Leadership 2016
Year One

# GSEM 790 DMIN PROJECT SEMINAR

*Spring 2016*

*Bill Knott, PhD*
*David Penno, PhD*

Andrews
University
Seek. Affirm. Change.

# Andrews ◮ University

## GSEM 790
# DMIN PROJECT SEMINAR
### 2016 LEADERSHIP COHORT
Spring 2016

---

### GENERAL SEMINAR INFORMATION

---

Intensive location:    La Sierra University
Intensive dates:       Wednesday, February 10, 2016, to Tuesday, February 16, 2016
Credits offered:       4

---

### INSTRUCTOR CONTACT DETAILS

---

Professor:          Bill Knott, PhD
Professor:          David Penno, PhD
Telephone:          269-471-6366
Email:              penno@andrews.edu
Office location:    Seminary, S207
Office hours:       8:00 am-12:00 pm, 1:00-5:30 pm (M-Th), 8:00 am-12:00 pm (F)

---

### SEMINAR DESCRIPTION

---

Forming the project proposal and issues related to completing the project successfully. Areas of focus include literature review, theological reflection, critical thinking, experiential learning, reflective observation, research design and techniques, reading and evaluating research, academic writing, an effective work plan for completion of the project, and other project-related topics.

# OUTCOMES

## Program Learning Outcomes (PO)

### Doctor of Ministry (DMIN) Program Outcomes

1. Experience positive collegial relationships (**PO 5**).
2. Gain theoretical knowledge that contributes to advanced ministry (**PO 7**).
3. Evaluate ministerial practices through theological reflection (**PO 9**).
4. Use appropriate tools to analyze the needs of churches and communities (**PO 10**).
5. Develop habits of study that contribute to lifelong learning (**PO 13**).

## Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)

The student should be able to:

1. demonstrate a focused commitment to academic research and writing
2. demonstrate a willingness to receive constructive criticism and input from others
3. demonstrate a knowledge of both *Andrews Standards for Written Work* and APA style
4. demonstrate an understanding of the principles of good academic research and writing
5. complete a successful DMin project proposal
6. incorporate the skills of good academic writing in all DMin assignments
7. complete a successful DMin project document

# SEMINAR REQUIREMENTS

I. Pre-Intensive

Pre-Intensive Reading:

A journal is due the first day of the teaching intensive for each of the two required pre-session titles (excluding *Andrews University Standards for Written Work*). The journal (there will be two, one for each book) is an informal reflection of your thoughts as you read the book. Reflection in this context suggests a cognitive and imaginative process. Examine what you read in the article and "bounce it off" what you have experienced or imagined. Consider the text in the light of your values, experiences, ideas, and hopes. The result is your *reflection* on the text. Give deliberate and intentional attention to how the text relates to your life and relate it with written clarity. Journals are usually four to six pages, need not follow any particular style, and will not be graded for grammar, writing, etc. Begin the journal for each book with a simple statement that you have read the required book or state what you have read of the book.

Prepare and submit a report stating that you have read *Andrews University Standards for Written Work* (12th -Updated).  You do not write a journal for this title.

The pre-intensive assignments are **due February 10, 2016, 8:00 am**. Upload these assignments in Learning Hub.

**Required Reading:**

1. *Andrews University standards for written work* (13th ed.). (2015). Berrien
    Springs, MI: Andrews University Press.

    This book can be downloaded from the following URL:
    **http://www.andrews.edu/sem/dmin/project/writing_assistance/**

2. Graff, G., & Birkenstein, C. (2014). *They say I say: The moves that matter in academic
    writing* (3rd ed.)*.* New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

3. Osmer, R. R. (2008). *Practical theology: An introduction*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B.
    Eerdmans.

**Optional Reading (no journal):**

4. Pyrczak, F. (2008). *Evaluating research in academic journals: A practical guide to realistic
    evaluation* (4th ed.).  Glendale, CA: Pyrczak.

Books can be purchased in any manner convenient to the participant. For ISBN and price information, please see the listing at the Bookstore www.andrews.edu/bookstore .

