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# General information

Credits: 6

# Bulletin module DESCRIPTION

A DMin project is a professional project that integrates theological reflection, scholarly research, and practical ministry. The project contributes to the enhancement of ministry in the church.

# program Outcomes

The Doctor of Ministry program seeks to develop the person, knowledge, and practice of its participants. While the program is structured around certain areas of concentration, there are competencies we feel are important to evaluate as outcomes for all students. The following are those program competencies.

Being:

Fosterdeeper spirituality

Encourage enrichment of personal and family life

Inspire greater commitment to ministry

Promote an Adventist perspective of evangelism, mission, and ministry

Cultivate positive collegial relationships

Develop a global view of society and ministry

***Assessed by:*** Requiring students to complete a section in their Ministerial Development Plan (MDP) in which they will name strategies for biblical spirituality and practices they adopted to grow spiritually as a result of the DMin program and the direct assessments in module two on theological and spiritual foundations administered by faculty.

Knowing:

Build exceptional theoretical knowledge that contributes to advanced ministry

Create an understanding of the biblical model of servant leadership

*Assessed by:* The direct assessment provided by the faculty in all modules for various assignments and by completing two theoretical chapters in their project documents (Chapters 2 and 3) where students will provide theological reflection on their research topic and show a high level of acquaintance with the current literature on the subject assessed with the project.

Doing:

Sharpen the ability to evaluate ministerial practices through theological reflection

Heighten the ability to use appropriate tools to analyze the needs of churches and communities

Enhance skills that facilitate more effective ministry

Honethe ability to articulate theological and theoretical understandings that advance global

ministry

Strengthenhabits of study that contribute to lifelong learning

***Assessed by:*** Successful presentation and assessment of their project before peers and their respective project committees as well as direct assessments of case studies and journals administered by faculty in the modules.

# project requirements

The Doctor of Ministry project includes:

1. reflection on the personal spiritual and theological foundations of the participant,
2. definition and analysis of the context in which the project will be carried out,
3. evidence of significant literature work,
4. theological reflection relevant to the project,
5. description of the appropriate research methods applied,
6. narrative of the doing of the project,
7. the outcomes, and
8. evaluation and recommendations.

The program includes GSEM790 DMin Project Seminar for four credits in the first year. A complete orientation to the project is provided in that seminar. Under the guidance of the professor of that class, a suitable proposal is developed and an advisor is selected. A second reader is also chosen.

The project proposal is submitted to the project coach for the DMin Proposal Committee*.* This committee analyzes the proposal and determines whether it meets Andrews standards for clarity, logic, organization, language, and presentation. The proposal may be accepted as presented, accepted with modifications to be certified by the student's advisor, or rejected. With approval of the proposal, the ministry intervention, with research and writing, begins in earnest.

The project is a ministry intervention aimed at providing a transforming learning experience and modeling excellence in ministry. It is supported by written work. The chapters of the resulting project document are 20 to 25 pages, and there are generally five or six. The project is not simply the written work, rather the written work grows out of the actual project and is a means of recording and presenting the project.

Advisor and second reader consult on the document, determining together when it is ready for the final oral assessment at the end of the program, generally five years. Some of the questions they will ask regarding the project are the following:

1. Does the project integrate or weave together theory, theology, and practice?
2. Does the writer use information from appropriate and relevant disciplines?
3. Are appropriate field research methods applied?
4. Does the project give a *clear description* of the process followed?
5. Are appropriate components of analysis, evaluation, reflection, and conclusions evident?
6. Is there proper documentation of all sources used?
7. Is the writing correct, clear, and done according to Andrews University standards?
8. Does this ministry promise to have a transformational effect on the student and ministry?

When advisor and second reader agree that the project is ready for assessment, the advisor requests the director of the DMin program to choose a third reader and set a date for the oral assessment. The oral assessment of the project is to evaluate the candidate's ability to integrate what he/she has learned into improved ministerial practice and to provide an opportunity for the candidate to explain the intervention and transformational effect.

