

## Andrews University Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

### Doctor of Ministry Program Project Assessment

*Note: Members of the participant's committee indicate their judgment by a check mark in the corresponding frame. A grade of S requires satisfactory or higher in 5 categories. Nomination for the annual DMin Excellence in Research Award requires proficient or higher in 4 categories with no unsatisfactory ratings and full implementation of a ministry project.*

Student	ID #:	Cohort:	Date	
	Distinguished	Proficient	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
1. Clarity and Organization	Ministry challenge is clearly stated, context is well defined, the project is carefully but concisely described, the project and project dissertation are well organized	Ministry challenge is clearly stated, project is described, limitations and definitions are clear, project and project dissertation are organized	Ministry challenge is stated, project is described, some organization is apparent	Ministry challenge is unclear, project is obscure, organization is not evident
2. Theological Reflection	Sophistication of reflection, acknowledges ambiguity, relates to project, critical thinking is evident, responds to textual and contextual meanings	Reflection is apparent, acknowledges complexity, relates to project	Tangential to project, limited proof texting, sermonic, limited engagement with theological tradition	Not related to project, proof texting, sermonic, no engagement with theological tradition
3. Literature Review	Pertinent purposefully selected literature is cited, critically evaluated, accurately represented and meaningfully organized. Subjectivity is limited	Pertinent selected literature is cited, evaluated, accurately represented and meaningfully organized. Subjectivity is limited	Pertinent selected literature is cited, accurately represented and meaningfully organized. Some subjectivity	Literature is cited, but not with organization or relevancy to the project
4. Research <small>Note: Judgment will be modified to reflect literature or empirical research for ministry-focus projects</small>	Research is sophisticated and clearly presented, field research applied well, and relevant to the project	Research is clearly presented and relevant to the project	Some research, some order, partially related to project	Research is not related to the project, data is poorly organized
5. Implementation <small>Note: Judgment will be modified to reflect proposed implementation for ministry-focus projects</small>	Project is thoroughly applied and integrated, research related to the project, reason and explanation applied to variations, results are reported and analyzed	Project is well applied, integrated with the theological and literature work, results are reported and analyzed	Project is applied, integration is partial, results are reported	Project is not applied or has no relevancy to the stated ministry challenge
6. Learning And Evaluation	Recommendations are well formed and presented, revisions are recommended and explained, critical thinking is evident, evaluation is exercised, transforming effect in the context is described	Recommendations are well formed and presented, possible revisions are cited, there is some evidence of transforming effect in the context	Relevant recommendations are formed and presented	Recommendations are absent or irrelevant to the project
7. Academic Writing	Consistent objectivity, good sentence structure and vocabulary	Limited subjective material, good sentence structure	Some subjectivity, sentence structure not concise	Contains errors that confuse the reader, dominated by subjective material, frequent flaws in style and formatting

5/16/2016

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_ Chair    Advisor    Second Reader    Third Reader