II. During the Intensive

   A. Punctual attendance is required for all intensive sessions. A maximum of 10% absence of
      total activities is allowed.

   B. Participation in discussion, group activities, journaling, and compilation of notes is
      expected.

   C. Assignments due during the intensive:

      1. Develop a Title Page. **Due day 2, 8:00 am**.
      2. Write a 2-3 paragraph Description of the Ministry Context. **Due day 7, 8:00 am**.
      3. Write a 4-5 sentence Statement of the Problem. **Due day 7, 8:00 am**.
      4. Write a ¼ to ½ page Delimitations section. **Due day 7, 8:00 am**.
      5. Write a 1 page Description of the Project Process. **Due day 7, 8:00 am**.
      6. Develop a 2 page Project Document Outline. **Due day 7, 8:00 am**.
      7. Develop a 1 page Vita. **Due day 7, 8:00 am**.

8. Develop a Reference List (12 references). **Due day 7, 5:00 pm**.

III. Post-Intensive

Prepare and submit a **Preliminary Project Proposal** to the DMin Project Proposal Subcommittee. This means that both the Project Coach and your advisor have approved the proposal as ready for submission to the sub-committee (see rubric in Appendix A). The advisor must send the Project Coach an email by the due date, affirming approval of the proposal. All drafts of the proposal are sent to the advisor and Project Coach via email.

Attend the **Field Research Symposium** April 18 and 19, 2017, on the campus of Andrews University.

Attend virtually the **Implementation Symposium** December 12, 2017, 1:00-5:00 pm (EST).

---

## GRADING AND ASSESSMENT

---

A. Credit Hour Definition

The Doctor of Ministry program requires 56 hours of study for each credit hour. This seminar is 4 hours, for a total of 224 hours.

For this seminar, the instructor estimates that this total of 224 hours will be distributed in the following activities:

- Reading and journaling – **119 hours (these hour include books, journals, and paper required in year two for the Field Research Symposium)**

- Intensive – **60 hours**

- Assignments during the intensive – **20 hours**

- Development of the project proposal – **25 hours**

## B. Criteria for Grades

Assessment is accomplished by evaluating participation and assignments around the outcomes of the concentration. The chart below describes the process of judging the integration of those outcomes.

| Due Dates | Learning Resources Provided in This Seminar | Process of Assessment |
|---|---|---|
| February 10, 2016, 8 am  During the Intensive | Pre-intensive reading and journaling  Intensive presentations and exercises | Journaling of literature: evaluation of personal reflection on the process of academic writing and research  Evaluation of the quality of intensive participation  **(SLO 1)** |
| During the Intensive | Peer group evaluations of writing exercises during the intensive One-on-one consultation with lead teacher(s) regarding draft of project proposal during the intensive | Observation of peer group interaction The response of the participant during the one-on-one consultation and the revision of their proposal to reflect the feedback they received **(SLO 2, PO 5)** |
| February 10, 2016, 8 am  During the Intensive | Pre-intensive reading and journaling  Intensive presentation and writing exercises | Journaling of literature and evaluation of their understanding of the principles expressed in the literature The incorporation of proper formatting and style into the writing work done during and after the intensive **(SLO 3)** |
| During the Intensive | Intensive presentations—in particular the academic writing workshop—and the writing exercises | Journaling of literature and evaluation of their understanding of the principles expressed in the literature. The incorporation of good principles of academic writing and research into their work done during and after the intensive  **(SLO 4, PO 7, PO 10)** |
| During the Intensive  May 30, 2016 | Intensive writing exercises  Peer group evaluations of writing exercises during the intensive  One-on-one consultation with lead | Evaluation of the Preliminary Project Proposal by the Project Proposal Subcommittee  Approval of the Preliminary Proposal by the Proposal Subcommittee (see Appendix on page 14ff for the **DMin** |

