

# DMin Project Proposal Rubric

## Title Page

Category	4.00 Target	3.00 Needs Improvement	2.00 Incomplete	1.00 Unacceptable
<b>Required Components</b>	All of the required components of the title page are included: (1) the name of the University and the 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
<b>Formatting</b>	The page is formatted correctly according to <i>Andrews University Standards of Written Work</i> . The components are all in the correct order and spaced correctly	The page is mostly formatted correctly according to <i>Andrews University Standards of Written Work</i> . 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
<b>Title of the Study</b>	Title <b>clearly</b> 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
<b>Language Conventions</b>	There are no spelling errors	There is 1 spelling error	There are 2-3 spelling errors	There are more than 3 spelling errors

# DMin Project Proposal Rubric

## Description of the Ministry Context

Category	4.00 Target	3.00 Needs Improvement	2.00 Incomplete	1.00 Unacceptable
<b>Length</b>	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
<b>Content</b>	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
<b>Format</b>	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
<b>Clearly Written</b>	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.
<b>Language Conventions</b>	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

# DMin Project Proposal Rubric

## Statement of the Problem

Category	4.00 Target	3.00 Needs Improvement	2.00 Incomplete	1.00 Unacceptable
<b>Length</b>	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.
<b>Nature of the Problem</b>	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
<b>Evidence of the Problem</b>	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
<b>Restrictive Nature of the Problem</b>	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 too broad or too narrow in scope	Multiple problems are identified	Does not demonstrate a clear understanding of the problem to be addressed
<b>Components of the Statement</b>	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
<b>Format</b>	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
<b>Language Conventions</b>	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
<b>Clearly Written</b>	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.

# DMin Project Proposal Rubric

## Statement of the Task

Category	4.00 Target	3.00 Needs Improvement	2.00 Incomplete	1.00 Unacceptable
<b>Length</b>	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.
<b>Relationship to the Statement of the Problem</b>	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
<b>Restrictive Nature</b>	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 too broad or too narrow in scope	Multiple tasks are identified	Does not describe a clear task to be implemented
<b>Necessary Descriptors</b>	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
<b>Imbedded Intentions</b>	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
<b>Format</b>	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
<b>Language Conventions</b>	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
<b>Clearly Written</b>	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.

# DMin Project Proposal Rubric

## Delimitations of the Project

Category	4.00 Target	3.00 Needs Improvement	2.00 Incomplete	1.00 Unacceptable
<b>Length</b>	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
<b>Content</b>	<b>Clearly</b> articulates self-imposed limitations of the project, such as ethnic groups, age groups, gender, church organizational units, geography, etc.	<b>Somewhat</b> articulates self-imposed limitations of the project, such as ethnic groups, age groups, gender, church organizational units, geography etc.	<b>Vaguely</b> 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
<b>Format</b>	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
<b>Clearly Written</b>	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.
<b>Language Conventions</b>	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

# DMin Project Proposal Rubric

## Description of the Project Process

Category	4.00 Target	3.00 Needs Improvement	2.00 Incomplete	1.00 Unacceptable
<b>Length</b>	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
<b>Logic/Flow</b>	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.
<b>Theological Reflection and Literature Review</b>	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
<b>Intervention Design</b>	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
<b>Implementation Process</b>	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
<b>Evaluation Process</b>	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
<b>Expected Completion Date</b>	Based on the nature of the problem, a <b>realistic</b> completion date is given (Month and Year)	Based on the nature of the problem, a <b>very tight</b> completion date is given (Month and Year)	Based on the nature of the problem, a <b>unrealistic</b> completion date is given (Month and Year)	No expected completion date is given
<b>Format</b>	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

(Continued on next page)

## DMin Project Proposal Rubric

<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>Language Conventions</b>	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
<b>Clearly Written</b>	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.

# DMin Project Proposal Rubric

## Proposed Project Document Outline

Category	4.00 Target	3.00 Needs Improvement	2.00 Incomplete	1.00 Unacceptable
<b>Length</b>	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
<b>Evidence of Reflective Work</b>	The chapter titles and subheads <b>clearly</b> show that reflective thought has been given to the content of each chapter	Chapter titles and subheads show that <b>some thought</b> has been given to the content of each chapter	Chapter titles and subheads suggest that <b>little thought</b> has been given to the content of each chapter	Chapter titles and subheads seem to be randomly selected
<b>Logic/Flow</b>	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
<b>Foundational Chapters</b>	Chapter 1 is designated as an Introductory chapter, Chapter 2 is set apart as a theological reflection chapter, and Chapter 3 as a literature review chapter	One of the foundational chapters is missing	Two of the foundational chapters is missing	All three of the foundational chapters are missing
<b>Intervention and Learning Chapters</b>	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
<b>Format</b>	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
<b>Clearly Written</b>	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.
<b>Language Conventions</b>	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

# DMin Project Proposal Rubric

## Project Proposal Reference List

Category	4.00 Target	3.00 Needs Improvement	2.00 Incomplete	1.00 Unacceptable
<b>Correct Style for The Type of Entry</b>	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
<b>Number of References</b>	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
<b>Language Conventions</b>	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
<b>Length</b>	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
<b>Components</b>	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
<b>Language Conventions</b>	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

# DMin Project Proposal Rubric

## Overall Project Proposal

Category	4.00 Target	3.00 Needs Improvement	2.00 Incomplete	1.00 Unacceptable
<b>Length</b>	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
<b>Components</b>	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
<b>Format</b>	The proposal is formatted correctly according to <i>Andrews University Standards of Written Work</i> .	The proposal is mostly formatted correctly according to <i>Andrews University Standards of Written Work</i> . There is one formatting errors	There are 2-3 formatting errors	There are more than 3 formatting errors
<b>Style</b>	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
<b>Clearly Written</b>	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.
<b>Language Conventions</b>	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

Revised 11/06/2012