 (111	Treamy reasoning. Or am r just	reemig.
Week 4	9/24/19	Т	Haidt (2001). The Emotional Dog and	Moral Intuitions: Is our moral
			Its Rational Tail	reasoning even rational?
	9/26/19	Th	Haidt & Graham (2007). When	Where do these intuitions lead
			Morality Opposes Justice	us? The politics of gut feelings.
Week 5	10/1/19	Т	Haidt, J. (2003). The moral emotions	The broad spectrum of moral
				emotions.
	10/3/19	Th	Resources and Justice at PLNU (no	
			reading for today)	
		Two	o "Virtuous" Emotions and a	<u>Critique</u>
Week 6	10/8/19	Т	Ch. 11 - Emmons (2009) Greatest of	Gratitude: An emotion or a
			the virtues? Gratitude and the	character virtue?
			grateful personality	
	10/10/19	Th	Batson, Fultz & Schoenrade (1987).	Empathy: A particular moral
			Distress and Empathy	emotion with a checkered
				history.
Week 7	10/15/19	Т	Batson, Klein, Highberger & Shaw	When is empathy problematic?
			(1995). Immorality From Empathy-	
	10/6=/:-		Induced Altruism	
	10/17/19	Th	Bloom (2017) Empathy and its	Empathy is ALWAYS problematic.
			discontents	
	1			

Week	<u>Date</u>	Day	Assigned Reading (Due)	<u>Topic</u>
Week 8	10/22/19	Т	Graham, J., Waytz, A., Meindl, P.,	Care vs. Justice reframed: The
			Iyer, R., & Young, L. (2017).	problem of centripital and
			Centripetal and centrifugal forces in	centrifugal forces on the moral
			the moral circle- Competing	life.
			constraints on moral learning	
	10/24/19	Th	Cameron & Rapier (2017)	Compassion: A more just and
			Compassion is a motivated choice	caring emotion.
Week 9	10/29/19	Т	Ch. 6 - Narvaez (2009) Triune Ethics	Triune Ethics Theory: Why caring
			Theory and Moral Personality	people can be hamstrung by
				vicious emotions.
	10/31/19	Th	The Dark Knight (watch the film prior	Case Studies of Care,
			to class, and answer 1+ questions)	Compassion, and Justice

<u>Take some Responsibility!</u> Reductionism vs. Selfhood in Moral Psychology

Week 10	11/5/19	Т	Colby & Damon (2015) Toward a Moral Psychology in Full	Against Reductionism: Moral identity and responsibility as the goal of maturation.
	11/7/19	Th	NO CLASS!!! Read and Respond to Hardy & Carlo (2011) Moral Identity - What Is It, How Does It Develop, and Is It Linked to Moral Action	What is Moral Identity?
Week 11	11/12/19	T	Ch. 10 - Walker & Frimer (2009) Moral personality exemplified	Tell me your story. The narrative nature of identity.
	11/14/19	Th	Frimer & Walker (2009) Reconciling the self and morality: An empirical model of moral centrality development.	Reconciling Agency and Communion in developing our characters.
Week 12	11/19/19	T	Hero (watch the film prior to class, and answer 1+ questions)	Two Curious Paths to Identity Development

So What Now?! Ideas for Growing Compassion and Character

<u>Week</u>	<u>Date</u>	Day	Assigned Reading (Due)	<u>Topic</u>
	11/21/19	Th	Aquino, K., Freeman, D., Reed II, A., Lim, V. K., & Felps, W. (2009). Testing a social-cognitive model of moral behavior- the interactive influence of situations and moral identity centrality.	Using situations to trigger moral identity.
Week 13	11/26/19	Т	Aquino, K., McFerran, B., & Laven, M. (2011). Moral identity and the experience of moral elevation in response to acts of uncommon goodness	Using Moral Emotions to Draw Us Closer to Exemplars
	11/28/19	Th	No class!!! Thanksgiving!!!	
Week 14	12/3/19	T	Narvaez (2013) Neurobiology and moral mindset	The role of early life experiences in shaping our emotional and moral lives.
	12/5/19	Th	Narvaez & Lapsley (2014) Becoming a Moral Person – Moral Development and Moral Character Education as a Result of Social Interactions	Relationships grow our characters.

Now It's Your Turn: Case Studies from the Media

Week 15	12/10/19	Т	Final Presentations	Character & Morality in the
				Media
	12/12/19	Th	Final Presentations	Character & Morality in the
				Media
Final	12/17/18	Т	Final Presentations from 10:30am-	Character & Morality in the
Present.			1:30pm	Media
T				

NOTE: THIS IS THE TUESDAY OF FINALS WEEK ... DO NOT PURCHASE A TICKET HOME BEFORE THIS DATE. ATTENDANCE IS MANDATORY.

