MIDWESTERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

DOCTORAL PROJECT DISSERTATION GUIDE

A DISSERTATION GUIDE FOR

DOCTORAL STUDENTS

PURSUING THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF MINISTRY OR DOCTOR OF EDUCATIONAL MINISTRY

BY

DOCTORAL STUDIES COMMITTEE

KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

September, 2012

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Congratulations! You have now completed all required doctoral seminars but one. This part of the doctoral program is the one all doctoral students look forward to as well as fear. Hopefully, you have taken seminar projects and research papers as great opportunities to learn how to do a project and write your dissertation. You may even have information you learned through your seminar projects that will be a stepping off point for your final project. Welcome to the final phase of your doctoral journey.

When you took the first seminar, the Colloquium, you received the handbook for your doctoral program. That handbook and this Doctoral Project Dissertation Guide will be your key tools for preparing, implementing, and writing during the Dissertation Phase. We intentionally put the basic information for the Project Phase in the handbook so that you would learn from the very beginning of the doctoral program what you would be doing at this time. Now you will find the rest of the information in this Doctoral Project Dissertation Guide for you to use in the Project and Dissertation Phases.

This Doctoral Project Dissertation Guide is literally your step by step guide as you prepare your report on your project. That's right. Your dissertation is your report on your project. So the Program Handbook goes hand in hand with this guide. You will even find the steps you will follow for both the Project Phase and the Dissertation Phase in both the Handbook and this Guide (appendix A). The Handbook provides an introduction to the Project and Dissertations phases while this Guide leads you through the step details for each phase.

Note that this Guide is written in the format based on *A Manual for Writers, 7th Edition* by Kate Turabian. You have been using it as you prepared all of your seminar

research papers. You will also be using a guide that identifies Midwestern Seminary's special formatting based on Turabian. This Guide is designed to be a model for you as you write your dissertation. From the title page to the bibliography, you will find Turabian's formatting throughout this guide. When you have a question about how something should look, you most likely will find it illustrated somewhere in this guide. Did you just catch that? Single space at the end of each sentence.

With your copy of the handbook and this guide in hand, you are ready to begin the journey. We suggest you put both tools in a binder that will make it easy for you to use on your journey. Tabs might even save you more time! You will find that this guide is basically two chapters with lots of appendices. Simple works!

Please know that your professors and your Dissertation Committee are praying for you as you make the journey. We have all made a similar journey so we know what you are going through. We are here to assist you. You are the leader of this project which means your committee will follow your lead. The program director and Dissertation Committee chair will give guidance in this process, but you must not treat either as if they were collaborators in the ministry project or a co-author of the project dissertation. Enjoy the ride now as Project Director!

Chapter 1

The Project Phase

As seen in the schedule, the professional dissertation is done in two phases. First, the Project Phase involves five steps while the second phase, the Dissertation Phase, involves writing the dissertation, defending the dissertation, and submitting the final copy. The Project Phase is explained in this chapter with headings corresponding to the five steps outlined in the schedule—looking for the challenge, need or opportunity to address, writing the project worksheet, writing the project proposal, requesting project proposal approval, and implementing the project.

Looking for Challenges, Needs, and Opportunities

Once the Project Director has completed the seminars, he or she is ready to begin the project phase of the program. The first step is to find a biblically definable challenge, need, or opportunity within his or her ministry setting, i.e., one which a *Christian minister* would naturally address, rather than some other kind of professional. A second step is to conduct considerable field research to substantiate the need. This research includes, but is not limited to, demographics, psychographics, surveys, interviews, historical research, and observation. A third step, the Project Director will propose a solution to the challenge, need, or opportunity that is *contextual* and *original*, if not radically so, lest the project fail to educate one's colleagues. Therefore, one *must* pore over the literature (books, journals, professional publications and to a lesser degree, the Internet) in the ministry field, checking to see whether the intended study covers familiar ground. The sources one explores and researches should be reflected in both the proposal and project dissertation bibliography.

The thought-process involved at this stage can be summarized with the following series of questions.

1. Do the scriptures implicitly or explicitly recognize the problem or opportunity that I see?

2. Based on what they have said or written, would other ministry professionals be concerned about this sort of problem or challenged by this opportunity?

3. What about the culture, context, and community that make this project unique?

4. Am I doing something different, thus allowing other ministry professionals to learn from this project?

5. As a practical matter, is the project doable?

6. Do I have an appropriate ministry setting for this project?

7. Will those in my ministry setting cooperate with me in this project?

8. Can I measure the changes the project intends to bring about? In other words, will I be able to demonstrate that I have changed the workings of my ministry setting?

These questions ought to receive favorable answers before one attempts to write the Project Worksheet.

Writing the Project Worksheet

To help the Project Director develop a viable project, the Project Worksheet (appendix B) is completed during the Dissertation Preparation seminar. This worksheet becomes the springboard for the Project Proposal. In this short document, one will identify the challenge, need, or opportunity in one's ministry setting, the biblical rationale for the proposed project, potential participants and supporters, and bibliographic resources for the project. The Project Director will select the project type to base the

project (see program handbook and appendix B), develop a thesis statement (purpose statement), set objectives and goals, identify likely measurement tools, and propose a clear, concise title for the project.

At the conclusion of the Dissertation Preparation seminar, the Project Director submits a completed two or three page project worksheet (including bibliography) to the seminar professor. On the basis of the project worksheet, the professor will either return it to the Project Director for revisions or submit it to the Doctoral Studies Committee who will assign a Dissertation Committee to the Project Director.

The Dissertation Committee will review the worksheet and recommend revisions if the thesis statement or other items are insufficiently clear to warrant that the Project Director proceed to develop and write the proposal. This step allows the Dissertation Committee to determine if the project concept is a viable project proposal. The following major questions must be answered successfully by the Dissertation Committee:

1. Does the project address a genuine ministry setting problem or need?

2. Does the Project Director have a clear-cut understanding of the context and of those who will be involved in the project?

3. Can the Project Director find a biblical basis and sources for addressing the problem?

4. Will the Project Director be able to demonstrate that the project resulted in the intended changes?

5. And finally, will the project educate colleagues in ministry?

The responses to these questions will be used to determine how to proceed with the project concept. When the worksheet is finalized, the Dissertation Committee gives the Project Director permission to proceed to the project proposal step. The Dissertation

Committee chairperson documents the committee approval through a letter or email to the Project Director with a cc to the Dissertation Committee second reader, and the Doctoral Studies Office to confirm the approval to proceed with preparing the Project Proposal. The Project Director will enter the candidacy phase of the doctoral program and may begin writing the Project Proposal.

Writing the Project Proposal (Chapters 1-4)

Only after the project worksheet is approved by the Dissertation Committee may the Project Director commence work on the *Project Proposal*, i.e., the final document that allows the Dissertation Committee to decide whether one is ready to implement the ministry project. The Project Proposal will include the first four chapters and bibliography of what will become the final dissertation.

Although the chair and second reader will generally be members of the MBTS faculty or administration, occasionally the doctoral studies director or Doctoral Studies Committee will assign someone outside of MBTS whose unique qualifications can be counted on to give sound advice in the area of practical theology and/or specific aspects of the project. Although the chairman and second reader are available for advice and evaluation, they will not do any work for the Project Director. Be advised that the ultimate responsibility for communication with the committee lies with the Project Director. Sometimes this communication takes perseverance and patience. All written and electronic communications must be sent to both committee members and to the Doctoral Studies Office. A record of all communications must be maintained by the Project Director.

The project proposal is a major undertaking. All work submitted must follow Kate

Turabian's *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations, 7th*

Edition. Any work which consistently deviates from this style will be rejected. The

proposal is essentially the first four chapters of the final dissertation. The length of the

proposal will vary. Generally, 20-35 pages per chapter is required. Chapters 1, 2, 3, and 4

are included in the project proposal. For a complete outline of the elements of the

proposal, see appendix F.

Writing Chapter 1: Ministry Setting

Chapter 1 sets the tone for the project. The purpose of chapter 1 is to show that the

Project Director understands the ministry setting and has conducted sufficient research to

identify the challenge, need, or opportunity one intends to engage through his or her

project. Here, the Project Director substantiates the challenge, need, or opportunity

through field research. Additionally, factors stemming from the type of project such as

the culture, context, and community that might affect the project will be identified.

Although not every project will require each element, the following are suggested

Chapter 1 subheadings: Describing the Ministry Setting, Demographics, Project Director

Information, Ministry Community Information, Hypothetical Presupposition, and Thesis

Statement.

Describing the Ministry Setting

In this section, the Project Director offers basic information about one's place of

service and where, by implication, he or she plans to implement the project. The

description of the ministry setting needs to emphasize salient features, i.e., the ones which

may have some impact on the project. For example, if the Project Director aims to increase the number of fellowship gatherings at one's church, the description needs to observe that the church has no fellowship hall or that it has a large one.

To gather this information, the Project Director will need to use reliable measurement tools. Measurement tools include questionnaires, surveys, personal interviews, group polls, etc., used by the Project Director to generate objective information about the ministry setting. Several helpful guides in the area of measurement tools are available on-line and through the library. A starting place is the book, *Studying Congregations*, edited by Nancy Ammerman, Jackson Carroll, Carl Dudley, and William McKinney (Nashville: Abingdon, 1998. ISBN: 0687006511). Other resources include the following titles:

1. *The Gallup Guide: Reality Check for 21st Century Churches*, George Gallup Jr. and D. Michael Lindsay, (Loveland, CO: Group Publishing, 2004. ISBN: 0764423975).

2. *Questionnaire Survey Research* by Linda Suskie (Tallahassee: Association for Institutional Research, 1992. ISBN: 1882393058).

Other measurement tools are identified in Appendix H and the Bibliography.

To examine the ministry setting, the Project Director should also read any archival documents e.g., minutes, publications, convention and association records, and letters that might shed light on the nature of the ministry setting. Finally, the Project Director might interview several members in the church or organization for the same end, especially former pastors, directors of missions, long-standing members, new members, and anyone who might have left under adverse circumstances. A similar interview process involving community leaders, residents and others dealing with similar ministry issues (i.e., other

pastors or ministers) might be undertaken. The project need will determine who is questioned and what is asked. As a rule, it is better to gather and generate more data than one anticipates using. The ministry description includes the demographics, information about the Project Director, and information about the ministry community.

Demographics

If a project confronts the "color line" of the church—i.e., the problem of a membership that does not reflect the racial realities of his community—the description gives historical and up-to-date statistics regarding the racial make-up of both. When using demographic and psychographic tools, beware of the "fallacy of demographics." A medium sized, racially diverse community with several thousand African-Americans and Hispanics with eight Baptist churches and a combined Baptist resident membership of 1,100 could imply several congregations that reflect the diversity of the population or one, large, Anglo church and seven small Anglo churches and no multicultural or ethnic congregations. Just saying, "Midville has eight Baptist churches serving, by resident membership, just over 3 percent of the city's population of 33,000 that includes 19,000 Anglos, 8,000 African-Americans and 5,000 Hispanics" is both inadequate and misleading. The demographic information provided here needs to relate directly to the context of the project.

Project Director Information

The Project Director should also give pertinent information about oneself that might affect the implementation of the project. Does the Project Director have special training in the proposed area of activity? The information here relates strictly to the

project. Full information about the Project Director will be located in the Vita at the end of the dissertation.

