Guidelines for the Project
Doctor of Ministry Program
Pastoral Leadership

2018 - 2019

Doctor of Ministry Program Office:
Kathleen D. McCallie, Director
kathy.mccallie@ptstulsa.edu

Tammye Jurena
Administrative Assistant
tammye.jurena@ptstulsa.edu

Phillips Theological Seminary
901 N. Mingo Road
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74116
918-610-8303
918-610-8404 (FAX)
www.ptstulsa.edu

Revised June 2018

Contents

Welcome and Introduction to the Project Phase

Welcome to the Project Phase of the DMin Program in Pastoral Leadership at Phillips Theological Seminary. In this phase you will produce a central piece of your program, a DMin project in which you contribute original research and reflection on the character and practice of some aspect of ministry. In the written report of this project, you will demonstrate the ability to integrate theological reflection as it is practiced in the traditional theological disciplines (Bible, History of Christianity, Systematic and Constructive Theology) with the practice of ministry as it is typified by your specialization. You will also utilize a research model that enables you to design a significant act of ministry that will yield evidence that can be gathered, analyzed and evaluated both theologically and socio-scientifically.

This means that you will be engaged in at least two conversations on several levels:

- a conversation between your actual practice of ministry and a theoretical research model that guides reflection about that practice for the purposes of the DMin project;

- and a conversation between the theological disciplines listed above and other theoretical frameworks drawn from the human sciences that facilitates reflection on ministerial practice.

These dialogues take place in and are shaped by the various contexts, (i.e., congregational, local, denominational, regional, theological, etc.) in which you carry out your ministry. Therefore, careful and respectful study of your ministry setting and the larger communities in which it is situated will be a significant part of your research.

To be more exact, you will be developing a specific “act of ministry” that will yield evidence that can be analyzed and assessed with both standard scientific tools drawn from the human sciences and your own theological commitments. An act of ministry may be a particular task designed with the project in mind or an ongoing aspect of ministry that you examine very carefully for the purposes of this project. However, the act of ministry is defined by you in consultation with your project committee, it must be a particular, concrete and limited practice that you will actually perform and evaluate during the time you are enrolled in DMPR 906 Project Course, after your proposal has been approved by your committee, including adviser, reader and DMin director, and the Phillips Institutional Review Board for Research with Human Participants. At the same time, you must be able to show how your chosen act of ministry intersects with your theological frame of reference, your ministerial context, and theories drawn from the human sciences.

The faculty of Phillips recognizes that this is difficult and complicated work that requires skills of conceptualization, analysis, and integration that you may not have used in such a significant way in any of your previous education. The purpose of this Handbook is to offer you the information you need as you develop these skills and produce a project of which you and the faculty of Phillips can be justifiably proud. In these pages, you will find specific information about the curricular design of the Project Phase, the plan of the project, including the models and methods you will utilize, form and style matters, student and faculty responsibilities, and helps for getting started and shaping your project. Throughout this phase of your study, the DMin director, the specialization coordinator, your adviser, and your reader will be available to interpret and aid you in all aspects of this important work.

ATS Standards for DMin Projects

The Association for Theological Schools of the United States and Canada, one of the accrediting agencies of Phillips, has adopted the following standards that guide our understanding of what students are producing in this phase:

"The [DMin] program shall include the design and completion of a written doctoral-level project that addresses both the nature and the practice of ministry. The project should be of sufficient quality that it contributes to the practice of ministry as judged by professional standards and has the potential for application in other contexts of ministry.

"The ministry project should demonstrate the candidate's ability to identify a specific theological topic in ministry, organize an effective research model, use appropriate resources, and evaluate the results, and should reflect the candidate's depth of theological insight in relation to ministry.

"Upon completion of the doctoral project, there shall be an oral presentation and evaluation. The completed written project, with any supplemental material, should be accessioned in the institution's library."

(from The *Bulletin* of the Association of Theological Schools, June 2004, p. 213.)

The Curricular Design of the Project Phase

In the Project phase, which includes 7 hours of the total program, DMin students begin work on an original project that makes a contribution to the study and practice of ministry within their chosen specialization. During this phase they will be assigned an adviser and reader to help them complete a project proposal, project report, and an oral presentation. They proceed through the Project phase by enrolling in the following four courses:

DMPR	904	Project Development Seminar I	.5 hour
DMPR	905	Project Development Seminar II **(students participate in this course 5 times to earn a required total of 2.5 hours)**	.5 hour
DMPR	902	Project Proposal Course	2 hours
DMPR	906	Project Course	2 hours

A description of each course and its requirements follows:

DMPR 904 Project Development Seminar I

This course, with .5-hour credit, is taught on the first Monday of the January DMin Fortnight from approximately 1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. with additional online hours required. It serves as an introduction to the art and craft of developing a DMin project, methods for research in ministry, and the process of writing a project. Usually, students will participate in this course after completing the second Foundation course (e.g., DMIN 807 Pastoral Leadership in Context, DMIN 808 Biblical Message and the Praxis of God, DMIN 809 Constructive Theology of Ministry).

As a part of the requirements of this course, students will submit a short trial project proposal and a preliminary schedule for completion of the project.

Students currently enrolled in the DMin program may audit DMPR 904 Project Development Seminar I as review after they have taken it for credit. The audit fee will be $40. Auditors will receive "AU" (Audit) recorded on their transcript. Auditors who miss 20% or more of the contact time for the course will receive a "U" (Unsatisfactory).

DMPR 905 Project Development Seminar II

Students must earn a total of 2.5 hours credit by participating in a minimum of 5 sessions with .5 credit hour earned per session on an ongoing basis. Usually the course will meet on the second Friday of every DMin Fortnight from approximately 8:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. with additional online hours required. This course will be required for all students in the Specialization and Project phases.

The goals of the **Project Development Seminar II** are:

- to facilitate peer learning as a tool for achieving clarity and accountability about a student's project research and interests;
- to provide requisite information for successful completion of the project and project report,
- and to continue to offer communal support in this phase of doctoral learning.

Regardless of their progress in the program, students who have completed Project Development Seminar I will meet in seminar format with the DMin director and one other faculty member to present preliminary versions of their proposals to one another, to participate in discussion of the project work of other students, and to report progress toward completion of the project. Students will also be given opportunity to present materials related to their research interests, ministry settings, and Specialization concerns. These materials may take various forms, i.e., case studies, book reviews, sermons, exegetical papers, verbatims, etc.

To receive credit for participation in a Project Development Seminar II students must submit, each time, specific portfolio assignments that advance the project. The director will provide instructions for each report before the Seminar meets.

Ideally students will participate in one Project Development Seminar II each academic year while they are in the Foundation and Specialization phases. Once they enter Project Phase they will develop a participation schedule in consultation with the director. Enrollment in individual seminars will be based on invitation by the director based on the cohort needs of each specialization and student progress.

DMPR 902 Project Proposal Course

This course, with 2 hours credit, consists of independent study and progress toward a project proposal and will be arranged between student and adviser. The reader will also be consulted. When the proposal in written form has been accepted by adviser, reader, specialization coordinator, and DMin director, the student will be granted candidacy for the DMin degree.

DMPR 906 Project Course

This course, also with 2 hours credit, may be taken only after passing the Project Proposal Course. It consists primarily of the carrying out of the act of ministry as a research tool and writing the final report. It is also arranged between student and adviser; again, the reader, DMin director, and specialization coordinator will be consulted as needed.

DMPR 902.01 906.01 Project Proposal and Project Course Continuations

If a student does not pass the Project Proposal Course or the Project Course by receiving approval from adviser, reader, and DMin director on a final draft in the first semester of enrollment, in the following semester he or she will enroll in DMPR 902.01 Project Proposal Continuation Course or DMPR 906.01 Project Continuation Course. Most students do not pass the Project Proposal Course or the Project Course the first time they enroll in it. A student may enroll in either continuation course for three consecutive semesters (counting the summer term as a semester). If, after three semesters of enrollment in the continuation courses, the student is unable to present an acceptable proposal or project, he or she must re-enroll in the Project Proposal course or the Project course (whichever is applicable) or may be terminated from the program.

The Specialization Elective

The Specialization elective described in the DMin Program Handbook has a specific relationship to the Project phase in that its purpose is to help students explore in depth a topic related to their project. By the time students enroll in this course, toward the completion of other Specialization phase courses, they should have delineated the issues and topics for their project that need further research and reflection. In consultation with the DMin director and the specialization coordinator they will design a course that is directly related to a primary concern to be addressed in the project. Their design should include a basic bibliography, possible assignments, and suggestions for faculty members who might direct their work in this course.

This course may take one of the following formats:

A. An **online model** in which student work load would be commensurate with the seminar format, typically taught during a Fall or Spring semester;

B. A **directed study format,** only for use as the elective, to be arranged between one or two students and a professor with the approval of the specialization coordinator of the track and the DMin director. Again, course work should be commensurate with the in-class model while recognizing that forty-eight contact hours between professor and student would be overwhelming;

C. An **advanced-level course in an MDiv program,** provided that students make arrangements with the professor regarding additional coursework commensurate with both DMin-level work and an additional hour's worth of credit, and that they receive the approval of the specialization coordinator and the DMin director;

D. A **seminar** taught during a DMin Fortnight which would run from Tuesday through Friday, the first week and Monday through Thursday of the second week.

Students must make arrangements for their elective course and seek the approval of their specialization coordinator and the DMin director **at least one full semester in advance** of the time the course is to be taught.

Grades and Grading Procedures

In the **Project Phase**, courses are graded "S" (Satisfactory progress), "P" ("Pass") or "F" ("Fail"). A passing grade is the equivalent of a B-.

When a student is enrolled in a Project Development Seminar (I or II) or a project research course (the Project Proposal Course or Project Course) and has made satisfactory progress on the proposal or project but has not successfully completed it, he or she receives an "S" ("Satisfactory") grade on the transcript. Furthermore, a student's work is considered satisfactory when verbal and written materials demonstrate adequate progress toward completing course work. The grade indicates that a student has engaged in substantial research, developed an annotated bibliography, demonstrated critical thinking about the project topic, and held at least two consultations with the project adviser via face-to-face meeting, telephone, or email.

For the term in which the proposal or project is completed and passed, the student will receive a "P." Students who do not make satisfactory progress on a proposal or project will receive an "F" ("Fail"). The Project Report may be accepted ("P"), sent back for revisions ("S"), or failed ("F").

Candidacy

Once a student's project proposal has been passed by the committee including reader and Dmin director as well as the IRB board, and the student has completed all Foundation and Specialization coursework with a 3.0 or better GPA, the student becomes a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Ministry.