When modifications are requested (as normally happens), the committee usually empowers the advisor to supervise the changes and provide certification that they have been accomplished. The student will then be responsible for reassuring that the copy has been delivered to the Doctor of Ministry office for signatures. The date of those signatures is the date of completion of degree work.

In the first year of your program you take the project seminar, submit your proposal, and do a literature review that contributes to your project. In the second year you do a theological reflection that contributes to your project. The third and fourth years require subsequent work contributing to the writing of your ministry project.

Those activities contribute to integrating the project with your other degree requirements. Thus, some of the work required of your lead faculty in modules one, two, three, and four (your first four years) contribute to your project and are calculated for the credit hours of project registration. The syllabus for each year clearly distinguishes that work.

You are registered for the six credits of the project in the third and fourth year.

# Project time and perameters

The Doctor of Ministry program requires 56 hours of study for each semester credit. The project is 6 hours, so the entire project is to require 336 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 the project is calculated as follows:

Post intensive paper in year one – the literature review 60 hours

Post intensive paper in year two – theological reflection 28 hours

Post intensive paper in year three – the third chapter describing the process for intervention and the field research involved 124 hours (the writing time - 60 hours, plus experiential and research time - 64 hours)

Post intensive paper in year four (the first chapter) and the subsequent work in year five and six –124 hours (the writing time - 60 hours, plus experiential and research time - 64 hours)

Total 336 hours

# University policies

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.

**CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT – The Project Assessment Rubric**

***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.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 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  Note: Judgment will be modified to reflect literature or empirical research for ministry- focus projects | 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  Note: Judgment will be modified to reflect proposed implementation for ministry- focus projects | 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 |

**CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT – The Project Chapter Assessment Rubrics**

**Chapter 1**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **4.00**  **Target** | **3.00**  **Needs Improvement** | **2.00**  **Unsatisfactory** | **1.00**  **Unacceptable** |
| **Contents** | The chapter includes all of the following components: Description of the Ministry Context, Statement of the Task, Statement of the Problem, Delimitations of the Project, Description of the Project Process, and Definition of Terms. | Only 1 of the elements is missing. | Only 2 of the elements are missing. | More than 2 of the elements are missing. |
| **Description of the Ministry Context** | A concise/precise (no more than 2 pages) description of the context where the project will be implemented. | Sets a clear context for the implementation of the project, but is three to four pages in length. | What is shared about the context for the project is not concise (over 4 pages). | It is not clear what the context for the project is. |
| **Statement of the Problem** | The problem is clearly defined in one half-page and supported by clear, objective evidence. | The problem is clearly defined in a one half-page and supported by subjective evidence. | The problem is not clearly defined and/or not supported by evidence and/or more than one half-page. | The problem is not clearly defined, not supported by evidence, and more than one half-page. |
| **Statement of the Task** | Clearly states what you are going to do, with whom, and why. | Clearly states what you are going to do, with whom, but is less clear on why. | The what, who, and why are vague. | It is not evident what you intend to do, with whom or why. |
| **Delimitations of the Project** | Expresses a clear understanding of the self-imposed limitations of the project. | Expresses an understanding of the self-imposed limitations of the project. | It is unclear what the self-imposed limitations of the project are. | There are no self-imposed limitations. |
| **Description of the Project Process** | The section is well organized. It outlines a clear and logical sequence of steps. | The section is organized. One idea may seem out of place. | The outlined steps do not seem to have a logical flow. | Steps seem to be randomly organized. |
| **Definitions of Terms** | Terms central to the study and used throughout the project document are listed in alphabetical order. The terms are defined by the literature in the field with proper citation. | Terms central to the study and used throughout the project document are listed in alphabetical order. The terms are defined by professional sources such as a dictionary or encyclopedia with proper citation. | The terms are not in alphabetical order or cited properly. | Terms central to the study and used through the project document are not defined. |
| **Format** | The chapter formatting follows proper *Andrews Standards for Written Work.* | There is 1 formatting mistake. | There are 2 formatting mistakes. | There are 3 or more formatting mistakes. |
| **Style** | The chapter follows APA Style in-text referencing to cite sources. | There is 1 stylistic mistake. | There are 2 stylistic mistakes. | There are 3 or more stylistic mistakes. |
| **Language Conventions** | There are no spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors. | There are 1 or 2 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors. | There are 3 or 4 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors. | There are more than 4 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors. |
| **Clearly Written** | The chapter is written in a reader-friendly manner that models clarity of expression. | The chapter is written in a mostly reader-friendly manner. There is a slight tendency to use a few long rambling sentences. | Expression of some ideas is confusing to the reader. Uses lots of long, rambling sentences. | The chapter does not promote reader understanding and/or is unclear in language use and expression. Uses long, rambling or run-on sentences. |
| **Length** | 10-12 pages | 13-15 pages | 16-20 pages | More than 20 pages |