FINAL EXAMINATION POLICY

Successful completion of this class requires taking the final examination <u>on its scheduled day</u>. The final examination schedule is posted on the <u>Class Schedules</u> site. No requests for early examinations or alternative days will be approved.

<u>Article Summary, Presentation, and Wikipedia Entry</u> 1st presentation is worth 10%, 2nd worth 20% of Final Grade

					Good job, but							
					missing a few	Missing some	Needs	Needs significant		Needs large-scale		Missing/
					key elements	key elements	improvement	improvement	Missing many key	improvement	Complete Re-	Incomplet
Criteria	Perfect (100%)	Nearly Perfect (95%)	Excellent (90%)	Great! (85%)	(80%)	(75%)	(70%)	(65%)	elements (60%)	(55%)	write (50%)	e (0%)
							Grammar and					
							spelling errors					
						Although your	are beginning					
					7+ spelling or	meaning is still	to make it					
					grammatical	relatively clear,	difficult to		Most of your			
					errors,	many of your	understand the		sentences include			
				4-6 spelling or	beginning to	sentences have	meaning of		spelling and			
				grammatical	affect	grammatical and	your sentences.	A large number of	grammar errors,	Most of your		
				errors. And/or	readability.	spelling errors. A	A large number	grammatical and	and make your	sentences include		
	Perfect! No spelling			4-5 confusing or	And/or a	significant	(about 30%-	spelling errors,	text difficult to	spelling and		
	or grammar errors.		2-3 spelling or	awkwardly	number (about	number (about	50%) of	which make your	understand. The	grammar errors,	Nearly every	
	Fantastic organization		grammatical errors;	phrased	10-20%) of	20%-30%) of	confusing or	text difficult to	poor quality of	and make your	sentence has	
	and perfect writing.		or A few (not more	sentences (not	confusing or	confusing or	awkwardly	understand. Over	most sentences	text quite difficult	errors in it, which	
	Arguments are		than 5%) confusing	more than 10%)	awkwardly	awkwardly	phrased	50% of sentences	and/or the	to understand.	make your text	
	structured well,	One or two	or awkwardly	(or fewer,	phrased	phrased	sentences;	are confusing or	significant	Most sentences	nearly illegible.	
	sentences are clear, .	spelling/grammatical	phrased sentences,	depending on	sentences;	sentences;	and/or	poorly phrased	disorganization	are difficult to	Sentences are	
	Your sentences, and	errors or confusing	or one dis-	the length);	and/or more	and/or	pervasive	and the overall	makes your	read, and your	nearly illegible,	Missing or
Grammar/ Phrasing	overall arguments	passages. Otherwise,	ordering.Otherwise	and/or slight	significant	significant	disorganization	structure is	meaning difficult	statements are	and almost no	completely
(5%)	flow well.	great!	, good!	disorganization.	disorganization.	disorganization.		disorganized.	to understand	quite unclear.	meaning is clear.	illegible.
		_		Great start!	_	-		_			-	_
				You've just								
				made a few								
				errors or a few								
	Perfect! You have			more additions								
	discussed the ways in			needed in your								
	which the author has			discussion of the	Good job, but	You have two or						
	drawn upon previous			background	your discussion	more significant		You are missing or				
	research and		Excellent! Just one	problem that	of the	errors of		have made major	You are missing or	You are missing or	You are missing or	
	statistics to make		or two minor errors	this study is	background	omission or	You have	errors in	have made major	have made major	have made major	
	their argument that		or additions	attempting to	problem	commission in	multiple	discussing NEARLY	errors in	errors in OVER	errors in all or	
