

ACTS Doctor of Ministry in Preaching

PROGRAM MANUAL

2023 – 2025 Cycle

Years 1, 2, & 3

Classes of 2024 & 2025



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary of the Program	page 4
Program Structure	page 4
Program Output	page 5
Learning Outcomes	page 6
Writing Standards	page 7
Plagiarism	page 7
Navigating the Program	page 9
Program Schools	page 10
Setting	page 10
Program Administration	page 11
Participants in the Program	page 13
Students	page 13
Advisors	page 13
Instructors	page 14
Parish Project Group	page 15
Timeline of Program Year	page 16
Schedule for 2023-2024 Program Year	page 19
Elements of the Program	page 21
Summer Residency Classes	page 21
The Preaching Ministry Project	page 23
The Learning Covenant	page 25
The Sermons	page 26
The Reflection Paper	page 29
The Integrative Paper	page 31
The Thesis Proposal	page 34
Candidacy	page 36
The Thesis	page 36
Parish Project Group (PPG)	page 41
The Peer Evaluator	page 44
Policy for Engaging Human Subjects	page 45
Evaluation of Student Progress	page 47
Program Years 1 and 2	page 47
Program Year 3	page 49
Completion of the Program	page 50

Appendices

A. Learning Covenant	page 51
B. Sermon Purpose Statement	page 53
C. Thesis Proposal Form	page 54
D. Parish Project Group (PPG) Response Form	page 56
E. Parish Project Group (PPG) Final Response Form	page 57
F. Sermon/Preaching Rubrics	page 58
G. Reflection Paper Rubrics	page 59
H. Integrative Paper Rubrics	page 60
I. Evaluation of the Integrative Paper and Program Year	page 61
J. Oral Exam Rubric	page 63
K. Student Evaluation Form	page 66
L. Course Evaluation Form	page 68
M. Human Subjects Research Checklist	page 69
N. Human Subjects Research Consent Form	page 72

SUMMARY OF THE PROGRAM

The *ACTS Doctor of Ministry (D.Min) in Preaching program* offers a unique learning experience for preachers of the gospel. Pastors and other preachers are taught to use their preaching skills to accomplish a specific task or enhance a particular area of ministry through a defined Preaching Ministry Project. This three-year program combines a learning component that is accomplished during each year's Summer Residency and the practice of learned skills that is appropriate to each preacher's individual preaching context. The Summer Residency brings preachers together from a variety of cultures, countries, and contexts of ministry to develop their proficiency as preachers, as well as to contribute to the growth of their fellow students' preaching skills. During this concentrated period of study, students work collaboratively with professors, advisors and peers, through courses, lectures and discussion to identify specific Learning Goals that are appropriate to their selected areas of homiletical engagement. The tools they gain during the Summer Residency are used to accomplish specific preaching goals for the year.

The 2023 Summer Residency will facilitate classes that permit students to be present in person and virtually at the same time. Microsoft Teams will be used for virtual participation.

Program Structure

The length of the program is three years, with a Summer Residency each year. The structure is the same for each year of study, as follows:

- Week 1 – Core week: Students in the same program year study together and are instructed in a pre-specified area of preaching.
- Week 2 – Elective week: Students select a course of study that offers instruction in particular sermonic styles or homiletical focus. Each class is a mix of students from different program years.
- Week 3 – Colloquy week: Students re-gather by program year to synthesize the learning gained in weeks 1 and 2, and develop academic skills for research and writing. A key area of instruction involves research methodologies that pertain to the practical implementation of the preaching projects. Students complete the definition of Learning Goals and develop the Learning Covenant that outlines the project plans to meet the stated goals in the year ahead. Students in years 2 and 3 also work on developing the draft or final Thesis Proposal as appropriate.

During the Summer Residency, time is also set aside for students to consult with their advisor, with whom they will work closely throughout the program.

After each Summer Residency, students are required to demonstrate their learning by developing and preaching sermons based on the specific homiletical instructions received, and to produce written reports that offer reflections on the experiences of study and practice.

Following the first year's Summer Residency, students are required to complete a process related to the research ethics that will undergird their engagement of human subjects in the research undertaken during the development of their program project. This process must be completed and approved by the seminary through which they entered the program.

Over the three years, students preach eight designated **sermons** based on classes taken during the residencies. For each sermon the student must prepare a **Reflection Paper** that reports on the experience of study, preaching, and their engagement with the Parish Project Group that supports and collaborates on the work done at the ministry site. The final document for Years 1 and 2 is an **Integrative Paper** that provides a comprehensive report on the learning, research, practice and methodology followed in completing the year's work. A **Thesis**, the culminating document of both Year 3 and the program, provides a comprehensive picture of the student's work throughout the program, the context, plan, and process whereby the project was carried out, and includes the results that were accomplished through the program and notes the significance of the project. A successful defense of the thesis is required, as evidence of the conclusion of the program.

The dates for the Summer Residency from 2022 to 2025 are:

- June 5 – June 23, 2023
- June 3 – June 21, 2024

Program Output

PREACHING MINISTRY PROJECT: During the Residency, students plan and design the Preaching Ministry Project with a Colloquy leader, advisor and peers. Each year's project represents a step on the way to the final project goal. After Residency, the student works in collaboration with members of their ministry context to implement the project. The Preaching Ministry Project requires students to preach and reflect on sermons that are related to their regular ministry context and demonstrate learnings from residency courses.

LEARNING COVENANT: This document is the main written output of the Summer Residency. It describes the goals developed, including the contents of the sermons to be preached, the activities to be accomplished and the process to be followed in carrying out the project at the ministry site in order to meet the requirements of the Preaching Ministry Project successfully.

SERMONS: Students preach a total of eight designated sermons over the three years – 3 sermons in Years 1 and 2, and 2 sermons in Year 3. The learning gained in coursework is expected to influence and help shape all sermons preached following Summer Residency. These sermons are time markers that demonstrate the substance of that learning in the shape, contents and delivery of each sermon. These sermons are videotaped for evaluation by partners in the program – Parish Project Group, advisor, professor, student peer.

REFLECTION PAPER: This report reflects the preacher's ability to look back and discern the elements of the course material that have influenced the development, contents and delivery of the sermon. It brings together the course work studied during the Summer Residency and the practices engaged in the performance of the sermon preached. It includes the process followed in ensuring that the goals and plans specified in the Learning Covenant were met, the results achieved, and the learning gained.

INTEGRATIVE PAPER: Prepared at the end of the first and second years of the program, the Integrative Paper is a compilation of all the learning gained in the year from both the Summer Residency and through performance of preaching in the ministry site. This academic paper describes the progress of the student with respect to the increase of knowledge homiletically, its use in preaching contextually, the impact on the ministry context, the reflection on the

performance, the evaluation of results and the overall advancement of the Preaching Ministry Project.

THESIS PROPOSAL: Starting with the first draft created during Colloquy 2, the Thesis Proposal is the beginning point for the creation of final program documentation – the thesis. It suggests the anticipated contents of the thesis based on the project that the student develops throughout the three years of coursework and preaching in their ministry context. The original draft is modified and updated between the second and third years and is one of the final documents of the third-year summer residency. In its final form, the thesis proposal will delineate the structure and identify the expected contents of the thesis.

THESIS: This is a cumulative academic paper that delineates the project as applied to the ministry context and which also contributes to the understanding and practice of preaching and its impact on wider ministry contexts. It reports on the methodology and process engaged by the student in the development of the thesis through the years of the program, and analyzes the results obtained from the implementation of the project. The thesis as the culminating document describes the significance of the student's work for the individual preacher, for the church, and for the field of homiletics in general.

Learning Outcomes

There are specific Learning Outcomes of the program that are determined for each student at different points in the program and by means of specific criteria and rubrics. The individual rubrics appropriate to the points of application and the learning outcomes (Appendices F – J) are:

- Sermon/Preaching:
 - *Demonstrate competency in creating sermons and in preaching that is relevant to their faith community and program focus.*
- Personal Reflection Paper:
 - *Demonstrate the ability to engage in self-analysis and critical reflection and to report with academic rigor on the homiletical theory learned and the practice engaged in light of the learning goals and project plan.*
- Integrative Paper:
 - *Integrate and reflect critically on homiletical theory learned and experienced through coursework and in the implementation of project plans to accomplish stated learning and project goals.*
- Oral Exam – Six Learning Outcomes are used to evaluate the thesis defense:
 1. *Preach out of an articulated theology of proclamation.*
 2. *Assess the strengths and weaknesses of one's own style of preaching.*
 3. *Collaborate with members of the ministry site in an ongoing process of reflecting on one's preaching.*
 4. *Demonstrate an acquaintance with leading authors in homiletics.*
 5. *Demonstrate an ability to think critically.*
 6. *Demonstrate an ability to think theologically.*

Writing Standards

The writing style of all documents created for the program should be commensurate with the quality and level of academic writing expected for doctoral work. The form or genre of all writing should be formally structured in a manner consistent with that required in the creation of formal doctoral papers and must be grammatically accurate and free of spelling and syntax errors and colloquial language. Quoted material should be properly cited with footnotes and include appropriate headings and formatted paragraphs, whether from textual or online sources.

When in doubt, students may choose to have their formal written work – the Reflection Papers, the Integrative Papers and the Thesis formally edited before submission. Students are encouraged to check with their seminary for available resources such as writing courses or a writing center.

Additional and expanded directives on academic writing related to the development of the thesis are contained in the Thesis section of this manual.

Inclusive language should be used for God and human beings. Students may consult “*APA Guidelines for Non-Sexist Use of Language*” for specific directions at the following address: www.apaonline.org/nonsexist

The form outlined in **Kate L. Turabian, *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations***, is the recommended resource for developing scholarly documents. Since updates are made consistently to this resource, it is recommended that students consult the most current version.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the intentional or accidental use of someone else’s words or ideas without proper acknowledgment. When intentional, such plagiarism amounts to stealing the work of others and is essentially a work of fraud. Accidental use is caused by inattention or carelessness in the preparation of one’s own work. Plagiarism can be avoided simply by acknowledging that certain material has been borrowed and providing your audience with the information necessary to find that information by citing sources. The following actions are considered plagiarism and apply equally to print and online sources:

- turning in someone else’s work as your own
- copying words or ideas from someone else without giving credit
- failing to put a quotation in quotation marks
- giving incorrect information about the source of a quotation
- changing words but copying the sentence structure of a source without giving credit
- copying so many words or ideas from a source that it makes up the majority of your work, whether you give credit or not.

While presenting as new and original one’s own material previously written and submitted is technically a form of plagiarism, there is an expectation of the progressive development of a larger work built into the structure of the ACTS DMin in Preaching program. Specifically, the outputs developed during the course of this degree program are intended to build upon previous work, therefore, reuse in subsequent and larger work is both expected and permitted. In such cases, no

more than 10% of the original should appear in the new work. In addition, it is important to identify the original, whether your own thought or that of others, that was previously incorporated into your original writing. At all times, the student must acknowledge the original source and context with appropriate citations.

Students must adhere to the Plagiarism policy of their school in addition to the requirements of the ACTS DMin in Preaching program. Students are encouraged to complete a tutorial on the subject of plagiarism if one is available through their seminary.

The Program's Response to Plagiarism

If a student is found to have committed plagiarism in any assignment, whether by a course instructor or advisor, the Dean of the program must be notified and they will initiate a conference with the student, the student's advisor and the instructor if appropriate. Since each participant in the program is a student of a specific seminary and must also meet the Plagiarism standards for their seminary, the Academic Dean of their seminary will also be notified. On the basis of the conference, the student will be informed in writing of the decision made regarding their continuation in the program and an accounting of procedure including the minutes of the conference and the resulting decision will be placed in the student's file. The Academic Dean of the student's seminary will also be provided a copy of those materials.

Since movement through the program requires successful completion of each output, the student may be given the opportunity to revise and re-submit the work. However, a student *may* be dismissed on a first case, depending on the substance and the severity of the act of plagiarism.

A student *will* be dismissed automatically from the program on a second instance of documented plagiarism and the student's seminary will be informed of the dismissal and the reason. The Dean of the program will document the cause for the student's automatic dismissal from the degree program.

In each case, the Academic Dean of the student's seminary will be informed of the situation and the subsequent decision in writing by the Dean of the program.

Avoiding Plagiarism

1. Always cite the source of anything created by someone else
Put quotation marks around word-for-word quotations and include a footnote/citation in your paper. Even if you summarize another writer's ideas in your own words, make sure you cite where the original idea came from. This includes photos, diagrams, charts, and other visuals.
2. Take careful research notes
Take screen shots, photocopy source information, or use highlighters to color-code your notes to the appropriate source. Especially if you copy and paste information from an online source, use a different font or color to code the material to the original source. Be sure to keep your own ideas separate from those you find in your research sources.
3. Distinguish your voice
The majority of a paper should be your original writing that demonstrates your understanding of a topic. Distinguish your voice from those of your research sources by

- making clear which are others' ideas, and which are yours. When you do this, you stay in control of the writing.
4. Use direct quotations effectively
Use direct quotations sparingly, but strategically. Introduce each quotation, integrate it into your writing, and comment, analyze, or expand on it—keeping your voice primary.
 5. Read research material more than once
Read the original source more than once, if necessary, to make sure you understand it fully and will not misrepresent the author's ideas in your own writing.
 6. Learn to paraphrase well
An effective paraphrase shows that you've read and understood the source material and can express the ideas without "borrowing" the author's language, structure, or expressions. Always write in your own words what you understand the source to be saying.
 7. Double-check your citations and bibliography
Make sure that all the sources in your footnotes appear in your bibliography (or reference list) and vice versa. Check all citations for completeness and accuracy.

This material on Plagiarism is adapted from the Plagiarism Policy of Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary contained in their student handbook.

Navigating the Program

The program is designed to be completed by each student over a three-year period and it is recommended that the program should be completed over a period of six years. Exceptions to this timeline may be made by the Dean of the program. Over the course of the program, there are several actions that are connected with navigating and completing the program successfully. These actions are advancement, extension, leave of absence, and dismissal.

ADVANCEMENT: Movement from year to year is determined through successful completion of all assignments and signified by receiving credit through the Integrative Paper Rubric. During the program year, the student must complete each assignment successfully before being permitted to continue to the next assignment for the program year. If a student is required to correct or repeat an assignment, a revised date for the next assignment may be negotiated with the student's adviser and course instructor. The Integrative Paper, as the final assignment for the first and second program years, must be completed successfully in order to receive credit for the year. Only upon successful completion of all assignments for the year will the student be advanced to the next program year.

EXTENSION: In the case of a sermon or a reflection paper, since the work is graded independently by the course instructor and the advisor, there may be differing responses, in that one party may approve the work while another requires modification. In that case the student should respond to the party who required the modification without recourse to the other party. In extreme cases where there are major issues of disagreement, the Dean shall be contacted. The Dean is responsible to interact with all parties involved as appropriate to resolve the issue.

When the Integrative Paper is not considered credit worthy, the student may be granted an extension and given the opportunity to modify and resubmit the final paper for credit. The student may also be assigned remedial work during the period of the extension. If the period extends beyond the end of the program year, the student will be required to pay an extension fee to the

program to cover the cost of the advisor. This fee is separate and distinct from any fees charged by the student's seminary for such an extension. Once the remedial work is completed successfully, the student is awarded credit and is permitted to move to the next program year. If the remedial work does not meet the stated requirements, the student may be permitted to repeat the program year. In such a case the student must pay the cost of a full year's tuition to their seminary but is not required to pay an additional extension fee. Under normal conditions, a student has only one opportunity to repeat a program year.

In the case of the thesis, if the student has not completed the final thesis within the time required for an oral defense in that year, the student may request or be recommended to extend the time to complete the thesis. In either case, the student may be given an extension by the adviser without penalty. When that occurs, the student is required to pay an additional fee to the program to cover the cost of the advisor.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: A student may request a Leave of Absence (LOA) when circumstances impact the student's ability to do the required work for the year. LOA is given for one year at a time and a student must request LOA for each year that the student is out of the program. Such a request may be made at any point in the program and is submitted to the dean and the student's advisor.