Major Participants in Project Phase

Faculty Participation

From the time of admission until students are assigned a faculty adviser, the DMin director serves as their faculty adviser in all aspects of the program. After they complete Project Development Seminar I, Specialization coursework, and the third twenty-page draft of the initial project proposal, they will be assigned a project adviser and a project reader by the DMin director. These persons will be selected in consultation with each student in light of her or his particular direction of the proposal. Please note that the specialization coordinator will be limited in the number of students for whom he or she may serve as adviser or reader.

Thus, four persons will comprise a student's faculty project committee: the adviser, the reader, the specialization coordinator, and the DMin director. The adviser will serve as chair of this committee and the final arbiter of all decisions regarding scheduling, content, and style and grammar issues. If the student has doubts about these or other matters, the first person he or she should consult is the adviser.

All project advisers and readers must be Phillips Theological Seminary faculty members and available in all semesters (including summer terms) in which their assigned students are enrolled in DMPR 902 Project Proposal Course, DMPR 906 Project Course, or a continuation of one of these two courses.

The Faculty Adviser

The responsibilities for the faculty adviser throughout the Project Proposal, Project and Continuation courses include:

- Being reasonably available during all semesters (including summer terms) by telephone, email, or in person for consultation with students currently enrolled as his or her advisee;

- Negotiating appropriate deadlines in relation to the schedules of the student, reader and adviser so that feedback can be given in a timely manner;

- Offering thorough review and critical evaluation of student's written work and oral presentations;

- Assigning the course grade for each semester (F, S, or P) in which student is enrolled in Project phase;

- Advising student about possible sources and resources related to DMin project topics;

- Consulting with the reader of the project and the DMin director about the student's progress and performance;

- Notifying the DMin director when a student's proposal or project report is nearing completion;

- Scheduling, participating in, and evaluating the oral presentation of the project in consultation with the student, reader, and DMin director;

- Serving as final authority of all matters of substance and style within the body of the project report;

- Approving final draft of the project report in consultation with the reader and DMin director.

The Faculty Reader

The responsibilities for the faculty reader throughout the Project Proposal, Project and Continuation courses include:

- Being reasonably available during all semesters (including summer terms) by telephone, email, or in person for consultation with students for whose work they have agreed to serve as reader;

- Giving timely feedback to adviser and student within mutually agreed time frames;

- Offering thorough review and critical evaluation of student's written work and oral presentations;

- Advising student about possible sources and resources related to DMin project topics;

- Consulting with the adviser of the project and the DMin director about the student's progress and performance;

- Participating in and evaluating the oral presentation of the project.

The Specialization Coordinator

The responsibilities for the specialization coordinator for students in his or her track (if not serving as adviser or reader) throughout the Project Proposal, Project and Continuation courses include:

- Consulting with the DMin director about appropriate assignment of advisers and readers for a student's proposal and project;

- Reading the final draft of a student's project proposal and consulting with adviser and reader concerning revisions and final grade;

- Reading the final draft of a student's project report and consulting with adviser and reader concerning revisions and preparation for oral presentation;

- Participating in and evaluating the oral presentation of the project.

The DMin Director

The responsibilities for the DMin director throughout the Project Proposal, Project and Continuation courses include:

- Communicating clearly to all parties expectations, deadlines, and other issues of concern in the process of developing and producing a DMin project and report;

- Reading the final draft of a student's project proposal and consulting with adviser and reader concerning revisions and final grade;

- Reading the final draft of a student's project report and consulting with adviser and reader concerning revisions and preparation for oral presentation;

- Assisting in arrangements for oral presentation, including room reservation and notification of Phillips faculty;

- Overseeing production of final draft of project report including issues of style, final approval, printing and binding, fees, and other last-minute matters;

- Dealing with unforeseen problems that might occur throughout the Project phase of each student.

Student Responsibilities

The Project phase of the DMin program is the place in which the individual student's abilities, interests and schedule become the primary focus as he or she seeks to produce an original and creative project and report in service to the profession of ministry.

The following is a list of student responsibilities in this endeavor:

- Initiating all contact with faculty adviser and reader and requesting consultation about her or his DMin project on a regular and timely basis each term;

- Facilitating communication of expectations by summarizing, orally or in writing, what the student understood about revisions and corrections in consultations with the adviser, reader, or DMin director;

- Demonstrating adequate progress toward completing the project proposal and project report;

- Meeting appropriate negotiated deadlines for submission of written materials to be evaluated and graded by adviser or instructor;

- Maintaining current and consistent enrollment in the DMin program and requesting appropriate leave of absence, when necessary, from the director;

- Submitting written materials that reflect academic competency to do post-graduate doctoral study and research.

Participation of Persons in Student's Ministry Setting

By its very nature, a DMin project is both contextual and communal. That is to say, the project is grounded in a particular setting that is populated by persons with varying degrees of allegiance to the setting, to its leaders, and to the DMin student, with a complex and rich history of interaction with one another and the larger community in which the setting is situated, and with their own theological interests and commitments. And the project is communal because ministry itself is communal, occurring among people who are connected to one another in a variety of ways. This means that people among whom the DMin student works are of necessity involved in the project and its requisite acts of ministry. However, the specific ways in which they participate in a project must be dictated by the issues raised in the project. At a minimum, the student will elicit some sort of evaluation of the project. In all cases, students must strive to treat all persons with respect, compassion and justice.

Policy for Institutional Review Board

We understand two values to govern research with human participants conducted under the auspices of Phillips:

- the extension of human knowledge that will benefit individuals, churches, societies, and indeed all creation; and,

- the ethical and theological requirement that God's compassion, respect, and justice for all participants is demonstrated in research conducted under the auspices of Phillips Theological Seminary.

The faculty of Phillips seeks to create a reasonable balance between these two values and to minimize risk for participants and researchers in all cases. Further, we seek to provide adequate protection, responsibility, and mutual accountability for all persons involved in terms of gathering, evaluating and publishing data. For these reasons an Institutional Review Board has been formed to guide the seminary's efforts to provide this protection and accountability. All DMin students must submit their research plans to the IRB for review and approval. Detailed information is found in Appendix IV.

Getting Started: The Project Proposal

The project proposal is a written document that serves as a very detailed roadmap for the project. It includes a description shaped by a research model and methods for evaluation of the project, a thick description of the context, a theological framework, a discussion of the theories and practices that are a part of the project, and a detailed description of the acts of ministry to be performed. All of these elements must be incorporated in some way in the proposal. How they are placed and utilized is up to the student as he or she designs the project.

At Phillips, we expect that a fully-developed project proposal will be a complete and well-written description of the project before the act of ministry is actually performed in the context. In fact, the Phillips faculty intends a proposal to be so complete that all a student has to do once a proposal is approved is to carry out the act of ministry, write up the results using the methods for analysis already developed and include some sort of final chapter that summarizes results and offers theological reflection on them.

For many students in the DMin program the theories, tools and language of the social sciences are unfamiliar and will require some independent work to develop facility in them. A list of resources that previous students and faculty have found useful is included in the bibliography in Appendix I. In addition, students will want to consult with the DMin director, faculty members, and one another as they shape their project around a research model and make use of various methods in data collection, analysis, and evaluation. What we mean about various terms like "model," "act of ministry," and "method," can become very confusing very quickly. Basic explications at this point which can serve as touchstones for developing the proposal may be helpful.

The Research Model

The **research model** serves as a kind of story of how the research will proceed once a proposal has been approved. Another way to think of the model is as a framework around which a student builds the project. As a student gains some clarity about the act of ministry and the methods used with data, a research model will provide a way to put all these elements together.

For the most part, DMin students at Phillips practice some version of "action research"—an approach to inquiry and study that is used in a variety of arenas including education and the social sciences. Kathryn Herr and Gary L. Anderson summarize key characteristics of this approach like this:

> Action research is inquiry that is done *by* or *with* insiders to an organization or community, but never *to* or *on* them. It is a reflective process, but is different from isolated spontaneous reflection in that it is deliberately and systematically

undertaken and generally requires that some form of evidence be presented to support assertions. What constitutes evidence or, in more traditional terms, data is still being debated. Action research is oriented to some action or cycle of actions that organizational or community members have taken, are taking, or wish take to address a particular problematic situation. The idea is that changes occur either within the setting and/or within the researchers themselves.[1]

As implied by this listing, action research is change-oriented and collaborative— an exercise in communal and participatory work toward change for the better. Further, such an approach must include some sort of ethical and theological understanding of what "the better" toward which change is promoted might be.

Within this broader approach are more specific research models, (think of these as narrative-like organizations of research), that students have used at Phillips in the past including:

- **The Functional Change Model:** The student gathers information about the situation, individual, or group before an act of ministry is performed. The same situation, individuals, or group are then tested after the act of ministry has been performed in order to determine the effects of the act of ministry. While one means of determining these effects is an objective measure (for instance, a test or questionnaire), other methods of assessing change may be used (for instance, observable change in the situation, participants' subsequent participation in other aspects of the church's program, or participants' ability to train others).

- **The Team Model:** Two DMin students who are roughly at the same place in the program perform the same act of ministry in their respective settings and then compare the results. This model enables the students to explore the effects that different institutional settings may have on a particular form of ministry. They are able to explore the reasons why a program or project works one way in one setting and another way in another setting.

- **The Pre-Ministry/Post-Ministry Model:** The student performs the same act of ministry two times. After performing the first act, the student reflects on the experience, does additional reading and consulting with advisers, then performs the second act. It is expected that the two acts of ministry will be similar to one another, but the second act will profit from reflecting on the previous experience. The report will describe how the second act of ministry differed from the first and will explore the reasons for the difference.

---

[1] Kathryn Herr and Gary L. Anderson, *The Action Research Dissertation: A Guide for Students and Faculty* (Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2005), 3-4.

- **Theological Appropriation of a Secular Theory Model:** The student carries out an act of ministry designed to show how a secular theory (e.g., counseling theory or a theory of social change) can be used in ministry. It is expected that the student will subject the secular theory to a theological critique both before and after it is used in ministry and that the theory will be modified through this critical appropriation.

- **Practical Theology Model:** The act of ministry is used to shape the student's theological perspective. The student in this model has a theological issue or set of issues on which greater clarity is desired. The act of ministry is used to help provide that clarity. The project report develops the student's theological perspective as informed or modified by the experience of the particular act of ministry.

- **Integrative Model:** The student's academic and practical areas are integrated by the act of ministry itself. For example, a student may have some ideas about how the Bible can be used in pastoral counseling, but the actual integration of Biblical studies and pastoral counseling occurs in the act of counseling rather than in advance of the counseling activities. The report then indicates in what ways the student was able to integrate the two areas (academic and practical) through the project itself.