Ministry Community Information

Does anyone in the congregation or organization have such skills or training that the Project Director plans to employ? How cooperative does one expect those in the ministry setting to be? How was this level of cooperation determined? What financial resources exist in the ministry? Has the organization's history been a stable one? What conflicts or successes in its past might affect how others in the organization view the Project Director's project? Are they theologically informed people? Are they industrious? Do they know and understand the needs of the community? Are they culturally literate? These questions are just a few of the many that might be entertained as the need for the project is substantiated.

In addition, the answer to these questions and others need to be in the context of the project purpose. The guiding question in determining the type of information to include about the community needs to ask how the information relates to the context of the project. For example, if any of the above questions do not relate to the context of the project, do not include that information.

Hypothetical Presupposition

Having already sketched a general picture of the need earlier, the Project Director now must validate the specific challenge, need, or opportunity the Project Director plans to address through this ministry project. Here the Project Director interprets the field research data to answer the question, "What actions need to be taken to engage this

challenge, need, or opportunity?" Suppose that the Project Director's ministry setting

falls presents a challenge, need, or opportunity in the area of lifestyle evangelism. The

laymen are just not finding ways to spend time with lost people. In that case, this section

might begin as follows which was taken from a dissertation:

> If lifestyle evangelism ought to be happening in local churches—as chapter 2 of the project dissertation will show—then a study of First Baptist Church (FBC), Anytown, substantiates that this church falls short of the biblical ideal. While some members of FBC do participate in monthly door-to-door witnessing, they otherwise surround themselves almost entirely with other believers. Seventy-four percent of the congregation believes relational evangelism is important. However, only seventeen percent of the members have a meaningful relationship with an unchurched person. Their relationships with lost people tend to be superficial, so that no opportunities for dialogue regarding spiritual matters ever surface naturally. When they do witness, members of FBC find themselves having to "force the issue," against the grain of modern American culture. Furthermore, most members were unaware of the major cultural, religious and economic shifts that have occurred in Anytown in the past decade.

Notice how the introduction proceeds from "thesis" to "hypothetical" to "present

reality". The final section of this chapter, the thesis statement demonstrates how the field

research conducted by the Project Director supports the need for the project.

Thesis Statement

The thesis statement summarizes the purpose of the project as this statement

anticipates the difference the ministry project will make in the ministry setting. Thus, by

its very nature, the purpose thesis statement refers to the project's anticipated ends and

not the means used to reach those ends. The means of the ministry project will be

identified in chapter 3 of the project dissertation, in which the Project Director outlines

the plan. The wording of the thesis statement should be consistent throughout the

proposal and project dissertation.

Suppose that the Project Director has detected a lack of intercessory prayer in the church. In that case, an outcome-based purpose statement corresponding to that need may say, "Selected members of FBC will significantly increase the amount of time that they now spend in intercessory prayer." If one believes the ministry setting lacks a proper emphasis upon benevolence ministries, the outcome-based purpose statement may say, "The members of FBC will implement strategies to aid needy persons within its community." If the Project Director gives the church low marks in the area of conflict management, the Project Director might state the purpose as, "Selected members of FBC will adopt the biblical model of graduated and delegated church discipline." The purpose statement addresses the basic questions of inquiry. In the sample above, *who* (selected members of FBC), *what* (implement strategies to aid), *where* (within its community), and *why* (needy persons are there) are all addressed. A concise purpose statement brings clarity to the project, and therefore, should be given significant thought and development.

In summary, chapter 1 is not the place to do exegesis or evaluate other attempts to solve the problem at hand; that comes later. This chapter concludes with the implied statement, "I think this is a challenge and here is why." *Substantiating* the need is theological in nature and is the heart of chapter 2. *Why* one understands the problem and proposed solution as having a theological and biblical basis will be the question of chapter 2.

Writing Chapter 2: Biblical Rationale

In this second chapter, the Project Director must demonstrate that the project aims to deal with a *ministerial* challenge, need, or opportunity as opposed to some other kind. Thus, the Project Director must show the challenge or need is justified from a biblical

standpoint. To illustrate this difference, consider the following two problems:

(a) "Seventy percent of First Baptist Church members are not getting adequate fluoride

protection," and (b) "Seventy percent of First Baptist Church members never pray." The

first problem is real, to be sure; but it is not one for a minister. The second problem falls

well inside the ministerial circle and is well suited for a ministry project. If the Project

Director cannot demonstrate from scripture—whether by direct statement or

implication—that Christians should be concerned about this challenge, the Project

Director must address a different one. The Bible must state that some of us, at least, ought

to be doing what the Project Director wants his or her own population to do.

Chapter 2 has three sections: Introduction, Biblical evidence, and Conclusion.

The explanations of these three sections follow in detail.

Introduction

This section of chapter 2 must tell the reader where the Project Director is going

with the Old and New Testament evidence. Consider the case of the prayerless church

mentioned earlier. In that case, the opening lines of chapter 2 would have the following

sort of content taken from a dissertation:

> The Project Director's ministry project intends to enhance the prayer life
> of First Baptist Church. Therefore, in this chapter, it shall be demonstrated (1) that
> having a substantial prayer life is a biblical priority and (2) the average prayer life
> of five minutes each week among members is insubstantial according to biblical
> standards.

Notice that this paragraph prepares the reader for an *argument*, not a discussion.

The Project Director is trying to prove something, not just to collect and disseminate

information. Would biblically informed people say with the Project Director, "Yes,

you've called attention to a real challenge in our church; and you, as our pastor, should be

specifically worried about it"? In chapter 2, the Project Director tries to show that they would in fact do so.

Biblical Evidence

All project dissertations get their rationale from a biblically derived imperative. Something that Christians ought to be doing, and the people in the Project Director's ministry setting are not doing that thing—or they are not doing it as well as they could. It really is that simple. Chapter 2 must get to the place where the Project Director says something like the following example:

> In chapter 1, the Project Director implied that the failure of FBC to do X is a ministry challenge. In the Biblical Rationale in chapter 2 the scriptures not only invite ~~us~~ believers to do X, but positively require people to do it. Therefore, the Project Director concludes that the project will address a genuine ministry challenge for FBC.

No substitute exists for an argument of this kind. The Project Director cannot justify the ministry project simply by finding *examples* in scripture of the behavior that one wants one's own people to adopt. All texts used in this chapter must command people of the church or organization to do, even if they do so only implicitly.

The basic skill of this chapter is to notice when the biblical writers are merely saying, "This happened," and when they are saying, "This ought to happen at all times and in all places." Take the Decalogue as an example. Both Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5 contain moral commands that God would now expect His people to follow, even if the form of our obedience might differ from what the ancient Israelites did. The same conclusion follows regarding the Sermon on the Mount. But what about the case of Jacob's wrestling with the angel? Has Moses included this episode in his works for the sake of encouraging us to wrestle with angels? What about the mentoring of Joshua by

Moses? Of course, it happened. No one doubts that. But does this historical report oblige us to go around mentoring people? Could we, on the basis of this text, call non-mentoring churches moral failures? Are they displeasing to God?

Regarding the New Testament, similar questions arise. Does a "Go and do thou likewise" attach to *everything* that Jesus happens to have done? Perhaps not. Of course, in *almost* every case, we can safely argue, "If Jesus did X, it's OK for us to do X." Justifying sinners would be an obvious exception here. But the conclusion, "We could do X if we like," differs categorically from, "We had better be doing X," and only the latter justifies a ministry project. Mere permission to do this or that is not enough. Likewise, if Paul does something, it is a safe bet that one may follow his example. But the Project Director needs more than this rationale to support the project. The Project Director needs to catch Paul stating or implying that one must copy his behavior. This confusion sinks more second chapters than any other. One might call it the "tunic fallacy." To wit: "We know that Jesus wore a tunic, so we must increase the tunic-wearing in our congregations."

Sometimes one discovers that the Bible really does not urge readers to do what the project assumes that they must do. The Project Director might be tempted to play "translation tango." Here the Project Director attempts to make the Bible say this or that by switching uncritically from one version of it to another, e.g., from the NAS to the KJV. Consider the Project Director who wants the church to 'cast a vision' regarding missions. The Project Director searches Strong's Concordance for the word "vision" and finds it, among other places, in Proverbs 29:18. But there is a problem: the Revised Standard Version, which the Project Director has been using thus far, says something

else, "Where there is no *prophecy* the people cast off restraint . . . ." So the Project Director turns to the New American Standard Version and finds, "Where there is no *vision*, the people are unrestrained." That is better: now we have the word vision in the text. But the Project Director has always thought that the lack of vision could be a matter of life and death, especially to a church. So the Project Director keeps going. He or she gets out his or her grandfather's King James Version, and there it is: "Where there is no vision, the people *perish* . . . ." The text now says what the Project Director wants it to say; and so the Project Director runs with it, making no attempt to argue that 'vision' and 'the people perish' are the best translations of the original Hebrew. But that, of course, is not exegesis, and it is not doctoral level work.

Two other errors need to be mentioned together. Dissertation Committees often receive second chapters featuring rampant quotations. Sometimes the Project Director puts three blocks on the same page, each one having fifty words or more. Combined with this first mistake is the tendency to quote authors uncritically. The Project Director's style amounts to, "He says, she says," with no evaluative remarks attaching them to his own dissertation. Does the Project Director agree with them? Does the Project Director disagree somewhat? Why are they being quoted at all? One can lay it down as a rule that persistent quotation of this kind results from half-baked thought. So avoid it at all costs. The Project Director may use substantive footnotes to demonstrate knowledge of textual debates, thereby avoiding the "He says, she says" problem.[2] Do quote as needed, but

---

2. A substantive footnote allows one to include brief quotations or notations that add credence to his or her statements or opinions. They may also be used to provide evidence of contrary views or opinions outside the focus of the body of the paper.

always ask, "Can I paraphrase what he says?" and "Do I really need to include this quote?"

Doctoral research must have higher standards than bachelors and masters level work. This principle applies to the arguments given in chapter 2 of the project dissertation. Consider, for example, the question of secondary literature. Many Project Directors settle on a project under the influence of a celebrated practitioner like John McArthur or Henry Blackaby. Popular practitioner/authors give the impression that they know what the Project Director is going through and can identify ministerial problems that he or she might never have thought to look for in the ministry setting. In the ideal case, such practitioners would build their efforts based on top-flight biblical scholarship. They would seek the advice of those who write commentaries based on the original languages of scripture. They would also rely on systematic theologians like Wayne Grudem and Millard Erickson. Therefore, the Project Director's expert witnesses in chapter 2 should not be practitioners. They should be the biblical scholars and theologians. The Project Director will explore the relevant contributions of the practitioners in chapter 3.

To give an example of this difference, consider the Project Director who plans to use a text from the Acts of the Apostles. One might argue a correct reading based on the testimony of various church-growth gurus, but if one does, one's examiners (Dissertation Committee) will be curious. Why does the Project Director not tell us what authors such as F. F. Bruce, I. H. Marshall, J. R. W. Stott, and Eckhard Schnable think about this text? If one is studying the Gospel of John, one's examiners will be looking for support from authors like D. A. Carson, Rudolf Schackenburg, C. K. Barrett, Leon Morris, and

Herman Ridderbos; and if the examiners do not find it, the same doubts will arise. Does the Project Director want to ignore the actual words of the text, or is the Project Director just not ready for doctoral level work? These are dreadful questions for the examiners to be asking, and the Project Director can avoid them by staying with the experts. Devotional commentaries and Sunday School literature do not belong here.

