

ASSIGNMENT INSTRUCTIONS & RUBRIC
MUWS 2001 – Survey of Worship Music
Reading Synthesis Project

Reading Synthesis Project

Part 1 (Aniol): Due 11 November (11:59 pm), 200 total points

Part 2 (Lim/Ruth): Due 8 December (11:59 pm), 200 total points

- As a part of your Reading Responses each week, you have identified many of the main thoughts and concepts the author is trying to communicate through the writing of the book. Your goal for this assignment is to distill all that information into a brief summary and evaluation. While your RRs were simply quotations with no commentary, your Synthesis should include your thoughts and ideas regarding the author’s work.
- You will write a synthesis for both of the required texts this semester. The synthesis on Aniol’s book will be due on 11 November, while the synthesis on Lim/Ruth’s book will be due on 8 December. Both parts of the project are worth 200 points, for a total possible 400 points.
- Each synthesis should contain a minimum of 1,000 words, but please do not exceed 2,500 words.
- Employ critical thinking and our analytical skills as you discuss each author’s work. You should include the following in your introduction/opening paragraph:
 - A statement of the author’s thesis for the book. It may be quoted verbatim or paraphrased.
 - The major supporting arguments that the author uses to bolster his thesis.
- Format of the project
 - Include a Title Page containing the following information (centered):

A SYNTHESIS OF [TITLE OF BOOK]
by [Your Name]
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
Survey of Worship Music, MUWS 2001
Dr. David Tatum, Instructor
[Date]

- Include a bibliography as your final page. Follow Turabian format for your bibliographical entries. Include all works that you have cited in your paper, including the main text (i.e., Aniol or Lim/Ruth)
- Use 1” margins on top, bottom, and sides.
- Text should be double-spaced using a 12-point font.
- Include parenthetical citations when quoting from the texts.
 - For example:
 - “...how theological beliefs affect the worship practices we have inherited” (Aniol, 17).

- “Contemporary worship is the worship of a specific people’s language” (Lim/Ruth, 25).
 - PLEASE NOTE, the reference should follow the quotation mark but come before the final punctuation of the sentence (Turabian, 9th edition, 16.4.3.2).
 - If you cite a work other than the one being discussed, use a parenthetical reference as described above, but include a bibliographical entry for the work in your bibliography.
- Use formal academic language (e.g., do not use contractions).
 - The Synthesis Projects will be graded using the following criteria (as evidenced in the Rubric):
 - Comprehensive summation of author’s work
 - Is there a clear thesis statement present?
 - Are the major supporting arguments discussed?
 - Does the student have a good grasp on what the author was trying to communicate?
 - Did the student use the points discovered during the RR assignments?
 - Does the paper meet the word count requirements for the project?
 - Grammatical and Mechanical Correctness
 - Does the student employ appropriate grammar?
 - Does the student employ appropriate academic language?
 - Are the mechanics of the paper correct?
 - Title page
 - Bibliography (if needed)
 - Margins and spacing
 - Parenthetical references used properly

Grading Rubric on following pages.

Content 80%	1 – There is no interaction with the author and there are major gaps in the summarization	2 – There is good effort at summarization but there are some gaps	3 – The student summarizes the author’s intent, but there is little critical interaction	4 – There are some critical interactions with the author	5 – Student purposefully interacts critically with the author
Possible Pts 160	32	64	96	128	160

5 – The student critically interacts with the author and content of the text. There is a clear description of the author’s thesis and supporting arguments. The student synthesizes the salient points from the author and incorporates them into a well-stated, critical evaluation of the author’s work.

4 – There is some critical interaction with the author and text. There is a clear description of the author’s thesis and supporting arguments.

3 – The student summarizes the content from the author but there is little critical interaction and synthesis with the text. There may be a brief description of the author’s thesis and supporting arguments.

2 – There is an attempt at summarization, but no critical interaction with the author or text whatsoever. A description of the author’s thesis and supporting arguments are shallow or missing.

1 – There is not interaction with the author or text, and there are major gaps in simple summarization. Many of the important concepts discussed by the author are missing from the summary.

Continued on next page

Mechanics 20%	1 – Paper meets very few of the requirements stated, there are numerous mechanical issues	2 – Paper does not meet the technical requirements, there are many mechanical issues	3 – Paper meets the technical requirements, there are some mechanical issues	4 – Paper exceeds all technical requirements and has some mechanical mistakes	5 – Paper exceeds all technical requirements and has few mechanical mistakes
Possible pts 40	8	16	24	32	40
<p>5 – The paper far exceeds the technical requirements and there are very few mechanical mistakes.</p> <p>4 – The paper meets or exceeds all the technical requirements. There are few (less than 5) grammatical errors per page.</p> <p>3 – The paper meets the technical requirements, however, there are some mechanical issues: incorrect bibliographical information, missing information in title page, some (less than 7) grammatical errors per page.</p> <p>2 – The paper does not meet the requirements. The title page OR bibliography is missing. Paper does not meet the minimum word count requirement, and has many (7–10) grammatical errors per page.</p> <p>1 – The paper does not meet the requirements, title page and/or bibliography is missing. Paper does not meet minimum word count requirement. Paper has numerous (10–15) grammatical errors per page.</p>					

