

# **GSEM 796 DMin Professional Dissertation**

## **2019 Intergenerational Church Cohort**

Year 2, Beginning Fall 2020

*Hyveth Williams, DMin*

### **SYNOPSIS OF THE COURSE**

#### **CLASS & CONTACT INFORMATION**

<b>Class location:</b>	N/A
<b>Class meeting times:</b>	N/A
<b>Course Website:</b>	N/A
<b>Instructor Telephone:</b>	(269) 471-6363
<b>Instructor Email:</b>	hyveth@andrews.edu
<b>Office location:</b>	Seminary S205
<b>Office hours:</b>	By Appointment

#### **BULLETIN DESCRIPTION OF COURSE**

A DMin Professional Dissertation integrates theological reflection, scholarly research and practical ministry. The project contributes to the enhancement of ministry in the church and to the growth and development of the ministry professional. This course qualifies for full-time status, requiring a minimum of 480 hours of work per semester of registration.

## PROGRAM & COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES

Your degree program seeks to help you achieve the **Program Learning Outcomes** basic to your chosen profession. Your Program Learning Outcomes primarily addressed in this course are:

1. Critically reflect on, articulate, and apply biblically based principles and values for excellence in mission and ministry.
2. Conduct research and implement an intervention in response to ministry challenges and trends in a global context, related to the primary field of service.

(The full set of program learning outcomes for your degree program is listed in **Appendix 3**)

The following **Course Learning Outcomes** contribute to the overall Program Learning Outcomes by identifying the key learnings to be achieved by diligent work in this course:

1. Demonstrate ability to conduct academic research and writing, particularly in conducting & writing a literature review.
2. Demonstrate ability to conduct serious theological reflection to address a ministry challenge.
3. Demonstrate an ability to receive constructive criticism and input from others.

## COURSE OVERVIEW

Course topics and assignments have been selected to contribute to learning and evaluating these Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) as follows:

Date	Topic	Assignment Due	CLOs Addressed
March 15, 2021	Literature Review	Chapter 3 of Professional Dissertation	1, 3
July 15, 2021	Theological Reflection	Chapter 2 of Professional Dissertation	2, 3

## GUIDELINES FOR COURSE ASSIGNMENTS

Grades are based on the independent learning activities below which provide practice toward, and assessment of, the learning outcomes of this course. The grade weighting for each assignment is provided in the right-hand column. Specific due dates are given in the Course Overview above.

Assignment Description	Weighting
Work with your advisor to develop your literature review (chapter 3). Make all revisions and changes requested. Your 2 <sup>nd</sup> reader will also give feedback via your advisor. Chapter is finished when both the advisor and 2 <sup>nd</sup> reader approve it.	S/U
Work with your advisor to develop your theological reflection (chapter 2). Make all revisions and changes requested. Your 2 <sup>nd</sup> reader will also give feedback via your advisor. Chapter is finished when both the advisor and 2 <sup>nd</sup> reader approve it.	S/U

\* For grading rubrics that specify grading criteria in more detail, see Appendices. S/U=Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory

### Submission of Chapters

Chapters are to be turned in via email to your advisor.

## OTHER COURSE-RELATED POLICIES

### Academic Integrity

The Seminary expects its students to exhibit rigorous moral integrity appropriate to ministry leaders representing Jesus Christ. Complete honesty in academic matters is a vital component of such integrity. Any breach of academic integrity in this class is subject to discipline. Consequences may include receipt of a reduced or failing grade, 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. A record of academic integrity violations is maintained by the University Student Academic Integrity Council. Repeated and/or flagrant offenses will be referred to an Academic Integrity Panel for recommendations on further penalties.

Academic Dishonesty includes:

- Plagiarism in which one fails to give credit every time use is made of another person's ideas or exact words, whether in a formal paper or in submitted notes or assignments. Credit is to be given by use of:
  - Correctly designed and inserted footnotes each time one makes use of another individual's research and/or ideas; and

- Quotation marks placed around any exact phrases or sentences (3 or more words) taken from the text or speech of another individual.
- Presenting another's work as one's own (e.g., placement exams, homework assignments);
- Using materials during a quiz or examination other than those explicitly 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
- Submitting the same work or major portions thereof, without permission from the instructors, to satisfy the requirements of more than one course.