	their study is		needed on your	address, and/or	includes	your discussion	significant	HALF of the	discussing HALF of	HALF of the	nearly all of the	
	important. You have		discussion of the	more specificity	multiple errors	of previous	errors (of	background	the background	background	background	
	mentioned any	Nearly perfect! Just a	background	needed in your	and/or	studies/problem	commission or	problems/theorie	problems/theorie	problems/theorie	problems/theorie	
	unanswered	few minor corrections	problem, and/or	descriptions of	significantly	s and/or much	omission) in	s that drive this	s that drive this	s that drive this	s that drive this	
	questions from	or additions needed in	slightly more	these problems	more detail and	more	your discussion	paper (see	paper (see	paper (see	paper (see	
Background Problem	previous studies that	discussing the	specificity needed.	and how they	examples are	detail/specificity	of the	previous grading	previous grading	previous grading	previous grading	Missing or
(Why was this article	led to this	background to this	To whom is this	link to this	needed in your	needed in these	background	categories for	categories for	categories for	categories for	completely
written?) (5%)	study/article.	study.	author responding?	current study.	discussion.	paragraphs.	problems.	details).	details).	details).	details).	illegible.
							Although you					
	1						have started to					
							describe the					
	Perfect! You have			Great start! This			study/theory,	You are missing or				
	thoroughly and			is a good			you have	have made major	You are missing or	You are missing or	You are missing or	
	articulately explained		Excellent! This is	description of	Good job in	You have started	multiple	errors in NEARLY	have made major	have made major	have made major	
	the study (for		still a thorough	the	giving a broad	to describe this	significant	HALF of your	errors in HALF of	errors in OVER	errors in ALL or	
	empirical articles) or		description of the	study/theory,	overview of the	study/theory,	errors (of	discussion of this	your discussion of	HALF of your	NEARLY ALL of	
	theory (for		theory, but you	but either lacks	study/theory,	but have left out	commission or	study/theory, or	this study/theory,	discussion of this	your discussion of	
	theoretical articles)		have either made	some detail	but you need to	a number of key	omission), or	are missing	or are missing	study/theory, or	this study/theory,	
	that was central to	Nearly perfect! This is	one or two errors in	throughout or	include	details and/or	your	multiple	many significant	are missing many	and/or your paper	
	this study. You have	a great description of	describing the	includes a few	significantly	you have made a	descriptions	significant details,	details, or your	significant details,	is so confusing	
Description of	included complete	the study/theory, but	theory, or your	errors in your	more details	number of errors	are confusing	or your paper is	paper is very	or your paper is	that it is nearly	
Methodology/Result	descriptions of	could use either a bit	description lacks	descriptions, or	(and/or check	and/or your	enough that it	quite confusing	confusing (see	very confusing	illegible (see	
s (Empirical) or	methods or terms	more detail, or is	some key details or	becomes	the accuracy of	writing becomes	is difficult to	(see previous	previous grading	(see previous	previous grading	Missing or
Theory (Theoretical)	that may be	missing a few	is otherwise	confusing in	your	significantly	tell whether or	grading categories	categories for	grading categories	categories for	completely
(20%)	confusing.	important details.	unclear in places.	parts.	statements).	confusing.	not you	for details).	details).	for details).	details).	illegible.