| | teacher(s) regarding draft of project proposal during the intensive<br><br>Post-intensive assignment of developing a preliminary project proposal for submission to the Project Proposal Subcommittee | **Project Proposal Rubric**, which is used to evaluate the proposal)<br><br>**(SLO 5)** |
|---|---|---|
| During the Intensive<br><br>May 30, 2016 | Intensive writing exercises<br><br>Post-intensive development of a preliminary project proposal | On-going evaluation of completed chapters by the project coach, the project editor, the advisor, and the 2nd reader<br><br>Final evaluation of the project document at the oral assessment<br><br>**(SLO 6, PO 9, PO 13)** |
| February 10, 2016, 8 am<br><br>During the Intensive | Pre-intensive reading and journaling<br><br>Intensive presentations and exercises | On-going evaluation of completed chapters by the project coach, the project editor, the advisor, and the 2nd reader<br><br>Final evaluation of the project document at the oral assessment.<br><br>**(SLO 7, PO 7, PO 9, PO 13)** |

C. Grade Points

<u>Pre-intensive Work:</u>
Reading Journals—60 points each x 2 books =           120 points
Reading Report (*AU Standards*)                          20 points


<u>During Intensive Work:</u>                             160 points


<u>Post-Intensive Work:</u>
An Approved Preliminary Project Proposal
(see **rubric** on pp. 14ff)                             700 points


Total                                                  1,000 points

**LETTER GRADE SCALE:**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A (96-100%) | B (85-89%) | C (75-78%) |
| A- (93-95%) | B- (82-84%) | C- (72-74%) |
| B+ (90-92%) | C+ (79-81%) | |

D. Assignment Submission

**All assignments, except your final proposal, will be turned in via Learning Hub** (go to https://learninghub.andrews.edu/login/index.php and log in using your AU username and password)

Assignments are **not** accepted via email or hard copy. The only exception is the final preliminary project proposal, which is sent to Dr. David Penno at penno@andrews.edu .

E. The late submission penalties for all assignments, **except the project proposal**, will be applied as follows:

Late up to 30 days:          15% penalty
Late 31-60 days:             20% penalty
Late 61-90 days:             25% penalty
Late more than 90 days:   Grade of zero: no assignments accepted beyond 90 days

---

> **Preliminary Project Proposal is due May 30, 2016.** A grade of DN (deferred and **not completable\***) will be given if the preliminary project proposal is not approved by the project coach and your advisor by this date. No excuses accepted or exceptions made. A DN means you must drop out of your cohort.

---

\* Graduation requires a 3.0 or better program GPA. Students who receive a DN must seek permission from the DMin office to restart with another cohort and seek a new program time limit. Such requests are considered by the DMin program committee and not guaranteed. No tuition refunds are considered.

---

## ASESSMENT GUIDELINES

See rubric in Appendix A of this syllabus for the assessment tool used for the project proposal.

# SEMINAR POLICIES

**Academic Integrity**

"In harmony with the mission statement (p.18), Andrews University expects that students will demonstrate the ability to think clearly for themselves and exhibit personal and moral integrity in every sphere of life. Thus, students are expected to display honesty in all academic matters.

Academic dishonesty includes (but is not limited to) the following acts: falsifying official documents; plagiarizing, which includes copying others' published work, and/or failing to give credit properly to other authors and creators; misusing copyrighted material and/or violating licensing agreements (actions that may result in legal action in addition to disciplinary action taken by the University); using media from any source or medium, including the Internet (e.g., print, visual images, music) with the intent to mislead, deceive or defraud; presenting another's work as one's own (e.g. placement exams, homework, assignments); using material during a quiz or examination other than those specifically allowed by the teacher or program; stealing, accepting, or studying from stolen quizzes or examination materials; copying from another student during a regular or take-home test or quiz; assisting another in acts of academic dishonesty (e.g., falsifying attendance records, providing unauthorized course materials).

