Note:

COURSE CONTENT MAY BE CHANGED, TERM TO TERM, WITHOUT NOTICE. THE INFORMATION BELOW IS PROVIDED AS A GUIDE FOR COURSE SELECTION AND IS NOT BINDING IN ANY FORM.
SYLLABUS FOR ST 5501: SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY 1

Name of Course
ST 5501: Systematic Theology 1, 3 hours
Developed by J. Brian Tucker, Ph.D., August 20, 2011.

Course Description
This course is a systematic study of the biblical doctrines of Bibliology and Trinitarianism (Theology Proper, Christology, and Pneumatology). It includes an examination of theological Prolegomena, major features pertaining to the Holy Scriptures, and a study of the identity and works of the Triune God. Key concepts, issues, and the practical implications and integration of these doctrines in Church and Christian life are discussed.

Course Objectives
By the end of this course the student will:

1. Articulate the meaning of key theological terms and concepts. (Knowledge and Understanding)

2. Explain the nature and necessity of systematic theology including the significance of theological thinking and interpretation. (Knowledge and Understanding)

3. Demonstrate knowledge and comprehension of the historical development of these doctrines. (Knowledge and Understanding)

4. Articulate personal positions on these doctrines within the biblical framework while employing proper theological method. (Judgment and Design)

5. Define each doctrine covered under Bibliology and Trinitarianism with accuracy providing biblical support and identifying deviations from, or false expressions of these doctrines. (Commitment and Identity)

6. Articulate Biblical answers to key theological questions raised by the church and/or the world that pertain to these doctrines. (Performance and Action)

Course Textbook(s) and/or Supplemental Information
Required textbooks for all Moody Online classes can be found on the Required Textbooks section of the Moody website.

You can purchase the book online through Amazon.com or any other bookstore.

Course Requirements
Each week you'll have discussion questions that will engage you in key aspects of the lesson for the week. Throughout the course you will also have four doctrinal position papers (Bibliology, Theology Proper, Christology, and Pneumatology). Also, you'll have a contemporary New Testament and Church Issue paper to write. This brief paper allows you to think about a key issue related to church life. You'll also prepare a timeline that covers key ideas and persons
relating to the doctrine of Christology. You'll also design a summary doctrinal table chart that will give you the big picture with regard to the key ideas you've studied in this course. Finally, you'll have mid-term and final exams that cover the central ideas for the doctrines that are the focus of this course.

Note: The online week runs from Tuesday morning through Monday night (12 midnight CST). Unless otherwise noted, assignments are due at the end of the week—Monday night. Make sure all weekly assignments are turned in by the end of the week.

REQUIRED READINGS

Week One: Read the following in Erickson [CT], pp. 17-38; 62-84.

Week Two: Read the following in CT, pp. 178-80, 191-94, 198-99; 201-3, 207-16, 221-23; 225-28, 235-38; 246-65.

Week Three: Read the following in Geisler and Nix, A General Introduction to the Bible, pp. 277-93. Tucker, “The Application of Contemporary Theories of Social Identity.”

Week Four: Read the following in CT, pp. 180-87.

Week Five: Read the following in CT, pp. 346-67.

Week Six: Read the following in CT, pp. 677-91; 699-720; 723-32; 742-50.

Week Seven: Read the following in CT, pp. 756-75; 751; 735-37; 788-90; 790-91; 794-97, 1204-5.

Week Eight: Read the following in CT, pp. 861-79; 880-98.

ASSIGNMENTS

What follows is a listing of the major assignments for this course.

Week One:
1-1 Self Introduction (non-graded)
1-2 Complete the Discussion Board Question
1-3 Complete the Discussion Board Question

Week Two:
2-1 Complete the Discussion Board Question
2-2 Complete the Discussion Board Question

Week Three:
3-1 Submit your Bibliology Position Paper
3-2 Complete the Discussion Board Question

Week Four:
4-1 Complete the Discussion Board Question
4-2 Submit your Contemporary Theological Issues Answer Assignment

Week Five
5-1 Take your Mid-Term Exam
5-2 Complete the Discussion Board Question

Week Six
6-1 Complete the Discussion Board Question
6-2 Submit your Theology Proper Position Paper

Week Seven
7-1 Submit your Christology Position Paper
7-2 Submit your Christology Timeline
7-3 Complete the Discussion Board Question

Week Eight
8-1 Submit your Pneumatology Position Paper to your professor
8-2 Submit your Summary Doctrinal Table to your professor
8-3 Take your Final Exam