Article Summary, Presentation, and Wikipedia Entry 1st presentation is worth 10%, 2nd worth 20% of Final Grade

	ı	1	1	1		ı	ı	1	1	1		1
					Good job, but							,
					missing a few	Missing some	Needs	Needs significant		Needs large-scale		Missing/
					key elements	key elements	improvement	improvement	Missing many key	improvement	Complete Re-	Incomplet
Criteria	Perfect (100%)	Nearly Perfect (95%)	Excellent (90%)	Great! (85%)	(80%)	(75%)	(70%)	(65%)	elements (60%)	(55%)	write (50%)	e (0%)
							understood the					
							paper.					
	Perfect! Your											
	argument about the											
	strengths and											
	weaknesses of this											
	study/theory draws											
	upon, not only a solid											
	understanding of its											
	findings, but also											
	previous theories as											
	to why people do the											
	things that they do.											
	You have organized											
	your argument such											
	that your discussion					You have two or						
	of					more significant		1		1		
	strengths/weaknesse					errors in your	You have	You are missing or				
	s is well-founded(not					discussion of	multiple	have made major				
	merely your opinion),					strengths and	significant	errors in NEARLY				
	and considers a					weaknesses, or	errors (of	HALF of your				
	variety of elements of			Great! You've	Good job, but	are missing some	commission or	discussion of the			You are missing or	
	the study/theory			just made a few	your discussion	key elements or	omission) in	strengths and	You are missing or		have made major	
	(e.g., operational			errors in your	of the	critiques, and/or	your discussion	weaknesses of	have made major	You are missing or	errors in all or	
	definitions,			descriptions of	study's/theory'	much more	of the	this study/theory,	errors in HALF of	have made major	nearly all of your	
	methodology,			strengths and	s strengths and	specificity	strengths and	or are missing	your discussion of	errors in OVER	discussion of	
	analyses, alternate			weaknesses,	weaknesses	needed in your	weaknesses of	multiple	strengths and	HALF of your	strengths and	
	explanations for		Excellent! Just one	and/or more	includes	critical analysis	this	significant	weaknesses, or	discussion of	weaknesses,	
	findings, statements		or two minor errors	specificity	multiple errors	of this	study/theory,	critiques, or have	your argument is	strengths and	and/or this	
	of cause-and-effect,		in your descriptions	needed in your	or omissions	study/theory.	and/or you	drawn mostly on	nearly all based	weaknesses or	section is nearly	
	etc.). Where there		of strengths and	discussion	and/or	You may have	have over-used	personal opinion	on pure opinion,	your argument is	illegible or has	
	are weaknesses, you	Nearly perfect! Just a	weaknesses, or a	and/or there	significantly	used a little too	personal-	rather than	rather than	completely	almost no	
	have suggested	few minor additions	few more details	one or more	more specificity	much personal	opinion, and	reasoned	reasoned	opinion-based	structure to the	
	alternate	needed in your	needed, and/or	logical	needed in your	opinion, and not	have not given	argument (see	argument (see	with no support	argument (see	
Critical Evaluation	studies/theories that	discussion of	slightly more	errors/omission	critical	quite enough	enough	previous grading	previous grading	(see previous	previous grading	Missing or
(Strengths &	would overcome	strengths/weaknesses	specificity needed	s in your	examination of	reasoned	reasoned	categories for	categories for	grading categories	categories for	completely
Weaknesses) (15%)	these limitations.		in your arguments.	argument.	these issues.	argument.	argument.	details).	details).	for details).	details).	illegible.
					Good job, but							
	Perfect! You have				your discussion	You have two or						
	raised a number of				includes	more significant		1		1		
	very insightful				multiple errors	errors (of		1		1		
	questions regarding				(of either	commission or				1		
	either the nature or				omission or	omission) in your						
	implications of this				commission) in	attempts to		1		1		
	research. You have				your discussion	connect the	You have	1		1		
	also explicitly			Great! You've	of how the	findings/theory	multiple	You are missing or		You are missing or	You are missing or	
	discussed ways in			just made a few	various	to the life of	significant	have made major	You are missing or	have made major	have made major	
	which this	Nearly perfect! Just a		errors in your	theories	faith, and/or	errors (of	errors in NEARLY	have made major	errors in OVER	errors in all or	
	study/theory can be	few minor corrections		connection the	connect to the	much more	commission or	HALF of your	errors in HALF of	HALF of your	nearly all of your	
	used (either	either on the	Excellent! Just one	study and the	life of faith,	specificity	omission) in	discussion of	your discussion of	discussion of	discussion of	
	positively or	questions you raise or	or two minor errors	life of faith,	and/or	needed in your	your discussion	these connections	these connections	these connections	these connections	
	negatively) in our	on your connections	in your connection	and/or more	significantly	discussion of	of these	and the lingering	and the lingering	and the lingering	and the lingering	
	lives as Christians,	between the	between faith and	specificity	more specificity	these	connections	questions. (see	questions (see	questions (see	questions (see	
Remaining Questions	and have attempted	findings/theory and	theories and/or	needed in your	or critical	connections and	and the	previous grading	previous grading	previous grading	previous grading	Missing or
& Theological	to examine this	the life of the	slightly more	links between	thought is	the lingering	lingering	categories for	categories for	categories for	categories for	completely
Implications (10%)	study/theory from a	Christian.	specificity needed.	them.	needed in your	questions.	questions.	details).	details).	details).	details).	illegible.
	study, theory from a	Carristiani.	specificity fieeded.	arenn.	necaca in your	questions.	questions.	actunaj.	actunaj.	actunaj.	actunaj.	megible.

<u>Article Summary, Presentation, and Wikipedia Entry</u> 1st presentation is worth 10%, 2nd worth 20% of Final Grade