- **Continuous Assessment Model:** The student has repeated encounters with an individual or group, during which a diary or journal or other method of recording the encounters is kept and ongoing theological reflections are made. For example, the student may have a series of pastoral visits with one or more parishioners who are terminally ill. The report documents the minister's growth in ministerial skill and the changes in his or her theology during the series of encounters.

- **Theological Reflection Model:** The student reflects upon the relationship between a particular aspect of his or her ministry and a specific theological problem, concept, or issue (for instance, the problem of evil, eschatology, the doctrine of scripture, Christology, the doctrine of God). The project report is a constructive theological statement growing out of the student's reflections and practice.

This list of models is not intended to be exhaustive. Rather, it should suggest to students that many different ways of constructing and organizing research are possible. Students may use one of these models, combine two or more of them, or develop different models. Additional research resources may be consulted in order to develop these models more fully.

Thinking about the Act of Ministry

The **act of ministry** is a specific and concrete practice that a student performs in her or his context in order to generate data for analysis and evaluation to support a hypothesis about the practice of ministry within the student's specialization. This act might be a workshop or series of workshops, a series of preaching events, an ongoing communal practice within the worshipping congregation or in the larger community, a curriculum of some sort, a series of counseling sessions, or any other form that directly relates to the hypothesis with which a student is working.

Students should develop these acts with the following criteria in mind:

- The act of ministry should be completed within at least one of the student's various contexts, i.e., the local congregation, a grouping of ministers, a denominational region or conference, a geographical community, etc.;
- The act of ministry should be related to the specialization in which the student is studying in the DMin program.
- The act of ministry should be limited enough to be completed in two years.
- The act of ministry should make a significant contribution to the student's particular ministerial praxis and to the body of literature about ministerial praxis.

Again, the information provided here about the act of ministry is not exhaustive. We encourage students to think creatively about this part of the project so that what he or she actually performs is an integral part of the project and provides useful information for the student, for the people in her or his context, and for those who make of their project report.

A Word about Methods

The word "method" is used so much in relation to many aspects of the project that some basic word of clarification may be helpful at this point.

First, students will make use of methods for data collection, analysis and evaluation as they perform their acts of ministry. These include surveys, questionnaires, interviews, focus group discussions, various documents in a setting, field notes, etc. In the social sciences a good rule of thumb for these methods is what is called "triangulation:" the use of three sources of data as tools for confirming hypotheses, intuitions, and results.

Second, often students are engaged in testing various methods or strategies related to their specialization. So, for example, a student might test the effectiveness of a rhetorical strategy in preaching, a counseling method, a community organizing method, a method for enhancing the spiritual formation of a particular group. In this case, methods are often drawn from various theoretical stances and approaches that are studied in the specialization coursework.

Third, within the traditional theological disciplines, i.e., Biblical Studies, the History of Christianity, Theology, the word method is often used to describe approaches to the subject at hand. For instance, theologians often speak of making use of a correlative method in which Christian traditions are brought into relationship with human experience. Biblical scholars speak of historical-critical or literary-critical methods to be used in the study of various texts. These kinds of methods are discussed in the two Foundation courses, Biblical Witness and the Praxis of God and The Constructive Theology of Ministry, that are offered as students begin this program. As students develop their own theological framework for their projects, they will make use of some of these methods.

The Elements of a Project Proposal

At Phillips we encourage students to develop a detailed and very specific project proposal that will need very little refinement for the final project report produced after the act of ministry is completed. Both the proposal and the final project report should include the following elements:

1. **Project Definition** **3-4 pages**
   This portion includes a brief definition of the project the student wishes to undertake. Booth, Colomb and Williams, in *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses and Dissertations*, say that a description consists of a sentence like this:

   1. "I am working on the topic of X
   2. because I want to find out Y
   3. so that I can help others understand Z."[2]

   In this section, should also appear a brief description of the research model that is framing the project and the methods that will be used to collect, analyze and evaluate data.

2. **Ministry Setting** **20-25 pages**
   This section serves as a thick description of the student's present ministry and contexts (social, religious, theological, political, economic, etc.) that are related to the project questions. It should include as much data about the context as is relevant for exploring the questions raised in the project.

[2]Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb, Joseph M. Williams, "Part I: Research and Writing: From Planning to Production," in *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations* by Kate L. Turabian, 9th Edition (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2018), 6.

3. Theological Framework **20-25 pages**

This is a discussion of the theological framework that informs the project. Here, the student must show how the project and all its elements relate to the student's own theological stance. Further, in this chapter the student should draw upon the resources of Christian tradition as he or she shapes theological commitments. These resources might include particular biblical texts, movements or major figures in the history of Christianity, conversation with specific theologians. The resources that are chosen and utilized should relate directly to the concerns the student is addressing in the project. These concerns will also determine the theological questions that students should address in this chapter.

4. Other Theoretical Issues, Resources **15-20 pages**

In exploring project themes and developing the act of ministry, students will often make use of other theories, resources, or techniques from the human sciences and other cognate disciplines. If so, students should include a chapter in which these are described in some detail, including IRB issues and review.

5. Project Outline **5-10 pages**

A description of the act of ministry, as it is shaped by the research model, including who will be involved, the specific procedures for carrying out the project, and a description of the methods used to collect, analyze and evaluate data. This section might also include a timeline for carrying out and completing the act.

6. Bibliography **5-10 pages**

A bibliography of books, articles, and other resources to be used in developing the proposal and the project.

The student should include all of these parts in the proposal; however, the interests and questions of the project, as well as the student's creativity, should determine how these elements appear and are arranged.

The Project Report and Oral Presentation

Once a proposal has been approved by the student's faculty project committee and the research plan has been accepted by the Institutional Review Board, the student may enroll in DMPR 906 Project Course and begin the actual act of ministry. Throughout this period, she or he will want to keep adequate notes about what is happening during this period and continue reading and writing on themes in the project. At the conclusion of the act, the student will finish the first draft of the project report and submit it to her or his faculty project committee.

The Project Report

The Project Report should follow the general structure of the proposal with the addition of at least three items:

1. **Expansion of the Project Outline** (5th part listed above) **25-30 pages**
   At this point the student should include a detailed description of how the project was actually carried out, what actually happened, how it was actually evaluated, and the results of the evaluation.

2. **Consequent Theological Reflection** **10-12 pages**
   This is an additional section in which the student reflects theologically on the experience of planning and doing the project. Doing the project should raise new questions and provide new insights about the issue focused upon and the model and methods used in the project. Thus, this section should involve the student in a reformulation of his or her theological understanding of this issue, of the situation that gave rise to the questions which led the student to do the project, and of the student's role in that situation. This section should contain both critical and constructive material. The student should use the experience of doing the project to reflect critically upon every step taken in planning and doing the project and to construct new theological justifications for and explanations of the issue and situation focused upon in the project.

   These new theological justifications and explanations should in turn suggest new methods and models through which the issue and situation focused on in the project can be studied, evaluated and transformed. This post-project theological reflection may thus involve new reading, research, and consultation with the faculty project committee.

3. **Conclusion** **3-5 pages**
   Finally, the student should provide some concluding remarks about the project. A summary of salient points is helpful as are some remarks about implications for the student's ministry and future study.

After the first draft is completed and turned in, the student should allow for 3-4 weeks for the committee to respond. The adviser will officially notify the student about what changes are needed in the next draft and whether or not the committee has determined that the project can now be presented orally to the PTS faculty. If not, the adviser will tell the student what must be done to move forward. At this point, it is possible for the committee to determine that a project cannot be passed and that a student should leave the program.

The Oral Presentation

If the committee judges the project to be essentially complete, the adviser will begin to make arrangements with the student and the other members of the faculty project committee for the oral presentation. The DMin director will invite all full-time PTS faculty and the faculty of partner institutions to read the project report and attend the oral presentation. The DMin candidate and all members of the faculty project committee are required to attend.

During the oral presentation, which lasts approximately two hours, any faculty member may ask the DMin candidate questions about the project and project report. Toward the end of the presentation, the candidate will be asked to leave the room. The faculty members in attendance will discuss the report and come to consensus on whether to accept it, return it for revisions, or reject it. If the report is accepted, the candidate is approved for graduation. If the report is returned for revisions, the candidate must revise it with the help of the adviser and reader, who may require another oral presentation. A candidate is allowed a maximum of two oral presentations. If the report is not accepted in two presentations, the candidate will be dismissed from the program.

The oral presentation must be satisfactorily completed **by February 28th of the academic year** if the student wishes to graduate in May of that year

Instructions for Submission of Final Copies of Project Report

The following are format and submission requirements for the final version of the DMin project report, two copies of which will be archived in the Phillips Theological Seminary library.

What You Need to Know to Format Your DMin Project

Because of the complexity of the DMin project, and the fact that it will be bound, its formatting follows some *different guidelines* from Phillips class papers. The Phillips Style Guide is still helpful in some respects, but many significant differences supersede conventions of the Style Guide.

Style Sources That Are Required:

- **Turabian Manual for Writers, 9th edition**
  - You will want to purchase a copy of this. The 9th edition is a must since the Internet citation style is different from previous editions.
- **Chicago Manual of Style**
  - You can access this from the library website. Turabian draws from it: http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/home.html.
- **SBL Handbook of Style, 2nd edition.**
  - If you plan on continuing in biblical scholarship you will want to own a copy of this one, too.

A note (warning) about MS Word:

- If you will be using MS Word you will need to create the document by using the sections approach. This is the only way to control the required variable pagination. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TaEk_8I6vuY does a good job of showing how to do that.
- Double-sided printing is allowed…though some word processing software can handle double-sided printing with variable margin gutters, to my knowledge MS Word cannot.

Typeface

- Typeface is Times New Roman only, not any other cool typeface.
- 12-point always for the text, 10 pt. always for the footnotes. Bolding and italics are reserved for the labeling of chapter sub-sections only.
- Typeface color is always black, not any other color.

Margins

- General margins are 1.5 inches on the ***left*** (to make room for the binding), and 1 inch for the other three edges of the pages… except for the first pages of sections. More on that below in "Section Margins" and "Chapter Margins."
- Section margins are different. A section is any new component – a chapter, a bibliography, a preface, an appendix – that requires the using of sectioning in Word. Top margins are different on the first page of most sections: 2 inches from the top. See the specific discussions on the various sections below for details.

