Missional Church 2015
Year One

GSEM 790 DMIN PROJECT SEMINAR

Spring 2015

James Wibberding, DMin

Andrews
University
Seek. Affirm. Change.

Andrews University

GSEM 790
DMIN PROJECT SEMINAR
2015 MISSIONAL CHURCH
Spring 2015

GENERAL SEMINAR INFORMATION

Intensive location: Location: Florida Conference Office, Altamonte Springs, FL
Intensive dates: Wednesday, February 4, 2015, to Thursday, February 12, 2015
Credits offered: 4

INSTRUCTOR CONTACT DETAILS

Professor: James Wibberding, DMin
Telephone: 360.421.9665
Email: james.wibberding@gmail.com

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 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 February 4, 2015, 8:00 am**. Upload these assignments in Learning Hub.

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. (2014). *They say I say: The moves that matter in academic writing* (3rd 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. For ISBN and price information, please see the listing at the Bookstore www.andrews.edu/bookstore .

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. Write a 2-3 paragraph Description of the Ministry Context. **Due day 2, 8:00 am**.
      2. Write a 4-5 sentence Statement of the Problem. **Due day 3, 8:00 am**.
      3. Write a 1-2 sentence Statement of the Task. **Due day 4, 8:00 am**.
      4. Write a ¼ to ½ page Delimitations section. **Due day 4, 8:00 am**.
      5. Develop a Title Page. **Due day 5, 8:00 am**.
      6. Develop a 1 page Vita. **Due day 5, 8:00 am**.
      7. Write a 1 page Description of the Project Process. **Due day 6, 8:00 am**.
      8. Develop a 2 page Project Document Outline. **Due day 7, 8:00 am**.
      9. Develop a Reference List (12 references). **Due day 8, 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 is in Appendix B, and will be explained during class time. The **due date** will be announced during the seminar.

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 Learning Hub in MS Word. Since this is a graduate course, correct spelling, proper grammar, and non-sexist, non-racist language usage are basic requirements.*

B. There will be a three hour webinar approximately three months after the end of the intensive, sometime in May 2015. The exact date will be set during the intensive. Attendance at this webinar is required.

C. 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 (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.

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 – **84 hours**

- Intensive – **55 hours**

- Assignments during the intensive – **10 hours**

- Ministry Context paper – **45 hours**

Development of the project proposal – **30 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 4, 2015, 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 4, 2015, 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 Field Research presentations	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 August 12, 2015	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) **(SLO 5)**
During the Intensive August 12, 2015	Intensive writing exercises Post-intensive development of a project proposal and the Ministry Context Paper	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. **(SLO 6, PO 9, PO 13)**
February 4, 2015, 8 am During the Intensive	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. **(SLO 7, PO 7, PO 9, PO 13)**

C. Grade Points

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

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%)	

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 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: 10% penalty

Late 31-60 days: 15% penalty

Late 61-90 days: 20% penalty

Late more than 90 days: Grade of zero: no assignments accepted beyond 90 days

Project Proposal is due August 12, 2015. 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.

* 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.

See Appendix B for criteria for the Ministry Context Paper.

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 Bulletin*

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 PROFILE

James Wibberding graduated from Southern Adventist University with a BA in Theology and has continued his studies with an MDiv and a DMin at Andrews University. He has served churches in Pennsylvania and Idaho, and is currently lead pastor of the Journey Adventist Church in Kelso, WA.

James' and his wife, Laura, have been happily married for fifteen years and thoroughly enjoy their three children, Kara, Jack, and Anna.

Appendix A

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	The Description is written in a reader-friendly manner. One or two sentences lack	Several sentence in the Description lack clarity of expression. Expression of some	The Description does not promote reader understanding and/or is unclear in language use

	expression. Uses short declarative sentences.	clarity of expression. Uses short declarative sentences.	ideas is confusing to the reader. Uses long, rambling sentences.	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	Pretty much follows	There are some clear	Does not follow at all

	format in the project proposal example	the format in the project proposal sample	differences from the project proposal sample	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 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	The project process is written in a reader-friendly manner. One or two sentences lack	Several sentence in the project process lack clarity of expression. Expression of some	The project process does not promote reader understanding and/or is unclear in language use

expression. Uses short declarative sentences.	clarity of expression. Uses short declarative sentences.	ideas is confusing to the reader. Uses long, rambling sentences.	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

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	1 of the components is missing or out of	2 of the components are missing or out of	More than 2 of the components are

	are included and in the right order	sequence	sequence	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

Appendix B

GSEM790 Field Research for Ministry

What to Include in the Research Paper

This assignment will also be the first draft of the section on your Ministry Context in Chapter 1 of your Project Document.

It should be a total of about **15 pages**, double-spaced, in APA style, and formatted using the latest version of *Andrews Standards for Written Works*. Use Times New Roman font in 12 point.

1. Introduce the congregation (one or two paragraphs)

       What year was it founded?
       Where does it meet on Sabbath? (address, brief description of facilities)
       Typical Sabbath attendance
       Official membership
       Total number of participants in all programs and activities
       What school(s), institutions and conference is it related to?
       When did you become pastor and how many years have you been there?

2. History (one page)

3. Internal statistics and trends (two or three pages)

       Membership data over at least 10 years (a table or graph)
       Attendance data over at least 10 years (a table or graph)
       Giving data over at least 10 years (a table or graph for Tithe, local, other)
       Summarize and comment on trends [Why various ups/downs/plateaus?]
       How does per capita giving compare to conference per capita? Why?

4. Ministry overview (two or three pages)

       Demographic profile of members if you have it or estimates/guesses
       What percentage of members are involved in leadership? ... volunteering?
       Describe regular ministries (groups, activities, programs)
                   About how many people currently participate in each?
                   Number of leaders? Number of others?
                   Percentage of members and non-members? (estimate)
          Purpose and effectiveness of each
          How did most of the people you baptized in the last year (or two or three) come into the
          congregation? How did your people flow relate to the various ministries?
       Other analysis or comments on ministries

5. Community context (five to eight pages)

       What type of community?
       Demographics (get data from census web site)
       Summarize: What kind of people live here? What is their culture and values?
       Compare demographics of community with demographics of church members
       Religious profile (www.thearda.com in the U.S.; census web site in other nations)
       What are some of the major human needs in this community? (United Way, Percept, etc.)
       What percentage of your members live in the community? Are involved in a civic group?
       How well known is your church in the community? What community needs does it meet?
          What is the penetration ratio? (Number of population per Adventist member)

6. How does the context relate to your project? (one or two pages)

If you are a department director, chaplain, administrator or director of a specialized ministry: Then
define your territory as the "community" above and your constituency as the "congregation" above. For a

department director, the focus may be "youth ministry in the Central Conference," for example. For a chaplain, the institution is the "community" and you can focus on either the pastoral care department (including volunteers, relevant administrators, etc.) as your ministry organization or those who attend chapel as your "congregation," if you wish.

Syllabus: Revised 07/31/2014