



Lay Ecclesial Formation

**C1 - Grading Rubric for P 799 – Capstone II
Master of Arts in Pastoral Ministry Degree Program**

Student's Name: _____

For the purposes of this rubric, "Above Average" shall be understood as surpassing the qualities described as "Satisfactory," but may not achieve the full quality of "Superior." Likewise, "Area for Improvement" shall be understood as possessing some deficiency of the qualities described as "satisfactory," but may not be wholly described as "Inadequate."

| CATEGORY | SCORE |
|---|----------|
| Ministry Site Selection, Needs Assessment, and Selection of Need to Address | _____/10 |
| Proposal | _____/10 |
| Pastoral Plan | _____/10 |
| Theological Paper: "Examination of the Examination of the Need in the Larger Church or Broader Community" | _____/10 |
| Project Report and Evaluation Narrative | _____/10 |
| Writing Style, Citation Format, Revisions, Appendices | _____/10 |
| TOTAL | _____/60 |

Ministry Site Selection, Needs Assessment, Selection of Need to Address _____/10

| Points | Performance | Description |
|--------|-----------------|---|
| 10 | <i>Superior</i> | Ministry site carefully chosen; evidences appropriate community support and resources for a successful Capstone; offers potential for student to serve in a leadership role; three distinct and valid needs assessment strategies employed, one of which includes contact with members of the proposed target |

| | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|
| | | population; clear separation of site needs and student's agenda/wants; needs assessment strategies and results succinctly stated and fully documented; chosen need to be addressed is clearly defined and appropriate for the scope, timeline, student's gifts and abilities; reflects the collaborative nature of the Capstone. |
| 9 | <i>Above Average</i> | |
| 8 | <i>Satisfactory</i> | Ministry site is appropriate; three needs assessment strategies employed and documented; identified need is within the guidelines of the Capstone. |
| 7 | <i>Area for Improvement</i> | |
| 6 | <i>Inadequate</i> | Ministry site offers challenges for servant leadership or effective implementation; needs assessment is biased, inadequate, or incompletely documented; need to be addressed is vague, unrelated to target population, and/or inappropriate for the student's gifts and abilities; lies and/or scope, timeline, and collaborative nature of the Capstone. |

Proposal

_____ /10

| Points | Performance | Description |
|---------------|----------------------|--|
| 10 | <i>Superior</i> | Ministry site fully described, including history, demographics, environmental scan, sacramental data (if pertinent), relationship of ministry site to broader community (if pertinent); events, initiatives, and issues at ministry site impacting implementation clearly described; target population clearly defined and described, and of an appropriate size and scope for effective ministry; secondary target (if appropriate) clearly defined and described; relationship between proposed project and ministry site mission clearly articulated (if ministry site does not have a mission statement, a project mission statement is incorporated); validation of the need (needs assessment results) explicitly articulated and methods of assessment are clearly articulated; defines both overarching need and proposed response (i.e., the need for Biblical literacy in parish/response of developing women's Bible study); documents how the ministry site and at least one other similar site previously/currently addresses this need; concretely and honestly explores and articulates personal gifts, values, and challenges in responding to the need. |
| 9 | <i>Above Average</i> | |

| | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|
| 8 | <i>Satisfactory</i> | Describes the ministry site and includes demographic and environmental data; identifies a target population; includes ministry site mission statement; outlines results of needs assessment process; offers information about initiatives in ministry site related to proposed project; includes discussion of personal gifts, values and challenges. |
| 7 | <i>Area for Improvement</i> | |
| 6 | <i>Inadequate</i> | Ministry site and/or target population inadequately described; missing demographic and/or sacramental information; target population of an inappropriate size or scope; mission statement missing or unrelated to proposed project; cannot articulate relationship of project to ministry site mission; needs assessment not well-developed or inadequately described; inadequate exploration of personal gifts, challenges and values related to the proposed project. |