DISMISSAL: If a student does not complete the program year successfully after two or three attempts, the student may be dismissed from the program. The number of opportunities given to the student to correct failing work is determined by the student's advisor. The student may also be dismissed for plagiarism as described in that section of this manual. The advisor may recommend and initiate the action of dismissal, which is finalized by the Dean of the program. Both the advisor and the Dean must ensure that all steps are taken to facilitate the student's success, and that appropriate documentation is provided and filed that are evidentiary of the steps taken that resulted in the dismissal. The determination of dismissal must be communicated to the student's seminary since the final action of dismissal is the purview of the seminary.

Program Schools

There are six schools that are part of the ACTS D.Min. in Preaching program – Bexley-Seabury Theological Seminary, Chicago Theological Seminary, Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary, Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, McCormick Theological Seminary, and North Park Theological Seminary. These schools are all members of the Association of Chicago Theological Schools, known commonly as **ACTS**.

Setting

The 2023 and 2024 Summer Residencies are being held on the campus of Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary in Evanston, Illinois, located on the north shore of Lake Michigan and in the heart of the Northwestern University campus. Northwestern University is one of the world's leading research institutions and includes Kellogg School of Management and the Music Institute of Chicago. Evanston is also home to Rotary International.

In 2021, Evanston became the first city in the United States to pay reparations to African American residents (or their descendants) who were considered subjects of housing discrimination between 1919 and 1969. The city of Evanston, approximately 12 miles north of downtown Chicago, is

connected to the region by roads, walking paths, biking paths and lanes, and multiple modes of public transportation.

Program Administration

The program is administered by a **Dean**, a **Program Coordinator** and a **Program Committee** comprised of representatives of each of the ACTS schools that participate in the D.Min. in Preaching program.

The **Dean** is the chief administrator and is responsible for selecting the faculty and for designing and carrying out the summer residency program. The Dean is also called to address and resolve issues with the program, the faculty and students.

The **Program Coordinator** keeps the program going on a day-to-day basis and works directly with the Dean to ensure the full and successful functioning of the program. The Program Coordinator is a part-time employee of the program and is the lynchpin of the program. The Program Coordinator maintains direct communication with the Dean, the students, the advisors and the faculty, receives the applicants who have been accepted by the schools, handles registration for classes, maintains the program website and ensures that it is updated on a timely basis, keeps track of the progress of students through the program, and is the liaison with the seminaries, providing all necessary information on the performance of students with respect to course completion. The Program Coordinator makes all necessary arrangements to ensure the smooth running of the Summer Residency and for the ongoing work of the Program Committee.

Part of the job of the **Program Office** is to assist with the development and cultivation of constructive working relationships between students, advisors, and teaching faculty. To facilitate this, students are requested to:

- ❖ Submit all work to the Program Office via email when it is submitted to the advisor, professor, or peer evaluator.
- ❖ Contact the Program Office if an advisor, professor or peer evaluator has not responded according to the timeline. Students should *first* contact the advisor or professor *directly* before notifying the Program Office.

Contact information for the Program Office

ACTS D.Min. in Preaching
2121 Sheridan Rd
Evanston, IL 60201
Phone: (847) 866-3916
Email: actsdmin@garrett.edu

When advisors and instructors respond to students regarding their review and evaluation of the work submitted, they will also send their response to the Program Office.

Names, addresses and phone numbers of students, advisors and instructors may be found on the appropriate lists and syllabi. A Directory with contact information is distributed before the end of the Summer Residency.

The **Program Committee** provides oversight of the program on behalf of the schools in the program. As a body they approve the budget and the teaching faculty, and present the applicants approved by their schools for acceptance into the program.

PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROGRAM

The major participants in the program are the students who have enrolled through the ACTS program school of their choice. Through the ACTS Doctor of Ministry in Preaching program students embark on a journey towards a very practical degree that influences, impacts and advances their knowledge and their ministry of preaching for the sake of the particular ministry context in which they are located. In addition, a cadre of persons join the students in teaching and learning, in developing and evaluating the projects that connect the student's preaching ministry with the life and function of the ministry area. These persons function as instructors, advisors, peer colleagues and supporters of the student, the ministry context and the program.

Students

Students come from a plethora of social, ecclesial and national contexts, and support one another through a communal understanding of their journey of learning. The students who enter together in a particular class form a cohort of support for their peers.

Students in the program will:

- ◆ Take the initiative. Students are responsible for their own progress in the program.
- ◆ Know and follow the program's expectations for content and format as outlined in the Program Manual.
- ◆ Complete written work within the timeline designated in the Program Manual.
- ◆ Participate in the work of their peers through engagement and interaction in and beyond classes.
- ◆ Serve as peer evaluator of the third sermon of one of their seminary colleagues in Year 1 and Year 2.
- ◆ Initiate and maintain regular contact with the advisor. This includes ensuring that discussions between the student and advisor are understood clearly.
- ◆ Contact the advisor, course instructor or peer, and the Program Office directly prior to the required date if any deadlines need to be rescheduled.
- ◆ Communicate directly and proactively with the advisor and Program Office if there is a concern that will impede timely progress.

Advisors

The advisor is an essential part of the D.Min. in Preaching program and the role of advisor is both a privilege and a challenge. Throughout the three years of the program, the advisor serves as coach, mentor, teacher, and guide to their students. As the direct link with the seminary, the advisor has a unique opportunity to experience the entire transformative process, share in the student's personal faith journey and witness the impact of the project in the student's congregation. The advisor is the most consistent source of long-term support and academic assessment. The advisor assigns the credit for Years 1 and 2 and oversees the defense of the thesis.

In special circumstances that may be warranted by the material submitted, the advisor may be in touch with a course instructor directly to clarify course requirements.

Advisors are expected to:

- ◆ Meet with their students once each week of the Summer Residency.
- ◆ Be responsive to student inquiries and respond to emails and written material from the students and the Program Office within the timeline designated in the Program Manual.
- ◆ Attend all scheduled meetings.
- ◆ Complete all sermon and program evaluations as required and respond to students and the Program Office within the timeline designated in the Program Manual.
- ◆ Schedule and lead the student's oral examination in defense of their thesis.

The forms related to student performance in the course of the program that must be completed by the advisor are found in Appendices F through J.

Instructors

The instructors who teach in the program are preachers and formal teachers of national and international reputation. They come from a wide range of settings and expertise as homileticians and preachers in the field.

Instructors are expected to:

- ◆ Design a syllabus for the course they teach and assign work to be done by the students prior to Residency.
- ◆ Provide comprehensive and precise instruction to the class that relates directly to the course requirements provided in the syllabus.
- ◆ Provide clear direction on the course requirements that must be demonstrated in the sermon that students preach after residency.
- ◆ Evaluate the Sermon Video and Manuscript, Reflection Paper, and PPG Response Form from each student in the class, complete the Rubrics required for the Sermon and Reflection Paper, and notify the student and the Program Coordinator of their evaluation.
- ◆ Complete the Student Evaluation form for each student and provide a final grade. The grade assigned may be credit or no credit. In some cases, students may be required to re-submit their work and that notation is made on the student evaluation form. A copy of the completed form is sent to the student and the Program Office along with all evaluative materials, within the timeline designated in the Program Manual.
- ◆ Provide direction on the contents and timeline for revisions when necessary.

The Rubrics for the Sermon and Reflection Paper are found in Appendix F and Appendix G respectively. A sample of the Student Evaluation Form is provided in Appendix K.

Parish Project Group (PPG)

The Parish Project Group is comprised of six to eight members in one's ministry context, selected to work directly with the student throughout the program. This group is central to the work of the Preaching Ministry Project and shares in both the formation and the evaluation of the sermons in light of the learning goals and the defined plan, and may also help in the process of research required for the project. The PPG also functions as the eyes and ears of the student to disseminate evaluative tools, review the responses, and to provide feedback from the wider congregation.

Students should foster healthy group dynamics that facilitate members in developing the skills needed for their work and be sufficiently secure in their preaching role to invite and accept honest evaluation and feedback from group members. The student may identify the member who will serve in the leadership role of the group and facilitate the group meetings. The student cannot serve as chair of the Parish Project Group.

The Parish Project Group is expected to:

- ◆ Work with the student to develop ideas and themes for each of the sermons that comprise the Preaching Ministry Project.
- ◆ Be present during the preaching of sermons to facilitate the evaluation of the sermon with respect to both content and performance.
- ◆ Offer constructive feedback following the delivery of the sermon to help the student learn how the sermon was heard in the student's ministry context and whether the learning goals for the sermon were realized.
- ◆ Submit written evaluations within the timeline designated in the Program Manual.
- ◆ During the thesis phase, be available for consultation and serve as a sounding board and provide feedback to the student as appropriate.

The full description, work and responsibilities of the Parish Project Group is detailed later in this Program Manual.

Instructions for training the PPG are contained in a PowerPoint resource that is provided to students for their use.

TIMELINE OF THE PROGRAM YEAR

The ACTS Doctor of Ministry program consists of three years of study from entrance into the program to the receiving of the degree. Class work is completed in three Summer Residencies and students complete their practical work in their ministry setting during the years in-between. The period of the Summer Residency for 2023 is **June 5 - 23**. The Summer Residency for the following year is **June 3 – 21, 2024**.

In April, current students receive the syllabi for their Core and Colloquy class and the Elective registration materials. Registrations for the elective classes are processed as space is available in the class of choice. Newly admitted students receive the materials for their classes as soon as their materials are received from their seminary's Admissions Office.

The monthly timeline of activities during the program year starting with the Summer Residency is as follows. Unless stated otherwise the activities are performed by the students.

◆ **JUNE**

- Summer Residency Classes
 - Welcome and orientation of students to the 2023 Summer Residency
 - Core, Elective and Colloquy classes
 - Opening and Closing Worship
 - Recognition of Candidacy of 3rd Year students

◆ **JULY/AUGUST**

- Adviser and Colloquy instructor approve Learning Covenant and Thesis Proposal as appropriate.
- Approved Learning Covenant and Thesis Proposal are sent to the Program Office by the advisor and the Colloquy instructor.
- Student convenes Parish Project Group to review residency learning and review the *Learning Covenant* for the Preaching Ministry Project.

◆ **SEPTEMBER/OCTOBER**

- Initiate Sermon Formation Meeting with PPG, develop and preach sermon #1 based on *Core Course* and the goals set out in the Learning Covenant.
- Evaluate preached sermon with PPG; prepare required materials to be sent to advisor and *Core* instructor.
- Submit materials for sermon #1 to advisor, *Core* instructor, and Program Office electronically. Materials to be submitted for all sermons are:
 - Video recording of the scripture reading and sermon (do not send the entire worship service)
 - Parish Project Group Response received from the chairperson
 - 8-10 page (double-spaced) Reflection Paper (plus Bibliography)
 - Copy of the Learning Covenant
 - Copy of the sermon manuscript
- Advisors and Core instructors return evaluation and rubrics to students and the Program Office.

◆ **OCTOBER / NOVEMBER**

- Review the feedback from sermon 1.
- Initiate Sermon Formation Meeting with PPG, develop and preach sermon #2 based on *Elective Course* and the goals set out in the Learning Covenant.
- Evaluate with PPG and prepare required materials to be sent to advisor and *Elective* instructor.
- Submit materials for sermon #2 (Sermon Video, PPG Response, 8-10 page Reflection Paper, Sermon Manuscript, Learning Covenant) to advisor, *Elective* instructor, and Program Office electronically.

◆ **DECEMBER**

- Review the feedback from sermon 2.
- Advisors and Elective instructors return evaluations to students and the Program Office.
- Year 3 students send first draft of Thesis to advisor.

◆ **JANUARY/FEBRUARY**

Year 1 and Year 2 Students:

- Initiate Sermon Formation Meeting with PPG, develop and preach sermon #3 based on the goals set out in the Learning Covenant.
- Evaluate with PPG and prepare required materials to be sent to advisor and peer reviewer.
- Submit materials for sermon #3 (Sermon Video, PPG Response, 8-10 page Reflection Paper, Sermon Manuscript, Learning Covenant) to advisor, peer reviewer, and the Program Office electronically.

Year 3 Students:

- Year 3 students receive the first draft of Thesis from advisors with comments for revisions.

◆ **FEBRUARY**

Year 1 and Year 2 Students:

- Review the feedback from Sermon 3.
- Advisor and peer reviewer return evaluations to student, advisor and Program Office.

Year 3 Students:

- Students make corrections suggested and send revised Thesis to advisor.
- Advisor either returns the Thesis for further corrections or schedules defense as appropriate.

◆ **MARCH**

Year 1 and Year 2 Students:

- PPG prepares the final group project evaluation in light of the experience of working with the student. See *Final PPG Response Form*, Appendix D.
- Student develops and submits the Integrative Paper along with the Final PPG Evaluation and evaluation of peer sermon to the advisor and Program Office.

Year 3 Students:

- Student defends the thesis.

◆ **APRIL**

Year 1 and Year 2 Students:

- Advisor reviews and evaluates Integrative Paper and student either receives credit for the program year or is advised on the status of the Integrative Paper, whether corrections or a total rewrite is necessary.
- Advisor sends the final evaluation of student work for the year to the Program Office with the determination of whether correctives are needed and the submission date.
- Student makes and submits revised work for evaluation and completion.

Year 3 Students:

- Advisor sends the thesis results and program rubrics to the Program Office.
- Student makes revisions to thesis as specified in the defense and submits the final corrected thesis to the adviser for approval.
- Thesis is edited per seminary requirements.
- Student sends an electronic copy of the final Thesis to the Program Office.

SCHEDULE OF THE 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 PROGRAM YEARS

June 5 – 23, 2023	2023 Summer Residency Classes
July 30, 2023	Final Approval of Learning Covenant and Thesis Proposal by Colloquy instructor and advisor
August 15, 2023	Learning Covenant finalized following review with PPG
September 10, 2023	Students Preach Sermon 1 (Core)
September 22, 2023	Sermon 1 Due to advisor, Core course instructor, and Program Office
October 13, 2023	Evaluation of Sermon 1 Due to students and Program Office
November 5, 2023	Students Preach Sermon 2 (Elective)
November 17, 2023	Sermon 2 Due to advisor, Elective course instructor, and Program Office
December 8, 2023	Evaluation of Sermon 2 Due to students and Program Office
December 15, 2023	First Draft of Thesis Due to advisor
January 7, 2024	Students Preach Sermon 3
January 12, 2024	Advisor Responds to First Draft of Thesis
January 19, 2024	Sermon 3 Due to advisor, peer reviewer, and Program Office
February 9, 2024	Evaluation of Sermon 3 Due to students and Program Office
February 16, 2024	Revised Draft of Thesis Due to advisor
March 15, 2024	Advisor Responds to Revised Draft of Thesis
March 15, 2024	Integrative Paper Due to advisor
March 29, 2024	Evaluation of Integrative Paper Due to students and Program Office
April 1, 2024	Completion of Thesis Oral Defense
April 8, 2024	Integrative Paper Extensions Due
April 8, 2024	Thesis Revisions from Oral Defense Due to advisor
April 15, 2024	Revised Integrative Paper Evaluations Due to student and Program Office
	Thesis Results and Rubrics Due to Program Office
April 30, 2024	Final Electronic Copy of Thesis Due to Program Office
June 3 – 21, 2024	2024 Summer Residency Classes
July 30, 2024	Final Approval of Learning Covenant and Thesis Proposal by Colloquy instructor and advisor
August 15, 2024	Learning Covenant finalized following review with PPG
September 8, 2024	Students Preach Sermon 1 (Core)

September 20, 2024	Sermon 1 Due to advisor, Core course instructor, and Program Office
October 11, 2024	Evaluation of Sermon 1 Due to students and Program Office
November 3, 2024	Students Preach Sermon 2 (Elective)
November 15, 2024	Sermon 2 Due to advisor, Elective course instructor, and Program Office
December 6, 2024	Evaluation of Sermon 2 Due to students and Program Office
December 15, 2024	First Draft of Thesis Due to advisor
January 20, 2025	Advisor Responds to First Draft of Thesis
February 17, 2025	Revised Draft of Thesis Due to advisor
March 17, 2025	Advisor Responds to Revised Draft of Thesis
April 1, 2025	Completion of Thesis Oral Defense
April 8, 2025	Thesis Revisions from Oral Defense Due to advisor
April 15, 2025	Thesis Results and Rubrics Due to Program Office
April 30, 2025	Final Electronic Copy of Thesis Due to Program Office

ELEMENTS OF THE PROGRAM

SUMMER RESIDENCY CLASSES

The Summer Residency is the event where instruction is provided on homiletical theories, methods, and models of preaching and homiletical practices that shape the design and development of sermons based on the context in which they are preached. Students are also given direction and access to tools that facilitate the program requirement of developing appropriate academic documentation to report on both their plans and the process of implementation. Instruction is disseminated to students through three weeks of classes that offer Core and Elective courses and Colloquy instruction. Students are required to complete the three classes offered in their program year in order to engage in the practical element of the program where they apply the learning from the classes.