A few more hints may also be helpful in this regard. The Project Director must always remember that one is trying to construct an argument that the examiners can easily follow. Therefore, one must learn to 'flag' the logical transitions of chapter 2 with appropriate English words. Too many Project Directors merely string declarative statements together without showing how they relate to one another. As an example, consider the following paragraph:

> Gilbert Bilzekian wrote that kephalē means "source" in Ephesians 5:23. He did not think that God wants husbands to have the leadership role in marriages. Wayne Grudem pointed out that kephalē rarely means "source." Its most common meaning is "head," which may then be used metaphorically to mean "leader." In Ephesians 5:23, the best translation of "head," is as a metaphor for "leader."

The general problem with this passage is that it lacks connective tissue. The Project Director has given us no words like 'but' and 'therefore' to show us where the Project Director is going here. But notice how simple this paragraph becomes once changes have been made to bring out its logical structure:

> Gilbert Bilzekian argued that kephalē means "source" in Ephesians 5:23; and thus, he did not think that God wants husbands to have the leadership role in marriages. However, Wayne Grudem responded by pointing out that kephalē rarely means "source" in ancient Greek literature. Rather, its most common meaning is "head," which may then be used metaphorically to mean "leader." Accordingly, the best translation of kephalē in v. 23 is probably "head," so that it becomes a metaphor for "leader."

Obviously, Bilzekian and Grudem were adversaries on the question of what *kephalē* means in Ephesians 5:23 and they have "locked horns" in print. Grudem rested his case on a word-study. Finally, by adding the word 'accordingly' in the last sentence, the Project Director has told his or her readers to brace themselves for the Project Director's own conclusion. The Project Director plans to take sides here, siding with Grudem. Notice, how appropriate transitions can simplify an argument and make it more convincing.

Another tip for arguing effectively is to follow the oldest version of Murphy's Law, which stated, "If you want a task to be done correctly, you must make doing it the wrong way impossible." This principle is called "idiot-proofing" in other contexts, and it applies well to the case of writing arguments. If the Project Director intends to be understood—which is the first step toward convincing anyone—the Project Director must make misunderstandings impossible. Each sentence and paragraph should be transparently clear, so that no one will struggle to read and understand it. Bad spelling, grammar, and style would shut down this process straightaway, of course, but even correct English can be awkward and vague.

At the macro-level, the key to writing clear arguments is visual structure. Some Project Directors plow straight through chapter 2 without using any headings and subheadings to bring the reader up for air, which is an obvious liability. As a rule, never write a paragraph that cannot be easily read while holding one's breath; and use headings and subheadings to provide oxygen and a sense of direction. To check the clarity of his or her work, the Project Director should ask a non-specialist to read it—someone who

knows nothing at all about his subject matter.[3] If *that* person can follow the argument, anyone can.

Conclusion

In this part of chapter 2, the Project Director should restate the overall objective and claim to have reached it. On the subject of enhanced prayer life, for example, the Project Director would say something like the following:

> The Project Director's project assumes that all Christians must have a constant and fully-developed prayer life; and so he has sought here to justify this mandate exegetically. Evidence from both the Old and New Testaments has been considered here; and having reflected upon it theologically, the Project Director is now able to say with confidence that the Project Director's assumption is defensible. A prayerless church is a defective church. Here is a a challenge that must be engaged by the church family.

Some statement of this kind will do. The main point to remember is that both the introduction and conclusion should indicate plainly where chapter 2 is going exegetically.

Writing Chapter 3: Research and Discovery

In chapter 1 of the project dissertation, the Project Director describes his or her ministry setting with special emphasis on the challenge, need, or opportunity that his project will engage. In chapter 2, one develops an exegetical basis for one's judgment that one has a genuine ministerial challenge, need, or opportunity. Now in chapter 3, the Project Director must provide readers a history of the church or ministry where the project will take place in regard to the challenge, need, or opportunity.

---

3. The Project Director is highly encouraged to enlist several persons to proofread one's work prior to submitting it for examination. This proofreading by other persons will assist in the identification of spelling errors, poorly worded arguments, form, and style issues.

Chapter 3 also surveys previous efforts to engage the same kind of situation in other ministerial settings and types of ministries through a review of literature, all with a view to showing that the Project Director's ministry project will edify the Project Director's colleagues. This chapter introduces the readers to what others have done in other places and situations and what has taken place in the past in the project's setting related to the challenge, need, or opportunity being addressed by the project. Consequently, chapter 3 of the project dissertation has three sections, the history of this project's setting, the review of literature, and the contextual application related to this project.

History of Practice

The history of the church or ministry in the context of the challenge, need, or opportunity being addressed by the project plays an important role in setting the stage for the reader to understand what is behind the situation. The project director needs to carefully consider what needs to be included to set that stage. The reader most likely does not need to know the entire history of the church. The reader only needs to know aspects of the ministry's history that directly relate to the context of the project.

If a project is focused on one church, consider including historical information that backs up the purpose of the project. In most situations that means a history of the buildings of the church will not be included here. Nor will the names of all the pastors. If the project relates to the evangelism mindset of the church, the history provided here only relates to the evangelism efforts in that church through the years.

All other types of projects that relate to specific ministries not limited to one church will focus on the history of the specific ministries. For example, if the project is

focused on enhancing the skill of preaching in some way, the history will focus on the project director's preaching experiences and possibly the overall history of preaching that relates to the project director's preaching needs.

Consequently, the history captured in this section needs to strictly focus on the context of the project's challenge, needs, and/or opportunity. By doing so, the project director will help the reader understand the background of the project.

Review of Literature

Few Project Directors will have seen a new kind of challenge, need, or opportunity in their churches or ministries—i.e., one not noticed by any other ministry professional. The tendency, rather, is to engage what everyone else engages. But where ministers differ, sometimes a great deal, is in terms of their response and solutions. Some try one thing, some another thing. Ideally, the whole Christian community will learn from the triumphs and failures of these attempts. Of course, few practitioners wind up analyzing their efforts in print; but some have, and the Project Director must try to learn what can be learned from this literature. Now is the time to reflect upon the contribution of practitioners such as John Maxwell, Chuck Swindoll, John McArthur, Allan Taylor, and Kenneth Gangel.

This Project Doctoral Project Dissertation Guide concludes with a list of resources, both on-line and in print, which are standard in the field of practical theology and research. The Project Director should make good use of these and other resources. But no one can read everything. In fact, one struggles just to access all of the information, let alone evaluate it. So how much is enough? The short answer is "representation." The Project Director's responsibility is not to secure and assimilate every single article and

project that relates to the topic chosen. Rather, the Project Director should concentrate on getting an overall view of what has been done by others thus far regarding the perceived challenge, starting with all available literature that is parallel to the Project Director's own plans. After all, the distinguishing mark of a professional doctorate is the ability to find new and better ways of engaging challenges, needs, and opportunities. To accomplish strategic problem solving techniques, one must know what others have attempted.

Clearly, this review of literature should not have a mere, "Warren did X, and Gangel did Y," structure. The Project Director must *evaluate* each effort in terms of its success, failure, and biblical fidelity, although it is permissible to comment on several of them as a class, i.e., Warren, Hybel, and Silva. If one reaches no clear conclusions about this literature, one's examiners will wonder why the project is needed. If other ways have succeeded, why not adopt them? This question is at the heart of every ministry project.

Contextual Application

For clarity, the history and the review of literature in chapter 3 applies only to the context of the project. The purpose of the research and discovery regarding the history and review of literature is to engage the reader in the challenge, need, and opportunity facing the project director. Therefore, chapter 3 needs to stay within the context of the project without exception.

Writing Chapter 4: Implementation Strategy

After the literature on the subject matter at hand has been examined, the Project Director tells the readers how the Project Director intends to deal with the challenge,

need, or opportunity identified back in chapter 1. Now the Project Director is ready to design a ministry plan and describe it in writing. Here the Dissertation Committee learns what the Project Director is going to do and how he or she is going to do it. The Project Director also explains how he or she plans to measure the results one achieves, though measurement devices will appear in the appendix of the dissertation. Thus, the Project Director restates Thesis Statement and then adds the Professional Goals and Project Goals, Logistical Annotation, Resources, Assumptions, Limitations, and Key Definitions.

Thesis Statement

The thesis statement, as it appears here, will be identical to the one given in chapter 1. No changes are necessary or desirable. Here is a place to cut and paste without remainder.

Project Objectives and Goals

Once the Project Director gets the thesis statement in line, the Project Director is ready to describe the objectives and goals of the ministry project. These would be bridges that the Project Director must cross on the way to accomplishing the Project Director's overall purpose. As an illustration, the objective of reaching St. Louis by car from Kansas City in five hours might entail the following goals: (1) To successfully rent a car at Enterprise Car Rental. (2) To stop for lunch and use the bathroom in Columbia. (3) To maintain an average speed of 60 MPH.

Of course, the number of such tasks could, in principle, be endless; and therefore, the objective and goal template found on each Project Type Worksheet is intended to keep the Project Director on track in terms of which objectives and goals should be mentioned. Following the guide is not optional: the Project Director's objectives and

goals must conform to the pattern of objectives and goals on the Project Type Worksheets so that all ministry projects undertaken at Midwestern Seminary play by the same methodological rules.

Logistical Annotation

All projects seek to accomplish the same thing in the abstract: they try to get people in a ministry setting to do what everyone else of their type (e.g., fathers, mothers, singles, adults, leaders, etc.) *should* be doing or they attempt to get the Project Director to improve or do something different with his or her skill set. But how does the Project Director plan to modify the group's behavior or that of his or her own? Obviously one would have to teach and lead practically with a group, as the ministry project is not an exercise in coercion. For those projects that focus on the Project Director's skill set, the same practical context is true. Consequently, the Logistical Annotation section explains the planning and implementation of the project through the following four areas: research of appropriate methodologies related to what the Project Director will be doing (i.e., teaching methods, preaching styles), group description (if a group is involved in the project), the experience i.e., lesson plans, sermon outlines, or agenda; and logistics of the sessions (i.e.. training, teaching, preaching).

Research of appropriate methodologies

The first area of the plan is to identify methods to be used in the projects. Of course, brand new methods are not the only place where novelty or originality might arise. The tendency among some Project Directors is to exaggerate the stringency of the ministry project's "novelty" and "originality" requirements. The Dissertation Committee does not require the Project Director to discover brand new methods. Rather, the Project

Director's work can educate one's colleagues by modifying existing methods, even if only slightly. Or one can attempt to apply existing methods to a qualitatively different population, showing that what works with Group A also works with Group B. Novelty might also arise when the same methods are used by a qualitatively different kind of ministry. In the above scenarios, the project might even obtain a negative result: thus the Project Director and his peers learn from something that had promising prospects yet turns out to be a failure (i.e., what works with Group A does not work with Group B). The basic lesson here is that novelty and originality may be fairly close at hand. The Project Director just needs to ask the right questions.