					Good job, but							
					missing a few	Missing some	Needs	Needs significant		Needs large-scale		Missing/
					key elements	key elements	improvement	improvement	Missing many key	improvement	Complete Re-	Incomplet
Criteria	Perfect (100%)	Nearly Perfect (95%)	Excellent (90%)	Great! (85%)	(80%)	(75%)	(70%)	(65%)	elements (60%)	(55%)	write (50%)	e (0%)
	Christian theological	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	,	,	discussion and	(,	,,	()	, , ,	(,	,	,
	perspective.				questions.							
						You have two or						
						more significant						
						errors (of						
						omission of						
						commission) in	You have					
						your discussion	multiple					
					Good job, but	and class-	significant					
					your discussion	leading, and/or	errors (of		You are missing or	You are missing or		
	Perfect! Your				included	much more	commission or	You are missing or	have made major	have made major	You are missing or	
	presentation and				multiple errors	specificity	omission) in	have made major	errors in HALF of	errors in OVER	have made major	
	discussion-leading			Great! You've	and/or	needed in your	your class	errors in NEARLY	your discussion	HALF of your	errors in ALL or	
	showed that you			just made a few	significantly	discussion,	discussion,	HALF of your	and/or HALF of	discussion and/or	NEARLY ALL of	
	were well prepared,			errors or had	more specificity	and/or	and/or	discussion and/or	your presentation	over half of your	your discussion	You were
	had thoroughly read			some noticeable	was needed	significant levels	disorganization	a good portion of	was significantly	presentation was	and or you had	either
	and thought about	Nearly perfect! Just a		disorganization	and/or there	of	impaired the	your presentation	disorganized or	disorganized or	clearly done little	absent or
	the article, and had	few minor errors or	Excellent! Just one	in your class	was some	disorganization	clarity and	was disorganized	unclear. (see	unclear. (see	preparation. (see	clearly had
Dracontation	organized your	mis-organization in	or two minor errors in your discussion	presentation	significant	impeded the	effectiveness of	(see previous	previous grading categories for	previous grading	previous grading	not done the
Presentation - Organized (15%)	thoughts prior to class.	your leading of discussion.	during class.	and discussion- leading.	disorganization evident.	clarity of your presentation.	the class discussion.	grading categories for details).	details).	categories for details).	categories for details).	reading.
Organized (1370)	Perfect! You had	discussion.	during class.	leading.	evident.	presentation.	uiscussion.	ioi detalisj.	details).	details).	details).	reading.
	prepared a significant											
	number of engaging,											
	and thought				Good job, but							
	provoking questions				multiple							
	for the class to				questions were	Multiple					You have either	
	consider throughout				unclear and/or	questions were					failed to generate	
	its discussion of this				significantly	unclear, and/or					any questions or	
	paper. You also				more specificity	you only had a					applications, or	
	identified multiple			Great! You just	needed in such	few questions			You have	You only engaged	they were so	
	diverse applications			need to be	descriptions	prepared, and/or	You either only	You only prepared	prepared only one	the class once	vague or	
	(both practical and			clearer in a few	(and/or the	much more	generated a	one or two	or two poorly	using either a	confusing that	You were
	theological) to which	Nearly perfect! Just	Excellent! Just a	of your	class could	specificity	couple of	questions and/or	phrased questions	question or a	they did not	either
Presentation -	this study pertains,	one or two minor	little more clarity or	questions,	have benefitted	needed in such	questions or	one or two vague	and/or	vague/simple	contribute to the	absent or
Engaging and	and engaged the class	errors in clarity in the	specificity needed	and/or more	from having a	your applications	applications, or	applications(see	applications (see	application (see	conversation (see	clearly had
Thought-Provoking	in discussion	questions you asked	in the questions	specificity	few more	(or only had a	they were	previous grading	previous grading	previous grading	previous grading	not done
Questions and	regarding these	and/or in your	you asked and/or in	needed in your	questions or	few	quite unclear	categories for	categories for	categories for	categories for	the
Applications (15%)	applications.	applications.	your applications.	applications.	applications)	applications).	or vague.	details).	details).	details).	details).	reading.
	5 (11)									You are missing or		
	Perfect! You have			Const. Nambre			V	V		have made major	Wassan asiasia	
	succinctly described			Great! You've	Good ioh hut		You have	You are missing or	Vou are missing s	errors in OVER	You are missing or	
	the essence and/or implications of the			just made a few minor errors (or	Good job, but	Vou have two as	multiple significant	have made major errors in NEARLY	You are missing or	HALF of your	have made major errors in all or	
	study/theory that you			one significant	your Wikipedia entry includes	You have two or more significant	errors (of	HALF of your	have made major errors in HALF of	Wikipedia entry, or it is so unclear	nearly all of your	
	had read in 3-4		Excellent! Just one	error) in your	multiple errors	errors in your	commission or	Wikipedia entry,	your Wikipedia	that it is difficult	Wikipedia entry,	
	sentences, and	Nearly perfect! Just	or two minor errors	Wikipedia entry	and/or	Wikipedia entry	omission) in	or it is quite	entry, or it is very	to understand	or it is nearly	
	smoothly integrated	one minor correction	in your Wikipedia	and/or more	significantly	and/or much	your Wikipedia	unclear (see	unclear (see	your writing (see	illegible (see	
	your comments into	in your otherwise	entry and/or	specificity or	more specificity	more specificity	entry, or the	previous grading	previous grading	previous grading	previous grading	Missing or
Wikipedia Entry	the already-existing	perfect Wikipedia	slightly more	clarity is	and/or clarity is	or clarity is	entry itself is	categories for	categories for	categories for	categories for	completely
(15%)	Wikipedia entry.	entry.	specificity needed.	needed.	needed.	needed.	unclear.	details).	details).	details).	details).	illegible.
· - / - /	1	1 /	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		1			,	,-	,-	,-	65