Core Classes: Week 1

Core courses address fundamental dimensions of preaching, providing a framework for students to explore their individual process of developing sermons. The core courses are:

Year 1: *Preaching as Interpretation*

Year 2: *Preaching as Performance*

Year 3: *Preaching as Social Transformation*

Preaching as Interpretation

This course offers an opportunity for students to acquire new perspectives and methods for engaging interpretive strategies for preaching that are appropriate to the present global reality, both in terms of the biblical text and the community. The course content is also aimed at sharpening their practice of interpretation in dialogue with recent critical thought.

Preaching as Performance

This class seeks to strip-away learned habits which impede the preacher's fullest expressive abilities. Students focus on self-awareness, becoming intentional about the ways they use body and voice to greatest effect for proclamation that involves full embodiment of the preacher in service to both the text and the preaching context.

Preaching as Social Transformation

In a culture marked by the ills of oppression and injustice, this class focuses on the necessity of the proclamation to address the call to justice and the requirement of preaching to offer a transformative word. This class explores deeply the way proclamation does things actively with words that can relate to and address the social realities in which the assembly is located.

Elective Classes: Week 2

Students choose an elective course from a menu of options that are provided to them at least three months prior to Summer Residency. Their selection is based on their project goals. Elective courses focus on issues that are reflective of current homiletical trends, or social issues. Many courses are offered on a two to three-year rotation. The following is a list of regular or recent offerings of electives:

- Preaching as Celebration
- The Four Pages of the Sermon
- Preaching as Apologetics
- Prophetic Preaching
- Gender, Power, and the Pulpit
- Preaching in an Age of Globalization
- Preaching and the Margins of the World
- Preaching about Old Testament Women and the MeToo Movement
- Preaching and the Problem of Evil
- Preaching to Expose Idols
- Preaching and Trauma

In 2023, the Elective classes offered are:

- Preaching as Celebration
- Preaching God's Transformative Justice

Colloquy Classes: Week 3

Colloquy I

Colloquy 1 prepares students for the work of academic research and writing that is essential to developing the various types of documentation that are outputs of the program. These include the Learning Covenant that describes the goals, intended contents and focus of the Preaching Ministry Project, the sermon manuscript, the Reflection Paper, the Integrative Paper and ultimately the Thesis. Colloquy 1 introduces research methodologies that apply to the requirements of the project. It provides instruction and guidance on the requirements of academic research and writing, specifically qualitative research methodologies for data gathering, critical analysis and reflection. It helps to guide students in appropriate methods of defining and addressing the specific goals that are supported by textual and other practical resources that serve to advance learning gained from the Core and Elective courses that are appropriate to the preaching project.

Please note, in 2023, Colloquy I and Colloquy II will be combined into one class.

Colloquy II

Students must complete the requirements for engaging human subjects in the research required for their project and submit evidence of successful completion to the Colloquy II instructors as precursor to their admission to the class. Students build on the learning in qualitative research methodology and academic writing gained in Colloquy 1 and engaged through implementation of the first *Preaching Ministry Project*. The Colloquy provides deeper exposure to research methodologies and helps to identify homiletical and other related theological sources that are foundational to the project thesis. Colloquy II seeks to continue the project formation and definition through the second Preaching Ministry Project. Specific attention is given to research methodologies and practices, to the identification and selection of literature appropriate to the preaching projects identified by students, and to protocols for academic writing. Students are guided in developing the framework for their *Thesis Proposal* in preparation for Year 3 of the program.

Please note, in 2023, Colloquy I and Colloquy II will be combined into one class.

Colloquy III

The Preaching Ministry Project for the third year is normally a continuation of the second year project and expands on the outline of the thesis proposal, shaping the contents of the thesis. Prior to Summer Residency, students are required to add appropriate details to build on the draft outline of their thesis proposals from Colloquy II and submit the revised proposal to the Colloquy III instructor. In some cases, students may choose a different focus for their Year 3 project based on developments that emerge from the previous year(s). In such cases, students must give particular attention to providing essential details to fully describe the project. Colloquy III provides specific guidance on the contents of the thesis as the culminating document of the program. Upon completion of Colloquy 3 the student attains Candidacy status.

THE PREACHING MINISTRY PROJECT

Purpose

The Preaching Ministry Project is a practical learning experience that integrates residency course work into one's ministry practice. It explores an issue or concern related to the preaching ministry that is relevant to both the student and members of the ministry context. The focus may be personal, directed to the development of the student as a preacher, or communal, directed to the development of the congregation through the preaching ministry. The project may have a different focus each year, but each should represent movement to the overall program focus that connects to the issues to be addressed in the thesis. The format of the Preaching Ministry Project fosters action and reflection on the student's preaching ministry based on the instruction received and the learning gained in the Core and Elective courses. The Preaching Ministry Project is designed by the student in collaboration with the advisor, course instructors, peers, and members of one's ministry context.

Defining the Preaching Ministry Project

In defining the project, the student must set specific goals and create a preaching plan for the sermons that are required to be preached as part of the program. These sermonic goals and the preaching plan are described in a ***Learning Covenant*** that must be approved by the colloquy instructor and the student's advisor as the final output of summer residency. Students review the Learning Covenant with members of the Parish Project Group when they return to their ministry context. Based on that discussion, changes may be made to the Learning Covenant, which must be reviewed and approved by the advisor.

Implementing the Preaching Ministry Project

Implementation of the Preaching Ministry Project occurs through the activities described in the Learning Covenant. This includes working with the PPG in the development and evaluation of the sermons; preaching the sermons that are designed to demonstrate learning from both the core and elective courses; engaging in critical and theological reflection of both the plan and process and the activities carried out in response to the plan; and developing and submitting those items that are required for the evaluation by the advisor, the instructor, or peer evaluator as required.

Although there are specific preaching events required by the program, it is expected that the learning gained in the course of the program shall be reflected in all aspects of their preaching ministry. Before each required sermon the student meets with the Parish Project Group to discuss the formation of the sermon, in light of course learning, and the defined goals. After each sermon, the student and the PPG meet to reflect on the effectiveness of the sermon in meeting the goals in

the ministry context. The PPG prepares and submits a report on their involvement with the development and evaluation of the sermon.

The student also responds to the experience of engaging their project through an eight to ten (8-10) page *Reflection Paper* addressing how the goals and concerns of the Learning Covenant and the core and/or elective course informed the sermon. This critical reflection by the student reviews both the theoretical and practical aspects of applying homiletical learnings to the area of ministry identified in the Learning Covenant. The specifics on developing the Reflection Paper are detailed in this manual.

In Years 1 and 2, the final evaluation of the Preaching Ministry project culminates in a fifteen to twenty (15-20) page *Integrative Paper* in which the student reflects critically on the total experience of implementing the Preaching Ministry Project in the ministry context. This includes the integration of material gained in the Summer Residency and other textual resources, critical and theological reflection on the material engaged and the learning gained and suggests the direction or proposed plan for the coming year's project. This is an academic paper that includes methodological aspects of implementing the project as defined and includes relevant material on the impact of the project on the preaching context, including an appropriately detailed description of the context. The specifics on creating the Integrative Paper are detailed in this manual. (A selection of outstanding papers is posted on the program website, www.actsadminpreaching.com)

In Year 3, implementation of the project goals in the ministry context concludes with the second sermon, which feed into the *Thesis*, which is the culminating document of the entire program. The *Thesis* documents all the work completed in the three years of the program and represents the culmination of the ACTS Doctor of Ministry in Preaching program for the student.

Although the student has sole responsibility for the work of the degree program, the project is impacted and influenced by the input and collaboration of all the persons and groups identified as participants in the program. These persons, the advisors, instructors, student peers and PPG members all have varying degrees of participation in the projects accomplished throughout the program. In addition to the advisor, the PPG works closely with the student on the implementation of the Preaching Ministry Project.

THE LEARNING COVENANT

Purpose

The Learning Covenant documents the plan for accomplishing the goals of the Preaching Ministry Project. It describes the goals and the process for meeting those goals within the student's ministry context. It provides the guidelines that will guide the implementation of the Preaching Ministry Project for the year and incorporates the learning gained from the Core and Elective courses for the year. It identifies the contents of the sermons to be preached during the year and connects each to specific learning goals that are based on the materials provided in the Summer Residency courses.

Developing the Learning Covenant

The development of the Learning Covenant begins at the start of the first session of the program and the format and contents are designed to define the goals and provide directives to the student for the implementation of the Preaching Ministry Project. The student develops the Learning Covenant according to the following format:

The Learning Covenant contains the following:

1. **Title** – This should be descriptive of the project or thesis being undertaken for the year. This may be the same for the three years.
2. **Learning Goals** – Provide 2 or 3 specific goals that relate directly to the development of the project and the learning gained in the Summer Residency courses. The goals should relate to the particular aspect of the issue or concern to be addressed by the project for the year and the ministry context.
3. **Homiletical Theology** – Describe your theological assumptions about the preaching task that establishes the foundation for this project. This should reflect your understanding of the divine/human relationship in preaching. Your response in Years 2 and 3 should reflect the impact of learning gained in the previous years.
4. **Preaching Context** – Provide a brief summary of the ministry context as it relates to this project and the sermons you plan to preach. Explain clearly why it is of importance to you as a preacher and to your ministry context in light of your stated goals and how the project will influence you and/or the context in a positive way. Years 2 and 3 should reflect changes that have resulted from the work undertaken in the previous year(s).
5. **Parish Project Group** – Identify the process that you hope to implement with the group for the year and your expectation of the group's collaboration and contribution beyond the basic requirements of the program, i.e., sermon preparation and feedback sessions. Provide in as much detail as possible the specific activities that will be done by the PPG in the process of developing the Preaching Ministry Project.
6. **Preaching Plan** – Provide an outline and a description of the sermonic plan that you will follow to accomplish the stated Learning Goals. The plan should be specific to the two or three required sermons but may also include other sermons that will be preached during the year that are applicable to the Preaching Ministry Project. The plan should **name** specific areas of learning from your Core and Elective courses that will be included in the design of the Core and Elective sermons respectively and in your preaching project as a whole. The student is advised to review the proposed design of the Core and Elective

sermons with the instructors of these courses before they are finalized in the Learning Covenant.

7. **Research Methods** – Describe the research methodologies that you plan to use for data gathering, validation of the project thesis, or application of learning goals.
8. **Evaluation of Project Activities** – Identify the evaluative tools you will use with both the PPG and the congregation to determine whether the preaching goals were achieved. Describe the criteria that will determine whether the learning goals were accomplished.

The form provided in **Appendix A** of this manual must be used to develop the Learning Covenant.

Authorization of the Learning Covenant

The approval of the Learning Covenant signifies the student's readiness to undertake the practical work of the project in the ministry context. The document is completed during the Colloquy session and must be signed by the student, the student's advisor and the Colloquy instructor. While the instructor's signature is required, it is the advisor's signature that signals the approval of the contents of the Learning Covenant. In reality, the Colloquy instructor is authorizing credit for the Colloquy course, therefore it is important that the signature sheet be emailed to the Program Office by July 30th following the end of Summer Residency.

Upon return to the student's ministry context, at the first meeting of the Parish Project Group, the chair of the PPG signs the Learning Covenant, signifying their knowledge of the contents and their intent to work within the parameters laid out in the Learning Covenant. If significant revisions are made to the document by the PPG, the student must review the changes with the advisor and obtain the advisor's approval before proceeding with the revised plan. In that event, a new signature page along with the final form of the *Learning Covenant* must be sent to the Program Office by August 15th.

For ease of reference, a copy of the *Learning Covenant* is included with each set of sermon review materials that are sent to the reviewers and Program Office.

THE SERMONS

Purpose

There are eight (8) sermons that each student is required to preach during the three years of the program, three in Year 1 and Year 2, and two in Year 3. These sermons relate directly to the instruction provided in the Summer Residency. The first sermon in each year is related directly to the Core class of the Summer Residency. The second sermon in each year is related directly to the Elective class of the Summer Residency. In each case, the sermon should reflect the learning gained in the particular class both generally and relative to the style and course goals provided by the course instructor. Each sermon must also reflect and respond to the goals stated in the Learning Covenant.

The third sermon in Year 1 and Year 2 provides evidence of the learning gained for the year and is developed to meet the goals outlined in the Learning Covenant.

For each sermon both the content and the delivery of the sermon are reviewed and evaluated in light of the criteria described in the Sermon Rubric. The sermons are the key output of the project and are the basis for both the Personal Reflection and the summative Integrative Paper.

Developing the Sermon

In developing the sermon, the student considers the purpose of the sermon in light of the situation of both the ministry context and the project. The goal of each sermon is connected directly to one or more of the goals stated in the Learning Covenant. One means of ensuring that the sermon is designed to connect with the project goals is to create a *Sermon Purpose Statement*.

The Sermon Purpose Statement assists the student in defining and clarifying determining factors in a particular preaching event. Every sermon, regardless of the ministry context, is developed and preached for a unique and specific purpose. This Statement reflects the dynamics of each preaching situation and consists of *three parts*:

The Situation

In the form of an introductory clause, describe the concern, issue, or need that elicits the sermon at this particular place and time.

Example: "In view of the congregation's feeling of insecurity and fear because of the violence in their community..."

The Goal

This is a statement that suggests what the preacher wants the hearers to experience, which is more than a simple hearing of the sermon. It identifies what is expected to happen through this sermon, and particularly the impact that what is preached is expected to have on the hearers, in light of the concern, issue, or need.

Example: "...I want the people to experience the assurance of God's presence and protection ..."

The Means

Using a qualifying phrase or clause, describe how or by what rhetorical means the hearers of the sermon will be led into this experience. What sermon strategy will be used to foster the expressed outcome? Upon what biblical material will the sermon be based?

Example: "...by means of biblical stories of God's care and protection and current examples of congregations that have faced and overcome similar difficulties that have resulted in strengthening their faith."

Example of a full sermon purpose statement: "In view of the congregation's feeling of insecurity and fear because of the violence in their community, I want the people to experience the assurance of God's presence and protection, by means of stories of God's care and protection both biblically and in the present that have enabled the people to face and overcome their fear in a way that resulted in strengthening their faith, through a sermon based on Philippians 4:4-9.

In addition to the biblical and contextual references, the contents of the sermon should also reflect its connection to the project focus and serve to advance the student's overall project.

A copy of the format for the Sermon Purpose Statement is provided in **Appendix B** of this manual.

Evaluation of Sermons

A formal evaluation of each sermon is completed to determine whether the sermon meets the stated requirements determined by the preaching course and in light of the learning goals and the overall project goal. The criteria for evaluation of each sermon used by the advisor and the course instructor are contained in a Sermon/Preaching Rubric that focuses on specific areas of the sermon contents and the preaching performance. The Sermon/Preaching Rubric as an evaluative tool is also used to assess one of the learning outcomes of the ACTS DMin in Preaching Program.