**Chapter 2**

| **Category** | **4.00**  **Target** | **3.00**  **Needs Improvement** | **2.00**  **Unsatisfactory** | **1.00**  **Unacceptable** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Introduction** | The chapter begins with an introduction that invites the reader into the topic and presents a bird’s eye view of what the chapter will cover. | Same as Target, the bird’s eye view is incomplete. | The reader is invited into the topic but no bird’s eye view is given of what the chapter will cover. | There is no introduction or no clear connection between the introduction and the body of the chapter. |
| **A Constructive Theological Essay** | The chapter is clearly written as a constructive theological essay. It identifies a theological question/problem which is central to the task of the project. It enters into conversation with the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy (optional) through the lens of a particular theological approach. It then constructs an answering biblical theology to serve as the theological foundation for the project. | Same as target, except there is a slight tendency to sidetrack onto tangents that are not directly related to the central issue being addressed. | There is a tendency to get off point and to deal with tangents that are not directly related to the central issue being addressed and/or the chapter is only loosely connected to the central task of the project. | One or more of the following is true:   * The chapter is not connected to the central task of the project. * There is no clear theological approach * There is no answering biblical theology constructed |
| **Writing in the Academic Voice** | All claims are supported by clear evidence. The connection between the claim and the evidence is warranted. The evidence is presented in a clear and linear fashion. The chapter bases its appeal upon *logos and* doesn’t attempt to divert to the sermonic lures of pathos and ethos. It does it overstate its claims. | The evidence is presented in a mostly linear fashion and is clear. There is a slight tendency to overstate certain claims. However all claims are still based on clear and warranted evidence and/or there is a minor inclination to use sermonic language. | 1 or 2 of the claims made in the chapter are either not supported by clear evidence or the connection between the claim and the evidence does not seem warranted and/or there is a clear tendency to write in a sermonic voice and not an academic voice. | 3 or more claims are not based on either evidence or warranted evidence and/or the entire chapter sounds like a sermon. |
| **Use of Quotations** | The chapter minimizes the use of quotations and instead seeks to summarize the ideas of others. All quotations are placed within a “quotation sandwich.” All quotations are formatted correctly. | There is a reasonable balance between summarization and quotation and the majority of quotations are placed within a “quotation sandwich.” | The quotations that are used are not placed within a “quotation sandwich.” and/or the chapter focuses more on quoting others than on summarizing their ideas. | The chapter looks like a “cut and paste” job and/or the quotations are not formatted correctly. |
| **Conclusion** | The chapter ends with a conclusion that reiterates the main points, restates the thesis in light of its substantiation and exemplification reflects on the journey that has led to this concluding moment, and acknowledges directions for further research and reflection. | The chapter ends with a conclusion that reiterates the main points and restates the thesis in light of its substantiation and exemplification. | One of the main points is not reiterated in the conclusion. Or in addition to reiterating what was discovered in the body of the chapter the conclusion presents new evidence or makes claims that are not substantiated in the body of the chapter. | There is no conclusion or the conclusion does not capture the main points of the chapter. |
| **Format** | The chapter formatting follows proper *Andrews Standards for Written Work.* | There is 1 formatting mistake. | There are 2 formatting mistakes. | There are 3 or more formatting mistakes. |
| **Style** | The chapter follows APA Style in-text referencing to cite sources. | There is 1 stylistic mistake. | There are 2 stylistic mistakes. | There are 3 or more stylistic mistakes. |
| **Language Conventions** | There are no spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors. | There is 1 spelling, grammar, or punctuation error. | There are 2 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors. | There are more than 3 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors. |
| **Clearly Written** | The chapter is written in a reader-friendly manner that models clarity of expression. | The chapter is written in a mostly reader-friendly manner. There is a slight tendency to use a few long rambling sentences. | Expression of some ideas is confusing to the reader. Uses lots of long, rambling sentences. | The chapter does not promote reader understanding and/or is unclear in language use and expression. Uses long, rambling or run-on sentences. |
| **Length** | 16-25 pages | 26-30 pages | 31-40 pages | More than 40 pages |