Morality and Values in the Media Project

Criteria	Perfect (100%)	Nearly Perfect (95%)	Excellent (90%)	Great! (85%)	Good job, but missing a few key elements (80%)	Missing some key elements (75%)	Needs improvement (70%)	Needs significant improvement (65%)	Missing many key elements (60%)	Needs large- scale improvement (55%)	Complete Re- write (50%)	Missing/Incomplete (0%)
Description of Media Clip (15%)	Perfect! You have discussed the characters and elements of the plot that are relevant to the theory you have chosen. You have included insights or summaries of the character's behavior that you will later use in your analysis.	Nearly perfect! Just a few minor corrections or additions needed in discussing the plot and characters involved in this media clip.	Excellent! Just one or two minor errors or additions needed on your discussion of the plot/character and/or slightly more specificity needed in your descriptions to help us make the links in the rest of your paper.	Great start! You've just made a few errors or a few more additions needed in your discussion of the plot/characters that your paper will address; and/or more specificity needed in your descriptions of these elements to better help us understand the rest of your paper.	Good job, but your discussion of the plot/characters includes multiple errors and/or significantly more detail and examples are needed in your discussion.	You have two or more significant errors of omission or commission in your discussion of character/plot (that are necessary for the rest of your argument) and/or much more detail/specificity needed in these paragraphs.	You have multiple significant errors (of commission or omission) in your discussion of the character/plot.	You are missing or have made major errors in discussing NEARLY HALF of the characters/plot that are essential to your arguments in the rest of this paper (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in discussing HALF of the characters/plot that are essential to your arguments in the rest of this paper (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in OVER HALF of the characters/plot that are essential to your arguments in the rest of this paper (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in all or nearly all of the characters/plot that are essential to your arguments in the rest of this paper (see previous grading categories for details).	Missing or completely illegible.
Description of Theory (25%)	Perfect! You have thoroughly and articulately explained the theory or theories that you have chosen. You have included complete descriptions of concepts or terms that may be confusing, and have provided a thorough overview of the most important elements of the theory.	Nearly perfect! This is a great description of the theory, but could use either a bit more detail, or is missing a few important details.	Excellent! This is still a thorough description of the theory, but you have either made one or two errors in describing the theory, or your description lacks some key details or is otherwise unclear in places.	Great start! This is a good description of the study/theory, but either lacks some detail throughout or includes a few errors in your descriptions, or becomes confusing in parts.	Good job in giving a broad overview of the study/theory, but you need to include significantly more details (and/or check the accuracy of your statements).	You have started to describe this theory, but have left out a number of key details and/or you have made a number of errors and/or your writing becomes significantly confusing.	Although you have started to describe the theory, you have multiple significant errors (of commission or omission), or your descriptions are confusing enough that it is difficult to tell whether or not you understood the theory.	You are missing or have made major errors in NEARLY HALF of your discussion of this theory, or are missing multiple significant details, or your paper is quite confusing (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in HALF of your discussion of this theory, or are missing many significant details, or your paper is very confusing (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in OVER HALF of your discussion of this theory, or are missing many significant details, or your paper is very confusing (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in ALL or NEARLY ALL of your discussion of this theory, and/or your paper is so confusing that it is nearly illegible (see previous grading categories for details).	Missing or completely illegible.
Application of Theory to "Diagnose" and Explain Issues in the Compassion/Morality of Your Character (25%)	Perfect! Your argument about the "diagnosis" of the character draws upon, not only a solid understanding of the theory you have described, but also a clear understanding of how this theory explains why people do the things that they do and HOW such tendencies develop. You have organized your argument such that your discussion of the	Nearly perfect! Just a few minor additions needed in your discussion of the "diagnosis" of your character, and your explanation for their current state.	excellent! Just one or two minor errors in your discussion of the "diagnosis" of your character, and your explanation for their current state, or a few more details needed, and/or slightly more specificity needed in your arguments.	Great! You've just made a few errors in your discussion of the "diagnosis" of your character, and your explanation for their current state, and/or more specificity needed in your discussion and/or there one or more logical errors/omissions	Good job, but your discussion of your discussion of the "diagnosis" of your character, and your explanation for their current state includes multiple errors or omissions and/or significantly more specificity needed in your critical	You have two or more significant errors in your discussion of the "diagnosis" of your character, and your explanation for their current state, or are missing some key elements or concepts, and/or much more specificity needed in your argument of how this theory	You have multiple significant errors (of commission or omission) in your discussion of the "diagnosis" of your character, and your explanation for their current state, and/or you have overused personal-opinion, and have not given enough	You are missing or have made major errors in NEARLY HALF of your discussion of the "diagnosis" of your character, and your explanation for their current state, or are missing multiple significant applications, or have drawn mostly on personal	You are missing or have made major errors in HALF of your discussion of the "diagnosis" of your character, and your explanation for their current state, or your argument is nearly all based on pure opinion, rather than reasoned argument (see previous grading	You are missing or have made major errors in OVER HALF of your discussion of the "diagnosis" of your character, and your explanation for their current state or your argument is completely opinion-based with no support (see previous grading	You are missing or have made major errors in all or nearly all of your discussion of the "diagnosis" of your character, and your explanation for their current state, and/or this section is nearly illegible or has almost no structure to the argument	Missing or completely illegible.