Page Numbers

- Page numbers are handled differently from class papers. They are placed either at the bottom center of pages .5 inch up, or in the upper right .5 inch from the top edge of the page, and flush with the right margin (1 inch in).
- The project uses both Roman and Arabic numerals.
- But, *there will be no page number at all* on the approval page, the title page, the blank page that follows it – in other words, on all pages *before* the contents page.
- Numbering that occurs before the first page of the actual body of the thesis is done in *lower-case Roman numerals*, and is always centered at the bottom of the page one inch up, no matter how many pages are in that section.
- The very first page that gets a number at all is the contents page.
- If you have an introduction, that will be the first page that has an *Arabic* numeral on it. If you do not use an introduction, the first Arabic numeral will appear on the first page of chapter one.
- This brings us to another rule that applies only to the Arabic number sections: the first page number of any new chapter or section (like a new appendix or the bibliography) will have its page number at the bottom center of that page, .5 inch up from the edge of the page. *All the following page numbers of the chapter/section will be in the* ***upper right****.*
- The bottom-center/upper-right rule continues through the thesis, even throughout all the back matter.

The Order of Things

Here is a master list of the sections that can appear in the project, in the order that they be placed:

- Approval page
- Title page
- Copyright page
- Dedication page (optional)

- Epigraph page (optional)
- Table of Contents
- List of Figures (optional)
- List of Tables (optional)
- List of Illustrations (optional)
- Preface (optional)
- Acknowledgements (optional)
- List of Abbreviations (optional)
- Glossary (optional, optional positioning)
- Abstract
- Body of Text (not optional (☺)
- Illustrations (optional)
- Appendixes (optional)
- Glossary (optional, optional positioning)
- Bibliography
- Library Release

Front Matter

The "front matter" refers to the stuff on the list above that goes before the body of the text.

- **Approval page:** has no page number; not even counted in pagination; see Appendix III of this document for a template of this page. (Please note: "Turabian" refers to this page as the submission page);

- **Title page:** no page number is shown; counted invisibly as page i; see Appendix III for a template of this page;

- **Copyright page:** though no page number is shown it is still counted as page ii. The copyright info is positioned at the bottom of the page, immediately above the bottom margin, flush left in two lines.Type:

    a. Copyright © 201? by Your Name
    b. All rights reserved

- **Dedication page (optional):** no page number is shown; counted as page iii if you use one; use a *3-inch top margin* for this page;

- **Epigraph page (optional):** no page number; its page number is contingent on whether or not there is a dedication page; use a *3-inch top margin* for this page;

- **Contents page (it is *not* called "Table of Contents" in the project):** this is the first page that *displays* a page number. As with all front-matter pages, that number will be a lower-case Roman numeral. Label the first page CONTENTS at the top of the page in all caps, *one* inch down from the top. If your contents table goes on for more than one page, the following pages will continue to have their numbers showing at the bottom center .5 in. up.

- **Lists of figures, tables or illustrations (optional):** number all of these pages with small roman numerals in continuation from previous pages;

- **Preface or Acknowledgements (optional):** number all pages with small roman numerals;

- **List of Abbreviations (optional):** number all pages with small roman numerals.

- **Glossary** (optional): number all pages with small roman numerals;

- **Abstract:** the heading is in all caps: ABSTRACT. Number with small roman numerals. See Abstract guide included in Appendix III. An abstract should be 100 words long. The purpose is to give potential readers a clear and quick understanding of the project's contents, not a thorough exposition of them.

The Text

The Body of Text comes next. Sometimes students have an Introduction, and sometimes they start off right away with CHAPTER ONE. Whichever you choose to do, this page will be the first to bear an Arabic page number. The first page is numbered at the bottom center, .5 inch up, and the subsequent pages of CHAPTER ONE show their page numbers on the upper right, one inch in and .5 inch down from the top edge of the page. Controlling this is why using sections is essential.

Each new chapter follows this page number positioning rule: first bottom center, next upper right.

- **Chapters and headings:** The chapter heading as well as the chapter title are both in all caps, and **not** bolded. (Bolding is reserved for labeling subsections - Thank you, Turabian.)

  There is a *double* double-space between the chapter title and the first line of text.

  Example:

CHAPTER FIVE

SEPARATION AND INDEPENDENCE

- **Footnotes:** Footnotes as opposed to end notes are used. Footnotes are indented 5 points in on the first line. Let the footnote wrap around, single-spaced, if it is long. The only double spacing that happens is between separate footnotes.

  How to cite Internet footnotes is handled excellently in the Turabian 9th edition and the PTS Style Guide 2018. (*Toss* that Turabian 8th and earlier. It will feel really good.)
- **Subheadings:** Oftentimes folks want to divide chapters into sub-parts. Turabian 9 has a set of rules addressing what kind of model of typeface to use.

  a. 1st level down after the chapter name: Bold, centered, headline-style capitalization: Antioch Controversy
  b. 2nd level down: Unbolded, centered, headline-style capitalization – The Episcopal Church
  c. 3rd level down: Flush to the left, italicized, headline-style capitalization – *Emotional Intelligence Measures.*

Back Matter

The back matter is what the appendixes, Informed Consent form, bibliography, and the library permission page are called. They continue the Arabic numbering system where the first page number is at the bottom, and subsequent ones are at the upper left.

- **Illustrations (optional):** If you have all your illustrations in one spot in the back instead if distributed throughout, they are first after the body of the text. If not, the appendix is first. They continue the Arabic numeral system (if your last text page is 77, then the appendix page number is 78), and the bottom center-upper right rule kicks in again.

- **Appendix/es (optional):** follow next, or behind the body of text if you do not group your illustrations at the end. Though optional they are very common in projects since this is where you include surveys and gathered data. They continue the Arabic numeral system (if your last text page is 77, then the appendix page number is 78), and the bottom center-upper right rule kicks in again.

  Often you will want to include prints or photocopies of pages in your appendix that are already numbered. Retain that pagination but continue your overall project pagination as well. (Yes, this happens.)

- **Informed Consent**: If you use one, the blank form will be included as one of your appendixes. Here is the link to the Informed Consent form: http://ptstulsa.edu/userPDFs/Sample%20Form%20for%20Informed%20Consent.pdf that is used for parties used in your data gathering.

- **Bibliography**: The bibliography is sorted by author's last name. In the unusual case that you have a very long and complicated bibliography you can organize the bibliography by format or another practical scheme. The bottom center-upper right pagination rule applies. Please consult Turabian 9 or the PTS Style Guide 2018 for excellent bibliography details.

- **Library Permission Page:** The Library Permission page, http://ptstulsa.edu/LibraryStudents, like the approval page, is neither counted nor numbered, and not mentioned in the contents. It is only needed for the two library copies. This page is also available at the Phillips Library website and the DMin "Moodle" site.

Submission of Final Copies

- **Clearance for Graduation**: After the DMin director and the Dean have given their final approvals the library director will check the formatting in preparation for binding. Send the director an electronic copy to start the checking process. It is very common to have several back and forth sessions for this final editing stage!

- **Binding**: The librarian will send off copies to be bound. Once the final version of the project is approved candidates must submit two copies on *archival quality*, 25% to 100% cotton bond or acid free document paper to the library at least two weeks before graduation. You can generally get archival paper at box office stores such as Staples or Office Depot. It is advisable to call first since you may be looking to acquire hefty amounts of paper. Include 6 blank pages of the same paper for each copy of the project to be used in binding

  * Students should not print final copies until their adviser, reader and DMin.

director and the library director have signed off completely and all style and form matters have been approved.

Two copies of your thesis will be placed in the library collection. You can bind any number of copies above those two for your own use. Every year the binding price varies – In 2018 it is $13.75 per copy.

- **RIM and the Abstract**: Students should also fill out online a "Research in Ministry Submission" form. To do this, go to: https://www2.atla.com/products/rim/Rimonlineform.html (see also http://rim.atla.com/scripts/starfinder.exe/0); fill out the form and paste your abstract in the space provided. (Again, students should not do this until the project report has been approved in final form.)

Appendix 1: Bibliography of Useful Resources

Resources for Practical Theology

Anderson, Ray S. *The Shape of Practical Theology: Empowering Ministry with Theological Praxis.* Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 2001.

Bevans, Stephen. *Models of Contextual Theology,* revised and expanded edition. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2002.

Browning, Don S*. A Fundamental Practical Theology: Descriptive and Strategic Proposals,* rev. ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.

Harris, James H. *Practical Theology: A Black-Church Perspective.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.

Killen, Patricia O'Connell, and John de Beer. *The Art of Theological Reflection.* New York: Crossroad, 1994.

Kinast, Robert L. *Let Ministry Teach: A Guide to Theological Reflection.* Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996.

_______. *Making Faith-Sense: Theological Reflection in Everyday Life.* Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999.

Neuger, Christie Conrad, ed. *The Arts of Ministry: Feminist-Womanist Approaches.* Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1996.

Stone, Howard, and James Duke. *How to Think Theologically.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.

Volf, Miroslav and Dorothy C. Bass, ed. *Practicing Theology: Beliefs and Practices in Christian Life.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2001.

Whitehead, James D., and Evelyn Eaton Whitehead. *Method in Ministry: Theological Reflection and Christian Ministry,* rev. ed. Kansas City: Sheed and Ward, 1995.

Wood, Charles M. and Ellen Blue. *Attentive to God: Thinking Theologically in Ministry.* Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2008.

Resources for Social-Scientific Research and Congregation Studies

Ammerman, Nancy T., Jackson W. Carroll, Carl S. Dudley, and William McKinney. *Studying Congregations: A New Handbook*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998.

Cohglan, David and Teresa Brannick. *Doing Action Research in Your Own Organization*. 3rd Edition. Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 2010.

Creswell, John W. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches*. 2nd Edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2007.

___________. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 3rd Edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2009.

Herr, Kathryn and Gary L. Anderson. *The Action Research Dissertation: A Guide for Students and Faculty*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2005.

Moschella, Mary Clark. *Ethnography as a Pastoral Practice: An Introduction*. Cleveland: The Pilgrim Press, 2008.

Myers, William R. *Research in Ministry: A Primer for the Doctor of Ministry Program*. 3rd Edition. Chicago: Exploration Press of Chicago Theological Seminary, 2000.

Savage, Carl and William Presnell. *Narrative Research in Ministry: A Postmodern Research Approach for Faith Communities.* Louisville: Wayne E. Oates Institute, 2008.

Stringer, Ernest T. *Action Research. 3rd Edition*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 2007.

Resources for Research and Writing in the Phillips Library
(Call numbers follow citation)

Abbott, Andrew Delano. *Digital Paper: A Manual for Research and Writing with Library and Internet Materials*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014. 808.02 Ab26d 2014.

Badke, William B. *Research Strategies: Finding Your Way Through the Information Fog,* 5th edition. New York: IUniverse, Inc. 020.72 B1428r 2014.

With his concise, understandable, witty manner, librarian William Badke shows you that research doesn't have to be painful. You'll learn the skills that are essential to the success of any research project so that you can take control of the research process and make it work for you. *Research Strategies* is as friendly as a puppy, as

informative as your friend's diary, and as helpful as a personal valet. Don't go to a library without it!