ASSIGNMENT INSTRUCTIONS & RUBRIC
MUWS 2001 – Survey of Worship Music
Song Evaluation Blog Project

Song Evaluation Blog Project

- **Song Eval 1: Due 20 September (11:59 pm), 200 total points**
- **Song Eval 2: Due 1 December (11:59 pm), 200 total points**

There will be many times in your ministry when you will be asked to write an article or a blog post for the people in your congregation. As students, we learn to write a specific way—using academic language and higher-level constructs. However, when we write for our people, we must engage them with common, every-day language as we seek to both inform and inspire them. The Song Evaluation Project will attempt to help you navigate the type of writing described above as you will seek to examine two worship songs in detail in a way that could be used during your ministry.

- Students will evaluate two (2) songs for theological integrity and musical suitability for use in corporate worship.
- Songs must be chosen from the list posted on Moodle.
 - Please email the professor (tatumd@obu.edu) with your two song choices.
 - Songs may only be evaluated by one student, and they will be assigned on a first-to-email basis. Therefore, you are encouraged to select both of your songs and submit your requests early.
- Once your song choices are approved, begin working on your evaluation.
 - When writing is complete, your evaluation should be posted to our class blog on medium.com (<https://medium.com/biblical-worship>).
 - See and follow the detailed instructions on the attached Medium Instructions handout.
 - Create a medium.com account if you do not have one already.
 - Follow the class blog (<https://medium.com/biblical-worship>).
 - You will receive an email inviting you to post to the blog.
 - When you are ready to post:
 - Go to the blog site
 - Click on your avatar at the top right
 - Select “Write A Story”
 - Begin writing your post.
 - Include at least four (4) external links in your blog post. For example:
 - A YouTube recording of the song
 - A link to an author page
 - A picture (royalty free) that encapsulates the theme of the song

- When you are finished editing
 - Click the “3 Dots” at the top and choose “Add to Publication”, then select our blog (Biblical Worship).
 - Once I receive your post for submission, I will do final editing and then add it to our blog page.
- Elements to be included in your blog post:
 - Author/composer information
 - Biblical basis of the song
 - Textual analysis of each portion of the song (e.g. verse/stanza, chorus, bridge, etc.).
 - Musical evaluation of the song
 - Critical evaluation of the song’s appropriateness and possible effectiveness in corporate worship.
 - External links (see above)
- There is no specific word length requirement on this assignment. However, you must fully examine and discuss the elements listed above.
- Each Song Evaluation is worth a possible 200 points for 400 total possible points.

Grading Rubric

Completion 20%	1 – Lacks some major components	2 – Some elements missing or incomplete	3 – Most elements covered sufficiently	4 – All elements covered sufficiently	5 – All elements covered well
Poss Pts 40	8	16	24	32	40
<p>5 – All elements are covered in detail and with clarity. There is no missing information.</p> <p>4 – All elements are covered sufficiently. There could be more in depth discussion on some elements.</p> <p>3 – There is some missing information. Most of the elements are not discussed in detail but simply touched on.</p> <p>2 – There are missing elements and most elements are not discussed in detail.</p> <p>1 – Many elements are missing.</p>					

Clarity and Argument 50%	1 – There is little clarity in the writing and there is very little critical thinking used in making arguments	2 – There is little clarity in the writing and some critical thinking in evidence	3 – There are a few problems with clarity	4 – Student writes with clarity but does not take the target audience into account	5 – Student writes with exceptional clarity and depth at an appropriate level
Poss Pts 100	20	40	60	80	100

5 – The student has done an exceptional job of clearly articulating their arguments related to the required elements. There are very few grammatical issues. The piece is written with the average church member in mind.

4 – The student writes with clarity and depth but is either too academic or too simple in their approach to the writing. There are few grammatical errors.

3 – There are some problems with clarity (i.e., unsupported arguments, hyperbolic statements, polemic opinions expressed with no academic support). There are several grammatical errors in the work.

2 – There is little clarity expressed in the writing. The topics are discussed on too shallow a level. There is little critical thinking in evidence in the arguments and evaluations made. Grammatical errors abound in the work.

1 – Clarity is absent and there are major grammatical issues. The arguments and evaluations made by the student show no critical thinking.

Creativity 30%	1 – There are no creative or improperly used elements	2 – There is little creativity in evidence	3 – There is evidence of some creativity	4 – There are many creative elements used	5 – Exceptional creativity is employed
Poss. Pts 60	12	24	36	48	60

5 – The student does an exceptional job of creatively presenting their information in an engaging way. The student uses pictures, audio/video, external links that greatly support their arguments and evaluations while maintaining the reader’s interest.