The Learning Outcome determined by the Sermon/Preaching rubrics is:

Develop competency in creating sermons and in preaching that is relevant to their faith community and program focus.

The five areas of assessment in the Sermon/Preaching Rubric are:

1. Understanding of the ministry context – this includes the appropriateness of the sermon in light of the social, cultural, theological and other dimensions that reflect the ministry context and influence the work of the project.
2. Learning Goals – this relates to the way in which the sermon responds to the specific goals described in the Learning Covenant.
3. Relationship to Scripture – the way in which scripture is applied and interpreted in the sermon and its relevance to the project goals and to the specific sermon goals identified in the Learning Covenant.
4. Homiletical Applicability – refers to the way in which the sermon reflects the preaching skills of both sermon development and preaching performance that were developed through the courses taken by the student during the Summer Residency.
5. Connection between Ministry Needs and the Project – reflects the way in which the needs of the ministry context in tandem with the project focus are represented in the sermon.

Sermons are reviewed by the advisor and either the course instructor or a student peer as appropriate. Review of sermons are done in tandem with Reflection Papers that are developed following the preaching of each sermon. Advisors or instructors may require that sermons be redone, either written or preached, to address specific omissions or requirements in line with the course goals or project goals described in the Learning Covenant in order for the student to receive credit for completion of the preaching assignment.

Students should maintain communication with the advisor or instructor to verify the improvements required, and keep in mind that the learning gained through their participation in the program should impact and be reflected in their preaching ministry and not only in the sermons required by the program.

The Sermon/Preaching Rubrics may be found in **Appendix G**. A copy of the rubric completed by both the advisor and the professor is given to the student along with a report of their work, and a copy is sent to the Program Office. The evaluation of the third sermon in Year 1 and Year 2 by the **peer evaluator** is based on a different set of criteria than the rubrics used by the instructors and the advisors.

THE REFLECTION PAPER

Purpose

The Reflection Paper demonstrates the student's ability for self-analysis and critical reflection. In developing the Reflection Paper, the student considers the homiletical learning gained in the summer residency courses, the homiletical practice gained through preaching the related sermon in the ministry context in light of the specific learning goals and plans set forth in the Learning Covenant. It also explores and responds to the expectations of the sermon formation, the results of the preaching event, and the evaluation and feedback of the sermon engaged with the Parish Project Group.

This paper is not simply a recounting of the step-by-step activities of the student's work with the PPG or sermons, although it may contain specific, or summary reports of activities carried out during the process of sermon development. The academic paper offers a critical reflection of both the homiletical learning and the preaching process, and includes the use of any additional resources, beyond those specific to the particular course that facilitates the engagement of the specific learning goals of the related sermon and the overall project goals.

Developing the Reflection Paper

The contents of the Reflection Paper are related directly to the sermon preached in concert with the course learning and goals described in the Learning Covenant. It contains the following elements:

- **The Preaching Context** – This is a summarized description of the ministry context, socially, culturally, geographically, denominationally, congregationally, liturgically and any other definers that are relevant to provide an appropriate understanding of the context in which the sermon was preached.
- **The Goal or Purpose of the Sermon** – This may include the formal Sermon Purpose Statement as described in the section *Developing the Sermon* as well as additional descriptive material that connects the sermon directly with the ministry context.
- **Course Learnings** – Application of the course learnings on which the sermon is based. The extent to which a particular sermon integrates learning from the Core or Elective course will depend on the sermon purpose and the expectations for sermon content and focus specified in the Learning Covenant.
- **Sermon Development Activities and Insights** – Application of readings from the summer residency course that influenced the formation, shape and delivery of the sermon. Students are required to reflect critically on the readings and their influence on the development and delivery of the sermon. The student is expected to include material that is taken directly from readings and to provide proper footnote citation for each quotation. This section

includes any additional homiletical, exegetical and hermeneutical insights or other readings in cognate fields appropriate to the project that inform the sermon or have bearing on the sermon or project as a whole. Here also, citation and critical reflection of these readings is required.

- **Critical analysis and reflection** on the sermon process, the course material, and the readings with respect to at least three of the four following categories:
 - a) reporting the thought of others
 - b) locating the thought of others within a field of inquiry – either homiletics or another practical or theological field
 - c) taking issue with the thought of others on the basis of personal knowledge or research
 - d) offering a creative synthesis of one's own thought and the thought of others
- **Bibliography:** An appropriate bibliography that demonstrates the consultation and engagement of relevant theoretical sources, including and beyond the texts used in the residency courses.
- **PPG Involvement:** Description of the role and involvement of the Parish Project Group in the sermon formation and feedback evaluation.
- **Critical Reflection:** Critical self-analysis of the student's performance in developing and preaching the sermon, in line with the project goals.

As a personal reflection, students are free to refer to themselves in the first person as well as the third person where appropriate. The paper should be approximately 8 pages long, double-spaced in 12 pt. font with one-inch margins and meet the stated standards for academic writing at the doctoral level.

Evaluation of the Reflection Paper

The following criteria are used by instructors and advisors for evaluating the Reflection Paper:

- Clarity of presentation and relevance of contents, including Sermon Purpose Statement, ministry context, and relevance of content to ministry context and learning goals
- Correlation between theoretical foundations and field research
- Capacity for critical thought, i.e., critical analysis and reflection on results based on the criteria described above in the section on ***Developing the Reflection Paper***
- Clear articulation of the goals described in the Learning Covenant
- Incorporation of course learning into the sermon
- Articulation of the response, involvement, and the contribution of the Parish Project Group
- Adherence to program procedures and formats as outlined in this manual (see *Reflection Paper, Sermon Purpose Statement, Integrative Paper, and Timelines*).

To facilitate the evaluation of the Reflection Paper, a set of rubrics is used as an evaluative tool that is also used to assess one of the learning outcomes of the ACTS DMin in Preaching Program.

The Learning Outcome determined by the Reflection Paper Rubric is:

Demonstrate the ability to engage in self-analysis and critical reflection and to report with academic rigor on the homiletical theory learned and the practice engaged in light of the learning goals and project plan.

The five areas of assessment in the Reflection Paper Rubric are:

1. Description of the Ministry Context – this should be general in its inclusion of the social, cultural, geographic and other related descriptions, but it should be more specific as it relates to congregational preaching context.
2. Relevance of Course Learnings – this refers to the way in which the sermon gives evidence of learning gained in the related course and to the specific goals described in the Learning Covenant for the sermon and for the project.
3. Critical Analysis and Synthesis of Thought – the ability to use and apply the tools and directives of critical analysis on both the plan and the role of the student in the implementation and reflection.
4. PPG Involvement – describes critically the process of engaging the members of the PPG in the formation, evaluation and feedback process of the sermon that is the focus of reflection. This may include reflection on the usefulness of evaluative tools.
5. Writing Structure, Style – evaluates the structure, form, and contents of the paper as an academic document. This evaluation focuses on grammar, spelling, word usage, use of colloquial language, presentation of material as written vs. literature.

Along with the sermons, the Reflection Papers are substantive items used for evaluation of student progress with respect to course learning and advancement of learning and project goals. Rubrics by which Reflection Papers are evaluated are provided in **Appendix H**. Advisors or instructors may require that inadequate reflection papers be rewritten. Generally, students have one opportunity to revise and submit a reflection paper, however the advisor has the freedom to determine the number of opportunities a student is given to revise and resubmit an assignment. Copies of the rubrics completed by both the advisor and the instructor are given to the student along with a report of their work, and a copy is filed in the Program Office.

The evaluation of Sermon 3 performed by a student peer in Year 1 and Year 2, provides valuable input to the student, however, the student peer cannot request a revision or resubmission of the student's work. The peer evaluator may also complete the rubrics, but this is not a formal part of a student's file.

THE INTEGRATIVE PAPER

Purpose

The Integrative Paper serves as the summative document for the Preaching Ministry Project for Year 1 and Year 2. The purpose of this paper is to communicate the student's learning from the preaching project, which has been governed by the Learning Covenant. The student is tasked to integrate theory and practice in his/her own ministry context. In the Integrative Paper, the student

provides a comprehensive description of the ministry context and describes their place in the context and in the program, as well as the elements that led them both to the program and to their specific project. The contents of the paper include a summary of the learnings from the year, critical and theological analysis of these learnings and related activities engaged in accordance with their Preaching Ministry Project in a way that reflects both their progress and their anticipated future work in the ACTS D.Min. in Preaching program.

In terms of writing style, the program expects writing that is scholarly, peer-oriented, informative, and substantive of critical reflection. The Integrative Paper is the final document evaluated by the advisor to determine whether the work meets the stated criteria for performance in the program, and whether the student should be granted credit for the year's work.

Developing the Integrative Paper

The Integrative Paper should present the gist of the project undertaken during the year, in the context of the student's ministry setting. It should present and reflect analytically on the intent or plan that was designed to meet the project goals. It should describe and analyze critically the means by which the plans were implemented, and the process and means by which the work performed was evaluated. The paper should also show the student's ability to do critical reflection from both a theological and homiletical perspective on the project designed and developed during the past year, and its ability to meet the stated goals. Samples of evaluative tools and a summary of the results of such evaluation should be included. A bibliography of textbooks consulted including those cited in the paper should be provided. The contents and structure of the paper should emphasize:

- The rationale for the project, which is the issue or concern in the preaching ministry and why it matters.
- The resources brought to bear (theory, process, research, evaluation methods etc.).
- How the preacher used those resources.
- What the preacher learned and how they reflected critically on these learnings.
- What the preacher plans to do next in light of what has been learned.
- Homiletical and other theological resources (texts) used.
- Evaluative tools employed, and interim results determined.

In order to serve its task of communicating and informing, the contents should be structured to demonstrate the student's learning and should conform to standard norms for academic, scholarly papers. The structure of the Integrative Paper is as follows:

- **Introduction and Background:** This should provide a summary of the journey to this point. This should explain briefly the rationale for beginning or continuing the program, including the related experience in ministry that led to this point of the journey. In the second year, this should reflect the changes that have impacted the journey to present.
- **Context:** A summarized description of the ministry context that relates directly to the choice of project for the year.
- **Learnings Gained:** Describe the learnings gained particularly in the area of homiletics; the sources – coursework, textbooks, research, etc., as well as the ways in which those learnings have impacted the project selected. The result of critical reflection on the work accomplished for the year should be clearly described.
- **Project Activities:** Should expound sufficiently on the work engaged during the year to

carry out the project and meet the specific goals described in the Learning Covenant. This must not be a blow-by-blow account of the sermon development but should combine and summarize the activities based on their effect in advancing the work of the year's project. This should include the description and use of evaluative tools. Avoid simply repeating the material provided in the Reflection Paper as that would constitute plagiarism.

- **Research Methods Employed:** The methodologies utilized in carrying out the project should be clearly described and the effect of such methods insofar as the result of the project work is concerned.
- **PPG Collaboration:** The engagement of the PPG and their impact on the work engaged must be clearly documented.
- **Future Plans:** Whether the student intends to continue the current project or continue in a different direction, there should be a specific outline or description of the direction the student intends to take.
- **Material Consulted:** A comprehensive bibliography of the material engaged as well as other possible sources related to the project from both a homiletical and a related theological or practical aspect should be provided. It is expected that there should be at least 10 book sources listed.

The normal length of the paper should be 15-20 pages, double-spaced, 12 pt. font with one-inch margins, with a maximum length of 25 pages, including supporting documentation. The student submits the Integrative Paper along with other concluding documents – the PPG Final Response Form to the advisor, and the Program Office.

Students should consult the latest edition of **Kate L. Turabian, *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations***, a resource for developing scholarly documents.

Evaluation of the Integrative Paper

The Integrative Paper is evaluated by the advisor, who determines whether the paper is acceptable or needs to be resubmitted. When an Integrative Paper receives the mark of “Resubmit” the student must submit the revised paper within the timeline established by the program. If the Integrative Paper is acceptable, it feeds into the overall evaluation of the student's work for the year.

The evaluation by the advisor is accomplished using a set of rubrics similar to those used for evaluating the Reflection Papers. The rubrics are based on one of the learning outcomes for the ACTS DMin in Preaching Program.

The Learning Outcome determined by the Integrative Paper Rubric is:

Integrate and reflect critically on homiletical theory learned and practice experienced through coursework and in the implementation of project plans to accomplish stated learning and project goals.

The five areas of assessment in the Integrative Paper Rubric are:

1. Description of the project theme in light of the ministry context – this provides an expansive description of the reason for selecting the project with respect to all relevant aspects of the location of the ministry context.

2. Project goals and plans – this offers as specific description as possible of the project, the goals to be met, the plans for accomplishing the goals and the assessment of the activities engaged in meeting the stated goals.
3. Homiletical Connection – this describes the relationship of the project to preaching, the use of preaching skills, and the application of homiletical learning gained from coursework and in the practical application through preaching sermons in the ministry context.
4. Research methods, critical analysis, and reflection – this is the presentation, description, use and evaluation of research tools and methodologies. It also looks at the presentation of the material in the document and its adherence to academic writing standards.
5. Parish Project Group involvement – the substance and use of the PPG, including the cohesiveness of the group in working with the student to develop the sermon, evaluate the preaching performance, provide feedback, and engage other members of the congregation.

Depending on the results of the Integrative Paper Rubric, the advisor will determine whether the paper is sufficient to assign credit to the document. If the Integrative Paper is deficient, the advisor may request corrections to be made or that the entire paper should be re-written and re-submitted within the timeframe set by the program. If the paper receives credit, the advisor performs the Final Evaluation of the student's work for the program year. Outstanding papers, nominated by advisors, are published on the program website.

The Integrative Paper Rubric may be found in **Appendix H** of this manual. A copy of the rubrics completed by the advisor is given to the student and Program Office along with the evaluation of the paper and program year (**Appendix I**) as appropriate.

THE THESIS PROPOSAL

Purpose

The Thesis Proposal is the preparatory document that outlines the proposed contents of the student's thesis. In most cases, the Thesis Proposal is based on the project that the student has been developing from the first year of the program. In some cases, a student may change to an entirely different project in Year 2, and in other, less frequent instances, a student may have a different project in each of the three years of the program. In such cases, it is important that the student describe the trajectory of their work that brought them to the point of the thesis. In all cases, the Thesis Proposal describes the contents of the theory, methodology and practices engaged in developing and completing the project as defined.

In preparation for Colloquy III, the student updates, revises and otherwise completes the draft of the Thesis Proposal and submits it to the Colloquy III instructor for review. The Year 3 Colloquy instructor reviews a detailed draft of the Thesis Proposal and provides comments to the students prior to the start of Colloquy 3, with the expectation that students will begin to make suggested modifications in order to advance the work of completing the Thesis Proposal. Students may also receive input from their PPG during this revision process.

Developing the Thesis Proposal

The following is a description of the contents of the Thesis Proposal Form. (See **Appendix C** for the format used in Colloquy II.)