POSITION PAPERS
These papers serve a dual purpose. They are a vital part of the requirements for this course and also serve for inclusion in your student portfolio for future reference during your exit interview at the time of graduation. The papers are to be a summary of the major doctrines of this course and the format for each topic (under each doctrine) should be as follows: (1) A clear and thorough definition. (2) As many relevant Bible references as possible to support each phrase that forms part of the definition. (3) A statement of your personal position, and as compared with MBI’s doctrinal statement (in the catalog). (4) Identify and discuss, where relevant, other positions, issues, and limitations. (5) Each topic addressed is expected to be no more than one page double spaced per sub-heading. Conciseness is a virtue. Min page length (not counting title page and bibliography), 5 and maximum page length is 6 pages.

Bibliology. Topics: (1) Revelation, (2) Inspiration, (3) Inerrancy, (4) Canonicity, and (5) Illumination.

Theology Proper. Topics on the attributes of God, namely (1) Immutability, (2) Eternity, (3) Foreknowledge (includes Omniscience), (4) Love, (5) Holiness, and (6) Trinity.

Christology. Topics: (1) Deity of Christ, (2) Humanity of Christ, (3) The God-man—meaning and importance, (4) Virgin Birth, (5) Kenosis, and (6) Life - (discuss His baptism, temptation, resurrection, and present ministry).


Primary grading criteria for these papers: (a) Clarity: Have you stated your view in a clear and consistent way? The idea is not for a survey of other views (quote others if you need to), but to express your view in your own words. (b) Coverage: Did you deal with all the topics stipulated? (c) Accuracy: When you make a statement about a theological viewpoint, have you stated it accurately? (4) Support: Did you support your views adequately and logically, primarily from the Bible, and/or other sources, where relevant?

Here are some general guidelines for all papers.
(1) **All papers** must have a **title page** that clearly indicates your name, box number, name and catalog number of the course, professor’s name, name of the institution, email address, and date the assignment is due. Make sure you can login to Blackboard and that you know how to upload assignments correctly. No emailed assignments will be accepted.

(2) All quotations and ideas from other sources must be properly credited and documented. Students are to use Turabian format.

(3) A Bibliography of sources consulted, in the proper format and style, is absolutely essential for any written work submitted. The bibliography is excluded from the page count.

(4) The lines on a page are to be double spaced, font size—12 points, with a one inch margin on all sides. The paper must meet the minimum page requirement, and must not exceed the page limit, if you divert from either of these requirements you will lose 1 letter grade (no exceptions). Use headings and sub-headings when appropriate.

(5) All papers must be theologically sound. Conclusion(s) are to be well argued and wherever possible, provide plenteous support from the Bible (i.e., provide references, do not included extended quotations, paraphrase the material only).

**CHRISTOLOGY TIMELINE**
Prepare a timeline of the historical development of Christology, placing major events in a timeline beginning with the Apostle Paul and the date he wrote 1 Corinthians, and ending with the publication of Larry Hurtado’s *How On Earth Did Jesus Become A God?*, published in 2005.

**SUMMARY DOCTRINAL TABLE**
Prepare a summary doctrinal table, placing key definitions, ideas, references, and points. Also, include the main opposing issues (heretical views, key individuals, etc.), and a brief summary of your position on the key ideas identified. Finally, include up to three concrete areas of application of these areas of theology to your personal and/or church life. You may draw from your textbook and the course notes; however, you should consult Logos and draw on at least one resource from it.

**CONTEMPORARY NT ISSUE PAPER**
Compose a response to the following contemporary theological-hermeneutical issue: The historical grammatical approach to biblical interpretation could/should (or should not) be expanded to include the resources of social scientific criticism. You will want to consult J. Brian Tucker, *You Belong to Christ: Paul and the Formation of Social Identity in 1 Corinthians 1-4*. Eugene, Ore: Pickwick, 2010, pp. 36-60. A copy of this chapter is available below. This paper is limited to 2 pages in length (and must interact with Tucker’s approach in the essay), double spaced, 12 point font, 1 inch margins, and correspond to Turabian guidelines. Answer paper is due at the end of this week.

**EXAMINATIONS**
There are two exams. Both exams will be more or less similar in the nature of questions. They may include, but not necessarily, multiple choice questions, fill-in the blanks, matching key terms and ideas to people and places, questions requiring short answers and essay answers. The first exam will cover Prolegomena, Bibliology, and Theology Proper. The second exam will cover Trinity, Christology, and Pneumatology. You may not use notes, internet sources, books, Bible, or any outside helps when you take these exams.
DISCUSSION BOARDS

In an online class, the discussion board takes the place of class attendance and in-classroom discussion. Here is what constitutes acceptable performance in the discussion board. The assessment rubric is located in the Grading Rubrics folder within the Course Materials section of this course.