**Chapter 3**

| **Category** | **4.00**  **Target** | **3.00**  **Needs Improvement** | **2.00**  **Unsatisfactory** | **1.00**  **Unacceptable** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Introduction** | The chapter begins with an introduction that establishes an appropriate context for reviewing the literature, defines and justifies the scope of the review, and provides a roadmap for the progression of the chapter. | Same as target, but less defined. | The context for reviewing the literature is unclear, or the scope of the review is not defined, or there is not a roadmap for the progression of the chapter. | There is no introduction or no clear connection between the introduction and the body of the chapter. |
| **Relevance of the Literature to the problem/topic** | The problem/topic is indentified and the chosen literature is clearly related. | The problem/topic is indentified and the chosen literature is related. | The literature chosen is only loosely related to the problem/topic. | There is no connection between the problem/topic and the selected literature. |
| **Currency of the Literature** | The literature represents the latest work done in the field. The focus is on literature written over the last five years. Specific reasons are given for the use of any literature that is not current. | The literature represents the latest work done in the field. The focus is on literature written over the last ten years. Specific reasons are given for the use of any literature that is not current. | Numerous sources of literature reviewed are over ten years old and no specific reason is given for the use of this noncurrent literature. | Most of the literature reviewed was written over ten years ago. |
| **Primary Literature is Emphasized** | Primary Literature is emphasized and secondary literature is used selectively. | Primary and secondary sources are distinctively indentified and come from reputable sources. | There is no distinction between primary and secondary sources but sources are reputable. | There is no evidence that the literature comes from reputable sources. |
| **Logical Organization of the Content** | The literature review is organized around ideas, not the sources themselves. The ideas are presented in either a chronological or a thematic structure. | The literature review is organized around ideas, not the sources and there is a logical structure. | The review is organized by author without a logical structure. | There is no organization at all, just a list of abstracts or disconnected reports. |
| **Comparison and Contrast of Studies** | The researchers whose works are being reviewed are put into conversation with each other and their studies are compared and contrasted with each other. | The studies are compared and contrasted. | There is some type of description of the relationship between studies. | There is no analysis of the relationship of the different studies to each other. |
| **Conclusion** | The chapter ends with a conclusion that summarizes the major insights gained from the review, addresses questions for further research and provides insight into the relationship between the review and the central topic of the research. | The chapter ends with a conclusion that summarizes the major insights gained from the review and provides insight into the relationship between the review and the central topic of the research. | One of the main points is not reiterated in the conclusion. Or in addition to reiterating what was discovered in the body of the chapter the conclusion presents new evidence or makes claims that are not substantiated in the body of the chapter. | There is no conclusion or the conclusion does not capture the main points of the chapter. |
| **Format** | The chapter formatting follows proper *Andrews Standards for Written Work.* | There is 1 formatting mistake. | There are 2 formatting mistakes. | There are 3 or more formatting mistakes. |
| **Style** | The chapter follows APA Style in-text referencing to cite sources. | There is 1 stylistic mistake. | There are 2 stylistic mistakes. | There are 3 or more stylistic mistakes. |
| **Language Conventions** | There are no spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors. | There is spelling, grammar, or punctuation error. | There are 2 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors. | There are 3 or more spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors. |
| **Clearly Written** | The chapter is written in a reader-friendly manner that models clarity of expression. | The statement is written in a mostly reader-friendly manner. There is a slight tendency to use a few long rambling sentences | Expression of some ideas is confusing to the reader. Uses lots of long, rambling sentences. | The chapter does not promote reader understanding and/or is unclear in language use and expression. Uses long, rambling or run-on sentences. |
| **Length** | 16-25 pages | 26-30 pages | 31-40 pages | More than 40 pages |

