



PRIOR MINISTRY EXPERIENCE PORTFOLIO RUBRIC

Reviewer Evaluation Instrument · Transfer Credit Policy, Section 7

01 PURPOSE & SCOPE

This rubric guides reviewers — the Registrar and the Executive Director — in evaluating Prior Ministry Experience portfolios submitted under Section 7 of the JBC Transfer Credit Policy. A separate rubric is completed for each course the student is challenging. One submission, one course, one rubric.

Per the Transfer Credit Policy:

- A maximum of 15 credit hours (typically 5 courses) may be earned through portfolio assessment.
- Portfolio credit does not count toward the total transfer credit cap.
- Only courses on the JBC portfolio-eligible list (Section 7.4 of the Transfer Credit Policy) may be challenged.
- Bible content courses, systematic theology, hermeneutics, and biblical theology are never eligible for portfolio review.
- Submissions are reviewed within 60 days of complete submission.

02 ELIGIBILITY VERIFICATION

Before scoring the portfolio, confirm each of the following. If any item is unchecked, the submission is returned without further review.

- Student has at least 5 years of documented vocational or significant lay ministry experience.
- Student is currently enrolled at JBC or has been formally admitted.
- The course being challenged appears on the portfolio-eligible list (Transfer Credit Policy).
- Awarding this credit will not push the student past the 15-credit-hour portfolio maximum.
- Awarding this credit will not push the student past the overall transfer credit cap.
- The \$50 portfolio assessment fee for this course has been received.

03 SUBMISSION IDENTIFICATION

Student Full Name	_____	
Student ID #	_____	Date of Submission _____
Course Being Challenged (Title)	_____	
Course Number	_____	Credit Hours _____
Years of Documented Experience	_____	Primary Ministry Role _____
Sending / Covering Local Church	_____	
Reviewer 1 (Registrar)	_____	Reviewer 2 (Exec. Director) _____
Review Window Begins	_____	Decision Due By (60 Days) _____

04 SUBMISSION CHECKLIST

A complete submission contains every item below. Incomplete submissions are not scored — they are returned to the student with instructions to complete and resubmit.

✓	REQUIRED ITEM	NOTES / GAPS
	Written narrative of at least 2,500 words describing learning gained, alignment with the course outcomes, and specific examples of practical application.	
	Supporting documentation: sermons preached, ministries led, training delivered, written content, photos or recordings of relevant ministry, and any other tangible artifacts.	
	Two letters of reference from supervising leaders (pastor, ministry director, or denominational overseer) on official letterhead where applicable.	
	Portfolio assessment fee of \$50 for this specific course (proof of payment attached).	
	Course Learning Outcomes worksheet completed: each published outcome addressed with specific narrative and artifact references.	
	Statement of Faith acknowledgment signed (current within 12 months).	

05 EVALUATION CRITERIA

Each category is scored on a 1–4 scale. A short reviewer comment is required for any score of 2 or below, & for any score of 4.