Barreto, Eric D. *Writing Theologically*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015. 808.0662 W9398 2015.

Bolker, Joan. *Writing Your Dissertation in Fifteen Minutes a Day: A Guide to Starting, Revising and Finishing Your Doctoral Thesis*. New York: Henry Holt, 1998. 808.066378 B6383w 1998.

Booth, Wayne C., Gregory G. Colomb, Joseph M. Williams. *The Craft of Research, 4th edition.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016. 001.42 B64459 2016.

Since 1995, more than 150,000 students and researchers have turned to *The Craft of Research* for clear and helpful guidance on how to conduct research and report it effectively. Now, master teachers Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams present a completely revised and updated version of their classic handbook.

Collins, Billie Jean. *SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd edition. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014. 808.027 Sb41 2014.

Garner, Bryan A. *The Chicago Guide to Grammar, Usage, and Punctuation*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2016. 428.2 G1863c 2016.

Graff, Gerald. *They Say I Say*: *the moves that matter in academic writing*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2007. 808.042 G758 2007.

Writing well means mastering some key rhetorical moves, the most important of which involves summarizing what others have said ("they say") to set up one's own argument ("I say"). In addition to explaining the basic moves, this book provides writing templates that show students explicitly how to make these moves in their own writing.

Huck, Geoffery J. *What Is Good Writing?* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015. 808 H865w, 2015.

Mann, Thomas. *Oxford Guide to Library Research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015. 025.524 M3158o 2015.

Mauch, James. *Guide to the Successful Thesis and Dissertation: A Handbook for Students and Faculty.* New York: M. Dekker, 2003. 808.02 M441g 2003.

This guide for graduate students and their supervising university faculty provides practical advice for writing and supervising the thesis or dissertation. The guide is based on input from interviews with more than 100 supervising faculty members as well as other sources.

Miller, Casey and Kate Swift. *The Handbook of Nonsexist Writing: An Indispensable Guide for Overcoming Gender Bias in Language with Clarity and Sensitivity.* Lincoln, NE: IUniverse.com, Inc., 2001. 428.2 M6127 2001.

Using hundreds of examples, mostly from published sources, the authors illustrate what certain words are saying to us on a subliminal level. Solutions are supplied that range from word substitutions to suggestions for rewriting.

Roach, Jonathan C. *Expressing Theology: A Guide to Writing Theology That Readers Want to Read*. Eugene: Cascade, 2015. 808 R53e 2015.

Sensing, Tim. Qualitative Research: A Multi-Methods Approach to Projects for Doctor of Ministry Theses. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2011. 207.32 S4785q 2011.

Silvia, Paul J. *How to Write a Lot*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 2007. 808.042 Si399h 2007.

In this practical, light-hearted, and encouraging book, Paul Silvia explains that writing productively does not require innate skills or special traits but specific tactics and actions. Drawing examples from his own field of psychology, he shows readers how to overcome motivational roadblocks and become prolific without sacrificing evenings, weekends, and vacations.

Strunk, William, and E. B. White. *The Elements of Style*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1999. 808.042 St898e 2000.

A classic work which is intended for use in English courses in which the practice of composition is combined with the study of literature. It aims to give in brief space the principal requirements of plain English style.

Turabian, Kate L. *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations: Chicago Style for Students and Researchers, 9th edition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018. 808.066378 T84m 2018.

Vyhmeister, Nancy J. *Your Guide to Writing Quality Research Papers: For Students of Religion and Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House 3rd edition, 2014. 200.72 V991q 2014.

This much-needed resource takes theology students from start to finish in writing a quality term paper, thesis, or dissertation. Step by step, here is the guidance you need to: Select a topic and narrow it down to a workable area of research;

Effectively use library and computer resources; Write clear, relevant notes; Organize your thoughts; Format the paper, including footnotes and bibliography; Present specific research such as surveys and case studies; Use statistics, tables, and graphs.

Yaghjian, Lucretia B. *Writing Theology Well 2nd edition*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2015. 808 Y108w 2015.

In its creative integration of the disciplines of writing, rhetoric, and theology, *Writing Theology Well* provides a standard text for theological educators engaged in the teaching and mentoring of writing across the theological curriculum. As a theological rhetoric, it will also encourage excellence in theological writing in the public domain by helping to equip students for their wider vocations as writers, preachers, and communicators in a variety of ministerial and professional contexts.

Zerubavel, Eviatar. *The Clockwork Muse: A Practical Guide to Writing Theses, Dissertations, and Books*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999. 808.02 Z55C 1999.

Appendix II: Common Grammatical and Stylistic Issues

The following are fourteen commandments regarding various grammatical and stylistic issues:

- Thou shalt **avoid sentence fragments**, i.e., sentences without a subject or verb, unless there is a significant stylistic reason to use one—for emphasis or in quotation.

- Thou shalt **not split infinitives**; in other words, do not insert an adverb between the "to" and the verb of an infinitive. Example: He wants to really preach that sermon (a no-no). Better: He really wants to preach that sermon.

- Thou shalt **watch carefully for spelling and grammatical slip-ups**. Spell-check programs often do not contain theological or ministerial vocabulary and are programmed to correct to whatever vocabulary is in their data banks (hence "pericope" becomes "periscope"). They are also not able to read your mind with regard to homonyms, synonyms, or other word choices you intended to make.

- Thou shalt **use inclusive language**, especially when referring to humans. The PTS policy is in your handbook.

- Thou shalt make sure that **all subjects, including pronouns, and verbs agree in number** when referring to the same person, thing, or place. This task of making sure that everything agrees often requires extra trouble— so be it. Example: If the student does not like to study New Testament exegesis, they will enroll in an easier elective (a no-no). Better: If the student does not like to study New Testament exegesis, he or she will enroll in an easier elective. To avoid exclusive language or redundancy, you might also employ a "he" throughout one paragraph and then a "she" in the next paragraph, as long as your reader is clear about the person to whom you are referring.

- Thou shalt **try desperately not to end a sentence with a preposition**. Even though students are often taught that doing so is accepted English usage, it is still quite awkward stylistically.

- Thou shalt **learn to use commas correctly**. Generally speaking, they are used less now than they were 50 years ago, but the doctoral student really needs to master the rules. See Turabian, 21.2[4]

- Thou shalt **avoid the passive voice**, using it only when absolutely necessary to convey your meaning. The use of the word "I" to refer to the author of a paper or book has now passed into common usage and I urge you to use it when referring to yourself rather than resorting to some awkward circumlocution to avoid saying "I think/believe/write," etc. Example: It is thought by some that ministers are lazy. Better: This author argues that ministers are lazy. Best: I argue that ministers are lazy.

- Thou shalt **use dashes and hyphens correctly**. See Turabian, 21.7

- Thou shalt **use adverbs to modify the verb and adjectives to modify the nouns** of any given sentence.

- Thou shalt **avoid "feeling" language to express thoughts, beliefs, opinions, ideas, or concepts.** Example: I feel like process theology offers a good foundation for understanding the relationship between science and religious belief (a no-no). Better: I am suggesting that process theology offers a good foundation . . .

- Thou shalt **notice that inanimate objects, ideas or places cannot <u>do</u> or <u>say</u> things**. Books cannot speak (the most common of these kind of errors); ideas cannot have opinions or teach anything; places cannot go anywhere. (Note this one well because this really bugs me and you will get very tired of my marking it on your papers .)

- Thou shalt **be aware that the word "theology," except when it appears at the beginning of a sentence, is not capitalized.** Forms of theology are also not capitalized, i.e., process theology, liberation theology, feminist theology. However, theologies denoted by a person's name or by a racial/ethnic group are capitalized, i.e., African-American theology, Wesleyan theology, Calvinist theology.

- Thou **shalt use the "Notes-Bibliography Style,"** described in the 9th edition of Turabian's manual, in all citations and bibliographies of written work at Phillips.

---

[4]Kate L. Turabian, *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*, 9th ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2018).

Appendix III: Style Guides

The following pages consist of style guides for formatting the front matter of the final project report. These are not merely suggestions! They are requirements.

TITLE IN ALL CAPITAL LETTERS

DOUBLE-SPACED, LINES APPROPRIATELY BROKEN,

CENTERED BETWEEN MARGINS

2" top margin
1" bottom margin
1 ½ "left margin
1" right margin

by

Your Name

Adjust line spaces to be equal above
and below name

A Project Report

Submitted to the Faculty

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

Doctor of Ministry

Date to be at the 1" bottom margin.
Double space above to add institution
and location.

Phillips Theological Seminary

Tulsa, Oklahoma

May 2008

TITLE IN ALL CAPITAL LETTERS

DOUBLE-SPACED, LINES APPROPRIATELY BROKEN,

CENTERED BETWEEN MARGINS

2" top margin
2" bottom margin
1 ½ "left margin
1" right margin

The signature lines should run from the center within the left and right margins to the right margin (41/2 inches from the left edge of the paper).

APPROVED:

____
Adviser

____
Reader

____
Director of Doctor of Ministry Program

____
Dean

ABSTRACT

TITLE OF PAPER IN SAME FORM AS ON

TITLE PAGE

by

Your Full Legal Name

Phillips Theological Seminary

Adviser: Professor A; Reader: Professor B

The project evolved from the question: “How can a middle class congregation deal with very difficult and controversial issues concerning world hunger and poverty?” The hypothesis was that through the creation of “para-ecclesial” groups that were able to deal with the root causes of world hunger and poverty, its members would be able to work toward new alternatives concerning the problem. The model was a modified Shared Christian Praxis approach. The hypothesis was proven correct. With the creation of the “para-ecclesial” group, its members were able to discover new alternatives for themselves and their group.

(The abstract itself should be no more than 100 words to meet RIM guidelines.)

Appendix IV: Policy for Institutional Review Board

Rationale: Two values govern this policy:

1. the extension of human knowledge that will benefit individuals, churches, societies, and indeed all creation; and,

2. the ethical and theological requirement that God's compassion, respect, and justice for all participants is demonstrated in research conducted under the auspices of Phillips Theological Seminary.

The faculty of Phillips seeks to create a reasonable balance between these two values and to minimize risk for participants and researchers in all cases. Further, we seek to provide adequate protection, responsibility, and mutual accountability for all persons involved in terms of gathering, evaluating and publishing data. For these reasons an Institutional Review Board (IRB; detailed below) has been formed to guide the seminary's efforts to provide this protection and accountability.