Discussion Board Posting: Post your discussion board responses to the appropriate discussion thread for the week in view. Write out your response to the chosen question before reading other posts. Write your initial response in a text editor and/or Microsoft Word and then cut and paste it into the correct location in Blackboard. The due date for your initial post for each question is by Friday night.

Procedure:
(1) Review the grading rubric located in the Course Materials section of the course and become familiar with its contents.
(2) Complete the assigned readings before answering the discussion questions. You may use material from your reading in your posts.
(3) Answer the chosen discussion question; you are limited to 150 words in your post. Your initial post must follow standard grammatical conventions; however, responses may progress at a more colloquial level.
(4) Submit your initial post by the Friday of the week in which it is assigned.
(5) Review the responses of your classmates and react appropriately. You are required to comment appropriately on a minimum of two of your classmate’s posts. These responses must occur by Monday night.

Questions for this course:
Lesson 1: Please introduce yourself to the class via this discussion by posting your name in the subject line, then state why you have decided to pursue seminary studies. Please also include 1 to 3 things you hope to learn from this introduction to systematic theology. Please respond to at least 2 of your classmates’ posts. Welcome to the class! I look forward to learning more about you! Note: This discussion board is for class orientation and is not graded by the professor.

Lesson 1: The lecture introduced the idea of areas of importance to different theological systems? Which of the movements do you identify with? Do you agree with the theological priority that is stated? Finally, what area of theology do you personally emphasize, and why?

Lesson 1: Moody Bible Institute has historically been known as a dispensationalist school. What do you see as the major features of dispensationalism? Which ones do you see as having weak biblical support? What is the relevance of dispensationalism in the 21st century (include at least a brief remark on Jewish-Christian dialogue)? Is progressive dispensationalism a valid development of classical dispensationalism? (see chapter on “Dispensationalism” in Blackboard).

Lesson 2: Scholars often point to historical errors in the book of Acts. Determine whether or not Acts 5:36 and the order in which Theudas and Judas of Galilee are referred in comparison to Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 20.5.1, is an error. Formulate a response if someone were to question your view of inerrancy based on Acts 5:36-ff in comparison with Josephus, *Antiquities* 20.5.1.

Lesson 2: Historically there is a temptation to equate our understanding of the Bible with the Bible itself. Galileo was one example of this in his disputes with the Roman Catholic Church. Is the present-day insistence by many evangelicals on “a six-day recent creation” as the only biblical position another example of this? Is there anything wrong with saying, the Bible, while absolutely true, is not absolute truth? Finally, while 2 Tim 3:15-17 declares scripture’s purpose; did scripture intend to give humanity an exhaustive exposition of the nature of the created order? How does general revelation help us understand the command to “have dominion” in
Genesis? Does this command imply that God had left to humanity the discovery and ordering of the creation?

Lesson 3: How do you respond to the argument that the Church invented the doctrine of the deity of Christ by destroying alternative gospels that portray Christ as human? Locate scholars who hold this view and develop a response based on what you discover and what you learned in this lesson concerning the process of canonicity and preservation of the NT.

Lesson 4: What is the new atheism? Why is it so popular? Who are its key proponents? How would you formulate a response to someone interested in this approach? You can start by viewing the following link [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sOusFD9PnsA]. How does this lesson help you in your response?


Lesson 6: Assess the accuracy of James Dunn’s claims concerning the early church and their view of Christ’s deity. (Check any of the following: Jesus Remembered, Beginning from Jerusalem, Did the First Christians Worship Jesus?)

Lesson 7: James G. Crossley argues against the historical plausibility of the bodily resurrection of Jesus. Locate some of Crossley’s works and discern the contours of his arguments. Provide an analysis of his case and offer at least three arguments against his approach. See Michael Bird and James Crossley, How Did Christianity Begin, which has a chapter on the resurrection for initial ideas (it is available in Blackboard).