4 — EXCELLENT <i>Equivalence Confirmed</i>		3 — PROFICIENT <i>Credit-Worthy</i>		2 — DEVELOPING <i>Partial Credit Range</i>		1 — NOT YET <i>Credit Cannot Be Awarded</i>	
A. DOCUMENTED MINISTRY EXPERIENCE · Weight: 10%							
What This Measures: Verifiable scope, length, and significance of the ministry experience being credited — not opinions, not stories, but documentation.							
4	EXCELLENT	Substantial, well-documented experience in this exact ministry area. Multiple seasons, multiple contexts, sustained fruit. Evidence is independently verifiable.					
3	PROFICIENT	Clearly meets or exceeds the 5-year minimum in this area. Documentation is sufficient and credible.					
2	DEVELOPING	Meets the eligibility floor but documentation is thin, scattered, or only loosely tied to the course being challenged.					
1	NOT YET	Documentation is missing, anecdotal, or unrelated to the specific course outcomes. Eligibility cannot be confirmed.					
CIRCLE SCORE: 1 2 3 4							
Reviewer comment (required for scores of 1, 2, or 4):							
B. WRITTEN NARRATIVE: QUALITY & DEPTH · Weight: 15%							
What This Measures: The 2,500+ word narrative as a piece of reflective writing — clarity, organization, honesty, depth of thought, and evidence of reflection rather than résumé recitation.							
4	EXCELLENT	Substantially exceeds 2,500 words with focused, well-organized reflection. Identifies failures alongside successes. Reads like a leader who has thought deeply about their craft.					
3	PROFICIENT	Meets the word count with coherent structure and genuine reflection. Connects experience to growth in clear, articulate language.					
2	DEVELOPING	Meets word count but reads as activity log or résumé. Reflection is shallow. Few specific examples. Limited self-awareness.					
1	NOT YET	Below word count or thoroughly disorganized. No genuine reflection. Cannot be assessed against course outcomes.					
CIRCLE SCORE: 1 2 3 4							
Reviewer comment (required for scores of 1, 2, or 4):							

C. ALIGNMENT WITH COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES · Weight: 25%

What This Measures: The single most important category. Does the documented learning genuinely match the published learning outcomes of this specific JBC course — or only resemble them?

4	EXCELLENT	Every published learning outcome of the course is addressed with specific, demonstrated learning. Equivalence is unmistakable. Reading the narrative produces the same competency confidence the course would.
3	PROFICIENT	Most learning outcomes are addressed substantively. Any gaps are minor and do not threaten the integrity of the credit.
2	DEVELOPING	Several outcomes addressed; multiple outcomes missing or thinly covered. Partial-credit territory — student would benefit from completing a reduced version of the course.
1	NOT YET	Experience is adjacent to the course, not equivalent. Most outcomes are not actually addressed. Student must take the course.

CIRCLE SCORE: 1 2 3 4

Reviewer comment (required for scores of 1, 2, or 4):

D. THEOLOGICAL GROUNDING & SCRIPTURAL INTEGRATION · Weight: 15%

What This Measures: Is the work theologically sound? Does the student articulate the biblical foundation behind their practice, or only the pragmatics of what worked?

4	EXCELLENT	Doctrinally sound throughout. Practice is rooted in clearly cited Scripture. Demonstrates ability to defend ministry decisions biblically, not just pragmatically.
3	PROFICIENT	Theologically aligned with JBC convictions. Scripture is cited and applied appropriately. Minor gaps in articulation but no doctrinal red flags.
2	DEVELOPING	Practice may be sound but theological articulation is weak. Scripture appears as decoration rather than foundation. Reviewer follow-up recommended.
1	NOT YET	Theological errors present, or doctrine clearly out of alignment with the JBC Statement of Faith. Credit cannot be awarded regardless of experience.

CIRCLE SCORE: 1 2 3 4

Reviewer comment (required for scores of 1, 2, or 4):

E. QUALITY OF SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION · Weight: 15%

What This Measures: The artifacts: sermons, lessons, training materials, written content, photos, recordings, ministry plans, evaluations, anything tangible that lets a reviewer see the work.

4	EXCELLENT	Robust portfolio of artifacts spanning multiple seasons. High-quality samples directly tied to course outcomes. Reviewer can independently assess the work.
3	PROFICIENT	Solid evidence base. Several relevant artifacts of acceptable quality, clearly tied to specific outcomes.
2	DEVELOPING	Few artifacts, low quality, or only tangentially related to the course. Reviewer cannot confidently verify learning from documentation alone.
1	NOT YET	No usable artifacts, or artifacts unrelated to the course outcomes. Documentation does not substantiate the narrative.

CIRCLE SCORE: 1 2 3 4

Reviewer comment (required for scores of 1, 2, or 4):

F. REFERENCE LETTERS & EXTERNAL VERIFICATION · Weight: 10%

What This Measures: Two letters of reference from supervising leaders (pastor, ministry director, denominational overseer). Honesty, specificity, and credibility of the references.

