Leadership, NAD2013
Year One
GSEM 790

DMIN PROJECT SEMINAR

2013

David Penno, PhD

Andrews
University
Seek. Affirm. Change.

Andrews University

GSEM 790
DMIN PROJECT SEMINAR
2013 LEADERSHIP (NAD) COHORT
SPRING, JANUARY 16-24, 2013

GENERAL SEMINAR INFORMATION

Module acronym: GSEM 790
Module name: DMin Project Seminar
Semester & year: Spring 2013
Intensive location: Florida Conference office, Orlando, Florida
Intensive Dates: Wednesday, January 16, 2013, to Thursday, January 24, 2013
Credits: 4

INSTRUCTOR CONTACT DETAILS

Professor: David Penno, PhD
Telephone: 269-471-6366
Email: penno@andrews.edu

BULLETIN 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.

SEMINAR OUTCOMES

The Doctor of Ministry program seeks to develop the person (Being), knowledge (Knowing), and practice (Doing) of its participants. The following constitute the outcomes for GSEM 790 DMin Project Seminar:

Being

The graduate will develop

      1. a focused commitment to academic research and writing
      2. a willingness to receive constructive criticism and input from others

Assessed by: (a) in-class assignments, (b) Requiring students to evaluate key components of the developing project proposal of each other's proposals, and to dialog with the instructors about their proposal.

Knowing

The graduate will acquire

      1. a knowledge of both *Andrews Standards for Written Work* and APA style
      2. an understanding of the principles of good academic research and writing
      3. an understanding of how to apply for and receive IRB approval for research

Assessed by: the writing of a project proposal that is approved by the DMin project coach, the advisor, and the DMin Proposal Sub-committee.

Doing

The graduate will complete

      1. a successful DMin project proposal
      2. incorporate the skills of good academic writing in all DMin assignments
      3. a successful DMin project document

Assessed by: Successful presentation and assessment of their project proposal, the ministry context paper and the 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 four required pre-session titles (excluding *Andrews University Standards for Written Work*). The journal (there will be four, 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 January 16, 2013, 8:00 am**. Upload these assignments in Moodle.

1. Ammerman, N. T., Carroll, J. W., Dudley, C. S., & McKinney, W. (Eds.). (1998). *Studying congregations: A new handbook*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.

2. *Andrews University Standards for Written Work* (12th ed. updated). (2011). Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press.

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

3. Graff, G., & Birkenstein, C. (2010). *They say I say: The moves that matter in academic writing* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

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

5. Sahlin, M. (2005). *Understanding your community*. Lincoln, NB: Center for Creative Ministry. (Distributed by AdventSource, the NAD materials center at www.adventsource.org)

   Books can be purchased in any manner convenient to the participant.

II. 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 2, 8:00 am**.
        3. Write a 4-5 sentence Statement of the Problem. **Due day 2, 8:00 am**.
        4. Write a 1-2 sentence Statement of the Task. **Due day 3, 8:00 am**.
        5. Write a ¼ to ½ page Delimitations section. **Due day 3, 8:00 am**.
        6. Write a 1 page Description of the Project Process. **Due day 3, 8:00 am**.
        7. Develop a 2 page Project Document Outline. **Due day 4, 8:00 am**.
        8. Develop a 1 page Vita. **Due day 5, 8:00 am**.
        9. Develop a 4 page Literature Review & Reference List (12 references). **Due day 7, 8:00 am**.

III. Post Intensive

    A. Ministry Context Paper-Use available sources of information to write a 15-page paper describing the congregation or ministry organization in which you serve—including basic statistics such as typical attendance, community context, demographics, growth/decline trends, involvement of volunteers, financial giving (tithe, offerings, etc.), regular activities and programs, etc.—as well as an analysis of the congregation and community as a context for your Doctor of Ministry Project. A detailed outline of what is expected in this paper will be posted on Moodle, and explained during class time. The due date will be the date set for the follow up webinar (see C below).

        This paper is to be written according to the latest edition of Andrews Standards for Written Work *and the* American Psychological Association (APA) Style Manual*, and submitted via Moodle in MS Word. Since this is a graduate course, correct spelling, proper grammar, non-sexist and non-racist language usage are basic requirements.*

    B. Prepare and submit a 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. The advisor must send the Project Coach an email

by the due date, affirming approval of the proposal. All drafts of the proposal are send to the advisor and Project Coach via email.

Due July 24, 2013. A grade of DN (deferred and **not completable**) will be given if the 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.