Andrews University takes seriously all acts of academic dishonesty. Such acts as described above are subject to incremental discipline for multiple offenses and severe penalties for some offenses. These acts are tracked in the office of the Provost. Repeated and/or flagrant offenses will be referred to the Committee for Academic Integrity for recommendations on further penalties. Consequences may include denial of admission, revocation of admission, warning from a teacher with or without formal documentation, warning from a chair or academic dean with formal documentation, receipt of a reduced or failing grade with or without notation of the reason on the transcript, suspension or dismissal from the course, suspension or dismissal from the program, expulsion from the university, or degree cancellation. Disciplinary action may be retroactive if academic dishonesty becomes apparent after the student leaves the course, program or university

Departments or faculty members may publish additional, perhaps more stringent, penalties for academic dishonesty in specific programs or courses."                                                    *AU Bulletin*

**Disability Accommodations**

Accommodations are made for disabilities. Students with diagnosed disabilities should request accommodation. If you qualify for accommodation under the American Disabilities Act, please see the instructor as soon as possible for referral and assistance in arranging such accommodations.

**Class Absences**

"Whenever the number of absences exceeds 20% (10% for graduate classes) of the total course appointments, the teacher may give a failing grade. Merely being absent from campus does not exempt the student from this policy. Absences recorded because of late registration, suspension, and early/late vacation leaves are not excused. The class work missed may be made up only if the teacher allows. Three tardies are equal to one absence.

Registered students are considered class members until they file a Change of Registration form in the Office of Academic records." *AU Bulletin*

**Excused Absences**

"Excuses for absences due to illness are granted by the teacher. Proof of illness is required. Residence hall students are required to see a nurse on the first day of any illness which interferes with class attendance. Non-residence hall students should show written verification of illness obtained from their own physician. Excuses for absences not due to illness are issued directly to the dean's office. Excused absences do not remove the student's responsibility to complete all requirements of a course. Class work is made up by permission of the teacher." *AU Bulle*

**Language and Grammar**

There is an expectation that a student enrolled in a graduate program possesses advanced written language skills, particularly in the language in which the degree is acquired. Thus, no special consideration will be given to English as a second language learners or native-English speakers who have yet to obtain mastery in written English. Such students are advised to seek the assistance of the campus writing lab or procure the services of an editor prior to the submission of their assignments. Tips for success include reading your assignments aloud and having someone else do likewise prior to submission. This practice will provide you with immediate feedback on your written assignments.

**Emergency Protocol**

Andrews University takes the safety of its student seriously. Signs identifying emergency protocol are posted throughout buildings. Instructors will provide guidance and direction to students in the classroom in the event of an emergency affecting that specific location. It is important that you follow these instructions and stay with your instructor during any evacuation or sheltering emergency.

---

## INSTRUCTOR PROFILES

---

# Bill Knott



Editor and executive publisher of the *Adventist Review* and *Adventist World* since January, 2007. Before his appointment, Bill served as an associate editor for nine years. A pastor for 18 years in both small and large parishes, he ministered in New England, New York, Michigan, and Washington state. He earned a Master of Divinity degree from the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary at Andrews University (Michigan) and a PhD in American Religious History from George Washington University in Washington, D.C. Bill is an elder and Sabbath School teacher in his Spencerville, Maryland congregation, and a frequent speaker at conventions, conferences, retreats and camp meetings worldwide. He and his wife, Debby, a specialist in the General Conference Human Relations Department, have two sons in college, Evan and Brady. "These two journals highlight the great depth and breadth of Adventism around the world," Knott says. "It's an amazing privilege to serve an international fellowship of believers eagerly living toward the Second Coming of Jesus."

# David Penno

After 25 years of pastoral ministry, I served the churches of Georgia-Cumberland as the Evangelism Coordinator for 5 years. I began my ministry in the Iowa-Missouri Conference in 1980, serving there for 13 years. We moved to Georgia-Cumberland in 1993.

I graduated from Southern Adventist University in 1980 with a BA in Theology and a minor in Biblical Languages. In 2000 I received an MA in Religion from Southern with emphasis in Homiletics and Church Growth. In May of 2009 I graduated with a PhD in Leadership from Andrews University, with a focus on cross-cultural and multi-cultural leadership.