## CHAPTER TWO: THEOLOGICAL REFLECTION

Category	4.00 Target	3.00 Needs Improvement	2.00 Incomplete	1.00 Unacceptable
<b>Introduction</b>	The chapter begins with an introduction that invites the reader into the topic and presents a bird's eye view of what the chapter will cover.	Same as Target, the bird's eye view is incomplete.	The reader is invited into the topic but no bird's eye view is given of what the chapter will cover.	There is no introduction or no clear connection between the introduction and the body of the chapter.
<b>A Constructive Theological Essay</b>	The chapter is clearly written as a constructive theological essay. It identifies a theological question/problem which is central to the task of the project. It enters into conversation with the Bible and Ellen White (optional) through the lens of a particular theological approach. It then constructs an answering biblical theology to serve as the theological foundation for the project.	Same as target, except there is a slight tendency to sidetrack onto tangents that are not directly related to the central issue being addressed.	There is a tendency to get off point and to deal with tangents that are not directly related to the central issue being addressed and/or the chapter is only loosely connected to the central task of the project.	One or more of the following is true: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The chapter is not connected to the central task of the project.</li> <li>• There is no clear theological approach</li> <li>• There is no answering biblical theology constructed</li> </ul>
<b>Writing in the Academic Voice</b>	All claims are supported by clear evidence. The connection between the claim and the evidence is warranted. The evidence is presented in a clear and linear fashion. The chapter bases its appeal upon <i>logos</i> and doesn't attempt to divert to the sermonic lures of <i>pathos</i> and <i>ethos</i> . It does not overstate its claims.	The evidence is presented in a mostly linear fashion and is clear. There is a slight tendency to overstate certain claims. However, all claims are still based on clear and warranted evidence and/or there is a minor inclination to use sermonic language.	1 or 2 of the claims made in the chapter are either not supported by clear evidence or the connection between the claim and the evidence does not seem warranted and/or there is a clear tendency to write in a sermonic voice and not an academic voice.	3 or more claims are not based on either evidence or warranted evidence and/or the entire chapter sounds like a sermon.

Continued on Next Page

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>4.00 Target</b>	<b>3.00 Needs Improvement</b>	<b>2.00 Incomplete</b>	<b>1.00 Unacceptable</b>
<b>Use of Quotations</b>	The chapter minimizes the use of quotations and instead seeks to summarize the ideas of others. All quotations are placed within a "quotation sandwich." All quotations are formatted correctly.	There is a reasonable balance between summarization and quotation and the majority of quotations are placed within a "quotation sandwich."	The quotations that are used are not placed within a "quotation sandwich." and/or the chapter focuses more on quoting others than on summarizing their ideas.	The chapter looks like a "cut and paste" job and/or the quotations are not formatted correctly.
<b>Conclusion</b>	The chapter ends with a conclusion that reiterates the main points, restates the thesis in light of its substantiation and exemplification reflects on the journey that has led to this concluding moment, and acknowledges directions for further research and theological reflection.	The chapter ends with a conclusion that reiterates the main points and restates the thesis in light of its substantiation and exemplification.	One of the main points is not reiterated in the conclusion. Or in addition to reiterating what was discovered in the body of the chapter the conclusion presents new evidence or makes claims that are not substantiated in the body of the chapter.	There is no conclusion or the conclusion does not capture the main points of the chapter.
<b>Format</b>	The chapter formatting follows proper <i>Andrews Standards for Written Work</i> .	There is 1 formatting mistake.	There are 2 formatting mistakes.	There are 3 or more formatting mistakes.
<b>Style</b>	The chapter follows Turabian Author/Date style, including in-text referencing to cite sources.	There is 1 stylistic mistake.	There are 2 stylistic mistakes.	There are 3 or more stylistic mistakes.
<b>Language Conventions</b>	There are no spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors.	There is 1 spelling, grammar, or punctuation error.	There are 2 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors.	There are more than 3 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors.
<b>Clearly Written</b>	The chapter is written in a reader-friendly manner that models clarity of expression.	The chapter is written in a mostly reader-friendly manner. There is a slight tendency to use a few long rambling sentences.	Expression of some ideas is confusing to the reader. Uses lots of long, rambling sentences.	The chapter does not promote reader understanding and/or is unclear in language use and expression. Uses long, rambling or run-on sentences.
<b>Length</b>	20-25 pages	26-30 pages	31-40 pages	More than 40 pages