Phillips follows the definitions and guidelines of the Common Rule of eighteen federal agencies for research with human participants.[5] The Common Rule defines research with human participants as "a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge."[6] Furthermore, a "human subject" (or participant) refers to "a living individual about whom an investigator (whether professional or student) conducting research obtains

1. Data through intervention or interaction with the individual, or

2. Identifiable private information."[7]

---

[5]United States Department of Health and Human Services, "Title 45: Public Welfare; Part 46: Protection of Human Subjects," 2005, http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/documents/OHRPRegulations.pdf (accessed October 20, 2009).

[6]Health and Human Services, "Title 45 Part 46," §102. d.

[7]Health and Human Services, "Title 45 Part 46," §102. f.

The National Science Foundation (NSF) makes the following clarification:

This includes activities, which are intended to lead to published results, or for example, findings presented at a professional meeting. Classroom exercises, involving interactions with human participants, which are part of an educational program, and are not designed to advance generalizable knowledge, are not covered by this regulation. Similarly, evaluations for quality improvement or assessment of instruction are not considered research so long as they are not designed to create generalizable knowledge.[8]

In some research no risk or minimal risk is involved. In the Common Rule, "*minimal risk* means that the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research are not greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests."[9] Faculty members and students who conduct research which they believe entails no risk or minimal risk to human participants should consult with the chairperson of the IRB to determine whether or not a research plan should be submitted for approval.

Finally, the Common Rule exempts from this policy research activity in which the only involvement of human participants falls in several categories including "research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:

> (i) Information obtained is recorded in such manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; *and* (emphasis added)
>
> (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation."[10]

This point is particularly relevant for those conducting historical research with persons still living.[11]

---

[8]National Science Foundation, "Frequently Asked Questions and Vignettes: Interpreting the Common Rule for the Protection of Human Subjects for Behavioral and Social Science Research" http://www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/hsfaqs.jsp p.13 (accessed March 3, 2009).

[9]Health and Human Services, "Title 45 Part 46," §102.i.

[10]Health and Human Services, "Title 45 Part 46," §101.b.2.

[11]See Linda Shopes, "Human Subjects and IRB Review: Oral History, Human Subjects and Institutional Review Boards," www.oralhistory.org/do-oral-history/oral-history-and-irb-review/ (accessed October 15, 2009).

All students and faculty of Phillips who conduct research with human participants are required to demonstrate that they have adequately considered the following issues:

1. all methods and procedures to be employed are safe and involve no undue risk to life, health, safety, or well-being of participants;

2. any risks to participants, which must be delineated in the form for informed consent, are clearly outweighed by potential benefits to them and to other pastors, care-givers, churches, and societies;

3. methods and procedures reflect respect for the dignity and privacy of participants and avoid unwarranted invasion of privacy or disregard for anonymity;

4. participants are informed in writing of the study's objectives, methods, risks, and issues related to data collection, storage, and disposal, and give in writing informed consent about their participation in the study;

5. if minors or other vulnerable participants are included in the research, they are given opportunity to make informed assent, but that consent in writing will be obtained from the appropriate care-givers;

6. data collected is used only for the purposes for which consent is obtained and then appropriately reported, stored, and/or destroyed.

These will be the criteria by which all plans for research with human participants submitted to the Institutional Review Board (IRB; described below) will be assessed.

Institutional Review Board (IRB): This board shall consist of three faculty members appointed by the dean for three-year terms. One of these faculty members shall be designated chairperson by the dean. It shall meet as necessary during the fall and spring semesters. All decisions made by the IRB will be recorded in the minutes of its meetings and kept on file in the office of the dean. The IRB can approve, disapprove or require revisions in the plan before approval is granted. A written copy of the research plan and action by the IRB shall be kept in the student or faculty member's permanent file. (For students this file is located in the registrar's office; for faculty members this file is located in the dean's office.)

Procedure: Faculty members conducting research with human participants should submit a written research plan to the PTS IRB before beginning the research.

Students conducting research for a Masters thesis or a Doctor of Ministry project must submit a written research request for review and approval to the IRB before beginning the actual research. At least two months, during the fall and spring semesters, should be allowed for the review and response of the IRB. No research plans will be accepted during the summer term. Students working on a Doctor of Ministry project should submit the research plan when the formal project proposal is near completion. They should submit the written plan to their adviser and reader for review before sending it to the IRB.

All researchers must submit four copies of their research plan to the IRB and allow two months for the committee to review and make a decision about the plan. They should include copies of all tests, questionnaires, inventories, consent/assent forms and letters to participants (See attached form).

Please Note: No participants may be approached, for pilot work or for the main study, until the researcher is informed in writing that the proposed research plan has been approved. Significant changes must also be cleared through the Institutional Review Board. Each item must be completed or identified as non-applicable.

An **expedited review** of the research plan of faculty members in need of timely response between scheduled meetings of the IRB may be conducted by a member of the IRB. All decisions in this case will also be recorded in the minutes of the following meeting of the IRB.

Policy for Inquiries into Unethical Conduct on the part of the Researcher
(Please note: this portion of the policy is currently under review by the institution in order that it and all such policies may be current and harmonious as far as possible [NCP, 1/4/10].)

Phillips Theological Seminary (PTS) is committed to fostering and maintaining an environment of rigorous education and preparation of men and women for ministry. This commitment includes an obligation to review all accusations of unethical conduct in the research activities of its students and faculty. If an individual in a supervisory capacity (i.e., an adviser or reader of a Masters thesis or a Doctor of Ministry project) has direct knowledge of an incident of unethical conduct on the part of a member of the PTS community, that supervisor is responsible for bringing the matter to the attention of the dean. If grounds for action exist, the supervisor may serve as complainant in such a matter and pursue whatever procedure is deemed appropriate.

The term “Unethical Conduct” when used in this document shall mean knowingly misrepresenting data, research procedures, or data analysis; plagiarism and other improprieties of authorship; violation of federal, state or institutional rules on research involving human participants; or other practices that seriously deviate from those commonly accepted within the scientific (or other relevant) community for proposing, conducting, or reporting research. Honest errors or honest differences in interpretation or judgments of data do not constitute unethical conduct.

Grievance Procedure for Unethical Conduct

The Grievance Procedure for Unethical Conduct provides an equitable mechanism to implement the Research with Human Participants Policy of Phillips Theological Seminary. The procedure seeks to provide confidentiality and a fair process for all parties involved. Together, the Policy and the Grievance Procedure help PTS create and maintain the highest standards of professional conduct and academic integrity.

The grievance committee has primary responsibility for interpretation of the PTS Research with Human Participants Policy, for the evaluation of complaints brought under it, and for making recommendations regarding such complaints to the seminary president. The grievance committee will not accept complaints it deems capricious or principally vindictive. Except in unusual circumstances, it will not pursue a case while the dispute is pending in another forum such as with another educational institution, a church judicatory, or through civil or criminal proceedings. Review of a complaint by the grievance committee should not be regarded as substitute for legal action.

Composition of the Grievance Committee

The grievance committee will be appointed by and report directly to the PTS president. If the seminary president is named in the grievance, another vice president will fill the role of president as described within this document and only for the purposes of the investigation. The committee will be representative of the diversity and variety of roles within the seminary community. It will be chaired by the chairperson of the IRB who will act as chief investigating officer. The rest of the committee will be comprised of representatives of the following groups or settings:

1. Masters students, or
2. Doctor of Ministry students,
3. Faculty Senate and
4. when appropriate, ministry site at which the research occurred.

The grievance committee membership will include at least two males and two females. No person who has been accused in the complaint will participate in the investigation or resolution of the complaint. If the chairperson of the IRB or the designated representative from any group is the accused, or otherwise is recused, he or she will be replaced by an appointment from the PTS president. (Again, if the president is named in the complaint, another vice president will appoint an appropriate replacement.)

A representative of each of the groups will be chosen by voluntary appointment when a complaint is made and deemed by the chairperson of the IRB as justifiable for review.

Complaint Procedure

1. The complainant should verbally present the complaint to the chairperson of the IRB or to the complainant's designated representative as promptly as possible after the alleged misconduct occurs. If the complaint is made to the complainant's representative, the representative should refer the complainant to the chairperson of the IRB or accompany the complainant to talk with the chairperson.

    A. The initial discussion between the complainant and the chairperson of the IRB will remain confidential, with no written record.
    B. Only in accordance with legal requirements or the PTS Research with Human Participants Policy, or in cases where any individual's personal safety is at issue or the well-being of the seminary is threatened shall information be acted upon or disclosed to others without the permission of the person making the complaint and the person against whom the complaint is made.
    C. The chairperson of the IRB has the authority to make a good faith effort to resolve the issue brought by the complainant through informal processes, at this stage. Informal resolution of the issue may occur with the consent of the complainant and the accused.
    D. If the complainant, after the initial discussion with the chairperson of the IRB or after a good faith effort on the part of the chairperson of the IRB to resolve the issue, decides to proceed with a formal complaint, the complainant is to submit a written statement. This statement should be very specific, including everything that was said and done by both parties.
    E. As soon as possible, preferably within seven (7) calendar days after receiving the written complaint, the chairperson of the IRB will inform the accused, in writing, of the allegation and of the identity of the complainant. A copy of this document will be sent to the complainant.
    F. The accused may respond to the allegation and is encouraged to do so within seven (7) calendar days after receiving notification of the complaint.
    G. The chairperson of the IRB will provide the complainant and the accused with written notification of the names of the persons serving on the grievance committee. The notice also shall state the time and place of the first meeting of the grievance committee regarding this complaint and shall be postmarked at least ten (10) days prior to the date of the hearing.
    H. The complainant and the accused may file a written objection with the chairperson of the IRB regarding the service of any grievance committee member, setting forth specific reasons for the objection. After reviewing such objection, the chair may, but need not, request the seminary president to replace any member of the grievance committee with another person.
    I. The complainant and the accused are expected to cooperate with pertinent

questions and supplying or authorizing the release of relevant information when requested. If this cooperation is denied, the chairperson of the IRB shall inform the grievance committee, providing where possible his or her understanding of the reasons for the lack of cooperation.

J. Efforts will be made to protect the complainant from retaliatory action by the person(s) named in the complaint.
    A. The accused person will be asked to refrain from any interaction with the complainant, except during official procedures regarding the complaint.
    B. The accused person will also be asked to keep the complaint private and to ask anyone with whom s/he shares this information to also keep it private and to refrain from any interaction with the complainant.
    C. Both the accused person and the complainant shall be asked to comply with any other requests or procedures the chairperson of the IRB deems appropriate to the particular situation.

2. Within no more than thirty (30) days and as soon as possible after a formal complaint has been lodged, the chairperson of the IRB will alert the grievance committee that a complaint has been filed and promptly call a meeting of the committee. Each member of the committee will receive a copy of the formal statement made by the complainant and any response made by the accused.

