

SOAN 232: Saints, Sects, and Society

Grading Rubric: “Religious Specialist Interview”

From the Syllabus:

- Interview a religious specialist – e.g., priest, rabbi, minister, imam, etc. – one whom you do not know personally (or did not know at the start of the semester). This specialist will be from a religious tradition other than your own.
- The topic of the interview will be the sense of personal meaning that this specialist gets from leading her or his religious group, and the reasons that this individual finds this particular group to be a congenial religious home. Please use the concepts you have learned during the first part of this course to deepen your conversation.

These assignments are graded on an “A-B-C-D-F” basis. I translate these grades into points, using the scheme noted on the syllabus. Thus even an “F” can earn some points, though not many. Not turning in the assignment or turning in something that bears no relationship to the assignment earns 0. Grades are scored as follows:

- A : A thorough and thoughtful interview write-up that ably communicates your interviewee’s point-of-view, simultaneously connecting that point-of-view to (or using that point-of-view to illuminate) many other things we have learned in the course. A paper at this level covers the two aspects of the topic—personal meaning and reasons for attachment to her or his group—with charm and pizzazz. The paper will be well-written, clear, and hold the reader’s interest.
- B : A reasonably complete and thoughtful interview write-up that ably communicates your interviewee’s point-of-view, simultaneously connecting that point-of-view to (or using that point-of-view to illuminate) some of the other things we have learned in the course. A paper at this level covers the two aspects of the topic—personal meaning and reasons for attachment to her or his group—competently, though without systematic excitement. The paper will be well-written, clear, and hold the reader’s interest.
- C : An incomplete but somewhat thoughtful interview write-up that communicates at least part of your interviewee’s point-of-view, without connecting that point-of-view to (or using that point-of-view to illuminate) the things we have learned in the course. A paper at this level touches on the two aspects of the topic—personal meaning and reasons for attachment to her or his group—at least one of them competently. As a piece of writing, it is halting and/or fails to hold audience interest.
- D : A very incomplete and unclear interview write-up that communicates something of your interviewee’s point-of-view, albeit unsystematically. Fails to touch on either of the two aspects of the topic—personal meaning and reasons for attachment to her or his group—competently. Poorly written.
- F : A mostly incoherent interview write-up that fails to communicate much of anything. The reader knows that you talked to someone and most likely knows who, but remains

More →

confused about that person's point-of-view. Readers get at most a vague idea of what the interviewee said about the two aspects of the topic—personal meaning and reasons for attachment to her or his group. Poorly written.

B+, B-, C+, C-, etc indicate presentations that stand somewhere between these major scores.