The Thesis Proposal Form

- 1) Proposed Title: This is usually the same as the title that appears on the Year 3 Learning Covenant.
- 2) A reflection on your doctoral journey up to this point and how it informs this project. (250 – 500 words)
- 3) My context can be described as: (*Include the congregational, social cultural, geographic or other characteristics that are relevant to the project. The description of the context should focus on those elements that reveal why the focus of, and process for the thesis is of particular relevance to your context*). (750 – 1,000 words)
- 4) In response to my context, I have identified a particular issue, problem, growing edge, or concern as the focus of my project. The presentation of this material may be made in one of these two ways (250 – 500 words):
 - a. This may be described as follows:
 - b. This is represented in a thesis statement in terms of preaching as:
- 5) Choose one and complete it: (*The choice is based on whether the focus of the project is the preacher or the congregation.*) (a maximum of 200 words)
 - a. Given this context, this concern, and this theory, I want to accomplish _____ in my congregation:
 - b. Given this context, this concern and this theory, I want to accomplish _____ in my preaching ministry:
- 6) Describe the project plan and process and explain why you think your plan addresses your concern, growing edge, problem or issue. Your plan should identify the steps already taken, future plans, and the timeline for the completion of the thesis by the required dates. (500 – 750 words)
- 7) Identify at least five homileticians that address the focus and provide direction for the project to be described in your thesis. Critically reflect on the work of each homiletician, the reason why they are appropriate to your focus, their contribution to homiletics, and how you will integrate their work into your project. (750 – 1,000 words)
- 8) Identify a field of study that connects biblically, theologically, or practically with the homiletical project being undertaken and describe how it connects with the preaching project. Identify at least five scholars in that field that address the focus and provide direction for the project to be described in your thesis. Critically reflect on the work of each scholar, the reason why they are appropriate to your focus, their contribution to homiletics, and how you will integrate their work into your project. (500 – 750 words)
- 9) Identify the methodology and the qualitative research tools you will use to produce dependable data to help you support your evaluation of the project. This is related to the

data gathering and evaluative process and tools you will employ in order to verify the results of your project goals and thesis. (250 – 500 words)

- 10) Develop an initial bibliography identifying homiletical and cognate resources applicable to this project. (Include a minimum of twenty-five entries.)

Students will finalize the Thesis Proposal with input from the Colloquy instructor, the advisor and peers obtained during the Colloquy III class, and the final version will be approved by the Colloquy III instructor and the advisor, and used for the creation of the thesis.

Students may refer to W. Myers, *Research in Ministry*, or Tim Sensing, *Qualitative Research*, or Nancy Jean Vyhmeister, *Quality Research Papers* for information on research tools.

CANDIDACY

Purpose

Advancement to candidacy status is representative of the student's eligibility to enter the thesis process. Although the student must complete the third-year project sermons, advancement to Candidacy status denotes successful completion of the Preaching Ministry Projects for Year 1 and Year 2 and the Year 3 Summer Residency, and signals the starting point of the development of the Thesis.

The designation of candidacy status effectively transfers responsibility for the completion of the thesis process and the graduation requirements to the seminary through which the student entered the program. Students who achieve Candidacy status are recognized at the end of the Year 3 Summer Residency.

THE THESIS

Purpose

The Thesis is the summative document for the ACTS Doctor of Ministry in Preaching program. It describes the trajectory of study and practices that were engaged which resulted in the conclusions reached with respect to the impact or influence of preaching on the preacher and/or the ministry context. The thesis expounds on the particular area of preaching that was the student's focus in the program. It should demonstrate the student's capacity for critical thought in light of the work that was done through the program.

The Thesis is not intended to be simply a step-by-step report of the work done by the student in the ACTS Doctor of Ministry in Preaching program, nor simply an evaluation and report of the eight required sermons, nor a reprise of the reflections done during the program process. Instead, it is the report of both the methodological research performed and the implementation of a preaching project that was experienced with a specific goal and that was based on a stated belief or position.

It should be written in scholarly form that honors requirements for academic rigor and that is representative of post graduate research and writing. The thesis shall have a **minimum length of seventy-five (75) pages** with a maximum length as set by the student's seminary. This includes

endnotes and footnotes but is exclusive of bibliography, appendices, and other supporting documents.

The thesis must conform in form and style to the standards of the seminary to which it is submitted. Style includes the precise format for documentation (endnotes, bibliographical entries, etc.) approved by the seminary. Additional supporting documents may be appended to the thesis as appropriate.

Developing the Thesis

The program expects that the thesis will contribute to general homiletical knowledge and specifically to the body of homiletical work available to practitioners of preaching ministry. The style of the paper ought to engage those who are interested or engaged in any form of preaching ministry. The writing style should be engaging, concise, and easy-to-follow. It should demonstrate careful identification of a homiletical issue, rigorous critical engagement with the relevant literature, considered practical approach to the issue, and thorough analysis of that approach.

The contents of the thesis, written in accord with formal academic standards for such documents, shall include but is not limited to the following chapters. Please note that the titles shown are not mandated to be used in the individual thesis, but all stated contents must be recognizably present in the final thesis.

Thesis Contents and Structure

1. *The Introduction*: (4000-4500 words) Identify the issue that engendered the thesis project. Describe in detail the reason or situation that led to the homiletical issue that was investigated and the intended goal. This should include a clear thesis statement which summarizes the claim you are making and the rationale that guides your thesis with respect to the role of preaching in addressing the issue that is at the heart of the project. It should provide sufficient background of the program to allow future users of the material in the thesis to locate the work appropriately within the context of the ACTS DMin in Preaching program.
2. *Ministry Context*: (3000 – 3500 words) Describe the ministry context or contexts in which the projects engaged in this course of study that culminated in the thesis were developed. This should include any relevant historical, social, cultural, geographic, denominational, congregational, or liturgical information that can provide an appropriate understanding of the context in which the project was carried out.
3. *Homiletical Issue*: (4000 – 4800 words) This is substantially a literature review that puts the issue identified in the thesis in conversation with recognized, homiletical scholarship that provided insight into the process of addressing the issue appropriately. Engaging the homiletical scholarship includes a summary of the discussion of the issue in homiletical literature and critical reflection of the related material as it relates to the stated thesis on the issue. This should include the work of homileticians within and beyond the boundaries of professors who are part of the ACTS Doctor of Ministry in Preaching program.
4. *Expanding the Issue beyond Homiletics*: (3000 – 3500 words) Preaching occurs within the context of the church and therefore within a wider theological scope such as biblical or systematic theology, ecclesiology, Christian education, pastoral care, congregational study,

or liturgical theology as appropriate. Here also review, summary and critical reflection of scholarly literature is required and the connection of the chosen field to the homiletical issue of the thesis must be clearly articulated.

5. *Project Plan and Process*: (4000 – 4500 words) Provide a structured outline and description of the plan developed over the three years to address the issue in light of the thesis. This is intended to be a description of the implementation steps followed and the methodology used for the development of the thesis project. This is not meant to be a verbatim report of the individual activities that contain the details of each minuscule step in the process but should be reported at a more summarized level and should include the research methodology utilized, the processes engaged including sermons preached throughout the years of the program, with specific outputs arising from the project that led to the concluding results. This chapter should be representative of the methodology used in developing the thesis.
6. *Results and Evaluation*: (3000 – 4000 words) Identify with as much specificity as possible the project's impact on the preacher and/or the ministry context. This includes a report of the results of the project, including an evaluation of the extent to which the thesis about the issue was sustained or disproven. This is not simply the results of the individual sermons but may include how those interim results impacted the overall project results. Provide an assessment of the reasons for the degree of success achieved in testing the thesis or why the thesis could not be sustained. As appropriate, identify future plans including additional work required to accomplish the thesis project within the ministry context.
7. *Homiletical Significance*: (3000 – 4000 words) Describe the impact of the project on the preacher and the ministry context, and the implications of the project and the findings for future homiletical practice within and beyond the ministry context to the wider community of preachers. Identify the significance for future pastors, other church congregations and the field of homiletics in general as appropriate.
8. *Bibliography*: Contains a listing of all resources consulted in the development and completion of the projects and the thesis. It includes both texts and electronic materials and must be formatted as specified in **Kate L. Turabian, *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Thesis, and Dissertations* (latest edition)**.
9. *Appendices*: (no limit on word count) All appropriate documents referenced specifically in the document must be included and identified as appropriate to the contents of the thesis document.

Please note that the titles provided here are not the actual or required titles of the chapters of your individual thesis.

The program expects that the thesis will contribute to general homiletical knowledge and specifically to the body of homiletical work available to practitioners of preaching ministry. The style of the paper ought to engage those who are interested or engaged in any form of preaching ministry. The writing style should be engaging, concise, and easy-to-follow. It should demonstrate careful identification of a homiletical issue, rigorous critical engagement with the relevant literature, considered practical approach to the issue, and thorough analysis of that approach.

In structuring the thesis document, although all the areas named above must be recognizably present in the document and presented in the same sequence as noted, the titles used above represent the contents only and are not required to be used as the specific title of each chapter.

Additionally, as is normative for this type of document, the following pages appear prior to the content pages, in the order of appearance as shown, are expected in each thesis document:

1. *Title Page*: Appears first and must be worded as specified by the requirements of your seminary. Please consult your seminary's DMin program specifications for the specific requirements.
2. *Approval Page*: This page contains the names of the persons who served on your DMin Defense Committee. In some cases, actual signatures are required. Please consult your seminary's DMin program specifications for the specific requirements.
3. *Abstract*: In addition to the full thesis, an abstract of the material included in the thesis must be written and included with the final document submitted to the advisor. The contents and structure of the Abstract is defined below.
4. *Acknowledgements (optional)*: Here the writer may express appreciation for persons who have contributed to the work involved in the degree program.
5. *Table of Contents*: A listing of titles and page numbers for chapters, major sub-sections, and appendices appear on this page.

Writing Guidelines

The style and form of the thesis should meet the requirements of the ACTS DMin in Preaching Program and also conform to the norms of the seminary through which the student is registered. In the majority of cases, the form outlined in **Kate L. Turabian, *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Thesis, and Dissertations (latest edition)*** is appropriate and the Program recommends students use this as a resource for all writing during the program.

In lieu of specific guidelines provided by your seminary, the ACTS DMin in Preaching program offers these additional guidelines that should be followed in structuring and completing the thesis:

- It is critical that students check with their seminary regarding any requirements specific to that seminary such as the **maximum** length allowed for text and the guidelines for other materials including the abstract, endnotes, bibliography, and supporting material such as appendices and bibliography that are included in addition to the text, and the format and contents of the title page and all additional pre-text pages. Follow the style designated by your seminary.
- Inclusive language should be used for God and human beings. You may consult "**APA Guidelines for Non-Sexist Use of Language**" through www.apaonline.org/nonsexist for specific directions.
- If your thesis will be bound by your seminary, please leave a 1 ½ inch margin on the left side. Use only letter quality or near letter quality print. Some seminaries may prefer a particular type face measured in characters per inch rather than a scalable font. Quality bond paper should be used for the copy due to the individual seminaries. **Do not** punch holes in, staple, or otherwise mark on submitted copies. Check for specific guidelines provided by your seminary. Please also verify with your advisor and the school the form you will use for notes: internal references/annotation, footnotes, or endnotes.

- A number of word processing software programs have templates that correctly format a thesis according to the form laid out in Turabian. Please consult online sources for availability and check with the school to determine whether the programmed templates are acceptable for the school's thesis requirements.

Thesis Abstract

The Thesis Abstract (100 – 125 words) is a summary of the thesis. It should be clear and precise in a way that captures the essence of its contents and invites the interest of the reader. The Thesis Abstract is used by library services to catalog the project for research purposes and by potential readers of the thesis to decide on its value for their own work. A Thesis Abstract is generally no more than 100 words, but students should verify the specific requirements with the seminary. The Abstract is required by the ACTS D. Min in Preaching program and is approved by the advisor as part of the thesis approval process.

The Abstract is normally written as a single long paragraph that is not indented and is centered on the page following the student's name and the title of the thesis. There must be a two-inch margin on all sides and the type should match the rest of the thesis. Other more specific requirements may be added by your seminary to meet the standard expectations for all doctoral theses from that seminary.

The contents of the Abstract should include:

1. A thesis statement which summarizes the claim you are making in your thesis project.
2. An explanation of the importance of this concern to the field of homiletics.
3. A brief summary of the method of study or research.
4. A summative conclusion from your findings.

The contents of the Abstract must be in complete sentences, preferably in the third person active voice, past tense (e.g., The author researched; he/she/they studied, etc.), and free of quotations, dedications, words of appreciation, book titles or names of specific people, unless the person mentioned is the actual subject of the thesis.

Evaluation of the Thesis

Evaluation of the thesis occurs at various stages in the development of the thesis. The advisor responds to each of the drafts submitted. In evaluating the contents of the thesis, the advisor gives attention to:

1. The clarity of the thesis for which the thesis project was developed.
2. The appropriateness of the project for testing the claim of the thesis.
3. The clarity of analysis and reporting.
4. The significance of the results for the project context and wider homiletic practice.
5. Other criteria as specified by the seminary.

Once the advisor has indicated the acceptability of the thesis, the official evaluation resulting in the determination of whether the Doctor of Ministry degree should be awarded takes place at the time of the oral examination in defense of the thesis.

Oral Examination and Thesis Defense

The examination and defense of the complete thesis is conducted at the student's seminary in early spring of the year in which the student expects to receive the degree, preferably before March 31st.

The advisor names the members of the oral exam team, which normally includes one or two other faculty persons, but may also include a student peer who is part of the ACTS DMin in Preaching program. In preparation for the oral examination the student is responsible for sending a quality copy of the final thesis draft to the team. The advisor is responsible for notifying the student of the names and addresses to which the thesis must be sent. The thesis must be in the possession of the oral exam participants at least two weeks prior to the date of the oral exam.

The requirements of the oral examination are set by the seminary that will award the degree. Procedures for the structure and content of the examination differ by seminary and students are encouraged to be in conversation with their advisor and school for specific requirements. Whether or not the advisor presides over the oral exam, the advisor must complete the Oral Exam Rubric (**Appendix J**) and return the form electronically to the Program Office.

As determined by the participants at the oral exam, the student will make any revisions and corrections required by the specified date. The advisor will provide specific directions in writing to the student of such modifications to the thesis. The advisor will signify final approval of the final copy of the thesis. The advisor is also responsible for approving the Thesis Abstract.

Final electronic copies of the thesis that have been approved by the advisor must be submitted to the seminary by the specified date of submission in order for the student to receive the degree at the seminary's graduation ceremony that year. A copy of the final thesis is also sent to the Program Office by April 30th. Upon recommendation by an advisor, a thesis that is considered outstanding may be uploaded to the ACTS DMin in Preaching website (www.actsdminpreaching.com).

THE PARISH PROJECT GROUP (PPG)

Purpose

The Parish Project Group consists of 6-8 members of the ministry context who will travel the journey of the ACTS DMin in Preaching Program with the student for the 3-year period of the program. In that respect, the student and the PPG are mutually engaged in developing the ministry context through preaching. Students are encouraged to select members of one's ministry context who are open to learning about the program and preaching. Members who are engaging, willing to question, have the ability to reflect critically and give constructive feedback, who have skills in developing designs and goals may be most helpful to the student. Students should seek persons who have capability for independent thought, are well grounded in the faith, and who can be a trusted, collaborative partner to their process of learning.

In addition, students are encouraged to include persons representing a cross-section of the ministry context – a balanced mix of gender, age, race and educational backgrounds. Depending on the project, it can be helpful to include a newcomer or a person who is just beginning their faith journey. It is crucial that group members be committed to the process throughout the tenure of their appointment, since it is disruptive to the group if members are absent or cannot complete their term. Groups are charged with providing continuity in support, guidance, and honest evaluation. Consistency in the membership of the PPG facilitates mutual learning between the student and the members of the PPG.

Responsibilities of the Parish Project Group

The Parish Project Group's work begins soon after residency. At the first meeting, the student discusses the *Learning Covenant* for the Preaching Ministry Project and plans for the project with the group. This includes the implementation of how the group could be involved in helping the student to achieve the learning goals for the project. The group signifies their approval of the process by signing the *Learning Covenant*.

Group meetings occur in conjunction with each of the sermons required for the project. The PPG:

- Meets after residency to receive information on the activities of the residency, for orientation to the Preaching Ministry Project, for discussion with the student on an overall preaching plan, and to signify their approval of the project by signing the Learning Covenant.
- Joins the student in a sermon formation meeting prior to each of the project sermons.
- Are present at the preaching event to take note of the preacher's performance and the congregation's reception and response to the preached sermon.
- Joins the student after each of the Preaching Ministry Project sermons to evaluate the sermon and to submit a report on the sermon development, performance, and follow-up meetings.
- Assists in disseminating evaluative tools to the congregation and in collecting and reviewing the responses to determine project results.
- Submits a group report after each sermon preached and a final group report as part of the Preaching Ministry Project Integrative Paper in Year 1 and Year 2.
- During the final year of the program, the PPG assists the student in research and evaluation associated with the thesis and may be a first reader of the written material that comprises the thesis.