**Chapter 4**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CATEGORY** | **4.00**  **Target** | **3.00**  **Needs Improvement** | **2.00**  **Unsatisfactory** | **1.00**  **Unacceptable** |
| **Introduction** | The chapter begins with an introduction that invites the reader into the topic and presents a bird’s eye view of what the chapter will cover. | Same as Target, the bird’s eye view is incomplete. | The reader is invited into the topic but no bird’s eye view is given of what the chapter will cover. | There is no introduction or no clear connection between the introduction and the body of the chapter. |
| **Profile of the Ministry Context** | A **concise** profile is given of the ministry context that relates specifically to the task of the project. | A concise profile is given of the ministry context that relates to the task of the project. | A profile of the ministry context is given that does not relate specifically to the task of this project. | There is no profile of the ministry context. |
| **Development of the Intervention** | An intervention is developed that **clearly** builds upon the theological foundation and the literature review. | An intervention is developed that **seems to** build upon the theological foundation and the literature review. | An intervention is developed, but no clear relationship is shown between it and the theological foundation and the literature review. | No intervention is developed. |
| **Description of the Intervention** | A **concise** description of the intervention is given, including how participants were recruited, what kind of sessions, how many, objectives, and content. | A description of the intervention is given, including how participants were recruited, what kind of sessions, how many, objectives, and content | An intervention is described, but it is unclear or lacks a logical flow. | No intervention is described. |
| **Conclusion** | The chapter ends with a conclusion that **clearly** reiterates the main points, and acknowledges directions for further research and reflection. | The chapter ends with a conclusion that reiterates the main points and acknowledges directions for further research and reflection. | One of the main points is not reiterated in the conclusion. Or in addition to reiterating what was discovered in the body of the chapter the conclusion presents new evidence or makes claims that are not substantiated in the body of the chapter. | There is no conclusion or the conclusion does not capture the main points of the chapter. |
| **Format** | The chapter formatting follows proper *Andrews Standards for Written Work.* | There is 1 formatting mistake. | There are 2 formatting mistakes. | There are 3 or more formatting mistakes. |
| **Style** | The chapter follows APA Style in-text referencing to cite sources. | There is 1 stylistic mistake. | There are 2 stylistic mistakes. | There are 3 or more stylistic mistakes. |
| **Language Conventions** | There are no spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors. | There is spelling, grammar, or punctuation error. | There are 2 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors. | There are 3 or more spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors. |
| **Clearly Written** | The chapter is written in a reader-friendly manner that models clarity of expression. | The chapter is written in a mostly reader-friendly manner. There is a slight tendency to use a few long rambling sentences | Expression of some ideas is confusing to the reader. Uses lots of long, rambling sentences. | The chapter does not promote reader understanding and/or is unclear in language use and expression. Uses long, rambling or run-on sentences. |
| **Length** | 16-25 pages | 26-30 pages | 31-40 pages | More than 40 pages |