Nancy and I have been married for over 38 years. We have two sons, Matthew and Eric. Matthew is a firefighter for Cobb County GA and is married to Heather. Eric is firefighter and EMT in the Berrien Springs area, is married to Melody, and they have a daughter Chrissy and a son Bentley.

We enjoy spending time at the beach, reading, and visiting historical sites. The boys and I also like to go backpacking and camping.

# Appendix

# DMin Project Proposal Rubric

## Title Page

| Category | 4.00<br>Target | 3.00<br>Needs Improvement | 2.00<br>Incomplete | 1.00<br>Unacceptable |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Required Components** | All of the required components of the title page are included: (1) the name of the University and seminary, (2) title of the study, (3) the degree for which the paper is submitted, and (4) the author's name and current month and year | 1 of the components is missing | 2 of the components is missing | More than 2 of the components is missing |
| **Formatting** | The page is formatted correctly according to *Andrews University Standards of Written Work.* The components are all in the correct order and spaced correctly | The page is mostly formatted correctly according to *Andrews University Standards of Written Work.* One of the components is not space correctly | There are 2-3 spacing or placement errors | There are more than 3 spacing or placement errors |
| **Title of the Study** | Title **clearly** describes the what, who, and where of the project | Title describes the what, who, and where of the project | The title is only vaguely connected to the project | The title seems to have no connection to the project |
| **Language Conventions** | There are no spelling errors | There is 1 spelling error | There are 2-3 spelling errors | There are more than 3 spelling errors |

# Description of the Ministry Context

| Category | 4.00 Target | 3.00 Needs Improvement | 2.00 Incomplete | 1.00 Unacceptable |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Length** | Limited to ½ to ¾ of a page | No more than 1 page | More than 1 page or less than ½ page | Guidelines for length are not followed |
| **Content** | Describes clearly and concisely the ministry context where the project will be implemented | Describes somewhat clearly the ministry context where the project will be implemented | Description lacks clarity and conciseness and/or are related more the outcomes than reasons of importance | No clear description of the ministry context |
| **Format** | Follows precisely the format in the project proposal example | Follows the format in the project proposal sample with minor variation | There are some clear differences from the project proposal sample | Does not follow at all the format of the project proposal sample |
| **Clearly Written** | The Description is written in a reader-friendly manner that models clarity of expression. Uses short declarative sentences. | The Description is written in a reader-friendly manner. One or two sentences lack clarity of expression. Uses short declarative sentences. | Several sentence in the Description lack clarity of expression. Expression of some ideas is confusing to the reader. Uses long, rambling sentences. | The Description does not promote reader understanding and/or is unclear in language use and expression. Uses long, rambling or run-on sentences. |
| **Language Conventions** | There are no spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors | There is one spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors | There are 2-3 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors | There are more than 3 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors |

# Statement of the Problem

| Category | 4.00<br>Target | 3.00<br>Needs Improvement | 2.00<br>Incomplete | 1.00<br>Unacceptable |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Length | The Statement of the Problem is limited to 4 to 5 sentences | The Statement is 6 to 7 sentences | The Statement is 8-10 sentences | Guidelines for Statement length are not followed. |
| Nature of the Problem | A specific problem from the ministry context is clearly identified | A specific problem is indentified that is somewhat connected to the ministry context | The problem is not connected to the context of ministry | The problem is outside of the scope of ministry |
| Evidence of the Problem | The reality of the problem is supported by clear objective evidence | The reality of the problem is supported by subjective evidence | The source of the evidence is unclear | There is no evidence given to support the reality of the problem |
| Restrictive Nature of the Problem | The problem is neither too broad or too narrow and deals with one specific issue—any other problems are seen in subordination to the major one | A specific problem is identified but is either two broad or too narrow in scope | Multiple problems are identified | Does not demonstrate a clear understanding of the problem to be addressed |
| Components of the Statement | The Statement addresses the stable context, provides evidence of the problem, the consequences of the problem, and identifies the destabilizing condition (root problem) | 1 of the four components are missing from the Statement | 2 of the four components are missing from the Statement | 3 or more of the components are missing from the Statement |
| Format | Follows precisely the format in the project proposal sample | Follows the format in the project proposal sample with minor variation | There are some clear differences from the project proposal sample | Does not follow at all the format of the project proposal sample |
| Language Conventions | There are no spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors | There is 1 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors | There are 2-3 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors | There are more than 3 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors |
| Clearly Written | The Statement is written in a reader-friendly manner that models clarity of expression. Uses short declarative sentences. | The Statement is written in a reader-friendly manner. One or two sentences lack clarity of expression. Uses short declarative sentences. | Several sentence in the Statement lack clarity of expression. Expression of some ideas is confusing to the reader. Uses long, rambling sentences. | The Statement does not promote reader understanding and/or is unclear in language use and expression. Uses long, rambling or run-on sentences. |