As much as possible the membership of this group should be consistent throughout the length of the program. The PPG may be constituted one year at a time or serve the entirety of the three years in the program, however for the sake of consistency, some of the original members should be part of the group each year. If possible, at least one member of the ministry setting's governing board or the committee that relates to pastoral performance in ministry should be a member of the PPG.

The Program assumes that the student and the PPG will be mutually engaged in learning. The feedback from and interaction with this group should assist the student significantly in developing his or her preaching ministry.

Orientation

The work of establishing a collaborative relationship between the Parish Project Group and the student begins at the orientation session in Year 1. At this meeting the student:

- introduces the group to the program;
- explains the role and responsibilities of the Parish Project Group;
- proposes plans for and expectations of the Preaching Ministry Project;
- reports on the experience of residency;
- reviews and obtains approval of the Learning Covenant (Appendix A);
- establishes a method of theological reflection to be used for sermon formation and feedback; (if you wish, please ask the advisor for input on this)
- develops a process for scheduling the sermon formation and feedback meetings.

The goal of the orientation is to enable the group to capture the vision of the project and to explore methods they will use for the first sermon formation meeting. If the group is re-constituted in Year 2 or Year 3, it may be necessary to have another orientation session especially for the new members. In addition to the material in this Project Manual, the PowerPoint slideshow available on the Student Resources area of the program website, www.actsdminpreaching.com, is another resource that may be used for orienting the group.

The Sermon Formation Meeting

Prior to or during the sermon formation meeting, the student assigns for group-study the biblical text for the sermon. Along with the biblical text, the student may include a *provisional Sermon Purpose Statement* that suggests the intent of the sermon. This meeting is held at least 10 days before the sermon is preached. Through theological reflection, the student and group members discuss the text and the Sermon Purpose Statement.

Together with the student, the group considers the intent of the sermon in light of the Preaching Ministry Project and the goals stated in the Learning Covenant. The student integrates the insights of the group members into the sermon as appropriate. In addition to providing support for the sermon development, the members consider the process of evaluating the impact of the sermon on the ministry context, and the tools that should be used to determine results. The group may assist the student formally in the creation of the Sermon Purpose Statement.

As appropriate, the evaluative comments provided to the student by the advisor and professor or peer on the previous sermon should be shared with the group so that they can be incorporated into the preparatory work for the next sermon.

The Sermon Delivery

It is expected that the members of the PPG will be present in the service when the sermon is preached to the congregation within the ministry context described in the Learning Covenant. The members of the PPG are expected to be the ears of the preacher and also to observe any specifics in the delivery performance of the sermon that may be helpful for their feedback and evaluation. As much as possible, the members of the PPG should enlist other members of the congregation as part of the feedback and evaluation process for the sermon.

The Sermon Feedback Meeting

Within a week following the delivery of the sermon, the group meets again with the student to view a recording of the sermon. At this meeting the student and the group discuss how they experienced the sermon and to what extent the learning goals were achieved. The discussion should also review and evaluate the feedback from the wider community.

Group Response Form

The group may use this gathering time to complete the Group Response Form, but without the presence and input from the preacher. Once the form is completed, it must be signed by all members of the group and given to the preacher to be submitted along with the other items required by the program. No later than two weeks after the sermon is preached, the student is to send the recording of the sermon, the Reflection Paper and the Group Response Form to the advisor and instructor or peer for evaluation (see *Group Response Form* in **Appendix D**), as well as to the Program Office for tracking.

Final Group Report (Years 1 and 2)

In Years 1 and 2, the process of sermon formation, delivery, and feedback is repeated for three sermons, September to January. At the end of this cycle, during the period when the student synthesizes the learning for the year into an Integrative Paper, the PPG will also prepare an integrated report for the year using the Final Group Response Form. The completed document is given to the preacher for submission with the Final Integrative Paper to the advisor (see *Final Group Response Form* **Appendix E**).

The Thesis (Year 3)

In Year 3, the process of sermon formation, delivery, and feedback is repeated for two sermons, from September to December. The learning for this year will be synthesized with that of Years 1 and 2 and reported through the Thesis, which is the culminating output of the degree program. There is no PPG report required for the Thesis, but the student is encouraged to include members of the PPG in both the development and the review of the thesis because of their close involvement in the projects throughout the program.

THE PEER EVALUATOR

Purpose

One of the tenets the ACTS DMin in Preaching program holds is that learning is collegial and students assist as peers in the learning of their colleagues. To that end, both through individual and group interaction during coursework, students help each other by providing input and sharing both information and challenges that occur in the process of engaging the requirements of the program. While that is informal engagement among peers, the assignment of responding as a peer evaluator is a formal process in the program.

A peer evaluator is assigned for the third sermon in the Preaching Ministry Project in Years 1 and 2. The peer evaluator will normally be someone with the same advisor and enrolled in the same seminary as the student and are assigned by the advisor during the Summer Residency, however depending on the availability of students to fill this role, one may be assigned across program years or seminaries.

Students send their sermon materials to their assigned peer evaluator in the same form and content as that sent to the advisor, i.e., the recorded sermon, Learning Covenant, PPG Response Form, sermon manuscript, and the Reflection Paper. The Peer Evaluator is required to return their evaluation to their peer within the deadline scheduled for the program.

The purposes and benefit of peer review and evaluation include the following:

- To participate in the work of a preaching colleague by offering insight and counsel based on one's own experience in ministry.
- To encourage the development of the peer's critical constructive reflection on the preaching ministry beyond their own work.
- To help strengthen the peer's skills of evaluation and communication on an academic level.

Evaluation by the Peer Evaluator

After reading the Reflection Paper, the Learning Covenant, the Parish Project Group Evaluation and viewing the sermon, the peer evaluator should incorporate the following concerns into their evaluation:

- How do you understand the focus and importance of the project?
- How can you describe the sermon's place in the project in light of the stated goals in the Learning Covenant?
- Does the Reflection Paper engage the issues of the project and the contributions of the group?
- From your perspective, what would strengthen the preaching and reflection in meeting the student's stated goals?
- Are there other aspects of the work, beyond the stated goals, upon which you believe it is important to comment (tone, structure, delivery, gestures, content, etc.)?
- What learning about preaching do you take from this work?

In making response to one's peer, a student might keep in mind good models of evaluation which they have experienced in the course of the D. Min. Program. The student may also use the Sermon/Preaching Rubric in the evaluation process (see **Appendix F**).

A written report of the evaluation of their peer must be sent to the advisor and Program Office along with the peer evaluator's **Integrative Paper**. The content of the evaluation should relate directly to the rubrics that are used to evaluate the Integrative Paper.

A written evaluation that includes elements that relate to the contents described above should be based on critical reflection of the peer's work and should be sufficiently specific in content to provide usable feedback to the peer. The length of the paper should be between three paragraphs (half a page) to a page and a half. Each student must complete an evaluation of a peer sermon as part of their final material required for the completion of Year 1 and Year 2 of the program.

HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH REVIEW POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Purpose

The pursuit of wisdom and the demands of justice to protect those who are vulnerable are commitments that are deeply grounded in Scripture and Christian tradition. As these two

commitments interact, it is crucial to maintain accountability and transparency in order to ensure the wellbeing of all participants.

Any student conducting research with human subjects must give attention to the potential risks for those subjects. The student must identify threats to the rights or well-being of persons or groups of persons who participate in any studies conducted under the auspices of the program. In general, classroom research projects will not need to undergo a Human Subjects Research Review process if they present low risks to the human subjects.

Each student is directed in this process by the Responsibilities for Human Subjects Research Review requirements of their seminary. The program will perform its own review by the ACTS HSR Review Board, and participants in the program are to be guided by the following:

Students

As students begin to solidify the focus of their ministry project in Year Two, they will begin the process of shaping their project which includes attending to the research requirements for Human Subjects Research (HSR) review. In Colloquy II, students will submit a draft of their Human Subjects Research checklist along with the initial draft of their Thesis Proposal. Students will receive feedback on their proposed research process in tandem with feedback on their initial thesis proposal.

As students prepare for Colloquy III, students will submit an updated draft of the Human Subjects Research checklist along with their thesis proposal that is submitted to the Colloquy III instructor. Students will receive feedback on both documents prior to Colloquy III with the expectation that the documents will be completed, reviewed, and approved as part of the process of completing Colloquy III.

Instructors

Colloquy II instructors will review the initial draft of the Human Subjects Research checklist and provide formative feedback. The Colloquy III instructors will review the revised draft of the Human Subjects Research checklist prior to the summer residency with feedback to students and will help students develop the final draft to be submitted to the HSR Review Board.

HSR Review Board

The HSR Review Board will be comprised of the instructors of Colloquy II and Colloquy III. The HSR Review Board will meet in the week following summer residency to review and approve—or otherwise—the final human subjects research proposal in concert with the final thesis proposal as approved by the Colloquy III instructor(s).

Advisors

The advisor will be responsible for assisting the student in developing their research plan and ensuring that the plan as approved by the HSR review board is appropriately implemented.

All students will need to submit application materials for review by the ACTS HSR Review Board. Students who engage in this process through their home institution may indicate so on the Human Subjects Research checklist and provide documentation of approval.

Copies of the HSR Checklist and the HSR Consent form can be found in **Appendix M** and **Appendix N** respectively.

EVALUATION OF STUDENT PROGRESS

Evaluation of the student's progress in the ACTS DMin in Preaching program occurs at several key points along the way, with the major evaluation occurring at the end of each year and is representative of the success of the student's activities and progress in completing the overall program project. The evaluation of the progress and accomplishments of Year 1 and Year 2 are measured by the documentation produced by the student at defined periods and culminates with the end-of-year reports, specifically the Integrative Paper for Year 1 and Year 2, and the thesis at the end of Year 3. The students move into Candidacy at the end of the Year 3 summer residency.

This final evaluation is provided by the advisor, but it includes the evaluations done during the year by:

- The Core and Elective instructors and the student peer who have responded to the student's proficiency in preaching in a way that integrates the course work into the preaching event specifically as it relates to and impacts the implementation of the goals outlined in the Learning Covenant.
- The Parish Project Group who have worked in tandem with the student throughout the year, provide insight and assessment of each preaching event connected with the Preaching Ministry Project. The group also reports on the student's ability to work as part of a team in order to accomplish work that has a positive impact on the ministry context through preaching.
- The advisor who travels the program journey with the student. Along with the written evaluations of the sermons and Reflection Papers done during the year, through interpersonal connection the advisor evaluates the student's ability to integrate and address the multiple concerns expressed by those in the ministry context through the plan developed and implemented for the preaching project. The advisor pays special attention to the student's growth as it relates to their preaching performances in both sermon content and delivery, and the way in which their project has been implemented to the benefit of the preacher and the ministry context. The advisor is also the lead member of the defense committee and selects the two other persons who are members of the committee.

PROGRAM YEARS 1 AND 2

Overall evaluation of the learning and achievement in Year 1 and Year 2 of the program is done in conjunction with the evaluation of the Integrative Paper and is based on the overall learning gained and the preaching experience of the student.

This final evaluation done at the end of Year 1 and Year 2 determines whether the student should receive credit for both the Integrative Paper and the year's work. It signals the student's readiness to continue in the program for the next year. Advisors evaluate the student's work within defined categories. Each item is scored on a scale of 1 to 5 points, where 5 = Excellent; 4 = Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Poor; 1 = Unsatisfactory. However, the advisor makes the final determination as to whether the student should receive credit for the year, or whether the paper should be resubmitted and the year's work re-evaluated.

The areas that are contained in the evaluation instrument used by the advisor are:

A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The extent to which the student:

- Clearly stated the theme of the project;
- Explained why they undertook the course;
- Related the course their personal theology of preaching, their denomination's theology, their learning goals;
- Referred to theological and extra-theological sources in discussing the rationale for the course.

B. LEARNING GOALS: Evaluate the clarity of the student's learning goals and how the student determined whether the goals were achieved.

B. PLAN: Assess the extent to which the plan for implementing the project was clearly spelled out and followed.

C. INTEGRATION OF PARISH PROJECT GROUP: Evaluate how the PPG was involved, how well members were prepared to meet the requirements of the program, and how well and appropriately they interacted with the student.

D. RESEARCH METHODS: Evaluate the methodology used to accomplish the project and the extent to which the tools matched the focus of the project. Discuss the extent to which the methodology yielded the stated results.

E. CRITICAL ASSESSMENT: The extent to which the student assessed and evaluated the results of the project and determined future plans. This includes the use of evaluative tools by the PPG and/or the congregation.

F. RELATION OF THE PROJECT TO PREACHING: The extent to which the student related the ideas in the project to their preaching ministry and whether they consciously used their preaching skills to affect their own development or that of the ministry context. This includes a determination of the extent to which the goals of the project were evidenced in preaching.

G. EVIDENCE OF GROWTH: The growth or change observable within the student's work and overall strengths of the work.

H. STRUCTURE AND STYLE:

- a. Writing clarity and content
- b. Form – grammar, syntax, use of colloquial language
- c. Endnotes, bibliography
- d. Preaching Project Group reflections, evaluation forms included
- e. Samples of evaluation instruments, e.g. questionnaires, included

The form used for the evaluation of the Integrative Paper is found in **Appendix H**.

Successful completion of all the elements of the Preaching Ministry Project will result in credit for the year. Failure to address any of these areas will result in an evaluation of *No Credit* or *Resubmit*.

If the Integrative Paper is judged to be unsatisfactory, students may receive one opportunity to revise and resubmit it within two weeks. Students must receive credit on all required work in order to be eligible to enter his or her next summer residency. Failure to submit in a timely manner one or more sermons (with reflection papers) or the Integrative Paper will result in “No Credit.”

The advisor completes the advisor Evaluation of the Integrative Paper (**Appendix H**) and submits it to the Program Office by April 15th as evidence of the completion of the academic year.

A copy of the Integrative Paper and Program Year evaluation form used by the advisor can be found in **Appendix I**. The form is sent by the advisor to the Program Office.

The student begins the preparatory work of thesis development in the Year 2 Colloquy class where a preliminary outline of the thesis is created. Upon successful completion of Year 2, the student moves into those activities connected with developing the thesis. A full draft of the Thesis Proposal is preparatory work for Year 3 of the program.

PROGRAM YEAR 3

This is the final year of the program and overall evaluation of the learning and achievement in Year 3 of the program is done in conjunction with the evaluation of the thesis and is based on the overall learning gained during the entire program and the completion of the preaching project by the student. However, there are levels of evaluation done throughout the year with respect to the various items that are produced in Year 3 – Personal Reflections for Sermons 1 and 2, the Thesis Proposal, and the Thesis.

The Thesis Proposal

In Year 3 Summer Residency, the student completes the thesis proposal that was drafted for Colloquy II and updated as preparatory to Colloquy III. The thesis proposal delineates the anticipated contents of the thesis and is the concluding document produced by students at the end of the Year 3 Summer Residency.

The thesis proposal provides an outline of the contents and shape of the thesis. As such, the Thesis Proposal is the blueprint for the student on writing the thesis and is developed in the format detailed by the Thesis Proposal Form. The Thesis Proposal Form enables the student to bring into focus the details of their work that will be described in the thesis.

Students will finalize the Thesis Proposal with input from the Colloquy instructor, advisor and peers obtained during the Colloquy III class. The finalized and approved proposal provides the structure of the thesis and will be used to ensure that the thesis is developed appropriately.

The Thesis

The evaluation, defense and approval of the thesis is the culminating event of Year 3 and of the student’s success in completing the program. The advisor is a key participant in the evaluation process and responds formally using the Oral Exam Rubric (**Appendix J**) to the student’s performance.

As stated previously, the official evaluation that determines whether the Doctor of Ministry degree should be awarded is done by the Oral Defense Committee under the leadership of the student’s

advisor who makes the report of successful completion to the student's seminary and to the ACTS DMin in Preaching Program Office.