Two final principles regarding methods ought to be mentioned here. First, the Project Director must recognize that methods are not theologically neutral. Some methods should never be used by a minister of the gospel—e.g., increasing church attendance through cash giveaways. Others are merely acceptable in that the scriptures do not forbid their use. Some methods are obligatory: we have no choice but to use them. Accordingly, here is a point at which the proposed plan might come under scrutiny. Are the Project Director's methods forbidden, permissible, or obligatory? Evaluate the plan carefully with this sort of question in mind.

Secondly, the proposed plan must be designed to yield measurable or demonstrable results. One cannot aim to change intangible states of affairs, such as whether a congregation is deepening their communion with God. Rather, the project must concentrate on personal and/or institutional behavior, plus changes in what people know and believe when appropriate. Someone can document whether John knows X and Mary does Y. However, no help is available for the Project Director who wants to know how

often the two of them receive guidance from the Holy Spirit. The same remark applies to states like the fervency of prayer, the peace of God and the joy of our salvation. These are realities, to be sure, but no one can generate data on them.

Group description (if a group is involved)

The second area of the plan describes the Project Director's selected group, the people on whom the ministry *experiment* will be conducted. This area includes each person's name (or pseudonym), age, marital status, and occupation, plus anything else that might be relevant to the ministry project. For some projects, it matters what ethnicity the member claims. In other cases, the socioeconomic status might have some bearing on the project. Obviously, the kind of information given will vary from case to case, but the dissertation should do some biographical sketching, including the Project Director himself or herself.

The experience

The third area of the Logistical Annotation section outlines what the participants will do. For example, when using the Enhancing a Ministry Skill type of project, the lesson plans for each training session, describe in broad detail what each session involves. A few sessions may use a lecture format, while others feature significant hands-on experience. Either way, however, the dissertation must tell the reader what the Project Director will do concretely and why anyone should expect these steps to have their intended result. Remember, at this stage, the project must be substantial enough to require at least three months to implement. What will the Project Director say and do? Who, if anyone, will be working with the Project Director? What handouts or visual displays will

be used? If the project involves sessions, how long will each session last? Why does the Project Director think these plans will realize the stated objectives? The Project Director will notice that the proposal should contain much information that would be useful here, since the participants will also need to know what the Project Director is doing and why. However, the Project Director should only *refer* to the project materials in this section: the materials themselves will appear as appendices to the dissertation.

Logistics of the sessions (if appropriate to the type of project)

The fourth area of the Logistical Annotation section must settle the logistics of the project experience. When does the Project Director intend to meet with the group or carryout certain project steps? The Project Director should answer this question with precise dates and times. Furthermore, the Project Director must inform the reader of the place where the sessions or steps will occur and why that particular place was chosen. This detail may seem trivial, but it is not: locations vary in terms of their appropriateness for this task. For example, for the Equipping Strategy type of project, no one would believe that serious study and training will occur at McDonald's or Denny's. Even conference rooms vary in terms of their fitness for this task. In all cases, then, the facilities chosen should be conducive to learning or whatever the purpose of the project.

This guide often reminds the Project Director that the project should concentrate on changing individual or group behavior, perhaps in concert with changing either one's thoughts, attitudes, feelings, etc. After all, the ministry project involves applied theology, and the Project Director needs to get measurable or demonstrable results. At the end of the project, the Project Director would like to say, "Before my project, my people/I were /was doing X; but now—as all can see—they/I are/am doing Y, and Y is better." But no

one else will be able to see this difference or learn from this project unless reliable measurement tools have been used. Think of the latter as 'before' and 'after' photographs.

Measurement devices

Therefore, the importance of this section, Logistical Annotation, including the careful reflection needed to write it, cannot be overestimated. Project Directors need to get this part right. Fortunately, excellent measuring devices have already been created in most cases. One needs only to modify them slightly for one's special needs.

With the Equipping Strategy type of project, the Project Director will usually find it best simply to apply the same tests twice, once before (pretest) and once afterward (posttest) so that the same information is measured each time. One must supplement one's pre- and post-tests with other measurement devices, and here is where troubles can arise. The usual supplement will be less formal questionnaires and the like, and the Project Director's use of them can go awry in at least two ways. First, one can use a test whose adequacy has not been established. No one has tried to see whether it produces similar results with similar inputs (= reliability), and no one has established that it measures what it says it measures (= validity). Of course, the Project Director would not be expected to achieve perfection in this area: the Project Director has neither the time nor the expertise to do so. However, one ought to keep in mind that these considerations can affect how others perceive one's results and even whether they see results at all.

For all types of ministry projects, a variety of devices might be used to measure the results of the project. These devices include interview, control groups, expert

observers, and learning contracts. Appendix H and the bibliography in this guide should prove helpful to Project Directors.

Resources

In this section, the Project Director needs to show that he or she has counted the cost of doing the proposed project. These 'costs' include, but are not limited to, the use of copyrighted materials, rented facilities, professional consultants, post office charges, printing of materials and travel expenses. All costs associated with project implementation need to be anticipated in this section, and reported in the project dissertation. Therefore, the time to do the math is before the project begins.

Assumptions

All ministry projects will have to work from starting points that cannot themselves be defended in any practical way. They are the Project Director's assumptions, and the Project Director must identify the decisive ones expressly in this section of the project dissertation. Consider the objectives described earlier with this question in mind: what 'breaks' does the Project Director need for the project to be successful? For example, when doing an Equipping project, one assumption is that the Project Director can actually teach one's participants what they need to know, i.e., that the Project Director is a competent pedagogue. Likewise, one assumes and hopes that one's participants will hold up their end of the project bargain. They must cooperate with the Project Director on some level, or the project will certainly fail.

One can also imagine a case in which a measurement tool does not hit its mark. Instead of quantifying one thing, it quantifies another. A test which would measure a

person's Bible knowledge might actually be an exercise in speed-reading. One might define success in terms of whether the selected members produced this or that document only to discover that they are semi-literate. They understand what needs to be done, but do not know how to commit their thoughts to paper. Therefore, the Project Director should include as one of the project's assumptions a statement to the effect, "The Project Director assumes that the measurement tools will measure what they purport to measure." Likewise, since there is no help but God for human nature, one ought to say, "The Project Director assumes that the selected members will answer the evaluation tools honestly."

Limitations

In this section, the Project Director draws several lines around the project, especially in terms of its population, use of time, area of study, number of trainers, and capabilities of its participants. These are the project's limitations, and they should appear as a list according to the following format:

1. This project is limited to the selected members of FBC.

2. This project is limited to the umpteen weeks from __/__/__ to __/__/__.

3. This project is limited to the topic of _____.

4. This project is limited to _____ instructor(s) on the topic of _____.

5. This project is limited to the physical and mental abilities of the selected members.

The setting of limitations is, therefore, a relatively straightforward matter.

Requesting Project Proposal Approval

The Project Proposal must be submitted to the Dissertation Committee members and the Doctoral Studies Office (one copy each) ten months or more prior to one's anticipated graduation. This ten-month schedule allows the highly motivated Project

Director adequate time for project implementation, writing the dissertation, and revisions, as needed. To ensure that the Dissertation Committee has adequate time to review the proposal, the Project Director must not implement his or her ministry project within sixty days following submission of the proposal. Please note that no project that is started—let alone completed—before the Dissertation Committee approval will count toward the degree requirements.

Only the Dissertation Committee chair can give approval to begin project implementation. The committee may request that revisions or changes be made to the proposal, or that additional research be reflected in your writing. Therefore, keep in mind that one should not presume immediate approval. Once the Project Proposal is approved, a letter or email to that effect will be sent from the Dissertation Committee chair to the Project Director, with a copy sent to the Doctoral Studies Office and the director of doctoral studies. The Project Director is encouraged to keep good notes and possibly a journal during project implementation to assist with the writing chapters 5 and 6 of the dissertation once implementation is complete.

Implementing the Project

Implementation of the project begins as soon as possible after the Dissertation Committee has approved the proposal. The project *must* be so substantial that it requires no less than three months to implement in which the Project Director works directly with those in his or her ministry community. Unexpected delays may result in the ministry project implementation taking longer than anticipated. Starting the project soon after approval enhances the possibility of completing the dissertation during the suggested implementation schedule (appendix J).

Chapter 2

Dissertation Phase

After project implementation and the results are gathered, the Project Director is ready to complete Chapter 5, *Implementation Report* and Chapter 6, *Implementation Analysis*. At this time, the Project Director may make only minor revisions to the first four chapters, and those revisions will require approval of the Dissertation Committee chair. No changes should be made to the project goals and objectives. Most likely the Project Director will uncover relevant information regarding the history or ministry setting during the implementation. These new findings or insights should be included in substantive notes or in chapters 5 and 6 rather than revising the body of the first four chapters.

Format of the Project Dissertation

All written work submitted must employ standard English and Turabian 7th edition format, subject to any qualifications added by the Doctoral Studies Office or Dissertation Committee. The Project Director is encouraged to secure the services of a qualified proofreader who will check the work for conformity to the current edition of Kate Turabian's *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations, 7th Edition* prior to the initial submission to the Dissertation Committee. The Dissertation Committee will not consider any dissertation which consistently falls short of Turabian standards. Prior to submission for binding, every dissertation must first be certified by a proofreader that it complies with Turabian's 7th Edition (appendix K).

The body of the dissertation must fall within certain limits, the absolute minimum being one hundred pages in double-spaced, Times New Roman size 12 font, Turabian

format. The body excludes the back matter (appendices, glossary, and bibliography). Shorter dissertation bodies will be considered only upon committee approval. As for the maximum length, no formal limit has been set, though the Project Director should recognize the demerits of verbosity. In many cases, lengthy dissertation results from one's inability to choose rationally what to include and exclude. Therefore, one must take special care to avoid "padding" the dissertation with extraneous commentary.

Special Note to DMin Dissertations: Acceptable Greek fonts, all of which are True Type fonts, are: Greek Regular, Greek FP, Graeca II, Graeca II Bold, Graeca II Bold Italic, and Graeca II Italic. Acceptable Hebrew Fonts, all of which are True Type fonts, are: Hebraica, Hebraica II, and Hebraica Regular. Most dissertations will not require the use of Greek or Hebrew fonts, as a transliteration of the text generally will suffice. Direct questions regarding the use of Greek and Hebrew to the committee chairperson.

Chapters 1-4 comprise the Project Proposal. Chapters 5-6 present the project report, evaluation, and analysis.

Writing Chapter 5: Implementation Report

During project implementation, the Project Director will be expected to keep notes, a journal, and other records of what happened. Upon the completion of the project implementation phase the Project Director is ready to begin writing the final chapters of the dissertation. The first of these is the implementation report.

The project implementation report tells the reader what happened as the Project Director implemented the project and what its final results were, all without saying yet whether they were good or bad. Fortunately, if one starts with a sound project proposal and good measurement tools, this part of the dissertation will present few difficulties. The

Project Director posed answerable questions and got definite answers back. Since the Project Director will have created softer data as well, the structure of this chapter needs careful planning.

The ideal presentation will start with a report of what the Project Director actually did procedurally (implementation summary). Then it will cover the data generated by the Project Director's measurement devices, *moving from the hardest data to the softest*— i.e., from the black-and-white pieces to the gray ones (results of direct and indirect measurement tools). Finally, one should refer to any causes and results that one did not expect (unforeseen causes and effects). Consequently, Chapter 5 has four major sections that need further explanation—implementation summary, results of direct measurement tools, results of indirect measurement tools, unforeseen causes, and unforeseen effects.