Criteria	Perfect (100%)	Nearly Perfect (95%)	Excellent (90%)	Great! (85%)	Good job, but missing a few key elements (80%)	Missing some key elements (75%)	Needs improvement (70%)	Needs significant improvement (65%)	Missing many key elements (60%)	Needs large- scale improvement (55%)	Complete Re- write (50%)	Missing/Incomplete (0%)
	diagnosis of the character is well-founded on concepts from the theory (not merely asserting your opinion), and displays appropriate use of theoretical concepts and terms in an explanation of how they might have developed in the way that they have.			in your argument.	examination of these issues.	applies to (and explains) this character. You may have used a little too much personal opinion, and not quite enough reasoned argument.	reasoned argument.	opinion rather than reasoned argument (see previous grading categories for details).	categories for details).	categories for details).	(see previous grading categories for details).	
Theory-Relevant Interventions for Your Character (25%)	Nearly perfect! You have identified two or three moral/compassion-related "goals" for your character, and have accurately and articulately described two or three different interventions that make sense in the context of this theory. All of these interventions are well-suited to the "areas of growth" that your character is facing, and they are well-tailored to help him/her grow toward a prescribed end. Further, you have used the language of the theory to discuss how (according to your theory) each intervention would specifically address the character's areas of growth.	Excellent! Overall, you have done a great job on this section. There are only minor issues of style and organization. All of the relevant information has been included.	Great! You have provided a very thorough overview of two or three interventions, and they make general sense with your theory. However, you have either made a few minor errors or omissions, have a few substantial errors in grammar/style, or need to use your own words more. You may also be missing a few connections between your character's "areas of growth" and the interventions you have suggested.	Very good. You have included general descriptions of two three interventions, but have made either a few small errors or one larger error with respect to linking your interventions to your theory, or with respect to shaping your interventions to the morally-oriented goals of your character. Or, this section of your paper might benefit from some reorganization.	Good. You have given a basic overview of two or three interventions, but may be missing some of the important details with respect to the theory or the specifics of the intervention. Or, you may have made a larger number of minor errors or omissions. Or, this section your paper might benefit from more in-depth re-organization.	Good, but there are some key errors or omissions, here. Specifically, you are missing at least one or two relevant core ideas of the theory, or you have not fully described two three interventions. Or, the links between your interventions and the theory may be a little vague. Or, this section could benefit from substantial organizational editing.	OK, but there are multiple (3+) aspects of these interventions that are either missing, or that have been poorly matched to either a) the theory or b) your character's areas of growth. Or, you have made a significant number of substantial errors. Or, you have a large number of either grammatical or organizational errors.	You have made a significant number of errors and/or omissions AND you have a number of stylistic and organizational errors.	Over half of your descriptions involve significant errors, or you are missing over half of the elements of these interventions or links to your theory. Or the interventions do not seem appropriate to the theory you chose or the goals of your character. Or, your errors, omissions, and/or organization has made this section difficult to read.	Over 75% of your descriptions involve significant errors, or you are missing most of the key elements of these interventions. Or there is very little link between your interventions and the theory/goals that you chose. Or, your errors, omissions, and/or organization has made this section very difficult to read.	You are missing nearly every single important element of this theory & intervention, or your grammar, spelling, and structure has made this section nearly unreadable.	This section of your paper is either missing, or is almost completely illegible.
Grammar/Phrasing (10%)	Perfect! No spelling or grammar errors. Fantastic organization and perfect writing. Arguments are structured well, sentences are clear, . Your sentences, and	One or two spelling/grammatical errors or confusing passages. Otherwise, great!	2-3 spelling or grammatical errors; or A few (not more than 5%) confusing or awkwardly phrased sentences, or one dis-	4-6 spelling or grammatical errors. And/or 4-5 confusing or awkwardly phrased sentences (not more than 10%) (or fewer,	7+ spelling or grammatical errors, beginning to affect readability. And/or a number (about 10-20%) of	Although your meaning is still relatively clear, many of your sentences have grammatical and spelling errors. A significant number (about	Grammar and spelling errors are beginning to make it difficult to understand the meaning of your sentences. A large number (about 30%-	A large number of grammatical and spelling errors, which make your text difficult to understand. Over 50% of sentences are	Most of your sentences include spelling and grammar errors, and make your text difficult to understand. The poor quality of	Most of your sentences include spelling and grammar errors, and make your text quite difficult to understand. Most sentences	Nearly every sentence has errors in it, which make your text nearly illegible. Sentences are nearly illegible, and almost no	Missing or completely illegible.