Pastoral Plan

_____/10

| Points | Performance | Description |
|---------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 10 | <i>Superior</i> | Goals written from desired client outcome/s in concrete, achievable and measurable terms; clearly stated objectives flowing from goals; detailed step-by-step action plan in both narrative and schematic format, outlining “who will do what by when”; shows a logical flow of events; clearly articulates the human, material, financial, physical, educational resources needed; contingency plan is complete and well-articulated; evaluation plan is comprehensive, appropriate for the ministry site and project, relates directly to the goals, and has a clear client; the financial plan is detailed, realistic, and transparent; the communications plan identifies stakeholders, content, avenues, and frequency. The plan clearly articulates, promotes and provides for collaboration and empowerment of others. |
| 9 | <i>Above Average</i> | |
| 8 | <i>Satisfactory</i> | Goals written from desired client outcome/s; objectives flow from goals; action plan presented in both narrative and schematic format; resources listed; plan contains budget, evaluation plan, contingency plan, and communication plan. Plan allows for collaboration and empowerment of others. |
| 7 | <i>Area for Improvement</i> | |
| 6 | <i>Inadequate</i> | Goals poorly defined, unachievable, or unmeasurable; narrative and/or schematic are missing, inadequate, or do not reflect |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | effective pastoral planning; resources not properly identified or inadequately described; contingency plan missing or inadequate; evaluation plan does not reference goals, is poorly constructed, or has no identified client; budget is unrealistic, poorly planned, or inadequately funded; communication plan is ineffective, poorly defined, or incomplete. The plan does not allow for or encourage collaboration and empowerment of others. |
|--|--|--|

Theological Paper _____/10
Examination of the Need in the Larger Church or Broader Community Ministry Site

| Points | Performance | Description |
|---------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 10 | <i>Superior</i> | 10-15 page research paper with a minimum of 5 references and bibliography. Thesis statement clearly connects topic with project; clear articulation of relationship between project and mission of Church; clear articulation and depth exploration of one or more theological issues at the heart of the project; insightful and appropriate use of secondary sources, scripture, and/or Church documents; clearly structured; free from grammatical, spelling, and word processing errors; language precise and effective in conveying understanding to the reader; citations according to K. Turabian, <i>Manual for Writers</i> . |
| 9 | <i>Above Average</i> | |
| 8 | <i>Satisfactory</i> | Paper follows guidelines; thesis statement connects topic with project; articulation of relationship between project and mission of Church; exploration of one or more theological issues at the heart of the project; appropriate use of sources; citations according to K. Turabian, <i>Manual for Writers</i> . |
| 7 | <i>Area for Improvement</i> | |
| 6 | <i>Inadequate</i> | Paper does not follow guidelines; inadequate connection between project and topic of research; unable to articulate relationship between project and mission of Church; unable to articulate one or more theological issues at the heart of the project; inadequate, incomplete, or inept use of secondary sources, scripture, and/or Church documents; poorly structured; excessive grammatical, spelling, and/or word processing errors; language imprecise or confusing; citations not according to K. Turabian, <i>Manual for Writers</i> . |

Project Report and Evaluation Narrative

_____/10

| Points | Performance | Description |
|---------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 10 | <i>Superior</i> | Implementation report is detailed, shows theological and pastoral insight; unintended outcomes are named and examined; clearly articulates revisions and changes that occurred during implementation; evaluation results clearly articulated; demonstrates understanding of the relationship between evaluation results and stated goals; articulates self-awareness of personal assumptions, challenges, and the effect of the capstone experience on relationship with God, Church, and spiritual growth; clearly articulates learning, theological and pastoral insights, experiences of collaboration, and connection between the project and the tradition of ministry in the Church; evidences ability to reflect theologically on experience. |
| 9 | <i>Above Average</i> | |
| 8 | <i>Satisfactory</i> | Implementation report includes all of the required elements of unintended outcomes, revisions and changes during implementation, evaluation results, challenges of implementation, and some connection between the project and the tradition of ministry in the Church. |
| 7 | <i>Area for Improvement</i> | |
| 6 | <i>Inadequate</i> | Implementation report is inadequate, incomplete; unintended outcomes missing or inadequately articulated; revisions or changes during implemented are undocumented or missing, evaluation results are missing, inadequate or poorly articulated; unable to articulate connection between project and tradition of ministry in the Church; unable to reflect theologically on experience. |

Writing Style, Citation Format

_____/10

| Points | Performance | Description |
|---------------|----------------------|---|
| 10 | <i>Superior</i> | Capstone report follows guidelines; free from grammatical, spelling errors, and word processing errors; language precise and effective in conveying understanding to the readers; citations according to K. Turabian, <i>Manual for Writers</i> . |
| 9 | <i>Above Average</i> | |
| 8 | <i>Satisfactory</i> | Capstone report follows guidelines; paper clearly written; |

| | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|
| | | citations according to K. Turabian, <i>Manual for Writers</i> . |
| 7 | <i>Area for Improvement</i> | |
| 6 | <i>Inadequate</i> | Capstone report does not follow guidelines; excessive grammatical, spelling, and/or word processing errors; citations not according to K. Turabian, <i>Manual for Writers</i> . |

Evaluator's Signature

Date

Please return completed form to:

Mount St. Mary's Seminary & School of Theology
 Lay Ecclesial Formation Office
 6616 Beechmont Avenue
 Cincinnati, OH 45230