Implementation Summary

In this section, the Project Director explains what was done to achieve the intended results in each aspect of the project. Did the Project Director proceed as planned? Did the Project Director use the plans found in the dissertation appendices? Did the experiences occur when and where they were scheduled to take place? Did everyone show up as planned? These are the sort of questions that ought to be addressed in the Implementation Summary, with the emphasis on brevity and orderliness.

Results of Direct Measurement

This section presents the data generated by the Project Director's measurement devices, proceeding from the most objective to the least. So then, consider how the results of the following kinds of tools might be described:

1. **Standard Tests:** The first matter to settle here is what happened when standard tests were given the second time. Thus, the Project Director would start by citing the previous 'scores' and then give us the latest ones, plus summaries of where the differences are. The Project Director should move through the tests question by question, keeping the answers as brief as possible.

2. **Interviews:** If the Project Director's evaluation featured interviews of various kinds, then the before-and-after results of them should be given here, coordinating the responses from person to person and question to question. One wants to see what everyone says about question A, before and after, then what everyone says about B, before and after, and so on. The key here is to make straight-line comparisons easy for the reader to make.

Results of Indirect Measurements

The Project Director might have several measurement tools which would generate data, and these results should be presented tool by tool. Were control groups utilized in addition to the group worked with directly? Did expert observers look for changes of the kind that were intended? Were individual learning contracts involved? What institutional changes may have occurred in the course of the project?

If the Project Director has included measurement devices to look for such changes, then they should be written about her. All without saying whether the changes are for the better or worse, expected or unexpected.

Unforeseen Causes

In this section, the Project Director describes any unanticipated causes that broke in on the project, whether they were good or bad (although one will not takes sides on this latter point until the last chapter of one's dissertation). For example, for the Equipping projects, was someone in the study group especially cooperative or uncooperative? Was a question used that the participants seemed not to understand? Did facilities become unavailable at some point, or was the condition of them other than expected? Did the Project Director spend more or less money than was anticipated? Were the assessment tools appropriate? These are the sort of questions that this section would cover.

Unforeseen Effects

In this section, the Project Director refers to any results of the project that were not anticipated beforehand. Perhaps the project created strategic friendships between people who had, up until then, hardly known each other. Perhaps the study group discovered needs that the church did not notice before. Serendipity is a large part of the learning process, so that a project dissertation ought to have a place where this kind of information emerges. At all times, one must discipline oneself so that evaluative commentary does not intrude. Adverbs like 'fortunately,' 'sadly,' 'regrettably,' 'luckily,' etc., do not belong here. Chapter 5 does not tell the reader, even indirectly, what to think about any of the data that it reports.

Writing Chapter 6: Project Implementation Analysis

Now the time for accolades, wonder, and lamentation has come. Did the Project Director achieve what the Project Director set out to achieve? If not, why not? In this

section, the Project Director will now size up the whole project, using its goals and data as guides for reflection.

The order of analysis in this section corresponds to the order of the proposal and project plan as seen in the order of chapters 1-4. This chapter must address each part of the project with a view to rendering a final verdict on the purpose statement. Did the project (and Project Director) arrive or not? The readers will have learned how the Project Director would answer this question, once one has judged one's success in carrying out each part of the project and meeting the project goals and objectives.

General Evaluation

This evaluation provides an overview of project and the project results in light of the project proposal. How well the project was prepared? How effective was the project implemented? How much change was brought about in the ministry setting as a result of the project? These are the largest questions that one's dissertation will confront, and they demand evaluation, with the stress on self-examination. Of course, the Project Director must not concentrate on shortcomings only. The reader must also learn of the project's successes, but one must be as tough on oneself as the data demands and be encouraged by this thought: even projects which turn out badly can edify the church, provided that they had every promise of succeeding beforehand. When a strategy seems like it should work and then does not, one wonders why.

Ministry Setting Evaluation

Here, the Project Director evaluates the effectiveness of the description of the need, problem, and/or challenge in the ministry setting found in chapter 1. Did the Project

Director identify a real challenge, need, and/or challenge that needed to be addressed? Did the Project Director establish a legitimate need, challenge, and/or opportunity? How did the hypothetical presupposition serve as the basis for the project? These and other questions will guide an evaluation of the information one provided in chapter 1 on the culture, context, and community related to the project.

Biblical Rationale Analysis

The evaluation of the Biblical Rationale in chapter 2 considers the exegetical basis for the Project Director's decision that he or she has a genuine ministerial challenge. Does the biblical rationale fully explain the project rationale as a biblically derived imperative? How does the biblical interpretation meet hermeneutics standards? Can the Project Director justify the project biblically? These and other questions will assist the Project Director in analyzing how his or her biblical rationale connected with the ministry project.

Research and Discovery Evaluation

Evaluation of the history, review of literature, and contextual application recorded in chapter 3 gives the Project Director the opportunity to draw conclusions about the role this information played in the results of the project. How does the history of the ministry impact the results of this project? Did the Project Director discovery some aspect of the ministry that was not found in the literature? Can the project content be done in other contexts or situations? This evaluation will help the reader connect the project results with the information captured in chapter 3.

Implementation Evaluation

Here, one reflects on the results of the project in light of the goals and objectives introduced in chapter 4. These goals and objectives are specific to each type of project. This section of the Project Director's evaluation requires the most commentary, since it builds on the data collected in chapter 3. Did the select members and/or the Project Director *learn* what they should have? Did they *assess* the congregation's strengths and weaknesses with a view to seeing the challenge, need, or opportunity that the project plans to address? Did they *develop a strategy* to confront this need, building on the Project Director's own ideas? Finally, did they *implement* the strategy adequately?

Summary Analysis

After detailing the points of evaluation and analysis for each aspect of the project, this section provides a summary analysis. A summary of points identified in the previous sections. Here, one connects back to the general summary in the form of a conclusion.

Recommended Revisions

In this section, one is to give evidence that one has learned from one's mistakes, assuming that one has made some big and important ones. What would the Project Director do differently, knowing what he or she knows now? What would stay the same?

Prospects for Future Study

During the process of preparing for and carrying out the project, the Project Director will most likely discover a variety of directions that need further study. Here is the place for the Project Director to show where the work is going, i.e., what would be the next step? In other words, can one suggest a project for someone else coming along

after oneself and wanting to build on what one has done? Are there gaps in what the Project Director has done of the kind that would suggest other projects for other ministers? This last task of the project dissertation is an important one.

Writing the Front Matter and Back Matter

The Front and Back Matter play a significant role in the readability of a dissertation. These elements are fully explained in *A Manual for Writers* by Turabian. Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary dissertations include the elements identified in the correct order on appendix G: Project Dissertation Contents.

Defending the Dissertation

When the Project Director and the Dissertation Committee determine that the Project Director is ready to defend his or her dissertation, the Project Director sends two hard copies and one electronic copy of the completed dissertation to the Doctoral Studies Office. These copies must be postmarked no later than February 15 or September 15 of the semester in which one intends to graduate.

Once the Doctoral Studies Office has received the project dissertation, the dissertation will be sent to the committee members within three working days. They will have up to 30 days to read and assess the dissertation by using the Professional Doctorate Dissertation Rubric (appendix C). The Dissertation Committee chair schedules the oral defense. The oral defense must take place by April 1 or November 1 of the semester one intends to graduate.

The defense interview will include the Project Director, the members of the Project Director's Dissertation Committee, and possibly others as requested by the

Dissertation Committee chair. In this interview, the committee members will ask questions which verify (1) that the Project Director has personally done the work in question and (2) that one understands the overall significance of one's own project. The Project Director will also be asked to defend any controversial points of the work—e.g., one's particular reading of a biblical passage, the appropriateness or results of a measurement tool—and show that one's project has involved significant ministry. Committee members will utilize the Professional Doctoral Oral Defense Rubric during the oral examination (appendix D). One should plan to be in session for approximately two hours and should bring to this meeting a copy of the project dissertation and supporting documents that may be helpful to the defense. This interview is a formal examination, and appropriate attire should be worn.

Upon the completion of the defense, the Project Director will be dismissed from the conference room and the Dissertation Committee will decide how to proceed. Four options are available to the committee:

1. Pass Orals and Approve Dissertation, with no revisions, or only minor revisions. Any revisions should be reflected in the final copies submitted for binding, but do not require Dissertation Committee review.

2. Pass Orals, with Dissertation Revisions Required. Graduation will be contingent upon major revisions and review by the committee prior to submission for binding. The committee chair will notify the Doctoral Studies Office when revisions have been approved.

3. Re-defense Required. Project Director must make major changes to the dissertation and re-defend his or her project.

4. Fail, with the recommendation the Project Director be allowed to make major revisions and defend the dissertation a second time.

5. Fail, with recommendation the Project Director not be allowed to re-defend. This recommendation will be submitted to the Doctoral Studies Committee.

If the Project Director fails the defense under option 4, the Project Director must wait at least three months before submitting and defending the project dissertation a second time. If the Project Director fails under option 5 above, the Doctoral Studies Committee will consider whether to allow the Project Director to complete and defend another project or be dropped from the program. If revisions are required, which is the usual outcome: one must complete all revisions within six months of the oral defense and pay any applicable fees.

Submitting the Final Copy

Once the dissertation has been approved, the Project Director must submit four hard copies and one electronic copy to the Doctoral Studies Office. These must be postmarked by May 1 or December 1 of the semester in which the Project Director plans to graduate. The four hard copies must be printed on water-marked, 20 or 24 pound paper, having a rag content of no less than 50%. The electronic copy must be submitted in PDF format for microfilm. All copies must be of a high quality, having a 1.5 inch margin on the left side for purposes of binding. The Project Director must also pay the costs of binding and microfilming by May 1 or December 1 respectively.

Further details regarding final copy submission is available on the schedule on page 47. Be encouraged, the end is near. Congratulations!

APPENDIX A
PROJECT AND DISSERTATION STEPS

Project Phase

Step 1: **Looking for Challenges, Needs, and Opportunities**
A. Find a biblically definable need within your own ministry setting.
B. Conduct considerable field research to substantiate the need.
C. Propose a solution to the problem that is *contextual* and *original*.

Step 2: **Writing the Project Worksheet**
A. During the Dissertation Preparation Seminar, the Project Director will complete the Project Worksheet.
B. Project Director submits the Project Worksheet to the Dissertation Preparation Seminar professor for feedback.
C. The Dissertation Preparation Seminar professor provides feedback to the Project Director.
D. The Project Director makes revisions and submits the final Project Worksheet to the Dissertation Preparation Seminar professor.
E. The Dissertation Preparation Seminar professor approves the worksheet and submits it to the Doctoral Studies Committee.
F. The Doctoral Studies Committee reviews the worksheet to determine a Dissertation Committee chair and second reader.
G. The Doctoral Studies Committee assigns a Dissertation Committee to the Project Director.
H. The Doctoral Studies Office emails the Project Worksheet to members of the Dissertation Committee to ask them if they would be willing to serve on this committee.
I. When the Dissertation Committee is set, the Doctoral Studies Office emails the Project Director contact information for the Dissertation Committee.
J. The Dissertation Committee chair initiates the work with the Project Director and second reader to finalize the Project Worksheet.
K. When the Dissertation Committee approves the Project Worksheet, the Dissertation Committee chair sends a letter or email to the Project Director with a cc to the Dissertation Committee second reader, the Doctoral Studies Office, to confirm the approval to proceed with preparing the Project Proposal.