COMPLETION OF THE PROGRAM

Successful completion, defense and filing of the final thesis to the academic locations required by the student's seminary denotes successful completion of the ACTS DMin in Preaching program. In completing the oral exam rubrics, the adviser effectively evaluates the learning gained by the student through their engagement of the program. These rubrics are designed to cover all the basic elements of the program and identify the level of accomplishment that the thesis represents. Using this form (**Appendix J**) the student's work may be evaluated as:

- Pass with distinction
- Pass
- Pass with stipulations
- No Pass

This evaluation of the student is instructive in evaluating the program and is a source of determining the future requirements of the ACTS DMin in Preaching program.

APPENDIX A

ACTS Doctor of Ministry in Preaching Program

Learning Covenant for the Preaching Ministry Project 2023-2024

NAME: _____ SEMINARY: _____

ADVISOR: _____ GRADUATION YEAR: _____

CORE COURSE: _____

ELECTIVE COURSE: _____

() Year One () Year Two () Year Three

1. TITLE: _____
2. STATE YOUR LEARNING GOALS FOR THIS PROJECT YEAR. (2-4 *specific goals related to the general issue or concern of ministry that will be addressed in your preaching.*)
3. STATE THE THEOLOGICAL ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT THE PREACHING TASK THAT ESTABLISHES THE FOUNDATION FOR THIS PROJECT. (A 2-3 *sentence summary of your homiletical theology or belief about preaching and ministry that motives you to explore the stated issue connected with your ministry.*)
4. DESCRIBE THE PREACHING CONTEXT AND EXPLAIN WHY THE PROJECT IS IMPORTANT TO YOU AND YOUR CONTEXT. (2-4 *sentences that summarize the current contextual realities that have originated or influence the requirements of your project.*)
5. DESCRIBE HOW YOU AND THE PARISH PROJECT GROUP WILL WORK TOGETHER IN ACCOMPLISHING THE GOALS LISTED IN THE PLAN? (How you and the PPG will interact in the implementation of your research to accomplish your project goals and your expectation of the group's contribution beyond the stated requirements of the program.)
6. OUTLINE THE CONTENTS OF THE SERMONS (THREE IN YEARS 1 & 2, TWO IN YEAR 3) THAT WILL INCLUDE LEARNING GAINED IN CORE AND ELECTIVE

COURSES AND FACILITATE THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF YOUR LEARNING GOALS (*Describe the outline of the sermons to be preached that includes the learning from coursework and the learning goals stated and praxis within the ministry context that will relate directly to meeting the stated goals.*)

a. Sermon 1 (Core):

b. Sermon 2 (Elective):

c. Sermon 3:

7. BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES THAT WILL BE USED FOR DATA GATHERING AND THESIS DEVELOPMENT. (*Identify the two or three research tools that will be used to gather and interpret the data connected with the project plan and goals.*)

8. DESCRIBE HOW YOU WILL EVALUATE ACHIEVEMENT OF YOUR LEARNING GOALS. (*Provide specific descriptions of the evaluative instruments that you plan to use in order to verify your research method and determine the results of your learning and project goals.*)

9. AUTHORIZATION OF THE LEARNING COVENANT FOR THE PREACHING MINISTRY PROJECT

Advisor Signature

Date

Colloquy Professor Signature

Date

Student Signature

Date

Parish Project Group Signature

Date

APPENDIX B

ACTS Doctor of Ministry in Preaching Program

Sermon Purpose Statement

The Sermon Purpose Statement assists the student in defining and clarifying determining factors in a particular preaching event. Every sermon, regardless of the ministry context, is developed and preached for a unique and specific purpose. This Statement reflects the dynamics of each preaching situation and consists of *three parts*:

The Situation

In the form of an introductory clause, describe the concern, issue or need that elicits the sermon at this particular place and time.

Example: "In view of the congregation's feeling of insecurity and fear because of the violence in their community...

The Goal

This is a statement that suggests what the preacher wants the hearers to experience, which is more than a simple hearing of the sermon. It identifies what is expected to happen through this sermon, and particularly the impact that what is preached is expected to have on the hearers, in light of the concern, issue or need.

Example: "...I want the people to experience the assurance of God's presence and protection ..."

The Means

Using a qualifying phrase or clause, describe how or by what rhetorical means the hearers of the sermon will be led into this experience. What sermon strategy will be used to foster the expressed outcome? Upon what biblical material will the sermon be based?

Example: "...by means of biblical stories of God's care and protection and current examples of congregations that have faced and overcome similar difficulties that have resulted in strengthening their faith."

Example of a full sermon purpose statement: "In view of the congregation's feeling of insecurity and fear because of the violence in their community, I want the people to experience the assurance of God's presence and protection, by means of stories of God's care and protection both biblically and in the present that have enabled the people to face and overcome their fear in a way that resulted in strengthening their faith, through a sermon based on Philippians 4:4-9.

APPENDIX C

ACTS Doctor of Ministry in Preaching Program

THESIS PROPOSAL FORM

NAME: _____ SEMINARY: _____

ADVISOR: _____ GRADUATION YEAR: _____

- 1) Proposed Title:
- 2) A reflection on your doctoral journey up to this point and how it informs this project. (250 – 500 words)
- 3) My context can be described as: (Include the congregational, social cultural, geographic or other characteristics that are relevant to the project. The description of the context should focus on those elements that reveal why the focus of, and process for the thesis is of particular relevance to your context.) (750 – 1,000 words)
- 4) In response to my context I have identified a particular issue, problem, growing edge, or concern as the focus of my project. (250 – 500 words)
 - a. This can be described as follows:
 - b. This is represented in a thesis statement in terms of preaching as:
- 5) Choose one and complete it: (The choice is based on whether the focus of the project is the preacher or the congregation.) (a maximum of 200 words)
 - a. Given this context, this concern, and this theory, I want to accomplish _____ in my congregation:
 - b. Given this context, this concern and this theory, I want to accomplish _____ in my preaching ministry:
- 6) Describe the project plan and process, and explain why you think your plan addresses your concern, growing edge, problem or issue? Your plan should identify the steps already taken, future plans, and the timeline for the completion of the thesis by the required dates. (500 – 750 words)
- 7) Identify at least five homileticians that address the focus and provide direction for the project to be described in your thesis. Critically reflect on the work of each homiletician, the reason why they are appropriate to your focus, their contribution to homiletics, and how you will integrate their work into your project. (750 – 1,000 words)

- 8) Identify a cognate field that connects biblically, theologically or practically with the homiletical project being undertaken and describe how it connects with the preaching project. Identify at least five scholars in that field that address the focus and provide direction for the project to be described in your thesis. Critically reflect on the work of each scholar, the reason why they are appropriate to your focus, their contribution to homiletics, and how you will integrate their work into your project. (500 – 750 words)
- 9) Identify the methodology and the qualitative research tools you will use to produce dependable data to help you support your evaluation of the project. This is related to the data gathering and evaluative process and tools you will employ in order to verify the results of your project goals and thesis. (250 – 500 words)
- 10) Develop an initial bibliography identifying homiletical and cognate resources applicable to this project. (Include a minimum of twenty-five entries.)

Refer to W. Myers, *Research in Ministry*, or Tim Sensing, *Qualitative Research*, or Nancy Jean Vyhmeister, *Quality Research Papers* for information on research tools.

APPENDIX D

ACTS Doctor of Ministry in Preaching Program

**PARISH PROJECT GROUP
SERMON RESPONSE FORM**

Preacher's Name _____ **Program Year #** _____ **Sermon #** _____

1. Explain how the preacher and the Parish Project Group worked together on the formation of this sermon.

2. Discuss insights on developing and preaching a sermon the group members gained as a result of working with the preacher on this sermon.

3. Discuss the extent to which the group felt the sermon achieved the purpose and met the goals expressed by the preacher and described in the Learning Covenant for this sermon.

4. *For Sermon #1:* What was of special significance in the preaching event either with the preacher's performance in the delivery of the sermon or how the congregation responded to the sermon.

5. *For Sermons #2 & #3:* Note any specific, significant changes observed in the preacher's preaching from the previous sermon preached for the Preaching Ministry Project.

6. Summarize the group's overall experience of collaborating with the preacher on the sermon.

Date of Meeting

Chair of the Parish Project Group

Signatures of the PPG Members

APPENDIX E

ACTS Doctor of Ministry in Preaching Program

PARISH PROJECT GROUP FINAL RESPONSE FORM

Preacher's Name _____

Program Year # _____

1. State the learning goals for this Preaching Ministry Project as *the group* understands them. In what way and how appropriately does *the group* think they apply to the context?

2. Evaluate the extent to which *your group* thinks the preacher achieved each of the Learning Goals. What process did the group use for the evaluation?

3. Describe any specific changes, positive or negative, *the group* observed in the preacher's knowledge about, skills in, performance or attitude toward preaching.

4. Describe (a) the role the group played in the sermon formation process, (b) the methods the group members used to prepare to actively participate, (c) the procedure the group used to view the sermon recording and evaluate the sermon preached and (d) the interaction with the congregation in the evaluation process. What impact has this experience had on you *as a group*? Please consider the question in light of your work with the formation and experience of the two or three sermons and the discussion of the sermons afterward.

5. Discuss the strengths of the experience and the challenges *the group* encountered with the process over the period. Be as specific as possible about what worked well and what did not.

6. Where do you see room for further growth in the preacher's preaching ministry in relation to the stated project?

Date of Meeting

Chair of the Parish Project Group

Signatures of the PPG Members

APPENDIX F

ACTS Doctor of Ministry in Preaching Program

SERMON/PREACHING RUBRIC

Student _____ Instructor/Advisor _____

Date _____ Sermon: First (Core) ___ Second (Elective) ___ Third _____

Learning Outcome: Develop competency in creating sermons and in preaching that is relevant to their faith community and program focus.				
<i>Areas of Assessment (Orally and/or written)</i>	<i>Strong Ability Exceeds Expectations</i>	<i>Adequate Ability Meets Expectations</i>	<i>Marginal Ability Does Not Meet Expectations</i>	<i>Fails to Demonstrate Ability Not in Evidence</i>
Sermon represents understanding and depth of the ministry context that includes its social, cultural, institutional, geographic, theological, and socio-economic dimensions.	Includes detailed and integrated description of all relevant areas of the ministry context.	Includes some descriptive aspects relevant to the ministry context.	Makes vague reference to ministry context but with no specific description	Contains no mention made or attention given to the ministry context.
Sermon focuses on designated goals detailed in the Learning Covenant.	Responds specifically and in detail to the learning goals articulated in the Learning Covenant as appropriate for this sermon.	References some aspects of the learning goals specified in the Learning Covenant.	Alludes to the learning goals in the Learning Covenant, but without direct application.	No connection made to stated learning goals in the Learning Covenant.
Sermon utilizes the biblical text and relevant connections and interpretations to the sermon purpose.	Clear scriptural foundation and appropriately detailed interpretation of the biblical text in the contents of the sermon.	Appropriate scriptural foundation, but with little interpretation of the biblical text.	Alludes to scripture but little application to sermon content.	No visible presence of the biblical text in the sermon.
Sermon demonstrates appropriate course and other homiletical learnings in both the specific contents and the delivery performance as appropriate.	Clear and deep engagement of course learnings and project focus in sermon content and delivery.	Sermon content and delivery gives adequate attention to course learnings and project focus.	Sermon alludes to course learnings and project focus.	Sermon gives no attention to course learnings or focus.
Sermon integrates the needs of the ministry context and the issue in preaching being addressed.	Sermon content clearly and deeply responds to the needs of the ministry context and the specific preaching issue.	Provides some reference to the needs of the ministry context and the specific preaching issue.	Sermon responds to either the needs of the ministry context or the specific preaching issue.	Sermon fails to address either the needs of the ministry context or the preaching issue.

APPENDIX G

ACTS Doctor of Ministry in Preaching Program

REFLECTION PAPER RUBRIC

Student Name _____ Instructor/Advisor _____

Date _____ Sermon: First (Core) ____ Second (Elective) ____ Third _____

Learning Outcome: Demonstrate the ability to engage in self-analysis and critical reflection and to report with academic rigor on the homiletical theory and practice engaged in light of the learning goals and project plan.				
<i>Areas of Assessment (Orally and/or written)</i>	<i>Strong Ability Exceeds Expectations</i>	<i>Adequate Ability Meets Expectations</i>	<i>Marginal Ability Does Not Meet Expectations</i>	<i>Fails to Demonstrate Ability Not in Evidence</i>
Description of the congregational ministry context from social, cultural, geographic, theological and congregational dimensions.	Includes relevant analysis of and specific details about the ministry context geographically, socially, culturally, and theologically.	Includes partial but relevant information and analysis of the ministry context.	Includes minimal reference to the ministry context, but without analysis.	Contains only passing mention of the ministry context.
Relevance of Course Learnings in connection with sermon and project goals detailed in the Learning Covenant.	Directly engages and reflects on the goals in the Learning Covenant through the connection of the course learning evidenced in the sermon.	Connects the course learning and the sermon, but with little direct reflection on the goals in the Learning Covenant.	Refers to the goals in the Learning Covenant but without direct connection to the course contents or the sermon contents.	No connection made between the course contents and the goals in the Learning Covenant.
Critical analysis and synthesis of thought using the research and evaluative tools.	Clear evidence of critical analysis that synthesizes the theoretical material provided in course and related texts and including modes and tools used in evaluation.	Some critical analysis of course material, but with no additional material and minimal evaluation.	Includes but with very little analysis of course material included.	No direct applicability or use of course material.
Involvement and analysis of the Parish Project Group.	Includes detailed summary and analysis of the work and the contribution of the PPG.	Describes the work of the PPG clearly but with little analysis of contribution.	Lists the details of the work of the PPG but with no analysis.	Refers only to the presence of the PPG.
Writing structure, style, format and adherence to academic standards for contents such as quotes, footnotes and bibliography.	Reflection Paper is structured appropriately for a formal academic paper, without spelling, grammatical errors, and colloquial language. Bibliography included.	Minimal editing errors and other requirements such as footnotes and quotes are correctly used. Bibliography included.	Few spelling, grammatical, and other errors, but quotes and footnotes are used incorrectly. Minimal bibliography.	Contains many errors of multiple types. Much colloquial language. Minimal or no bibliography.

APPENDIX H

ACTS Doctor of Ministry in Preaching Program

INTEGRATIVE PAPER RUBRIC

Student Name _____ Instructor/Advisor _____

Date _____

Learning Outcome: Integrate and reflect critically on homiletic theory learned and practice experienced through coursework and in the implementation of project plans to accomplish stated learning and project goals.				
<i>Areas of Assessment (Orally and/or written)</i>	<i>Strong Ability Exceeds Expectations</i>	<i>Adequate Ability Meets Expectations</i>	<i>Marginal Ability Does Not Meet Expectations</i>	<i>Fails to Demonstrate Ability Not in Evidence</i>
Description of the project theme in light of the ministry context.	Clearly states the theme of the project and the theological rationale for selection and relevance to the ministry context.	Presents the theme and rationale for ministry context but without theological reference.	Project theme and ministry context stated but without rationale for selection.	Only project theme stated.
Description of project goals and plans and assessment strategies.	Detailed description and explanation of the learning goals contained in the Learning Covenant and their relationship with the overall project goal.	Describes and explains the learning goals from the Learning Covenant but without reference to the overall project goal.	Lists either the Learning goals from the Learning Covenant or the overall project goal, but with insufficient detail in either case.	Refers to the goals but without clearly identifying them as either Learning Covenant goals or the overall project goal.
Homiletical connection to ministry project i.e. the way in which the project relates to the preaching ministry.	Fully describes how and why the project in the ministry context is connected to preaching and the way that preaching is used to implement the project goals.	Limited description of the connection between project goals and the preaching ministry.	Project goals described separately from specific preaching ministry.	No connection of project goals to preaching ministry.
Research methods, critical analysis, reflection and evaluation of results.	Describes in detail the research methodology used, the evaluation and critical analysis of results.	Names the methodology, lists the results with limited evaluation. No critical analysis.	Names the methodology and lists the results.	Lists the methodology or no specific methodology.
Evaluation of involvement of Parish Project Group.	Detailed description and critical analysis of group formation, process, cohesiveness, and involvement, and interaction with the preacher and congregation.	Description of the group process and specific interaction with the preacher and the congregation.	Description of the group process.	Mention of the group without details.