## CHAPTER THREE: LITERATURE REVIEW

Category	4.00 Target	3.00 Needs Improvement	2.00 Incomplete	1.00 Unacceptable
<b>Introduction</b>	The chapter begins with an introduction that establishes an appropriate context for reviewing the literature, defines and justifies the scope of the review, and provides a roadmap for the progression of the chapter.	Same as target, but less defined.	The context for reviewing the literature is unclear, or the scope of the review is not defined, or there is not a roadmap for the progression of the chapter.	There is no introduction or no clear connection between the introduction and the body of the chapter.
<b>Relevance of the Literature to the problem/topic</b>	The problem/topic is identified and the chosen literature is clearly related.	The problem/topic is identified and the chosen literature is related.	The literature chosen is only loosely related to the problem/topic.	There is no connection between the problem/topic and the selected literature.
<b>Currency of the Literature</b>	The literature represents the latest work done in the field. The focus is on literature written over the last five years. Specific reasons are given for the use of any literature that is not current.	The literature represents the latest work done in the field. The focus is on literature written over the last ten years. Specific reasons are given for the use of any literature that is not current.	Numerous sources of literature reviewed are over ten years old and no specific reason is given for the use of this noncurrent literature.	Most of the literature reviewed was written over ten years ago.
<b>Primary Literature is Emphasized</b>	Primary Literature is emphasized and secondary literature is used selectively.	Primary and secondary sources are distinctively identified and come from reputable sources.	There is no distinction between primary and secondary sources but sources are reputable.	There is no evidence that the literature comes from reputable sources.
<b>Logical Organization of the Content</b>	The literature review is organized around ideas, not the sources themselves. The ideas are presented in either a chronological or a thematic structure.	The literature review is organized around ideas, not the sources and there is a logical structure.	The review is organized by author without a logical structure.	There is no organization at all, just a list of abstracts or disconnected reports.
<b>Comparison and Contrast of Studies</b>	The researchers whose works are being reviewed are put into conversation with each other and their studies are compared and contrasted with each other.	The studies are compared and contrasted.	There is some type of description of the relationship between studies.	There is no analysis of the relationship of the different studies to each other.

Continued on Next Page

CATEGORY	4.00 Target	3.00 Needs Improvement	2.00 Incomplete	1.00 Unacceptable
<b>Conclusion</b>	The chapter ends with a conclusion that summarizes the major insights gained from the review, addresses questions for further research and provides insight into the relationship between the review and the central topic of the research.	The chapter ends with a conclusion that summarizes the major insights gained from the review and provides insight into the relationship between the review and the central topic of the research.	One of the main points is not reiterated in the conclusion. Or in addition to reiterating what was discovered in the body of the chapter the conclusion presents new evidence or makes claims that are not substantiated in the body of the chapter.	There is no conclusion or the conclusion does not capture the main points of the chapter.
<b>Format</b>	The chapter formatting follows proper <i>Andrews Standards for Written Work</i> .	There is 1 formatting mistake.	There are 2 formatting mistakes.	There are 3 or more formatting mistakes.
<b>Style</b>	The chapter follows Turabian Author/Date style, including in-text referencing to cite sources.	There is 1 stylistic mistake.	There are 2 stylistic mistakes.	There are 3 or more stylistic mistakes.
<b>Language Conventions</b>	There are no spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors.	There is spelling, grammar, or punctuation error.	There are 2 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors.	There are 3 or more spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors.
<b>Clearly Written</b>	The chapter is written in a reader-friendly manner that models clarity of expression.	The statement is written in a mostly reader-friendly manner. There is a slight tendency to use a few long rambling sentences	Expression of some ideas is confusing to the reader. Uses lots of long, rambling sentences.	The chapter does not promote reader understanding and/or is unclear in language use and expression. Uses long, rambling or run-on sentences.
<b>Length</b>	20-25 pages	26-30 pages	31-40 pages	More than 40 pages

## APPENDIX 2: PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

### Doctor of Ministry (DMin)

- 1) Critically reflect on, articulate, and apply biblically based principles and values for excellence in mission and ministry.
- 2) Conduct research and implement an intervention in response to ministry challenges and trends in a *glocal* context, related to the primary field of service.
- 3) Demonstrate knowledge and skills acquired, and analyze the resultant impact on one's ministerial experience.