Step 3:   **Writing the Project Proposal (Chapters 1-4)**

    A. Writing the Project Proposal and a Project Implementation Schedule (Appendix I) must wait until the receipt of the Project Worksheet approval letter or email from the Dissertation Committee.

    B. The Project Director submits a review draft of the Project Proposal and a Project Implementation Schedule to the Dissertation Committee for feedback and guidance.

    C. The Dissertation Committee has sixty (60) days to finalize the Project Proposal with the Project Director. Please note that no project that is started—let alone completed—before the Dissertation Committee approval will count toward the degree requirements.

    D. The Project Director has the Project Proposal reviewed by a Turabian reader or proof readers.

Step 4:   **Requesting Project Proposal Approval**

    A. Within the allotted sixty (60) days, the Project Director must submit the official Project Proposal and Project Implementation Schedule to the Dissertation Committee members. This submission needs to be done ten (10) months or more prior to one's anticipated graduation.

    B. With the approval of the Dissertation Committee, the chair sends the approved draft of the Project Proposal with a letter or email to the Doctoral Studies Office, the Director of Doctoral Studies, and the Project Director confirming that the Dissertation Committee has approved the Project Proposal.

Step 5:   **Implementing the Project**

    A. Implementation begins as soon as the Dissertation Committee approves the Project Proposal and documentation is filed with the Doctoral Studies Office.

    B. The Project Director follows the Project Implementation Schedule as planned with the Project Proposal.

Dissertation Phase

Step 1:   **Writing the Dissertation**

    A. Once the project is implemented and the results are gathered, the Project Director is ready to write chapters 5 and 6.

    B. The Project Director and the Dissertation Committee determine how often they will communicate during the writing process.

C. When the dissertation is written, the Project Director is responsible for having the dissertation proofed and edited by trusted friends or a professional editor.

D. When the dissertation is deemed grammatically correct, the Project Director is responsible to engage a Turabian expert to read the paper for style and formatting concerns. This expert needs to fill out the Turabian Certification form (appendix J) which will be submitted with the dissertation.

E. Now is the time to request a Graduation Checklist from the Doctoral Studies Office.

F. The following tasks take place by February 15 or September 15 of the semester in which one intends to graduate.
  1) Send two hard copies and one electronic copy of the completed dissertation (must be postmarked no later than February 15 or September 15) to the Doctoral Studies Office.
  2) The Application for Graduation is also due to the Doctoral Studies Office.

G. Within three (3) working days, the Doctoral Studies Office will send the two hard copies to the Dissertation Committee members.

Step 2: **Defending the Dissertation**
A. Upon receipt of the dissertation, the Dissertation Committee will have thirty (30) days to evaluate the dissertation by using the Professional Doctorate Dissertation Rubric (appendix B).

B. The Dissertation Committee chair schedules the oral defense with the second reader and the Project Director. The Doctoral Studies Office is available to assist with reserving a meeting room on campus.

C. The oral defense must take place before April 1st or November 1st of the semester one intends to graduate.

Step 3: **Submitting the Final Dissertation**
A. Once the dissertation is approved by the Dissertation Committee, the Project Director submits four hard copies and one electronic copy as follows to the Doctoral Studies Office no later than May 1 or December 1 of the semester of graduation.
  1) PDF copy for microfilm
  2) One hard copy on cotton rag paper for binding your copy.
  3) Three hard copies on cotton rag paper for binding copies for the Doctoral Studies Office and the MBTS library.
     a. Requesting additional copies for binding is accepted at this time with an additional $15 charge per book. The additional copies are not required to be on cotton rag paper.

   b. Cotton rag paper must be at least 20 pound weight with 50% (or greater) cotton content. Look for "fine business paper" or "resume stationary."

B. The Project Director also needs to pay all fees by May 1 or December 1 to the Doctoral Studies Office.

 1) Binding and microfilming fee: $65.00 (Due the Doctoral Studies Office)

 2) Graduation Fee: $150.00

   a. Billed directly to your MBTS account.

   b. This fee includes the cap, gown, and hood rental.

   c. Check with the Doctoral Studies Office to make sure your MBTS account is paid in full so that you can receive your degree.

Project Director's Name: _____

1. **Thesis Statement**: (The thesis statement for this project (generally one sentence, having the form: *The purpose of this project is to accomplish X by doing Y…..*)

2. **Title:** (Proposed Title of Project.)

3. **Proposed Ministry Challenge:** (Proposed ministry setting challenge, need, or opportunity this project will address.)

4. **Biblical Rationale:** (The biblical mandate – key biblical rationale – Scripture references for this project.)

5. **Type of Ministry Project:** (Select one or blend of two from PDG pages 49-53)

6. **Project Objectives and Goals**: (see PDG page 24; 49-53)

7. **Participants:** (If appropriate for your Project Type, identify the selected participants for this project including selection criteria and possible participants.)

8. **Anticipated Project Implementation Schedule:** (Anticipated time line for implementing the project, exclusive of writing the dissertation.)

9. **Primary Ministry Area to which Project Relates**: (e.g. preaching, teaching, administration, evangelism, leadership, church planting, counseling, etc. The project should have one clearly definable area to which it relates.)

10. **Field Research Methods:** (Surveys, demographics, polls, awareness events, etc. to be used. Clear examples include: "Project Director will conduct a survey of 40 area pastors" or "Project Director will give the 'Congregational Health Survey' consisting of 121 questions to all members attending the morning worship service on March 10." You will need an adequate number of measurement tools and participants to validate the problem and support your approach for chapters 1-3.)

11. **Others who may affirm the validity of this project**: (This requirement prevents the project from being eccentric.)

12. **Others involved in the project**: (Others who may be involved as supporting facilitators, observers, practical experts, etc.)

13. **Bibliography:** (For this document, please include at least 40 sources, with about half relating to the History of Practice and Review of Literature, chapter 3, and the others relating to the Biblical Rationale and support of the project need, chapters 1 and 2.)

Equipping Strategy

Setting: A group of Christ-followers needs to be equipped for a specific ministry. Many training models for that ministry are available but the Project Director will mine the literature on this type of training and explore the existing models to synthesize a distinctly new approach to equipping people for this specific ministry.

Scope: The Project Director's research is the starting point of the project which ends with the people being equipped for ministry. The actions that follow the training sessions go beyond the scope of this project.

Focus: Equipping Christ-followers to carry out a ministry

Product: Equipped Christ-followers for a specific ministry

One Sentence Purpose Statement:
   The purpose of this project is to equip [who] to [ministry].

Project Objective(s):
   1. The project director will [learning domain] [specific ministry] by [action].

Project Goals to reach the Project Objective(s):
   1. To research how to equip people for [specific ministry].

   2. To develop a workshop that would equip [who] to [the specific ministry].

Professional Objective(s):
   1. The project director will [learning domain] [skill to be developed] by [action].

Professional Goals to reach the Professional Objective(s):
   1. To increase the Project Director's knowledge of how to [ministry].

   2. To increase the Project Director's skill in [a skill needed to develop the workshop].

Enhancing a Personal Ministry Skill

Setting: The project director has a ministry skill that needs improvement that relates directly to his or her ministry responsibilities.

Scope: This project starts with identifying the ministry skill that needs enhancing and concludes with implementing the skill enhancement.

Focus: A ministry skill area.

Product: The skill improvement becomes the norm.

One-Sentence Purpose Statement:
The purpose of this project is to enhance the project director's [skill to be improved] to be more effective in [related ministry task].

Project Objective(s):
1. The project director will [learning domain] [skill to be enhanced] by [action].

Project Goals to reach the Project Objectives:
1. To identify [elements or related aspects] that are effective for [ministry task or target].

2. To develop [related to the ministry task] identified as [what is needed by the target].

3. To use [the enhanced skill] at [name of church or group].

Professional Objective(s):
1. The project director will [learning domain] [skill to be developed that will help the project director enhance the project skill being enhanced] by [action].

Professional Goals to reach the Professional Objective(s):
1. To increase the project director's knowledge [related to skill being enhanced] that are effective in [the result of the improvement].

2. To increase the project director's skill in [skill being improved] that is effective in [target of improvement].

Thinking Strategically

Setting: A specific set of ministry actions with a single purpose is needed by a specific group of people.

Scope: An analysis of demographics, characteristics, and existing strategies launches this project and ends with the initial stages of implementation.

Focus: A comprehensive strategy

Product: A strategy recommendation with initial implementation actions such as: presentation and approval processes or the first steps of the strategy (pilot projects, demographics, etc.)

One Sentence Purpose Statement:
> The purpose of this project is to develop a strategy to [ministry action] with [target audience].

Project Objective(s):
> 1. The project director will [learning domain] develop [strategy] by [action].

Project Goals to reach the Project Objective(s):
> 1. To explore the demographics and existing models of [ministry] which are effective for [strategy plan].
>
> 2. To develop a strategy for [the specific ministry].
>
> 3. To present the strategy for [ministry strategy] to [church or organization] for approval.

Professional Objective(s):
> 1. The project director will [learning domain] [skill to be enhanced] by [action].

Professional Goals to reach the Professional Objectives:
> 1. To increase the Project Director's knowledge of strategy thinking and development.
>
> 2. To increase the Project Director's skill in [related to this strategy].

Assessing a Community Need

Setting: A community within the Project Director's community has an expressed need that needs to be met through some sort of ministry.

Scope: The Project Director begins this project by identifying demographic data with existing needs and ends with specific recommendations to a church. The implementation of those recommendations is beyond the scope of this project.

Focus: A need in the community surrounding the church or ministry point.

Product: Community recommendations to a specific church or ministry group.

One Sentence Purpose Statement:
The purpose of this project is to assess [community needs] and present detailed recommendations to [name of church or ministry group] for establishing [ministry to community].

Project Objective(s):
1. The project director will [learning domain] assess [community] by [action].

Project Goals to reach the Project Objectives:
1. To explore the demographic data and needs related to [community need].

2. To research how [the specific ministry] could be used to meet the needs created by [crisis or situation in the community].

3. To present recommendation for [ministry to community] to [church or group's name] for approval.

Professional Objective(s):
1. The project director will [learning domain] [skill to be enhanced] by [action].

Professional Goals to reach the Professional Objective(s):
1. To increase the Project Director's knowledge of the community needs related to [specific community need].

2. To increase the Project Director's skill in development of recommendation for [community ministry strategy].

Researching a Ministry

Setting: A new ministry form is needed but few related models exist to suit that new ministry form. In order to establish that new form of ministry, research and development is needed to synthesize ideas to create this new form.

Scope: Research is the starting point of the project which concludes with the design of a new workshop, conference, module, etc. Implementing the workshop, conference, module, etc. is beyond the scope of this project.

Focus: Researching a new ministry form

Product: The design and create new resources and tools for a new ministry form.

One Sentence Purpose Statement:
The purpose of this project is to research (topic) and to develop a workshop that will equip (who) to (ministry).

Project Objective(s):
1. The project director will [learning domain] assess [community] by [action].

Project Goals to reach the Project Objective(s):
1. To research the field of (research topic).
2. To develop a workshop that would equip (topic) to (ministry).

Professional Objective(s):
1. The project director will [learning domain] [skills to do the project] by [action].