Grading

GRADING GRID
Your grade for this course will consist of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Papers (4@ 5% each)</th>
<th>20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christology Timeline Project</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Doctrinal Table</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary NT Issue Paper</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Term Exam</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Board Posts (9)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MTS LETTER GRADE SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Grade</th>
<th>Percentage Equivalent</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>96-100</td>
<td>Exceptional Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>94-95</td>
<td>Excellent Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>92-93</td>
<td>Very Good Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>89-91</td>
<td>Good Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>87-88</td>
<td>Above Average Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>83-86</td>
<td>Average Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>79-78</td>
<td>Work Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>75-78</td>
<td>Minimally Acceptable Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0-74</td>
<td>Unacceptable Work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Course Policies

**Late Work**

It is essential that students learn to deliver course requirements by the due date. Students must learn to plan their schedules accordingly so that assigned work will be able to be delivered by the assigned date. Any work not turned in by the end of the week in which it is assigned, Monday night, will be considered late. 20% will be deducted from the total grade for any assignment turned in late for the first week (80% total highest possible grade), an additional 10% will be deducted after the first week. No assignment will be accepted later than two weeks past the due date.

**Plagiarism**

Plagiarism is taking the ideas or words of another person and presenting them as one’s own. Sometimes plagiarism is an intentional act of deception. Sometimes it is simply the result of ignorance, carelessness, or sloppy work. In either case it is unethical and constitutes a serious infraction of Seminary policy. When the words or ideas of others are used, proper credit must be given either in a footnote or in the text. Consequences of plagiarism will normally follow a three-step process:

- **First offence** – a grade of F is given for the assignment; the professor must notify the Registrar and Dean of Students. A statement goes into the student’s file.

- **Second offence** – a grade of F is assigned for the course; the professor must notify the Registrar and Dean of Students. A statement goes into the student’s file. The Dean of Students and/or Registrar will notify faculty of students who incur a second offense in this area.

- **Third offence** – the professor must notify the Registrar and Dean of Students. The student may be suspended or dismissed from the Seminary. A statement goes into the student’s file.

Upon recommendation of the Academic Standards Committee faculty, consequences for plagiarism may include dismissal from the Seminary or the revocation of a degree.

Course Resources

**Library**

Online students have access to the Moody Library. Though students may wish to check out books via inter-library loan, the online database has a number of articles and reviews available for download. You can access the online database by logging into your account at my.moody.edu. If you have not previously accessed the library database you may wish to complete the online database tutorial at http://library.moody.edu.

**Other**

Information about Logos Bible Software can be found at http://www.logos.com
Turabian Citation Guide can be found at http://www.press.uchicago.edu/books/turabian/turabian_citationguide.html

**Course Bibliography and Supplementary Materials**


### Grading Rubrics

#### Grading Rubric for the Discussion Boards
- Total Possible Points: 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Minimally satisfactory</th>
<th>Not satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of Ideas</strong> 15 points</td>
<td>Well-developed ideas; introduces new ideas; stimulates discussion 13-15 points</td>
<td>Developing ideas; sometimes stimulates discussion 10-12 points</td>
<td>Poorly developed ideas which do not add to discussion 8-9 points</td>
<td>May post some comments but comments are off topic 0-7 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence of Critical Thinking</strong> 15 points</td>
<td>Clear evidence of critical thinking--application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. Postings are characterized by clarity of argument, depth of insight into theoretical issues, originality of treatment, and relevance. Sometimes include unusual insights. Arguments are well supported. 13-15 points</td>
<td>Beginnings of critical thinking; postings tend to address peripheral issues. Generally accurate, but could be improved with more analysis and creative thought. Tendency to recite facts rather than address issues. 10-12 points</td>
<td>Poorly developed critical thinking 8-10 points</td>
<td>Little to no evidence of critical thinking about the question. 0-7 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response to Other Students and Instructor</strong> 10 points</td>
<td>Interacts at least twice with other students and/or instructor 9-10 points</td>
<td>Interacts at least once with other students and/or instructor 6-8 points</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does not enter discussion 0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeliness and Mechanics</strong> 10 points</td>
<td>Individual message and at least two responses posted before deadline. Standard English mechanics and grammar were used in the initial post. 9-10 points</td>
<td>Noticeable problems with mechanics or late postings. 6-8 points</td>
<td></td>
<td>No messages posted 0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Grading Rubric for Position Papers