# Statement of the Task

| Category | 4.00<br>Target | 3.00<br>Needs Improvement | 2.00<br>Incomplete | 1.00<br>Unacceptable |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Length** | Is limited to 1 to 2 sentences | Is limited to 3 to 4 sentences | The statements is 5 to 7 sentences | Guidelines for statement length are not followed. |
| **Relationship to the Statement of the Problem** | The Statement of the Task relates directly to the Statement of the Problem | The Statement of the Task is somewhat related to the Statement of the Problem | The Statement of the Task does not clearly relate to the Statement of the Problem | There is no correlation between the Statement of the Task and the Statement of the Problem |
| **Restrictive Nature** | The task is neither too broad or too narrow and deals with one specific problem—any other problems are seen in subordination to the major one | A specific task is identified but is either two broad or too narrow in scope | Multiple tasks are identified | Does not describe a clear task to be implemented |
| **Necessary Descriptors** | Clearly states what you are going to do and why | Clearly states what you are going to do, but is less clear on why | The what and the why are vague | It is not clear what you intend to do or why |
| **Imbedded Intentions** | There is a clear intention stated to develop, implement, and evaluate the intervention | The statement is missing one of the three intentions | Two or more of the intentions are missing from the statement | There are no imbedded intentions in the statement |
| **Format** | Follows precisely the format in the project proposal sample | Follows the format in the project proposal sample with minor variation | There are some clear differences from the project proposal sample | Does not follow at all the format of the project proposal sample |
| **Language Conventions** | There are no spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors | There is 1 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors | There are 2-3 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors | There are more than 3 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors |
| **Clearly Written** | The Statement is written in a reader-friendly manner that models clarity of expression. Uses short declarative sentences. | The Statement is written in a reader-friendly manner. One or two sentences lack clarity of expression. Uses short declarative sentences. | Several sentence in the Statement lack clarity of expression. Expression of some ideas is confusing to the reader. Uses long, rambling sentences. | The Statement does not promote reader understanding and/or is unclear in language use and expression. Uses long, rambling or run-on sentences. |

# Delimitations of the Project

| Category | 4.00 Target | 3.00 Needs Improvement | 2.00 Incomplete | 1.00 Unacceptable |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Length** | Limited to 1/3 to ½ of a page | No more than ¾ of a page | More than ¾ of a page | Guidelines for length are not followed |
| **Content** | **Clearly** articulates self-imposed limitations of the project, such as ethnic groups, age groups, gender, church organizational units, geography, etc. | **Somewhat** articulates self-imposed limitations of the project, such as ethnic groups, age groups, gender, church organizational units, geography, etc. | **Vaguely** articulates self-imposed limitations of the project, such as ethnic groups, age groups, gender, church organizational units, geography, etc. | Does not articulate any real self-imposed limitations |
| **Format** | Follows precisely the format in the project proposal example | Pretty much follows the format in the project proposal sample | There are some clear differences from the project proposal sample | Does not follow at all the format of the project proposal sample |
| **Clearly Written** | The expectations are written in a reader-friendly manner that models clarity of expression. Uses concise sentences. | The expectations are written in a reader-friendly manner. One or two sentences lack clarity of expression. Uses concise sentences. | Several sentence in the expectations lack clarity of expression. Expression of some ideas is confusing to the reader. Uses long, rambling sentences. | The expectations do not promote reader understanding and/or is unclear in language use and expression. Uses long, rambling or run-on sentences. |
| **Language Conventions** | There are no spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors | There is 1 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors | There are 2-3 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors | There are more than 3 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors |

# Description of the Project Process

| Category | 4.00<br>Target | 3.00<br>Needs Improvement | 2.00<br>Incomplete | 1.00<br>Unacceptable |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Length** | The description is limited to 1 page | The description is 1 ½ pages | The description is less than ¾ of a page and greater than 1 ½ pages | Guidelines for statement length are not followed |
| **Logic/Flow** | The section is well organized. It outlines a clear and logical sequence of steps. | The section is pretty well organized. One idea may seem out of place. | The flow is a little hard to follow. The outlined steps do not seem to have a logical flow. | Steps seem to be randomly organized. |
| **Theological Reflection and Literature Review** | Shows a clear and well defined intention to provide theological reflection and significant literature reporting | Shows an intention to provide theological reflection and literature reporting but is less clearly defined | Is missing one of the two components | Does not show an intention to provide either |
| **Intervention Design** | Clearly articulates the intervention design that will be used | Somewhat articulates the intervention design that will be used | The intervention design is unclear | The intervention design is not given |
| **Implementation Process** | The process of implementation is well defined | The process of implementation is somewhat defined | The process of implementation is unclear | No implementation process is given |
| **Evaluation Process** | The process of evaluation is well defined | The process of evaluation is somewhat defined | The process of evaluation is unclear | No evaluation process is given |
| **Expected Completion Date** | Based on the nature of the problem, a **realistic** completion date is given (Month and Year) | Based on the nature of the problem, a **very tight** completion date is given (Month and Year) | Based on the nature of the problem, a **unrealistic** completion date is given (Month and Year) | No expected completion date is given |
| **Format** | Follows precisely the format in the project proposal example | Pretty much follows the format in the project proposal sample | There are some clear differences from the project proposal sample | Does not follow at all the format of the project proposal sample |
| **Language Conventions** | There are no spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors | There is 1 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors | There are 2-3 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors | There are more than 3 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors |
| **Clearly Written** | The project process is written in a reader-friendly manner that models clarity of expression. Uses short declarative sentences. | The project process is written in a reader-friendly manner. One or two sentences lack clarity of expression. Uses short declarative sentences. | Several sentence in the project process lack clarity of expression. Expression of some ideas is confusing to the reader. Uses long, rambling sentences. | The project process does not promote reader understanding and/or is unclear in language use and expression. Uses long, rambling or run-on sentences. |

**Continued on next page**

# Proposed Project Document Outline

| Category | 4.00 Target | 3.00 Needs Improvement | 2.00 Incomplete | 1.00 Unacceptable |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Length | Outline is limited to 2 pages | No more than 2 ½ pages | Outline is more than 2 ½ pages but no more than 3 | Guidelines for length are not followed |
| Evidence of Reflective Work | The chapter titles and subheads **clearly** show that reflective thought has been given to the content of each chapter | Chapter titles and subheads show that **some thought** has been given to the content of each chapter | Chapter titles and subheads suggest that **little thought** has been given to the content of each chapter | Chapter titles and subheads seem to be randomly selected |
| Logic/Flow | The chapters are well organized. One chapter follows another in a logical sequence. | The chapters are well organized. The flow of material in one of the chapters may seem out of sequence. | An entire chapter seems out of place. | Chapters seem to be randomly arranged |
| Foundational Chapters | Chapter 1 is designated as an Introductory chapter, Chapter 2 is set apart as a theological foundations chapter and Chapter 3 as a Literature review chapter | One of the foundational chapters is out of sequence | Two of the foundational chapters are out of sequence | All three of the foundational chapters are missing |
| Intervention and Learning Chapters | Chapter 4 will describe the plan or strategy of intervention, Chapter 5 will narrate the implementation of the intervention, and Chapter 6 will describe the learning from the project, and describe the personal and professional transformation of the participant | One of the Intervention and learning chapters is missing | Two of the intervention and learning chapters is missing | All three of the intervention and learning chapters are missing |
| Format | Follows precisely the format in the project proposal example | Follows the format in the project proposal sample with minor variation | There are some clear differences from the project proposal sample | Does not follow at all the format of the project proposal sample |
| Clearly Written | The outline is written in a reader-friendly manner that models clarity of expression. Uses concise sentences. | The outline is written in a reader-friendly manner. One or two sentences lack clarity of expression. Uses concise sentences. | Several sentence in the outline lack clarity of expression. Expression of some ideas is confusing to the reader. Uses long, rambling sentences. | The outline does not promote reader understanding and/or is unclear in language use and expression. Uses long, rambling or run-on sentences. |
| Language Conventions | There are no spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors | There is 1 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors | There are 2-3 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors | There are more than 3 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors |

# Project Proposal Reference List

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

| Category | 4.00<br>Target | 3.00<br>Needs Improvement | 2.00<br>Incomplete | 1.00<br>Unacceptable |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Correct Style for The Type of Entry** | All of the various types of entries are in correct APA style | 2 of the entries are not in correct APA style | 3-4 of the entries are not in correct APA style | 5 or more of the entries are not in correct APA style |
| **Number of References** | A minimum of 60 references from varied types of sources | 50 references from varied types of sources | 40 references or, regardless of the number of entries, they are limited to one single source type | Less than 40 references |
| **Language Conventions** | There are no spelling errors | There is 1 spelling error | There are 2-3 spelling errors | There are more than 3 spelling errors |

## Vita

| Category | 4.00<br>Target | 3.00<br>Needs Improvement | 2.00<br>Incomplete | 1.00<br>Unacceptable |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Length** | Should be very brief—no more than 1 page | Just over 1 page | Is more than 1 ½ pages | Guidelines for length are not followed |
| **Components** | Includes educational and employment history, and current contact information | Does not include 1 of the components | Does not include 2 of the components | Does not include any of the components |
| **Language Conventions** | There are no spelling or punctuation errors | There is 1 spelling or punctuation error | There are 2-3 spelling or punctuation errors | There are more than 3 spelling or punctuation errors |

## Overall Project Proposal

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

| Category | 4.00 Target | 3.00 Needs Improvement | 2.00 Incomplete | 1.00 Unacceptable |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Length** | The main text of the proposal should be limited to 5-6 pages | The main text of the proposal is 7-8 pages | The main text of the proposal is 9-10 pages | The guidelines for length are not followed |
| **Components** | All of the components of a project proposal are included and in the right order | 1 of the components is missing or out of sequence | 2 of the components are missing or out of sequence | More than 2 of the components are missing or out of sequence |
| **Format** | The proposal is formatted correctly according to *Andrews University Standards of Written Work.* | The proposal is mostly formatted correctly according to *Andrews University Standards of Written Work.* There is one formatting errors | There are 2-3 formatting errors | There are more than 3 formatting errors |
| **Style** | The proposal follows correct APA style | The proposal mostly follows correct APA style. There is 1 APA style error. | There are 2-3 APA style errors | There are more than 3 APA style errors |
| **Clearly Written** | The overall proposal is written in a reader-friendly manner that models clarity of expression. Uses concise sentences. | The overall proposal is written in a reader-friendly manner. One or two sentences lack clarity of expression. Uses concise sentences. | Several sentence in the proposal lack clarity of expression. Expression of some ideas is confusing to the reader. Uses long, rambling sentences. | The proposal does not promote reader understanding and/or is unclear in language use and expression. Uses long, rambling or run-on sentences. |
| **Language Conventions** | There are no spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors | There is 1 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors | There are 2-3 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors | There more than 3 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors |

**Rubric:  Revised 11/06/2012**