

D. Min. Student's Name:

Date of Oral Defense:

Dissertation Title:

Dissertation Committee:

Firs Reader / Advisor:	
Second Reader / Cross-Examiner:	
DMin Director or Institutional Rep.	

Rubric For Dissertation Evaluation

Criteria	Association of Theological Schools Standard	Alliance Theological Seminary D. Min. Program Goal	Exemplary	Proficient	Basic	Emerging	Unsatisfactory
1. Identifies and addresses a significant <u>problem in</u>	Standard 1: demonstrates the student's ability to identify and understand a significant problem in ministry Standard 6: provides	Program Goal 6: demonstrates competency in integrating leadership understandings	Identifies a significant problem in ministry with <u>great</u> clarity	Identifies a significant problem in ministry with <u>sufficient</u> clarity	Identifies a significant problem in ministry <u>unclearly</u> , but the reader <u>can</u> still under-	Identifies a significant problem in ministry, but so <u>unclearly</u> that the reader <u>cannot</u>	Identifies no significant problem in ministry

Criteria	Association of Theological Schools Standard	Alliance Theological Seminary D. Min. Program Goal	Exemplary	Proficient	Basic	Emerging	Unsatisfactory
<u>ministry</u> (ch 1 and ch 5)	opportunity for future development of the student's practice of ministry		and makes <u>abundantly</u> clear its relationship to the research project	and makes <u>sufficiently</u> clear its relationship to the research project	stand it with effort and makes <u>somewhat</u> clear its relationship to the research project	understand it	
2. Demonstrates <u>biblical-theological</u> or theoretical <u>foundational knowledge</u> (ch 1 and ch 2)	Standard 2: informed by appropriate biblical, theological, historical, sociological, psychological and other sources	Program Goal 6: demonstrates competency in integrating theological understandings	Shows <u>abundant</u> foundational knowledge	Shows <u>sufficient</u> foundational knowledge	Shows <u>some</u> foundational knowledge	Show <u>minimal</u> foundational knowledge	Shows <u>no</u> foundational knowledge

Criteria	Association of Theological Schools Standard	Alliance Theological Seminary D. Min. Program Goal	Exemplary	Proficient	Basic	Emerging	Unsatisfactory
3. Offers a clear <u>hypothesis</u> and reflects sound <u>research design</u> (ch 1 and ch 3)	Standard 3: demonstrates the student's ability to use a variety of skills, tools and methods in the practice of ministry	Program Goal 2: Demonstrates enhanced competency in social/cultural analysis for ministry	Hypothesis is <u>abundantly</u> clear and well defined Instrument measures what the hypothesis calls for, with <u>great</u> validity Full discussion of <u>limitations</u> that undermine validity and takes steps to control for them.	Hypothesis Is <u>sufficiently</u> clear and well defined Instrument measures what the hypothesis calls for, with <u>some</u> validity <u>Full</u> discussion and acknowledgement of <u>limitations</u> that undermine validity	Hypothesis is <u>unclear</u> , but the reader <u>can</u> understand it with effort Instrument <u>crudely</u> measures what the hypothesis calls for, with <u>little</u> validity <u>Some</u> discussion of <u>limitations</u> that undermine validity	Hypothesis is <u>unclear</u> to the point where the reader <u>cannot</u> understand it Instrument does <u>not</u> measure what the hypothesis calls for, with <u>no</u> validity <u>Little</u> <u>discussion of</u> <u>limitations</u> that undermine validity	No hypothesis No instrument No awareness of <u>limitations</u> that undermine validity
4. Clearly presents and accurately interprets relevant data (ch 4 and ch 5)	Standard 4: has made a significant contribution to the student's understanding of and practice of ministry Standard 5: contributes to public knowledge about the	Program Goal 2: Demonstrates enhanced competency in social/cultural analysis for ministry	Presents <u>data</u> with <u>great</u> clarity Draws an <u>interpretation</u> that is <u>highly</u> accurate and	Presents <u>data</u> with <u>sufficient</u> clarity Draws an <u>interpretation</u> that is <u>sufficiently</u>	Presents <u>data</u> <u>unclearly</u> , yet the reader <u>can</u> still understand it with effort Draws an <u>interpretation</u> of the data that is	Presents <u>data</u> so <u>unclearly</u> that the reader <u>cannot</u> understand it. Draws an <u>interpretation</u> that is inaccurate and	Presents <u>no</u> <u>data</u> Draws <u>no</u> <u>interpretation</u> from the data

Criteria	Association of Theological Schools Standard	Alliance Theological Seminary D. Min. Program Goal	Exemplary	Proficient	Basic	Emerging	Unsatisfactory
6. Defended well orally	N/A	N/A	<p>Prepared and delivered an <u>abundantly</u> clear and engaging presentation</p> <p>Answered <u>all</u> questions confidently and knowledgeably with <u>no</u> poor answers</p>	<p>Prepared and delivered a <u>sufficiently</u> clear and engaging presentation</p> <p>Answered <u>most</u> questions confidently and knowledgeably with <u>very few</u> poor answers</p>	<p>Presentation showed <u>some</u> preparation</p> <p>Delivery was <u>not always</u> clear and engaging</p> <p>Answered <u>many</u> questions confidently and knowledgeably but with <u>several</u> poor answers</p>	<p>Presentation showed <u>little</u> preparation</p> <p>Delivery was <u>unclear</u> and <u>unengaging</u></p> <p>Answered only a <u>few</u> questions confidently and knowledgeably and had <u>many</u> poor answers</p>	<p><u>No</u> preparation for the presentation</p> <p>Had <u>no</u> answers to many questions</p>

Verdict and Follow-Up

What decision have the two readers and the D. Min. Director rendered?

Part 1: The Oral Defense

_____ Fail (Oral Defense to Be Re-Scheduled With the Same Readers Within Two Weeks)

_____ Pass

Part 2: The Written Dissertation

_____ Fail

_____ Pass, Without Condition

_____ Conditional Pass, Upon Submitting a Copy of the Dissertation with the Revisions Specified Below by Dec 25th