4	EXCELLENT	Both references from credible supervising leaders. Specific, honest, and detailed. Confirms the narrative with first-hand observation. References include addressing limitations as well as strengths.
3	PROFICIENT	Two valid references that confirm the student's claims. Generally specific. No red flags.
2	DEVELOPING	References present but generic, brief, or from leaders with limited oversight of the actual ministry. Follow-up phone call recommended.
1	NOT YET	Missing, unverifiable, conflict-of-interest, or contradicting the student's narrative. Submission cannot be approved as presented.

CIRCLE SCORE: 1 2 3 4

Reviewer comment (required for scores of 1, 2, or 4):

G. DEMONSTRATED FRUIT & PRACTICAL APPLICATION · Weight: 10%

What This Measures: Did the work bear fruit? Disciples disciplined, teams built, leaders raised up, problems solved, ministries multiplied. Activity is not enough — we are looking for harvest.

4	EXCELLENT	Visible, measurable fruit — lives saved, leaders raised, ministries multiplied, problems resolved. Examples are specific and verifiable.
3	PROFICIENT	Clear fruit demonstrated in at least one significant area. Examples are specific enough to substantiate the claim.
2	DEVELOPING	Fruit is asserted but vague. Difficult to distinguish activity from impact.
1	NOT YET	No demonstrable fruit, or claimed fruit cannot be substantiated. Long tenure without visible Kingdom return.

CIRCLE SCORE: **1 2 3 4**

Reviewer comment (required for scores of 1, 2, or 4):

06 SCORING & CREDIT DETERMINATION

Multiply each category score (1–4) by the assigned weight, sum the totals, and divide by 4 to convert to a final percentage. The percentage and the pattern of category scores together drive the credit decision.

CATEGORY	SCORE (1–4)	× WEIGHT	= SUBTOTAL
A. Documented Ministry Experience		× 10	
B. Written Narrative: Quality & Depth		× 15	
C. Alignment with Course Learning Outcomes		× 25	
D. Theological Grounding & Scriptural Integration		× 15	
E. Quality of Supporting Documentation		× 15	
F. Reference Letters & External Verification		× 10	
G. Demonstrated Fruit & Practical Application		× 10	
TOTAL (max 400)			
FINAL PERCENTAGE = Total ÷ 4			

Apply the threshold rules below to determine the credit decision:

DECISION	THRESHOLD	OUTCOME
FULL CREDIT	Final score $\geq 85\%$ AND no category below 3 AND Category C (Course Outcome Alignment) scored 3 or 4.	Credit posted with "Portfolio Credit" notation. No GPA impact. Counts toward 15-credit-hour portfolio cap.
PARTIAL CREDIT	Final score 70–84%, OR $\geq 85\%$ with one category at 2, OR Category C scored 2.	Reduced version of the course required — specify required components in Section 8. Student receives partial credit upon completion.
CREDIT DENIED	Final score $< 70\%$, OR any category scored 1, OR Category D (Theological Grounding) scored 2 or below.	Course must be completed in full. \$50 fee is non-refundable. Student may not resubmit the same course for portfolio review.

07 REVIEWER NOTES

Specific observations, follow-up questions, and any conversations with references or the student. Required for any partial or denied determination.

08 FINAL DETERMINATION

- FULL CREDIT GRANTED** — the credit is posted to the student transcript with a notation of "Portfolio Credit." No GPA impact.
- PARTIAL CREDIT GRANTED** — a reduced version of the course must be completed (specify required components below).
- CREDIT DENIED** — student must complete the course in full. The fee is non-refundable per policy.

If partial credit is granted, list required components, deliverables, or modified assignments:

Communicated to student on:

Date Communicated _____ **Method (email / letter / meeting)** _____

REGISTRAR SIGNATURE

DATE

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIGNATURE

DATE