APPENDIX I

ACTS Doctor of Ministry in Preaching Program

ADVISOR EVALUATION of the INTEGRATIVE PAPER and PROGRAM YEAR

Student's Name: _____ Class of 20_____

Advisor's Name: _____ School: _____

Please rate each item on a scale of 1-5 (5 = Excellent, 4 = Good, 3 = Satisfactory, 2 = Poor, 1 = Unacceptable). Provide comments on areas that you rank 1 or 2. You are encouraged to make other comments. Total the scores and assign credit as appropriate. It is expected that students will obtain a score >65.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	
Clearly stated the theme of the project.	
Explained rationale for undertaking this project, relevance to ministry context.	
Referred to theological and extra-theological sources in discussing rationale for the project.	
Comments:	
LEARNING GOALS	
Defined learning goals that fit the project theme and the ministry context.	
Used appropriate means to determine whether learning goals were achieved.	
Comments:	
PLAN	
Clearly described the plan for implementing the project.	
Developed a plan appropriate to the project's goals, the program's expectations, and the realities of the ministry context.	
Comments:	
RELATION OF THE PROJECT TO PREACHING	
Extent to which the student related the ideas in the project to the preaching ministry.	
Extent to which the student consciously tried to effect changes in the preaching event.	
Comments:	

RESEARCH METHODS	
Extent to which the tools used matched the focus of the project and the ministry context.	
Extent to which the methodology yielded usable results.	
Comments:	
CRITICAL ASSESSMENT	
Student's ability to reflect theologically and critically on the project.	
Extent to which the student stepped back to assess what happened, what it meant, and where to go from here. This also includes the student's facility as a peer evaluator.	
Comments:	
INTEGRATION OF PARISH PROJECT GROUP	
Preparation of PPG members to participate in the project.	
Manner and extent of PPG participation and interaction with student.	
Comments:	
EVIDENCE OF GROWTH	
Extent of growth or change evidence in student's work.	
Developed a mature personal theology of preaching and related project to theology, Christian tradition, and learning goals.	
Comments:	
STRUCTURE AND STYLE	
Development of academic writing style (clear, free of jargon).	
Ability to produce appropriate project documentation (Doctoral Quality, Footnotes, Endnotes, Bibliography).	
Appropriate use of evaluation instruments.	
Comments:	
FINAL EVALUATION (Please check one) ___ Credit ___ No Credit ___ Resubmit	
In the case of "No Credit" and "Resubmit," indicate the areas of the project on which the student needs to work to receive credit. Attach an additional sheet, if necessary.	
Advisor's Signature	Date

APPENDIX J

ACTS Doctor of Ministry in Preaching Program

ORAL EXAM RUBRIC

Student _____ Class of 20 _____ Date _____

<i>Areas of Assessment (orally and/or written)</i>	<i>Strong Ability Exceeds Expectations</i>	<i>Adequate Ability Meets Expectations</i>	<i>Marginal Ability Does Not Meet Expectations</i>	<i>Fails to Demonstrate Ability Not In Evidence</i>
Learning Outcome 1: Preach out of an articulated theology of proclamation.				
Articulates a clear statement of the issue in the practice of preaching that is at the center of the project and research.	Statement is clearly worded, concise, and focused, presenting an important and timely issue.	Statement coherently presents issue in preaching.	Statement lacks coherence and/or focus or is undeveloped.	Statement is incomprehensible and bears no relevance to issue in preaching.
Provides a coherent rationale for the study of this issue in preaching.	Discussion is clear, concise, and focused, and presents a compelling and persuasive rationale.	Discussion coherently presents a thoughtful and reasonable rationale.	Discussion lacks coherence and a convincing or complete rationale.	Discussion of rationale is incomprehensible, absent, or bears no relevance to issue.
Learning Outcome 2: Assess the strengths and weaknesses of one's own style of preaching.				
Coherently expresses strengths and weaknesses of preaching events.	Appraisal of sermons illustrates thoughtful, articulate, and thorough assessment of the preaching events.	Critique of preaching is concise and complete.	Limited and incomplete evaluation of preaching.	Fails to identify attributes of preaching events
Makes connection between aspects of the preaching style and the results of the project.	Characteristics of preaching style are clear, focused, compelling and persuasive in relationship to the project.	Relationship between preaching style and project is coherent, thoughtful, and reasonable.	Relationship between preaching style and project is limited and the impact is unclear.	No relationship given between preaching style and project
Learning Outcome 3: Collaborate with members of the ministry site in an ongoing process of reflecting on one's preaching.				
Articulates relevant and reachable goals achieved in collaboration with the Parish Project Group or a broader group within the ministry site.	Project goals are relevant, reachable, clearly articulated and appropriately address the issue.	Project goals are mostly coherent, relevant, reachable, and appropriately address the issue.	Project goals lack coherence, and/or are not especially relevant/ reachable, or do not address the issue.	Lacks appropriate project goals.
Analyzes how the project goals were achieved or not achieved with reasons for success or failure.	Skillful assessment with a clear understanding of the success and/or failure of each aspect the project.	Coherent assessment and some understanding of the success and/or failure of most aspects of the project.	Assessment of the success and/or failure of the project is incoherent or shows limited understanding.	Student unable to assess success and/or failure of project.

Learning Outcome 4: Demonstrate an acquaintance with leading authors in homiletics.				
Uses and cites significant scholarly and other resources that show an understanding of the breadth of the field of homiletics.	Discussion of scholarly resources presents their ideas cogently and accurately. Resources used are appropriate to project and significant in the field.	Discussion of scholarly resources presents their ideas accurately. Resources used are appropriate to project or significant in the field.	Use of resources shows misunderstanding of the ideas discussed.	Fails to draw on leading authors.
Applies knowledge of scholarly resources in the field of homiletics to the project.	Project is founded on appropriate scholarly resources, which are used creatively and skillfully to enhance project.	Project is grounded in appropriate scholarly resources.	Use of resources is incidental to project, or use of resources is not appropriate to project.	Application of resources is not evident in project.
Learning Outcome 5: Demonstrate an ability to think critically				
Evaluate authors in the field of homiletics both in their own right and in the context of the project.	Creatively and persuasively present strengths and weaknesses of authors both in the context of the field of homiletics and in the context of the project.	Cogently present strengths and weaknesses of authors both in the context of the field and in the context of the project.	Evaluation of authors is incoherent or incomplete.	No attempt to evaluate authors in their own right or in the context of the project.
Offers a creative synthesis of project and authors in the field of homiletics.	Application of resources to project is innovative, imaginative, thoughtful, and relevant.	Application of resources is thoughtful and appropriate.	Application of resources is inappropriate and/or lack thoughtfulness.	Project and authors are not synthesized.
Learning Outcome 6: Demonstrate an ability to think theologically				
Project brings sermons into conversation with student's own theological framework.	Discussion of sermons attends thoughtfully and insightfully to theological integrity, drawing clearly on student's theological framework.	Discussion of sermons attends to theological integrity, drawing on student's theological framework.	Discussion of sermons draws only shallowly on student's theological framework, or is incoherent in this area.	Discussion of sermons does not attend to student's theological framework.
Project brings sermons into conversation with the theological tradition.	Discussion of sermons attends thoughtfully and insightfully to the theology of the student's tradition and to many or all of the major theological loci (God, the church, salvation, etc.)	Discussion of sermons attends to the theology of the student's tradition and to theological loci (God, the church, salvation, etc.)	Discussion of sermons touches only lightly on the theology of the student's tradition and theological loci.	Discussion of sermons does not attend to the theology of the student's tradition or theological loci.

Result of the oral exam – select one.

Pass With Distinction	Pass	Pass with Stipulations	No Pass
“Strong” on 8 or more of the 12 areas.	“Strong” or “Adequate” in 8 or more of the 12 areas.	Examiners believe that with revisions as specified, student can achieve “Strong” or “Adequate” in at least 8 of the 12 areas.	Student receives “Marginal Ability” or “Fails to Demonstrate” in 3 or more areas.

Advisor Name _____ **School** _____

Comments and/or Stipulations (attach additional sheet if necessary):

APPENDIX K

ACTS Doctor of Ministry in Preaching Program

STUDENT EVALUATION

Instructor: _____

Class: _____

Name of Student: _____

Please provide both a numeric notation where “5” indicates the highest evaluation and a “1” indicates that further work is needed and as specific a written evaluation as possible.

1. Did the student read the assigned course material?

5-----4-----3-----2-----1

Comment:

2. Did the student complete all pre-class assignments as required in the syllabus?

5-----4-----3-----2-----1

Comment:

3. Rank the level of participation in class discussion.

5-----4-----3-----2-----1

Comment:

4. How well did the student grasp the materials presented through reading, lecture and discussion?

5-----4-----3-----2-----1

Comment:

5. **To what extent did the student's preaching in class and in his/her congregation reflect course learnings?**

5-----4-----3-----2-----1

Comment:

6. **Are there dimensions of the course that the student should revisit in order to more profitably strengthen his/her learning experience in your course?**

Yes

No

Comment:

7. **Overall, what comprehensive evaluation for your class would you advise for this student? (Circle one).**

Credit

No Credit

Resubmit

Additional Comments:

Signature of Instructor _____ **Date:** _____

Thank you for e-mailing this form back to the Program Office.

This form will be forwarded to the advisor to assist them in assessing the final grade for the year.

Your stipend will be processed upon receipt of all student evaluations and rubrics.

APPENDIX L

ACTS Doctor of Ministry in Preaching Program

COURSE EVALUATION of the RESIDENCY CLASS

Name of Course: _____

Instructor's Name(s): _____

We appreciate your honest feedback and reflective comments on your experience before and during class sessions. Your signature is optional.

Please answer the following questions honestly and with as much detail as possible.

1. How prepared were you for the course in light of the material provided prior to classes?
2. Were the goals of the class presented clearly, were they in concert with the title of the course, and were the goals as stated met during the presentation of materials?
3. In what way(s) did the teaching styles, e.g. lectures, group work, individual work, written work, etc., contribute to or hinder your experience in the class? Please be as specific as possible with respect to the ways the content was presented both verbally and in written materials, the variety of learning methods used, the balance between them, which were most and least helpful and why, and how the group was enabled or not enabled to work together.
4. Considering the title and intent of the course, name two important learnings for you from this course?
5. In what way did the learning from this course impact or help to facilitate the learning goals for your project?
6. Are there concerns or other reflection that you wish to share with the instructor(s) regarding the class?

Submitted by: _____ (Optional)

**PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM AT THE END OF CLASS ON FRIDAY TO THE
PROGRAM OFFICE AT: actsadmin@garrett.edu**



APPENDIX M

Human Subjects Research Application Checklist

Name of Student: _____

Title of Project: _____

	Year 2 and 3		Year 3 only
	Yes	No	Brief Explanation
1. Protection of Subjects (should be in Consent Form and Application)			
a. Is the subject assured of anonymity?			
b. Is there adequate explanation of how data will be stored securely?			
c. Has the researcher adequately addressed potential conflicts of interest?			
d. Is there an adequate plan for dealing with adverse effects on subjects?			
2. Full Disclosure (should be in Consent Form and Application)			
a. Is there an adequate (clear, accessible) description of the project and its purpose given to research participants (in the consent form)?			
b. Has the researcher explained why the particular subject(s) was/were chosen?			
c. Is the subject informed about the potential benefits as well as risks of the project?			
d. Are the research subjects informed that they may opt out of the research at any point without negative consequences?			
e. Is the subject informed of how the research will be used/reported?			
f. Is the subject informed that the research may be published (and, if so, where)?			

3. Consent (additional items related to the consent form)			
a. Is the Consent Form in plain and easily understandable language appropriate to potential subjects?			
b. Does the Consent Form include the name of the researcher, their institution, and contact information for the researcher?			
c. Does the Consent Form include the name of the faculty advisor with contact information?			
d. Does the Consent Form include an approximate amount of time subjects will spend being part of this research?			
e. Is there a clear statement of consent with a signature and date line for subjects to indicate their agreement to participate?			
f. If the subject is to be recorded (by video or audio), is consent to be recorded specifically identified in the statement of consent?			
4. Mandatory Reporting: Is the subject informed that the researcher will comply with mandatory reporting requirements?			
5. Research Instruments: Is there inclusion of research tools for review (including, but not limited to, interview questions, surveys/questionnaires, focus group protocols)?			
6. Will the researcher be engaging any subject that is part of a vulnerable or special class (e.g. children) beyond observation of public behavior in which the investigator does not participate in the activities observed? If so,			

what additional steps will be taken to minimize risks unique to subjects of each vulnerable or special class observed?			
--	--	--	--

Additional comments or request for waiver (*If requesting a waiver, please attach documentation of human subjects research review approval from your institution.*):

for HSR Review Board use only

<p>Result of initial review: Approve: Approve with minor revisions (under advisor guidance): Revise and resubmit: Deny (research may not be conducted due to serious ethical concerns): Date of review:</p>
--

<p>Result of revision review: Approve: Approve with minor revisions (under advisor guidance): Revise and resubmit: Deny (research may not be conducted due to serious ethical concerns): Date of revision review:</p>
--

Additional comments:

APPENDIX N

HSR CONSENT FORM

Basic Information

Student name: [insert here]

Project title: [insert here]

Project description and purpose: [insert here]

Explanation of selection criteria: [insert here]

Description of how research will be used/reported: [insert here, including notice of publication]

Expected duration of participation: [insert here]

Recording

[remove if not applicable] The researcher will be recording participation by means of _____. By signing this consent form you are indicating your consent to be recorded. Recordings will be securely stored as described under “risks of participation.” Recordings will be [insert description of the purpose of recordings and exactly how these will be used].

Mandatory Reporting

The student conducting this research will comply with all mandatory reporting requirements for the state of Illinois or the state in which this research occurs.

Confidentiality

[insert assurance of confidentiality here]

Study Participation and Early Withdrawal

Taking part in this study is your choice. You are free not to take part or to withdraw at any time for any reason. No matter what you decide, there will be no penalty or loss of benefit to which you are entitled. If you decide to withdraw from this study, the information that you have already provided will be kept confidential. I might decide to withdraw you from the study if I think it is in your best interests.

Risks of Participation

Participants in this research should be aware of the following risks of participation:

- [insert description of how data will be securely stored and eventually discarded]
- [describe any conflicts of interest and the steps that will be taken to address them]
- [insert instructions for dealing with adverse effects of the research]
- [insert additional risks and mitigation efforts here]

Benefits of Participation

Participants in this research can expect the following benefits:

- Contribute to scholarship and practice of preaching in [insert student name here]’s ministry context.
- Participate in ongoing conversation among Christians about the theory and practice of preaching in this particular context.
- Know that your voice is included in conversation about the theory and practice of preaching in this particular context.
- Contribute to the vitality of ministry—including but not limited to preaching—in this particular ministry context.
- [insert additional benefits here]

Contact

Student contact:

[insert address here]
[insert phone number]
[insert email address]

Faculty advisor contact:

[insert name here]
[insert address here]
[insert phone number]
[insert email address]

Enrolling institution:

[insert name here]
[insert address here]
[insert phone number]

If you have questions or concerns regarding the research, either now or at any time in the future, please contact me, [insert student name]. You may also contact my faculty advisor, [insert faculty advisor name].

If you have questions about your rights as a research subject or want to speak with someone independent of the research team, you may contact the Dean of the ACTS DMin Program for contact information for a representative of the review board.

Statement of Consent

I have read the information in this consent form including risks and possible benefits. I have been given the chance to ask questions. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in the study.

Signatures:

Student Researcher

Date

Research Participant

Date