**Chapter 5**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CATEGORY** | **4.00**  **Target** | **3.00**  **Needs Improvement** | **2.00**  **Unsatisfactory** | **1.00**  **Unacceptable** |
| **Introduction** | The chapter begins with an introduction that invites the reader into the topic and presents a bird’s eye view of what the chapter will cover. | Same as Target, the bird’s eye view is incomplete. | The reader is invited into the topic but no bird’s eye view is given of what the chapter will cover. | There is no introduction or no clear connection between the introduction and the body of the chapter. |
| **Implementation Narrative** | A **concise** narrative of the precise chronological implementation of the intervention is given. | A narrative of the precise chronological implementation of the intervention is given. | The implementation narrative does not move in chronological fashion and/or it gets side-tracked with tangents that are not relevant to the implementation process. | No narrative of the implementation of the intervention is given. |
| **Format** | The chapter formatting follows proper *Andrews Standards for Written Work.* | There is 1 formatting mistakes. | There are 2 formatting mistakes. | There are 3 or more formatting mistakes. |
| **Style** | The chapter follows APA Style in-text referencing to cite sources. | There is 1 stylistic mistake. | There are 2 stylistic mistakes. | There are 3 or more stylistic mistakes. |
| **Language Conventions** | There are no spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors | There is1 spelling, grammar, or punctuation error. | There are 2 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors. | There are 3 or more spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors. |
| **Clearly Written** | The chapter is written in a reader-friendly manner that models clarity of expression. | The chapter is written in a mostly reader-friendly manner. There is a slight tendency to use a few long rambling sentences | Expression of some ideas is confusing to the reader. Uses lots of long, rambling sentences. | The chapter does not promote reader understanding and/or is unclear in language use and expression. Uses long, rambling or run-on sentences. |
| **Length** | 16-25 pages | 26-30 pages | 31-40 pages | More than 40 pages |

**Chapter 6**

| **CATEGORY** | **4.00**  **Target** | **3.00**  **Needs Improvement** | **2.00**  **Unsatisfactory** | **1.00**  **Unacceptable** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Summary** | A **concise** summary is given of the project. | A summary is given of the project. | A summary of the project is given that only reflects a portion of the project but not the project in its entirety. | No summary of the project is given. |
| **Description of Method Used to Evaluate the Intervention** | A **concise** description is given of the evaluation method employed, the interpretation of data, and the conclusions drawn from that data. | A description is given of the evaluation method employed, the interpretation of data, and the conclusions drawn from that data. | The interpretation of the data and/or the conclusions drawn from the data is not in harmony with the selected evaluation method. | There is no description of the evaluation method employed. |
| **Outcomes** | Outcomes of the intervention are examined that are **clearly** measurable by the evaluation method employed. | Outcomes of the intervention are examined that are measurable by the evaluation method employed. | Outcomes are addressed, but there is no relationship between them and the evaluation method that was used. | The outcomes of the intervention are not addressed. |
| **Conclusions** | A **concise** recap is given of all of the conclusions that have been drawn through each of the chapters that culminate in final overarching conclusions. | A recap is given of all of the conclusions that have been drawn through each of the chapters that culminate in final overarching conclusions. | One of the main points is not reiterated in the conclusion. Or in addition to reiterating what was discovered in the body of the chapters the conclusion presents new evidence or makes claims that are not substantiated in the body of the project document. | There is no conclusion or the conclusion does not capture the main points of the chapters. |
| **Recommendations** | A **concise** list of recommendations are given that detail further actions that need to be taken or research done in the area of this project. | A list of recommendations are given that detail further actions that need to be taken or research done in the area of this project. | The recommendations given are not clearly connected to the focus of this project. | No recommendations for future actions or research are given. |
| **Format** | The chapter formatting follows proper *Andrews Standards for Written Work.* | There is 1 formatting mistake. | There are 2 formatting mistakes. | There are 3 or more formatting mistakes. |
| **Style** | The chapter follows APA Style in-text referencing to cite sources | There is 1 stylistic mistake. | There are 2 stylistic mistakes. | There are 3 or more stylistic mistakes |
| **Language Conventions** | There are no spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors. | There is spelling, grammar, or punctuation error. | There are 2 spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors. | There are 3 or more spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors. |
| **Clearly Written** | The chapter is written in a reader-friendly manner that models clarity of expression. | The chapter is written in a mostly reader-friendly manner. There is a slight tendency to use a few long rambling sentences | Expression of some ideas is confusing to the reader. Uses lots of long, rambling sentences. | The chapter does not promote reader understanding and/or is unclear in language use and expression. Uses long, rambling or run-on sentences. |
| **Length** | 10-12 pages | 13-15 pages | 16-20 pages | More than 20 pages |
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