

Curriculum Evaluated: _____

Intended Participants: _____

Curriculum's Purpose: _____

Curriculum Evaluation Form

Date of Evaluation: _____

Overall Score: _____

	Weak (Rate: 0-3)	Average (Rate: 4-6)	Proficient (Rate: 7-10)
<p>—Whole Person Learning— We desire for our curriculum to challenge each participant to learn & process Scripture in three main domains: intellectually, emotionally & with volition [with our Head, Heart & Hands].</p>	Curriculum makes note of at least one domain, but does little to move the learner from head knowledge - to heart – to hands. _____	Curriculum notes <i>two</i> domains, but sharply ends. Leaves the learner confused & without posing the questions, “So What? Or What Next?” _____	Curriculum moves through all <i>three</i> domains, challenging head knowledge, heart recognition & need for implementing into real life experience. Encourages the questions, “So What?” Or “What Next?” _____
<p>—Diverse Methodology— Does our curriculum seek to present more than one method to help increase learning? -Visuals/Charts -Brainstorming - Types of Questions -Reading aloud</p>	Little to no diversity in methodology within the curriculum. _____	Two or more methodologies that engage different learners & seek to increase learning. _____	A wide variety of methodologies are utilized in this curriculum to seek to increase learning. _____
<p>—Learner Motivation— Our curriculum should seek to engage different types of learners by enhancing motivation through story, illustration, practical helps, historical reference material, etc.</p>	Curriculum offers little to no helps in learner motivation. _____	Curriculum offers two or more helps in learner motivation. _____	Curriculum offers a wide variety of helps in learner motivation. _____
<p>—Theological Framework— What we believe & the way Scripture is presented in curriculum matters. Does the curriculum fit within our reformed theological framework? [One continuous covenantal story] Creation/Fall/Redemption/Glory</p>	Curriculum is loose & disjointed. Not in alignment with PCA doctrinal & theological standards. Pulls Scripture from various places with no context or overarching thought to “one continuous covenantal story.” _____	Curriculum makes reference to reformed doctrine & theology, but presents Scripture with little context or overarching thought to “one continuous covenantal story.” _____	Theology is reformed in nature & would fall in alignment with main doctrines & theology of the PCA. Expands well “one continuous covenantal story.” _____
<p>—Gospel Application— Does this curriculum promote a Spirit-led & grace motivated obedience to law application or rather a works righteousness & duty-based obedience application?</p>	Curriculum <i>weakly</i> applies material in a grace motivated obedience to law application. Continually informs learner of more to “do” rather than focusing on “being” & our identity in Christ. _____	Curriculum is <i>moderate</i> in a grace motivated obedience to law application. Does not fully challenge the learner to move toward holiness based on identity in Christ solely, but rather still emphasizes works righteousness & duty-based obedience. _____	Curriculum applies a very <i>strong</i> gospel-oriented application. Focusing learner on Spirit led & obedience to law out of a response to the grace of the gospel. _____

Add'l Notes:

Jen Stegmann, January 2015

Using this Rubric: Things to Consider While Evaluating Curriculum

One of the reasons to evaluate curriculum is to see the strengths and weaknesses of each material. Curriculum is designed to act as a guide, tool and resource for navigating God's people through His Word. Keep in mind fallible human beings who all have various gifts and strengths in creating this material (i.e., theological, educational theory, ability to apply to everyday life) have produced what is to be evaluated.

These five categories in this rubric are to be used as a grid to aid in allowing God's leaders in His church to better evaluate what is needed for their particular church context, philosophy of ministry, and desire for the study of God's Word.

1. **Whole Person Learning:** God designed human beings as image bearers of Himself. Therefore, we learn intellectually, emotively, and by volition. God's people grow in spiritual maturity in each of these domains. This category allows us to see the curriculum's emphasis or lack thereof.
2. **Diverse Methodology:** Different methods offered in curriculum allow for learning to occur in a variety of ways. Depending on the purpose of the curriculum/study there may be a need for more or less methodology.
3. **Learner Motivation:** This category can aid in understanding how much additional encouragement may be needed for the learners to engage with the material.
4. **Theological Framework:** This category is designed to allow the leaders to determine how much emphasis and priority is given to theological instruction. An additional teacher and/or resources may be needed to adjust a theological perspective that may differ from the PCA, but the curriculum itself has great strengths in many other categories.
5. **Gospel Application:** The desire is to utilize curriculum that points the learner to a Spirit and grace-oriented life application. This category aids to measure how the leaders may additionally need to emphasize or challenge a particular curriculum.

Other questions to consider while evaluating:

1. What is the primary purpose of this curriculum?
 - a. To foster spiritual maturity/formation?
 - b. Relational and community building?
 - c. Theological training?
 - d. All of the above?
 - e. Other?
2. How will church leaders and participants view this curriculum? As a tool, guide or resource? All three? None?
3. Will supplemental teaching, information and/or materials be needed to strengthen this curriculum?
4. What relationships might be challenged from using this curriculum? [i.e., church leaders, participants, others in the community]
5. What relationships might be strengthened from using this curriculum? [i.e., church leaders, participants, others in the community]
6. How does this curriculum fit within the local church values and leadership? Does it promote the values and leadership? Could this curriculum bring discord among the leadership and participants?