## Total Possible Points: 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Minimally satisfactory</th>
<th>Not satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of Ideas</strong></td>
<td>Well-developed theological position; supports ideas scripturally; recognizes deviant ideas.</td>
<td>Developing theological ideas; sometimes provides appropriate biblical support, notes variant views.</td>
<td>Poorly developed ideas which do not add to discussion, lacks accurate scriptural support, misidentifies deviant views.</td>
<td>May contain some ideas, but are not their own but others, lacks biblical support, and overlooks wrong views. 0-7 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence of Critical Thinking</strong></td>
<td>Clear evidence of critical thinking - application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. Position paper is characterized by clarity of argument, depth of insight into theological issues, originality of treatment, and relevance. Sometimes include unusual insights. Arguments well supported.</td>
<td>Beginnings of critical thinking; position paper tends to address peripheral issues. Generally accurate, but could be improved with more analysis and creative thought. Tendency to recite facts/scripture rather than address issues.</td>
<td>Poorly developed critical thinking 8-10 points</td>
<td>Little to no evidence of critical thinking about the doctrinal position in view. It is not clear if the student even knows which doctrines are to be addressed. 0-7 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison to MBI doctrinal statement</strong></td>
<td>Interacts at least twice with the MBI statements</td>
<td>Interacts at least once with the MBI statements</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does not enter into a discussion with MBI statements. 0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeliness and Mechanics</strong></td>
<td>Position paper was turned in on the deadline. ESV employed. Standard English mechanics and grammar were used, Turabian followed. 9-10 points</td>
<td>Noticeable problems with mechanics or late. Turabian problems, wrong version of the Bible used, did not follow page length restrictions. 6-8 points</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not turned in on time, mechanics unacceptable, page limit exceeded, wrong version used, grammar unacceptable. 0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Grading Rubric for 'Timeline of Christology'

- **Total Possible Points**: 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Minimally satisfactory</th>
<th>Not satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completeness 15 points</strong></td>
<td>Addresses all elements contained within the stated assignment and goes beyond timeline assignment requirements. 13-15 points</td>
<td>Addresses all components of the timeline assignment, no omissions of content. 10-12 points</td>
<td>Omits aspects of the timeline assignment (key figures, dates, or debates). Did not follow directions completely. 8-9 points</td>
<td>Fails to address all the required elements of the Christology timeline assignment. 0-7 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence of Critical Thinking 15 points</strong></td>
<td>Clear evidence of critical thinking: application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. 13-15 points</td>
<td>Beginnings of critical thinking: but some timeline material was off the topic. Some aspects evidenced minimal thought. 10-12 points</td>
<td>Critical thinking minimally evident. Timeline seemed to be hastily thrown together. 8-10 points</td>
<td>Little to no evidence of critical thinking, slavish copying is evident. 0-7 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content 10 points</strong></td>
<td>Provided original content and supporting details, and reflection and what is important in the history of Christological debates. 9-10 points</td>
<td>Provided good content, some details but lacked engagement with sources beyond one or two interpretive traditions. 6-8 points</td>
<td>Does not provide acceptable content and lacks details and reflection. 0 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeliness and Mechanics 10 points</strong></td>
<td>Assignment was turned in on time with no technical errors. Proper English style was used. 9-10 points</td>
<td>Noticeable problems with timeliness and/or mechanics. 6-8 points</td>
<td>Did not complete assignment. 0 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Grading Rubric for ‘Contemporary Theological Issue Answer’ - Total Possible Points: 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Minimally satisfactory</th>
<th>Not satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coverage of Ideas</strong></td>
<td>Addressed the key issues with regard to the use of social science studies when interpreting scripture theologically. Supported case scripturally; consulted JB Tucker’s book. 13-15 points</td>
<td>Addressed most of the issues in an effective manner; reflected on some of the scriptures; answered the question but not in a thorough manner 10-12 points</td>
<td>Addressed only half of the issues related to the use of social scientific criticism; did not engage in some of the key ideational requirements of the assignment. 8-9 points</td>
<td>Evidence minimal or no coverage of ideas from the assignment. 0-7 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence of Critical Thinking</strong></td>
<td>Clear evidence of critical thinking: application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. Observations and comments showed depth of insight in observations about the way previous identities continue or do not continue in Christ. 13-15 points</td>
<td>Beginnings of critical thinking: but thoughts were sometimes off the topic; good work but could be improved with more thought. Tendency to answer question with minimal thought. 10-12 points</td>
<td>Critical thinking minimally evident. 8-10 points</td>
<td>Little to no evidence of critical thinking. 0-7 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Response to Topic</strong></td>
<td>Interacts with the personal impact of this theological issue on their life. 9-10 points</td>
<td>Interacts at least minimally with the personal nature of this question. 6-8 points</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does not provide comments with regard to the ‘My’ and/or ‘I’ aspects of the question. 0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeliness and Mechanics</strong></td>
<td>Assignment was turned in on time with no technical errors. Complete sentences were used, Turabian followed, margins, etc. 9-10 points</td>
<td>Noticeable problems with timeliness and/or mechanics. 6-8 points</td>
<td></td>
<td>Did not complete assignment. 0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>