Professional Goals to reach the Professional Objective(s):
1. To increase the Project Director's knowledge of (research topic).
2. To increase the Project Director's skill in (ministry).
3. To increase the Project Director's research skills.
4. To increase the Project Director's skill in developing learning objectives, conference outlines, and conference materials.

APPENDIX C
PROFESSIONAL DOCTORATE DISSERTATION STANDARDS

Dissertation Committee _____ _____

Project Director: _____Date:_____ Degree: ( ) DMin ( ) DEdMin

	1 Deficient	2 Substandard	3 Acceptable	4 Excellent
Clarity & Style of Writing	Little clarity at paragraph or section levels	Frequent unclear concepts and language construction	Occasional unclear concepts and language construction	Clear concepts and language construction throughout paper
Spelling and Grammar	Excessive errors, shows pattern and consistency	Numerous errors, pattern evident	Occasional errors, no pattern	Free of errors or only minor errors
Organization	Minimal use of transitions, paragraph order, or flow of thought	Readable but sections lack clear organization, use of transitions, and flow of thought	Organized with sufficient transitions, and flow of thought	Organized with logical paragraph order, use of transitions, and work flows from section to section smoothly
Form: Adherence to Manual of Style (Turabian), 7th Edition	Minimal conformity with substantial changes needed	Limited conformity with numerous changes needed	Substantive conformity with occasional changes needed	Complete conformity with only minor changes needed
Thesis Statement	Not clear, specific, or defined	Understandable, aim is not defined and unobtainable	Reasonably clear and precise, obtainable, aim and population somewhat vague	Clearly defined aim, obtainable, defined population and purpose
Challenge, Need, Opportunity	No clear, specific, or defined challenge, need, or opportunity	Challenge, need, or opportunity is broad and vague, refinement essential	challenge, need, or opportunity is defined and state the intention of the study, additional refinement needed	challenge, need, or opportunity is clearly stated, narrowly defined and related to the field of study
Ministry Setting	No clear, specific, or defined educational setting	Little ministry setting context or research provided	Adequate ministry setting context and research provided	Defined ministry setting and substantive research provided
Community, Congregational, Cultural , or ministry Setting	No clear, specific, or defined community or ministry setting	Little ministry setting context or research provided, little impact information provided	Adequate ministry setting context and research provided, impact analysis provided	Defined ministry setting and substantive research provided, impact analysis supports challenge, need, or opportunity
Project Director Information	Little information about the Project Director provided that relates to problem	Limited relationship and support of challenge, need, or opportunity	Adequate relationship and support of challenge, need, or opportunity, defines skills and training needed to address the challenge, need, or opportunity	Substantive and clear relationship that supports the challenge, need, or opportunity , impact analysis of skills and training need is substantial
Theological/Biblical Rationale	Evidence not related, logical, or supported by subject	Evidence is weak, with little support and interaction with subject	Reasonable support and interaction with subject	Subject is supported and interaction is logical and orderly
History of Practice	Evidence not related, logical, or supported by subject , erroneous sources are cited, limited interaction with subject	Evidence is weak and often illogical, inadequate sources are cited, little support and limited interaction with subject	Reasonable support and interaction with subject, centers primarily on research with some original thought	Subject is supported and interaction is logical and orderly, demonstrates original thought
Implications	No implication for addressing the challenge, need, or opportunity, no evaluation of components, no clear conclusion drawn	Limited implication for addressing the challenge, need, or opportunity, evaluation of components and conclusions drawn	Adequate implication for addressing the challenge, need, or opportunity, evaluation of components and conclusions drawn	Substantive implication for addressing the challenge, need, or opportunity, evaluation of components and conclusions drawn

Research	Inadequate number of resources, overuse of secondary resources, resources are not current	Minimum of one resource per page, Unbalanced use of primary and secondary resources, occasional use of current resources	Minimum of 2 or more resources per page, balanced use of primary and secondary resources, adequate use of current resources	Substantial use of primary and secondary resources,
Citations	Improper documentation and reference, possible plagiarism issues	Occasional documentation and reference errors, possible unintentional plagiarism issues, secondary sources	Adequate documentation, minimal errors, no plagiarism issues	Thorough and complete documentation, no plagiarism
Objectives, Goals and Outcomes	No clear specific or defined objectives, goals or outcomes	Two or more elements not clearly defined	One or more elements not clearly defined	All elements clearly defined
Procedures and Measurements	No clear specific or defined procedures or measurements,	Two or more elements not clearly defined, procedures and measurement do not agree	One or more elements not clearly defined, one or more elements not in agreement	All elements clearly defined and are in agreement
Report of Sessions, where appropriate	No clear report of sessions	Two or more elements not clearly defined	One or more elements not clearly defined	All elements clearly defined
Report of Plan	No clear report of plan	Two or more elements not clearly defined	One or more elements not clearly defined	All elements clearly defined
Analysis of Outcomes	No analysis of data, change in learning, or application; measurements did not support outcomes	Minimal analysis of data, change in learning, or application; two or more measurements did not support outcomes	Adequate analysis of data, change in learning, or application; one or more measures did not support outcomes	Substantive analysis of data, change in learning, and application; measurements supported outcomes
Analysis of Plan	No analysis of plan, explanation of adjustments needed, or corrective action taken	Minimal analysis of plan, explanation of adjustments needed, or corrective action taken	Adequate analysis of plan, explanation of adjustments needed, or corrective action taken	Substantive analysis of plan, explanation of adjustments needed, or corrective action taken
Implications for Future Study	No presentation of additional studies or projects that stem from the study's findings	One presentation of additional studies or projects that stem from the study's findings	Two presentations of additional studies or projects that stem from the study's findings	Three or more presentations of additional studies or projects that stem from the study's findings
Summary	No evidence of what was learned, identification of mistakes, and explanation provided	Minimal evidence of what was learned, identification of mistakes, and explanation provided	Adequate evidence of what was learned, identification of mistakes, and explanation provided	Substantive evidence of what was learned, identification of mistakes, and explanation provided
Appendix	Limited use of appendix in support of the study, no order	Minimal use of appendix materials to support the study, some order	Adequate use of appendix materials to support the study, adequate organization	Substantive use of appendix materials to support the study, corresponds to order in project body
Bibliography	Several footnote references not included	Three or more footnote references not included	No more than two footnote references not included	All footnoted references included

Signature: _____ _____ Date: _____
                        Chairman   *2nd Reader*

PROFESSIONAL DOCTORATE ORAL DEFENSE STANDARDS

	1 Deficient	2 Substandard	3 Acceptable	4 Excellent
Content Review	Major points not covered, does not flow from cognitive to application, material does not support project purpose, questionable authorship	Points are not logical or sequential, some resources are provided, some material supports project purpose	All major points are covered, with adequate flow and order, adequate resources are provided, and materials support project purpose	All major points flow from general to specific, resources and background material supports purpose, teaching flows from cognitive to application
Research	Showed little support of having done original research	Minimum articulation of research findings and implications	Adequate support of original research and understanding of implications	Enthusiastic discussion of the Project Director's research and its impact upon the project and dissertation
Presentation	No engagement of listeners, no variety of teaching approaches, little creativity, poor use of time, Little sense of poise or confidence	Some engagement of listeners, at least two teaching methods used, fair use of time, some sense of poise and confidence	Adequate engagement of listeners, at least two or more teaching methods used, adequate use of time, poise and confidence expressed	Listeners engaged, variety of teaching methods used in support of materials, well organized, informative, good use of time, creativity evident, strong sense of poise and confidence
Understanding of Findings	Little or no understanding of the findings, unable to relate to field	Limited understanding of the findings and their relationship to the field	Adequate understanding of the findings and their relationship to the field, interacts with some primary and secondary sources	Advanced understanding of the findings and their relationship to the field, interacts with key primary and secondary sources
Thesis	Not clear, specific, or defined	Understandable, aim is not defined and unobtainable	Reasonably clear and precise, obtainable, aim and population somewhat vague	Clearly defined aim, obtainable, defined population and purpose
Implications for Further Study	No presentation of additional studies or projects that stem from the study's findings	One presentation of additional studies or projects that stem from the study's findings	Two presentations of additional studies or projects that stem from the study's findings	Three or more presentations of additional studies or projects that stem from the study's findings
Summary	No evidence of what was learned, identification of mistakes, and explanation provided	Minimal evidence of what was learned, identification of mistakes, and explanation provided	Adequate evidence of what was learned, identification of mistakes, and explanation provided	Substantive evidence of what was learned, identification of mistakes, and explanation provided
Response to Questions	Inability to adequately respond to questions, no clear and supportive responses	Adequate response to questions, somewhat scripted	Clear response to questions, supported with findings, some integration to the practice of ministry	Clear response to questions, strong grasp of findings and integration to practice of ministry

Comments:

Committee Recommendation: Please submit this form to the Doctoral Studies Committee Office.

- ☐ **Pass Orals and Approve Dissertation, with no revisions, or only minor revisions**. Any revisions should be reflected in the final copies submitted for binding, but do not require Dissertation Committee review.
- ☐ **Pass Orals, with Dissertation Revisions Required.** Graduation will be contingent upon major revisions and review by the committee prior to submission for binding. The committee chair will notify the doctoral office when revisions have been approved.
- ☐ **Re-defense Required.** Project Director must make major changes to the dissertation and re-defend his or her project.
- ☐ **Fail, with the recommendation the Project Director be allowed to make major revisions and defend the dissertation a second time.**
- ☐ **Fail, with recommendation the Project Director not be allowed to re-defend**. This recommendation will be submitted to the Doctoral Studies Committee.

Signature: _____ _____ Date: _____
                          Chairman   *2nd Reader*

APPENDIX E
PROJECT OVERVIEW

1. **Need.** The project must respond to a genuine challenge, need, or opportunity. It must be more than a mere academic exercise. The project must demonstrate that the Project Director can see a challenge, need, or opportunity and meet it.

2. **Ministry.** The project is to render a definite ministry.

3. **Focus.** Care must be taken to do one project, not several. A clearly written purpose or thesis statement is evidence that the project is precisely focused.

4. **Evaluation.** Evaluation involves clearly stated goals and tangible evidences for showing the extent to which the Project Director reached the goals and objectives.

5. **Understanding.** The Project Director must demonstrate in the Project Dissertation that he or she understands what happened, what did not happen, and the reasons for each. The Project Director will need to convince an oral examination committee that he or she has this understanding. Process notes, logs, and audio or video tapes can provide essential information for developing and later presenting clear understandings of what went on in the project.

6. **Communication.** Doctoral Project Directors must show that they can communicate effectively with the specific doctoral programs language (English, Spanish, or Korean). The Project Proposal and the Project Dissertation demonstrate their writing skills. The oral examination allows them to express their oral communication abilities.

7. **Appreciation.** Working at a doctoral level expresses the Project Director's respect for the doctoral program. Although the degree is different from other doctoral programs, the ministry project should be viewed with the same seriousness as a Ph. D. dissertation or inventions required of some engineering degrees.