C. There will be a three hour webinar approximately three months after the end of the intensive, sometime in April, 2013. The exact date will be set the last day of the intensive. Attendance at this webinar is required.

Submission deadlines all assignments **except the project proposal**:

Assignment due date:	(possible A grade)
Late up to 30 days:	(no more than A- grade)
Late 31 to 60 days:	(no more than B+ grade)
Late 61 to 90 days:	(no more than B grade)
Late 91 days or more:	**No work accepted**

All assignments, except your final proposal, will be turned in via Moodle (go to https://aumoodle.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 proposal, which is sent to Dr. David Penno at penno@andrews.edu .

GRADING CRITERIA AND COURSE ASSESSMENT ITEMS

A. Criteria for Grades

Assessment is accomplished by evaluating participation and assignments around the outcomes of the concentration. There are two outcomes in the area of being, three in the area of knowing, and two outcomes in the area of doing. The chart below describes the process of judging the integration of those outcomes. Distinctions become vague when the contribution of all experience to the cyclical process of true learning in the areas of being, knowing, and doing are considered. See the project proposal rubric guidelines at the Doctor of Ministry web site for further information.

Seminar Outcome	Learning Resources Provided in This Seminar	Process of Assessment
Focused commitment to academic research and writing	Pre-intensive reading and journaling Intensive presentation and exercises	Evaluation of the quality of intensive participation Journaling of literature: evaluation of personal reflection on the process of academic writing and research
A willingness to receive constructive criticism and input from others	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
Knowledge of both *Andrews Standards for Written Work* and *APA* style	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
An understanding of the principles of good academic writing and research	Intensive presentation—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
An understanding of how to apply for and receive IRB approval for research	Intensive presentation and exercise	Receiving official approval from the IRB for their research involving "human subjects"

Development of a successful DMin Project Proposal	Intensive writing exercises 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 Post-intensive assignment of developing a project proposal for submission to the Project Proposal Subcommittee	Evaluation of the Project Proposal by the Project Proposal Subcommittee Approval of the Proposal by the Proposal Subcommittee (see Appendix on page 14ff for the **DMin Project Proposal Rubric**, which is used to evaluate the proposal)
Incorporation of the skills of good academic writing	Intensive writing exercises Post-intensive development of a project proposal	On-going evaluation of completed chapters by the project coach, the project editor, the advisor, and the 2nd reader Final evaluation of the project document at the oral assessment.
The ability to develop and write a DMin Project Document	Pre-intensive reading and journaling Intensive presentations and exercises	On-going evaluation of completed chapters by the project coach, the project editor, the advisor, and the 2nd reader Final evaluation of the project document at the oral assessment.

B. Grade Points

Pre-intensive Work:
Reading Journals—30 points each x 4 books =   120 points
Reading Report (*AU Standards*)   20 points

During Intensive Work: 160 points

Post-Intensive Work:
Description of Ministry Context Paper   350 points
An Approved Project Proposal (see **rubric** on pp. 14ff)   350 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%)

C. The submission deadlines for all assignments, **<u>except the project proposal</u>**, will be applied as follows:

Assignment due date: (possible A grade)

Late up to 30 days: (no more than A- grade)

Late 31 to 60 days: (no more than B+ grade)

Late 61 to 90 days: (no more than B grade)

Late 91 days or more: (**DN deferred and not completable***)

> **Project Proposal due July 24, 2013.** A grade of DN (deferred and **not completable***) will be given if the <u>project proposal</u> 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.

D. Course Time Parameters and Calculations

The Doctor of Ministry program requires 56 hours of study for each semester credit. This module is 4 hours, so the entire course module is to require 224 hours. Following is a rule of thumb to help guide your reading, research, and writing for Seminary courses:

- Average reading speed   15-20 pages/hr
- Average writing speed   3 hr/page

The time for this module is calculated as follows:

Reading and journaling (approximately 1,500 pages) – 100 hours for the reading and 25 for the journaling = **100 hours**
Intensive – **55 hours**
Assignments during the intensive – **10 hours**
Post intensive Ministry Context paper – **45 hours**

Development of the project proposal – **20 hours**

Total **230 hours**

Accommodations are made for disabilities. Students with diagnosed disabilities should request accommodation.

E. Assignment Submission

All assignments, except your final proposal, will be turned in via Moodle (go to https://aumoodle.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 proposal, which is sent to Dr. David Penno at penno@andrews.edu .