3. The grievance committee has two options: to dismiss or to proceed to further investigation. The grievance committee will base its decision on:
    A. The seriousness of the complaint;
    B. The degree to which the complaint alleges specific violations of the Phillips Research with Human Participants Policy;
    C. Whether the committee deems this to be a matter better handled by legal authorities.

    If the committee decides to decline consideration of the complaints, it will submit an explanation in writing to the complainant and the alleged offender. A copy of the explanation will also be sent to the president of Phillips. Dismissal of the complaint may be required by a legal process.

4. The chairperson of the IRB will gather all facts pertinent to the allegations of the complaints.
    A. The investigation will be conducted promptly and impartially.
    B. The investigation will include statement by the complainant(s), persons(s) accused, and others, as necessary.

5. The grievance committee has the following options:
    A. If the committee concludes that on the basis of the investigation insufficient evidence of unethical conduct exists to warrant any action, it may close the investigation and so notify the complainant in writing.

B. If the committee concludes on the basis of the investigation that unethical conduct has occurred, a report will be made to the president of Phillips with recommendations for further action, such as:
    a. Dismissal from the seminary
    b. Probationary period followed by further review
    c. Notice of censure placed in the perpetrator's file
    d. Counsel to the victim to file civil action

C. At the same time, the complainant and accused will each be sent a copy of the report.

D. Reasonable efforts to maintain confidentially will be made throughout the process, but total confidentially cannot be guaranteed. The grievance committee will protect the privacy of both the complainant and persons accused in every way possible during the process of the complaint and thereafter.

6. Phillips prohibits any form of retaliation against any faculty, staff, or student of Phillips filing a complaint against any other faculty, staff, or student. Any retaliatory action of any kind taken against a complainant under this procedure will be the basis for separate complaint subject to disciplinary action by the president of Phillips.

7. If the grievance committee determines that a complainant knowingly made a false complaint or knowingly provided false information regarding a complaint, the committee may decide to send a report regarding this issue to the president of Phillips for further action, such as:
    A. Dismissal from the seminary
    B. Probationary period followed by further review
    C. Notice of censure placed in the perpetrator's file
    D. Counsel to the victim to file civil action

8. One set of documents relevant to the complaint and procedures of the committee will be held in a confidential file for a period of five years. Cases concerning students will be filed in the registrar's office. Those concerning faculty or staff will be filed in the office of the corporate secretary. The registrar and corporate secretary will purge the files annually, as appropriate. All other copies of relevant documents must be shredded or otherwise destroyed.

Additional Matters

A. Cooperative Relationships: In the event that a complaint is lodged against a PTS faculty member or student by a faculty member, staff member, or student of another educational institution with which PTS has entered a formal relationship, the chairperson of the IRB will meet as soon as possible with her or his counterpart (who handles unethical conduct in research) at that institution. Further, the PTS procedures will take precedence over the institutional counterpart; a complainant's representative may be invited to sit on the grievance committee for information and process. If the invitation is declined, the complainant shall be kept informed of disposition.

B. Emergency Situations: In an emergency, where the health or well-being of a member of the PTS community or the well-being of the seminary as an institution is threatened, any individual with knowledge of the situation should promptly inform the president or a vice president of the seminary. The president, vice president or another person designated to act on the seminary's behalf, is authorized to take such steps as may be necessary and appropriate to ensure the well-being of the seminary community and the seminary.

C. Federal and State Rights: This policy is intended to supplement but not replace the rights under federal and state law of members of the seminary community to be protected from unethical conduct regarding research. Those laws have their own procedural requirements, including time limits, for filing a complaint. Proceeding under this policy may not satisfy those requirements.

D. Seminary Agent Protection: Members of the PTS community who hold formal responsibilities for the enforcement of this policy are considered, in the exercise of those responsibilities, to be acting as agents of the seminary and, accordingly, to the extent permitted by law shall be defended legally by the seminary for all such actions taken in good faith, even if mistaken.

E. Relation to Other Policies, Rules, Guidelines, Regulations or Procedures: This policy is designed to provide definitions and procedures for handling cases of unethical conduct in research procedures. If a conflict should arise between the provisions of this policy and other seminary procedures, rules, regulations, or terms or conditions of employment, the provisions of this policy shall govern and control in cases of unethical conduct in research procedures, unless those other procedures, rules, regulations, or terms or conditions of employment shall specifically provide to the contrary.

F. Amendments: The IRB may, from time to time, after consultation with appropriate faculty, staff, and student groups, propose amendments to the grievance policy and procedure.

Approved by the Faculty Senate of Phillips Theological Seminary
October 26, 2009
(Pending legal review)

Form for Research Plan
for Institutional Review Board (IRB)
Phillips Theological Seminary

Date submitted: ______________________________

Date approved:
____

Instructions: Please submit four copies of your research plan to the IRB and allow two months for the committee to review and make a decision about the plan. Include copies of all tests, questionnaires, inventories, consent/assent forms and letters to participants.

Please Note: No participants may be approached, for pilot work or for the main study, until you are informed in writing that the proposed research plan has been approved. Significant changes must also be cleared through the IRB. Each item must be completed or identified as non-applicable.

1. **General Information:**
   - **a.** Primary Investigator/Director of Project:

     ____

   - **b.** Adviser and Reader of Project (for students):

     ____

     ____

   - **c.** Degree for which Project is partial fulfillment:

     ____

   - **d.** Title of Project:

     ____

     ____

   - **e.** Funding for Project:

     ____

     ____

f. Setting(s) where Research will be Conducted:

____

____

g. Permission for research in setting(s) obtained? Yes___No________(explain:)

2. **Brief Description of Research:** (include hypothesis or research question; methodology; plans for pilot testing; sampling/selection of subjects; and method for evaluation of data – attach separate page if necessary)

3. **Credentials of Investigator and/or Plan for Student Supervision:** (Outline here or attach CV)

4. **Risk/Benefit Assessment:**
   - **a.** Will deception be involved? Yes______No_______
   - **b.** If so, what are your debriefing procedures?
   - **c.** Are participants at risk of physical, mental, or social discomfort, harm, or danger? (describe in detail)
   - **d.** What steps will be taken to minimize risk, to respect the feelings and dignity of participants, and to remedy harm?
   - **e.** How will voluntary informed consent/assent be attained (attach proposed informed consent form to this proposal)?

f. Will subjects be anonymous? Yes_____No _______

g. If so, how will participant privacy/anonymity being assured?

h. How will data confidentiality be protected?

i. Will participants be minors (under 18 years of age)? If so, how will parental consent be obtained? How will minors' assent be obtained?

5. Use of Data:

a. What are your plans to use, disseminate and share the data?

b. How will data be stored?

c. How long will data be kept until destroyed?

I have read the PTS policy on Institutional Review Board and agree to abide by it, and by the ethical research standards applicable to my field of study. I also agree to report any significant and relevant changes in the procedures or instruments to the IRB Committee for additional review.

Investigator:____________________________________Date: ________________________

Adviser (for students):___________________________Date:_________________________

Sample Form for Informed Consent

Title of Project: ____

Primary Investigator/Director of Project: ______________________________

Address: ____

Telephone:____

Email: ____

I,______________________________**(please print name)** hereby agree to participate in the above-named research project (detailed description included with this form), and to have my participation recorded and transcribed.

I understand that my participation may be reported in the written form of the project in print or online as described in the research plan.

I understand that I may stop my participation at any time, and that I may withdraw my consent at any time up to the final publication of project results by contacting the project director in writing at the email or street address listed above. If I have any questions about the project, I may write, email or phone the project director at any time.

I also understand that if I have concerns or questions about the conduct of this project I may contact the chairperson of the Institutional Review Board of PTS (the oversight committee for research with human participants).

Chairperson: ____

Contact Information:____

[Include this if you are photographing the participant]:
I do______do not________give permission for my photograph to be reproduced.

I do______do not______give permission to be contacted with any follow-up questions following my participation at (if yes, please enter phone number or email address):

____

____

Signed (participant):
____Date ____________________

Signed (interviewer):
____Date ____________________

Sample Information (to be Distributed with Informed Consent Form)

Title of Project: ____

Primary Investigator/Director of Project: ______________________________

Address: ____

Telephone:____

Email: ____

This project is being conducted in partial fulfillment of the_____degree at Phillips Theological Seminary under the auspices of Phillips Theological Seminary.

The purpose of the project is to investigate (*add your description in layperson's terms*):

The research method(s) chosen for this project is/are (*identify your methods*, *e.g., anonymous questionnaire, structured interview, case study, open-ended interview, etc*.)

This project is intended to benefit whom in the following ways by providing information about:

This project may be published how:

This project may entail the following risks:

Sample Form for Informed Consent of Governing Board of a Congregation

Title of Project: ____

Primary Investigator/Director of Project: _______________________________________

Address: ____

Telephone:____

Email: ____

______________________________ (**please print** official name of governing board of the congregation) hereby agrees that______________________________ (**please print** official name of congregation) will participate in the above named research project (detailed description included with this form), and will allow this participation to be recorded and transcribed.

We understand that our participation may be reported in the written form of the project in print or online as described in the research plan.

We understand that we may stop this participation by official action of this body at any time, and that we may withdraw consent at any time up to the final publication of project results by contacting the project director in writing at the email or street address listed above. If we have any questions about the project, we may write, email or phone the investigator/project director at any time.

We also understand that if we have concerns or questions about the conduct of this project we may contact the chairperson of the Institutional Review Board of PTS (the oversight committee for research with human participants).

Chairperson: ____

Contact Information:____

[Include this if you are photographing participants]:

We do______do not_______give permission for photographs of research activities to be reproduced.

We do______do not________give permission to be contacted with any follow-up questions following participation at (if yes, please enter phone number or email address)

____

____

Signed (chairpersons of governing board)

____Date ____________________

Signed (investigator/project director):

____Date ____________________

Sample Information for Governing Board

Title of Project: ____

Primary Investigator/Director of Project: ______________________________________

Address: ____

Telephone:____

Email: ____

This project is being conducted in partial fulfillment of the_____________degree at Phillips Theological Seminary under the auspices of Phillips Theological Seminary.

The purpose of the project is to investigate (*add your description in layperson's terms*):

The research method(s) chosen for this project is/are (*identify your methods, e.g., anonymous questionnaire, structured interview, case study, open-ended interview, etc.*)

This project is intended to benefit whom in the following ways by providing information about:

This project may be published how:

This project may entail the following risks:

If you have questions concerning the research in this project or your rights as a participant, you may consult with me as the investigator or with the chairperson of the Institutional Review Board of Phillips Theological Seminary. Currently this person is ____and may be contacted at **Phillips Theological Seminary, 901 N. Mingo, Tulsa, OK 74116, 918-610-8303.**
Email:____.