APPENDIX F
PROJECT PROPOSAL CONTENTS

Title Page

Blank Page

Table of Contents

List of Tables and Charts

Chapter 1: Ministry Setting
        Describing the Ministry Setting
        Demographics
        Project Director Information
        Community Information
        Hypothetical Presupposition
        Thesis Statement

Chapter 2: Biblical Rationale
        Introduction
        Biblical Evidence
        Conclusion

Chapter 3: Research and Discovery
        History of Practice
        Review of Literature
        Contextual Application

Chapter 4: Implementation Strategy
        Thesis Statement
        Project Goals and Objectives
        Logistical Annotation
        Resources
        Assumptions
        Limitations
        Key Definitions

Appendices

Bibliography

APPENDIX G
PROJECT DISSERTATION CONTENTS

Title Page

Blank Page

Dedication Page (Optional)

Table of Contents

List of Tables and Charts

Acknowledgements (Optional)

Abstract

Chapter 1: Ministry Setting
        Describing the Ministry Setting
        Demographics
        Project Director Information
        Community Information
        Hypothetical Presupposition
        Thesis Statement

Chapter 2: Biblical Rationale
        Introduction
        Biblical Evidence
        Conclusion

Chapter 3: Research and Discovery
        History of Practice
        Review of Literature
        Context Application

Chapter 4: Implementation Strategy
        Thesis Statement
        Project Goals and Objectives
        Logistical Annotation
        Resources
        Assumptions
        Limitations
        Key Definitions

Chapter 5: Implementation Report
        Implementation Summary
        Results of Direct Measurement
        Results of Indirect Measurement
        Unforeseen Causes

Unforeseen Effects

Chapter 6: Project Implementation Analysis
General Evaluation
Recommended Revisions
Prospects for Future Study
Summary Analysis

Illustrations

Appendices

Glossary[1]

Endnotes

Bibliography

Program Director VITA (appendix L)

---

1. Almost every project dissertation will use specialized or technical terms as labor saving devices. "Prayer," "fasting," "mentoring," and "witnessing" would all qualify as technical in this sense. But if the Project Director plans to use any of them at decisive points in the dissertation—in the project title, purpose statement, goals, and sub-goals objectives—the Project Director must define them precisely. In terms of format, these definitions should be listed in prose or as footnotes. Consider the following three examples:
   A. Deepen: to extend and expand each person's capacity for X.
   B. Intimacy: a person's awareness of proximity to another.
   C. Fasting: going without food voluntarily for purposes of gaining intimacy with God.
   The main point to remember here is that specially defined terms must be used as such throughout the dissertation. The danger of definition-creep is high.

Jim England used two **expert witnesses.** The participants completed **two evaluation forms,** one at the conclusion of the project and a second four weeks after the seminar (23 & 56). Expert witnesses sat in on some of the sessions which Jim led and viewed some of the sessions on videotape. Afterward, they wrote a letter to Jim evaluating the project sessions and Jim's conducting of them. In his analysis of evaluation procedures, Mr. England would add **"brainstorming** (with participants) of possibilities for an on-going ministry." (84) Jim also used a **telephone survey** before and after his project but notes that the **post project survey might be changed to a mail survey** and thinks the most effective process would be to **visit participants in their home following the project.**

Carl Anderson used a **pretest and posttest** "to ascertain whether participants had grown in knowledge skills and teaching methodology." (18) Participants also completed an **evaluation sheet late in the project** and a **follow-up evaluation inventory one month after the project.** The form "allowed workers to indicate . . .teaching skills they were now using that they had not used before the training began." (18) Carl also used two professional religious educators as **expert evaluators.** Prior to the project, he gave them explicit instructions as to what they were to evaluate. They were to evaluate the project goal, project procedures, evaluation procedures, his annotated bibliography, and the detailed plans for each phase of the project, materials used in each phase and his process notes on each phase. Both gave Carl written evaluations following the project. Carl also used **process notes** as an evaluation tool. Near the close of the project, Carl also **interviewed participants** concerning their appraisal of the project and his conduct of it. (19)

Rufus Adetona used, in addition to pretests and post-tests, an **observer group** of five people. He asked the group to "record their impressions of change in the church as a result" of the project. He provided them with a questionnaire to guide them in their evaluation and to give a structure for tabulating their responses.

John W. Adams compared participant's involvement in family activities before the project with their participation during the project. He provided a form for them to estimate their participation before the project and another to record their actual participation during the project. He also provided a summary form for tabulating the information. (39)

Richard Smith surveyed failed church planters in Missouri over a five year period.

George Authur asked the church committee and church staff who participated in his project to complete an **evaluation sheet** which evaluated the study as a whole, the materials used in the study and the project leader. The sheet was formatted with continuum scales of one to ten with ten being "very good" and one being "poor". The

pastor completed the same evaluation sheet with some additional questions. He also conducted an evaluation interview with the pastor after the project. (56-63)

Charles Anderson asked participants to complete an **evaluation questionnaire** at the end of the project. The questionnaire used a continuum from not well, 1, to quite well, 7. He also used a **standardized test, the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis,** to assess the level and range of stress among the project participants. He used **a testing consultant** who evaluated both the Taylor-Johnson and Personal Evaluation forms. (63-64) He did not attempt any before and after analysis of the project participants. The testing consultant wrote an evaluation of both instruments, which Charles included in his Project Dissertation. (68-69)

Gary Autry used a program evaluation form (148) and a post-exit interview (153) in addition to a pretest and posttest.

Johnny Baker used two standardized tests, the pr scale of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (41) and the Taylor Johnson Temperament Analysis (43). He also administered a race relations questionnaire (45). He enlisted a psychologist as a consultant for interpreting the MMPI pr scale. Johnny did his own interpretation and analysis of the Taylor-Johnson inventory.

Ronald Baker used an external evaluator who observed his project and later wrote an evaluation. He also asked each project participant to write an evaluation of the process followed in the project. One thing they evaluated was the church's response to a presentation, which the participants made to the church. He set up specific criteria for them to follow in their evaluation. Ron also used a pretest and posttest.

Larry Baker used tests and evaluation forms to measure the success of his project. He also stated that "completing the project would determine the effectiveness" of the project's goals.

Charles Barfield evaluated his project using two standardized instruments. He obtained permission to revise the instruments to fit the focus of his project. Part of his revision was adding quantifying scales which allowed him to tabulate subjective responses using objective data. He was thus able "to tangibilate the intangible" (Robert Mager, Goal Analysis, 8). The instruments he used were "Affirmation of Trust Questionnaire" and "Developing Trust Inventory." He used these as pretests and posttests.

Gerald Bauman's evaluation tool was a statistical report form. He also asked project participants to write an evaluation of the project. He interviewed participants regarding their written evaluation. He also cited specific accomplishments to support his conclusions about the success of each of the project goals.

APPENDIX I
OUTCOME VERBS

Comprehension (Awareness):

Cognitive – list, recall, identify, name, reproduce, match, recognize, define, distinguish, acquire, to state, answer

Understanding:

Cognitive - translate, explain, paraphrase, compare, contrast, outline, and combine, illustrate, diagram, elaborate, transform, interpret, reorder, rephrase, rearrange, distinguish, categorize, deduce

Affective – differentiate, select, set apart, share, and separate

Attitudinal:

Cognitive – judge, argue, validate, assess, appraise, discuss

Affective – encourage, value, defend, justify, prioritize, reflect, choose, relate, accept, comply, approve, commend, deny, debate, applaud, acclaim

Application:

Cognitive – combine, formulate, design, create, apply, employ, adopt, modify, propose, derive, synthesize, adapt

Affective – practice, act, demonstrate, integrate, volunteer, revise, require

Transformational (Spiritual Life):

imitate, adapt, modify, enhance, develop, compose, perform, tell, and produce, initiate, confront, create, appraise, validate, display

APPENDIX J
SAMPLE IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

March 1, 2011. Project Proposal approved

March 21, 2011. First letter to participants confirming participation

April 15-May 5, 2011. Confirm speakers, room assignments and other logistics

May 6, 2011. Second letter with final seminar schedule

June 17-18, 2011. First Seminar (Sessions 1-4)

June 20, 2011. Reminder letter for personal consultations

June 25 to July 13, 2011. Personal consultations with participants (Session 5)

July 2, 2011. Reminder letter for second seminar

July 13-14, 2011. Second seminar (Sessions 6-9)

July 23, 2011. Reminder letter for the third seminar

July 29-30, 2011. Third seminar (Sessions 10-13)

August 15-30, 2011. Final follow-up with participants (Session 14)

August 21, 2011. Meet with expert observers for post-seminar evaluation

September 1-10, 2011. Project Dissertation written

September 11-14, 2011. Project Dissertation Turabian Review

September 15, 2011. Project Dissertation submitted

October 30, 2011. Oral Defense

APPENDIX K
TURABIAN CERTIFICATION

To the best of my ability, I certify that Name Of Project Director"s project dissertation complies with Kate L. Turabian's, *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*, Seventh Edition (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2007).

_____   _____
Signature   Date

APPENDIX L
PROJECT DIRECTOR VITA OUTLINE

VITA

Name
Street Address
City, State Zip Code
Phone:
(Home)
(Office)

EDUCATIONAL
Degree, University/College, Year Graduated
Degree, Graduate School, Year Graduated
Degree, Institution, Year Graduated

MINISTERIAL
Title, Church/Entity/whatever, City, State, Years Served
(list all positions in order of service, first to present)

PROFESSIONAL
Position, Name of Association/Organization, Years Served
(list all professional positions served in order of service, first to present)

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES
Member, Name of Association/Organization, Years
(list all organizations, first to present)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Blaxter, Lorraine, Christina Hughes, and Malcolm Tight. *How to Research*, 2nd edition. Buckingham: Open University Press, 2001.

Bloom B. S. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: The Cognitive Domain.* New York: David McKay Co Inc., 1956.

Carroll, Dudley, and McKinney. *Handbook for Congregational Studies*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998.

Davies, Richard E. *Handbook for Doctor of Ministry Projects*. New York: University Press of America, 1984.

Mager, Robert, *Preparing Instructional Objectives: A Critical Tool in the Development of Effective Instruction*, 3rd edition. Atlanta: Center for Effective Performance, 1997.

Strunk, William, Jr. and E.B. White. *The Elements of Style*. 4th edition. New York: Macmillan Press, 1996.

Suskie, Linda A. *Questionnaire Survey Research*. 2nd ed. Tallahassee: Association for Institutional Research, 1992.

The Chicago Manual of Style. 15th ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Turabian, Kate L. *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses and Dissertations*. 7th ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Vyhmeister, Nancy Jean. *Quality Research Papers for Project Directors of Religion and Theology.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001.

ELECTRONIC DOCUMENTS

"Academic Theology Sites," *APS Research Guide to Resources for Theological and Religious Studies.* Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University, 2005. http://resources.library.georgetown.edu/libdata/rqs.phtml?core=1&subject_id=95 (Accessed 5 July 2012).

"Research Methods Knowledge Base." Web center for Social Research Methods. 2006, http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/index.php (Accessed 5 July 2012).

JOURNALS

Conniry, Charles, Jr. "Reducing the Identity Crisis in Doctor of Ministry Education."
    Theological Education 40, no. 1 (2004): 138.

MBTS PUBLICATIONS

Doctoral Studies Committee. *Doctor of Educational Ministry Handbook*, Kansas City:
    Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2012.

Doctoral Studies Committee. *Doctor of Ministry Handbook*, Kansas City: Midwestern
    Baptist Theological Seminary, 2012.

Doctoral Studies Committee. *Doctoral Studies Guide.* Kansas City: Midwestern Baptist
    Theological Seminary, 2012.