Morality and Values in the Media Project

Criteria	Perfect (100%)	Nearly Perfect (95%)	Excellent (90%)	Great! (85%)	Good job, but missing a few key elements (80%)	Missing some key elements (75%)	Needs improvement (70%)	Needs significant improvement (65%)	Missing many key elements (60%)	Needs large- scale improvement (55%)	Complete Rewrite (50%)	Missing/Incomplete (0%)
	overall arguments flow well.		ordering. Otherwise, good!	depending on the length); and/or slight disorganization.	confusing or awkwardly phrased sentences; and/or more significant disorganization.	20%-30%) of confusing or awkwardly phrased sentences; and/or significant disorganization.	50%) of confusing or awkwardly phrased sentences; and/or pervasive disorganization.	confusing or poorly phrased and the overall structure is disorganized.	most sentences and/or the significant disorganization makes your meaning difficult to understand	are difficult to read, and your statements are quite unclear.	meaning is clear.	
Presentation - Organized (15%)	Perfect! Your presentation and discussion-leading showed that you were well prepared, had thoroughly read and thought about the article, and had organized your thoughts prior to class.	Nearly perfect! Just a few minor errors or mis-organization in your leading of discussion.	Excellent! Just one or two minor errors in your discussion during class.	Great! You've just made a few errors or had some noticeable disorganization in your class presentation and discussion- leading.	Good job, but your discussion included multiple errors and/or significantly more specificity was needed and/or there was some significant disorganization evident.	You have two or more significant errors (of omission of commission) in your discussion and class-leading, and/or much more specificity needed in your discussion, and/or significant levels of disorganization impeded the clarity of your presentation.	You have multiple significant errors (of commission) or omission) in your class discussion, and/or disorganization impaired the clarity and effectiveness of the class discussion.	You are missing or have made major errors in NEARLY HALF of your discussion and/or a good portion of your presentation was disorganized (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in HALF of your discussion and/or HALF of your presentation was significantly disorganized or unclear. (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in OVER HALF of your discussion and/or over half of your presentation was disorganized or unclear. (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in ALL or NEARLY ALL of your discussion and or you had clearly done little preparation. (see previous grading categories for details).	You were either absent or clearly had not done the reading.
Presentation - Engaging and Thought-Provoking Questions and Applications (15%)	Perfect! You had prepared a significant number of engaging, and thought provoking questions for the class to consider throughout its discussion of this paper. You also identified multiple diverse applications (both practical and theological) to which this study pertains, and engaged the class in discussion regarding these applications.	Nearly perfect! Just one or two minor errors in clarity in the questions you asked and/or in your applications.	Excellent! Just a little more clarity or specificity needed in the questions you asked and/or in your applications.	Great! You just need to be clearer in a few of your questions, and/or more specificity needed in your applications.	Good job, but multiple questions were unclear and/or significantly more specificity needed in such descriptions (and/or the class could have benefitted from having a few more questions or applications)	Multiple questions were unclear, and/or you only had a few questions prepared, and/or much more specificity needed in such your applications (or only had a few applications).	You either only generated a couple of questions or applications, or they were quite unclear or vague.	You only prepared one or two questions and/or one or two vague applications(see previous grading categories for details).	You have prepared only one or two poorly phrased questions and/or applications (see previous grading categories for details).	You only engaged the class once using either a question or a vague/simple application (see previous grading categories for details).	You have either failed to generate any questions or applications, or they were so vague or confusing that they did not contribute to the conversation (see previous grading categories for details).	You were either absent or clearly had not done the reading.
Wikipedia Entry (15%)	Perfect! You have succinctly described the essence and/or implications of the study/theory that you had read in 3-4 sentences, and smoothly integrated your comments into the already-existing Wikipedia entry.	Nearly perfect! Just one minor correction in your otherwise perfect Wikipedia entry.	Excellent! Just one or two minor errors in your Wikipedia entry and/or slightly more specificity needed.	Great! You've just made a few minor errors (or one significant error) in your Wikipedia entry and/or more specificity or clarity is needed.	Good job, but your Wikipedia entry includes multiple errors and/or significantly more specificity and/or clarity is needed.	You have two or more significant errors in your Wikipedia entry and/or much more specificity or clarity is needed.	You have multiple significant errors (of commission or omission) in your Wikipedia entry, or the entry itself is unclear.	You are missing or have made major errors in NEARLY HALF of your Wikipedia entry, or it is quite unclear (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in HALF of your Wikipedia entry, or it is very unclear (see previous grading categories for details).	You are missing or have made major errors in OVER HALF of your Wikipedia entry, or it is so unclear that it is difficult to understand your writing (see previous grading	You are missing or have made major errors in all or nearly all of your Wikipedia entry, or it is nearly illegible (see previous grading categories for details).	Missing or completely illegible.

Rubric #2 – Page 17

Morality and Values in the Media Project

Worth 35% of Final Grade	Worth	35%	of Fir	al (Grade
--------------------------	-------	-----	--------	------	-------

Criteria	Perfect (100%)	Nearly Perfect (95%)	Excellent (90%)	Great! (85%)	Good job, but	Missing some key	Needs	Needs	Missing many	Needs large-	Complete Re-	Missing/Incomplete
					missing a few	elements (75%)	improvement	significant	key elements	scale	write (50%)	(0%)
					key elements		(70%)	improvement	(60%)	improvement		
					(80%)			(65%)		(55%)		
										categories for		
										details).		