Appendix V: Rubric for DMIN Project Report Assessment
Approved by Faculty Senate, October 25, 2010

	Well Demonstrated	Demonstrated	Not Demonstrated
Contribution to ministerial praxis (theological reflection and pastoral skills), pastoral leadership, and the church's ministry and mission?	Offers a deeper and broader understanding of a specific act of ministry within a specialization, has strong application to ministerial contexts other than the one in report, contributes in an important way to understanding of church's ministry and mission	Offers an understanding of a specific act of ministry within a specialization, has some application to other ministerial contexts, contributes to understanding of church's ministry and mission	Little or no understanding of a specific act of ministry; little or no application to other ministerial contexts; doesn't contribute to understanding of church's ministry and mission
Theological Reflection	Demonstrates creative, critical and nuanced theological reflection skills based on explicitly mentioned and described sources; clearly anchors ministry issues within theological and practical context; shows awareness of complexity and ambiguity in dealing with questions of human living; relates directly to the concerns raised in the project; demonstrates integration with issues raised in project	Shows evidence of theological reflection in conversation with other sources but may have minor lapses in developing ideas; adequately anchors ministry issues within theological and practical context; acknowledges complexity and ambiguity in dealing with questions of human living; relates directly to the concerns raised in the project; demonstrates some integration with issues raised in project	Shows little or no depth of theological reflection or awareness of complexity and ambiguity; doesn't anchor ministry issues within theological and practical context; has little or no conversation with other theological sources or sources are insignificant; little or no integration with issues raised in project

Literature review	Making use extensively and appropriately of scholarly literature pertinent to the themes of the project	Demonstrates awareness of scholarly literature pertinent to the themes of the project but doesn't always use appropriately or in depth	Little awareness of broader context of problem; few sources cited
Contextual Analysis	Skillful presentation of ministerial context relevant to the project; good use of data drawn from a variety of sources to support analysis of the context	Offers a presentation of the ministerial context that is somewhat supported by data drawn from several sources	Presents ministerial context based only on one's own observation, demonstrates little awareness of differing ways of understanding context
Presentation of Data	Detailed presentation of all data gathered with careful descriptions of how they were gathered	Clear presentation of all data gathered	Presents no data, or presented in non-systematic way, over-reliance on summaries
Evaluation and Critique	Assesses data effectively, providing sufficient analysis and explanation to support assertions and convince readers	Offers reasons to support assertions; begins to interpret evidence and make connections	Offers little evidence of any kind or misreads data
Composition and Style	Confident rhetorical style and authorial voice; ability to community ideas clearly; free of spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors; effective use of style guidelines	Fairly fluid rhetorical style that communicates ideas with some clarity; some minor errors that annoy but do not impede understanding	Difficulty expressing central ideas of the project; many errors or a few large errors that block the reader's understanding and ability to see connections

Much of this document is dependent upon "Partial Assessment Grid for Doctor of Ministry Final Projects, Austin Seminary," handed out by Timothy Lincoln in a presentation at the Association for Doctors of Ministry Educators, Austin, April 2010 and is used by permission.

Appendix VI: Checklist for Completing the Project Phase

1. ____Take DMPR 904 Project Development Seminar 1, usually after 2nd Foundation course is completed.

    a. ____Submit five to seven-page trial proposal to DMin director six weeks after the completion of DMPR 904;

2. ____Enroll in first session of DMPR 905 Project Development Seminar II;

3. ____Consult with DMin director and specialization coordinator about an adviser and reader for your project.

4. ____Enroll in DMPR 902 Project Proposal Course and initiate contact with adviser and reader to arrange a meeting for discussion of project topic. At this meeting discuss with them preferred methods of contact (e.g., face-to- face, phone, or email) and expected time frames for receiving a response to questions and written materials.

5. ____Submit all drafts of your proposal to your adviser, reader, and DMin director.

6. ____Enroll in Project Proposal Course Continuation DMPR 902.01 if project proposal is not complete and passed by the end of the term.

7. ____Submit a final draft of your project proposal to your faculty project committee.

8. ____Submit a research plan to the Institutional Review Board. Allow two months for its action

9. ____After receiving a passing grade for the project proposal and approval from the Institutional Review Board, enroll in the Project Course DMPR 906.

10. ____Begin conducting your project. Consult regularly with your adviser.

11. ____Once the project has been completed, begin writing the project report. See Project Guidebook for instructions for writing the final report.

12. ____Enroll in Project Continuation Course DMPR 906.01 as needed.

13. ____Submit a first draft of the Project Report to the faculty project committee. See Timeline in Appendix VII. Be prepared to make revisions. **Those students wanting to graduate in May should submit the first complete draft including reflections by May 1st of the year prior to graduation.**

14. ____Expect to complete numerous revisions based on the comments of the committee. When the adviser, readers and DMin Director determine that the written project is nearly complete, schedule an oral presentation. **Those students wanting to graduate in May must complete their oral presentation by February 28th**.

15. ____Present project orally, usually during the month of February.

16. ____Submit final project with revisions suggested at oral presentation to adviser and DMin director. **Those students wanting to graduate in May must submit the final draft by March 15th prior to ordering cap and gown.**

17. ____If your oral presentation and project report pass, make proper application for graduation with the seminary registrar's office. Check with student accounts to make sure all tuition graduation, diploma and other fees have been paid.

18. ____After receiving the revised draft from the adviser and DMin director, make all final corrections and submit required material for final review to person designated by DMin director.

19. ____Two weeks before graduation, submit a final, camera-ready draft of the Project Report, Approval Page, Abstract, signed RIM Submission Form, signed Copyright Approval Form, and library invoice to the library director. A student will not be able to participate in graduation ceremonies or receive a diploma until these items have been submitted.

20. ____Celebrate!!!!!!

DMin Project Timeline

During Specialization Phase

DMin Director assigns an adviser and reader. Every effort will be made to approve the student's request.

Student begins to meet with adviser and continues to write and develop proposal through coursework and research, keeping careful notes about the development of the project.

After the End of Specialization Coursework

Submit written **Project Proposal** to adviser. When the adviser thinks the proposal is satisfactorily completed, the student submits project proposal to the reader, concentration coordinator, and DMin Director for review.

Proposal will be approximately 75-100 pages including: see **Project Guidebook p. 20-21**

IRB Committee reviews project. This must be done before approval to pass to project phase.

The four-member committee will suggest revisions and consult with the adviser who will decide when to pass to project status (from proposal status). After proposal is passed, expect to spend approximately one year finishing action research, analyzing findings, writing and revising the results before turning in your completed project thesis report. Candidacy year begins when proposal is passed by the committee to project phase.

Each proposal will include a timeline with specific dates for submission deadlines and feedback targets. Depending on the advisor's and student's schedules drafts and feedback may be scheduled earlier than the following timeline for the final year.

Candidacy year: (expect to turn in approximately 3 drafts, making revisions after each)

Written draft of **Project Report** should be turned in to advisor no later than July 1st

Advisor should get feedback to student no later than August 15th

Student turns in second draft to advisor and DMin director no later than September 15th

Advisor should get feedback to student no later than October 15th

Final draft of Project Report should be turned in to advisor, reader, and DMin director no later than November 15th

Full committee reads **Final Draft** and makes comments by December 15th

Advisor should get feedback to student by December 15th

Semester before graduation:

If revisions need to be made in the final draft before the oral presentation is set, those revisions are due back from the student to the adviser by January 15th.

Adviser, Reader, Con Coordinator, and Director approve project for oral presentation – by February 1st.

Adviser, Reader, and DMin Director consult with student to schedule the oral presentation to be held prior to February 28th.

Before March 15th -- complete application for graduation and order cap and gown.

Two weeks prior to graduation – complete format corrections and preparation for binding.

Candidacy Year

Student turns in draft of project:	**Advisor responds with comments:**
July 1st	August 15th
September 15th	October 15th
November 15th	December 15th
January 15th	February 1 – approval for oral to be set

Appendix VIII: Self-Assessment Questions

These questions may help students and advisers evaluate and improve the project.

Assessment Questions for Project Proposal:

(See pages 20-21 for the elements of the proposal)

1. Project Definition

Can your audience understand what it is you hope to learn and why?
Have you introduced a brief overview of how you will conduct the act of ministry and what methods you will use to collect, analyze, and evaluate information?

2. Ministry Setting

Will your audience have a complex, deep understanding of this setting? Have you painted a rich portrait of the people and systems within this setting including history, burning issues, and hopes? Have you drawn multiple connections explaining how the dynamics within the setting give rise to how you imagined this act of ministry?

3. Theological Framework

Will your audience have a strong grasp of your own theological stance?
Did you draw a strong connection between resources of the Christian tradition and your own concerns?

Will your audience understand how your project connects with the broader conversation of theological reflection?

4. Other Theoretical Issues, Resources

What other theories or techniques provide the basis for this act of ministry and learning?
What additional areas of study contributed to your ability to complete this project?

5. Project Outline

Is your description detailed enough that someone could replicate your project?

Would they have additional questions about how you decided who would be involved or what steps you would take?

Did you include a proposed timeline for the project and how you would analyze and evaluate your discoveries?

6. Bibliography

Have you left out resources that informed the project in any way?

Assessment Questions for the Project Report:

(See pages 22-23 for the general structure of the report)

1. Expansion of the Project Outline

Can your audience understand how you conducted the act of ministry in detail? Did you include a detailed description of what actually happened during this act of ministry? Can your audience understand how you evaluated this act of ministry as you did?

2. Consequent Theological Reflection

What new theological questions and insights developed as you did this act of ministry? Did you state critical reflections about each step in your planning and implementation process?
What new theological explanations resulted? How has your theology changed because of the project?

3. Conclusion

How would you tell someone about the important highlights of your project in a brief summary?

Will your audience be able to outline salient points including why and how you did this act of ministry?

What single sentence can you craft to most effectively convey what you learned and how your learned it? Can your audience find that sentence in a prominent place in the conclusion?

Appendix IX: DMIN Forum

During the final day of each fortnight course all students, faculty, and concentration coordinators will be encouraged to attend a forum from 2:00-5:00 p.m. Each teacher who has taught during that fortnight will share highlights of the class including ways the course contributed to the overall concentration. Students will share reflections on how the course connected with their DMin process and projects. The afternoon will include time for each concentration coordinator to meet with students in that track. The goal of the forum is to improve communication within and among each concentration track.

Typical Outline for the DMin Forum

2:00-3:00 Reports from faculty teaching in that fortnight about course goals, highlights, and connection with DMin concentration track goals.

3:00-4:00 Reports from each student about course highlights, overall DMin program, and development of progress toward a project.

4:00-5:00 Meeting of each concentration group with their coordinator.