4 – The student uses many creative elements (pictures, audio/video, external links) to support their arguments and evaluations.

3 – There is evidence that the student used a few elements that would help to engage their readers. Much more could have been done.

2 – There is little evidence of creative thought in the creation of this project. There may be some elements present but the elements used detract from message being conveyed.

1 – There are no creative elements used—no pictures, audio/video, external links. The student uses only text to convey their message.

ASSIGNMENT INSTRUCTIONS & RUBRIC
MUWS 2001 – Survey of Worship Music
Worship Observation Project

Worship Observation Project [Due 30 October (11:59 pm), 200 total points]

- Students will attend a worship service from a Christian tradition that differs from their own personal worship background.
 - The purpose of this project is to experience a worship service that differs greatly from the student's familiar liturgical tradition.
 - It is recommended that the student attend a service in a Christian tradition. Others (e.g., Jewish Synagogue Service) may be used with prior approval from the professor.
 - For example, if the student was raised Baptist, they should observe a Methodist, Lutheran, Catholic, or other mainline denomination.
 - There should be a difference in worship tradition.
 - A non-denominational church often has much the same liturgical tradition as a Baptist church.
- Attending the service in-person is required.
 - If circumstances necessitate, you may attend a service online—but only with PRIOR APPROVAL from the instructor.
 - Email the instructor with reasons you are seeking to attend an online service.
 - Do not wait until the last minute to seek approval for attending online.
 - If you attend a service online without prior approval, your project will not be accepted.
- The Response
 - Prepare a response of 1,000–1,500 words regarding your experience.
 - Include the following information and thoughts in your response:
 - Comments and questions related to the liturgical, biblical, and theological concepts and processes.
 - Indicate—in your opinion—the theological and liturgical strengths and weaknesses of the service planning and execution.
 - Include information regarding the date and time of the service you attend. List any information you deem relevant (e.g., attendance, instruments/vocalists used, etc.).
- Format
 - The paper should follow Turabian format and include a title page containing the following information (centered).

A WORSHIP OBSERVATION:
[NAME OF CHURCH OBSERVED]

by [Your Name]
 in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
 Survey of Worship Music, MUWS 2001
 Dr. David Tatum, Instructor
 [Date]

- The paper should also include a bibliography (separate page) with at least three academic references that are cited in the paper. You may use our texts as sources.
 - The citations should bolster your opinions/arguments regarding the liturgical structure and theological integrity of the service.
 - Use footnotes to cite your sources. Footnotes should conform to Turabian style.
 - Bibliographical entries should conform to Turabian style.
- The Worship Observation is worth a total possible 200 points.

One final note regarding the Worship Observation: attend the service as an active participant not as a liturgical tourist.

- Do not sit on the back row taking notes.
- Participate in the structure and elements of the service.
- Immerse yourself in the liturgy.
- Then, immediately following the service, set aside time to note your reactions and impressions while they are still fresh in your recollection.

Grading Rubric

Content 80%	1 – There is little useful information regarding liturgical practices	2 – There is some summary of liturgical practice	3 – Student summarizes the service well but there is no critical interaction	4 – There is some critical interaction with the liturgical practice	5 – Student interacts critically with the liturgical practice of the service
Possible Pts 160	32	64	96	128	160
<p>5 – There is deep critical interaction with the service’s liturgical, theological, and biblical structure as it relates to the student’s liturgical history. The summary is well-written and conveys a deep respect for the liturgical tradition of the host church—but interacts critically with the structures.</p>					

4 – The service is well-summarized and there is some evidence of critical interaction with the liturgical, biblical, and theological structures of the service—as it relates to the student’s perception of their own liturgical preferences and history.

3 – The student summarizes the service well. There is evidence of participation and connection with the service. However, there is little to no critical interaction with the liturgical, biblical, and theological structures of the service.

2 – There is some summary of the service, but there is missing information that is crucial to understanding the service planner’s liturgical and theological choices. There is no critical evaluation or attempt to compare it with the student’s historical liturgical practice.

1 – There are major gaps in the summarization. There may be no discussion of liturgical, biblical, or theological concepts. There is also no critical evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of the service.

Mechanics 20%	1 – Many mechanical errors	2 – There are numerous mechanical errors	3 – There are some mechanical errors	4 – There are very few mechanical errors	5 – Project is exceptionally well-written
Possible Pts 40	6	16	24	32	40

5 – The project is exceptionally well-written (fewer than 3 mechanical errors per page).

4 – There are very few mechanical errors (3–6) per page. Arguments and critical evaluations are planned and executed logically.

3 – There are some mechanical errors (7–10) per page. There is some discontinuity in arguments and evaluations.

2 – There are numerous mechanical errors (10+) per page. Arguments and critical evaluations are difficult to follow.

1 – The projected is rendered unreadable due to the number of grammatical and mechanical errors.