<hr>

UNIVERSITY POLICIES

<hr>

Academic Integrity

Andrews University takes seriously all acts of academic dishonesty. Academic dishonesty includes (but is not limited to) falsifying official documents; plagiarizing; misusing copyrighted material; violating licensing agreements; using media from any source to mislead, deceive or defraud; presenting another's work as one's own; using materials during a quiz or examination other than those specifically allowed; stealing, accepting or studying from stolen examination materials; copying from another student; or falsifying attendance records. For more details see the Andrews University Bulletin 2010, page 30.

"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."

Andrews University Bulletin 2010, page 30

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.

I.   Theory and Mechanics of Writing a Project Proposal, Doing the Project, and Writing the Project Document

II. Field Research Methods

INSTRUCTOR PROFILE

 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 35 years. We have two sons, Matthew and Eric. Matthew is a firefighter for Cobb County GA and is married to Heather. Eric is an ER tech for a hospital in Atlanta, is married to Melody, and they have a 3 year old daughter named Chrissy.

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

CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES

THE B GRADE

We start with the B grade for a very specific reason. It is because a B grade is a sign that you have competently fulfilled all of the requirements stipulated for an assessment or competency evaluation. It is an excellent grade and demonstrates a high level of knowledge, insight, critique competence and professional written presentation standards essential for an individual wishing to pursue a career as a professional pastor.

THE A GRADE

An A grade is only given when a student not only fulfils the criteria stipulated above for a B grade, but in doing so demonstrates an advanced academic aptitude for content knowledge, critique, synthesis and independent insight, while exhibiting highly developed communication skills and professional publication standards that would allow them to pursue a highly competitive academic career.

THE C GRADE

The C grade differs only from a B grade in that the traits outlined in the B grade above are not consistently applied. However, with diligence and applying feedback from your lecturer, the academic process can provide a perfect opportunity for a student to improve their consistency, and hence, their grade.

THE DN GRADE

The DN grade is given when very limited or no demonstrable competency has been observed and exhibits a limited level of knowledge, insight and critique and poor written presentation standards. This may be because of a lack of time management on the part of the student, they may have difficulty grasping the concepts being taught, English may be their second language, or they may be experiencing a personal issue that is affecting their concentration and motivation levels. Again, with diligence, applying feedback from your lecturer, and seeking services offered by the University like the writing lab or the counseling centre, the academic process can provide an opportunity for a student to significantly improve their performance.

Your assessments have been specifically designed to measure and provide evidence of your competency with relation to the subject matter. This is to meet University accreditation standards. Thus, you will only be graded on the content of the assessments you submit. If it is not in your assessments, your lecturer will not have adequate evidence of your competency and will have to grade you accordingly.

PLAGIARISM

Replicating writing, cutting and pasting or moderately paraphrasing text from publications, internet sources, books, friends papers or publications, family members papers or publications, ghost writers papers or publications with the intent of passing it off as your own work, is strictly prohibited and unacceptable. Students found to be plagiarizing the work of others will receive an immediate Failing grade. Your actions will be reported to the University and your sponsor (if sponsored). You may even face expulsion from the University. Your lecturer will randomly sample sentences, phrases and paragraphs from your paper and compare them with papers from past students and with content on the internet. Your lecturer is also familiar with a lot of the publications and sources you will be using for your assessment and will also be able to identify any potential plagiarism.

LANGUAGE AND GRAMMAR

There is an expectation that a person who holds a Master's qualification will have advanced written language skills, particularly in the language in which their Masters was taught. Thus, no special consideration will be given to students who speak English as a second language or native-English speakers who struggle with written English. Such students are advised to seek the assistance of the campus writing lab or seek the services of a professional academic editor prior to the submission of their assessment.

Students are encouraged to have someone else read their assessments aloud to them prior to submission. This practice will provide you with immediate feedback as to how your written assessments sounds/reads to another person. You may even want to have a friend or a professional academic editor look over your assessments to identify any typing, spelling or punctuation errors too.

Appendix

DMin Project Proposal Rubric

Title Page

Category	4.00 Target	3.00 Needs Improvement	2.00 Incomplete	1.00 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 Target	3.00 Needs Improvement	2.00 Incomplete	1.00 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 Target	3.00 Needs Improvement	2.00 Incomplete	1.00 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

Continued on next page

Description of the Project Process

Category	4.00 Target	3.00 Needs Improvement	2.00 Incomplete	1.00 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.

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

Category	4.00 Target	3.00 Needs Improvement	2.00 Incomplete	1.00 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 Target	3.00 Needs Improvement	2.00 Incomplete	1.00 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

Continued on next page

Overall Project Proposal

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

Syllabus: Revised 11/06/2012