Student Competency Assessment Guide

January 2020

ANTIOCH SCHOOL
OF CHURCH PLANTING AND
LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Contents

The Context of Assessment for Antioch School Students

The <u>historical</u> context for student assessment in the Antioch School is deep in its roots. For decades, BILD International has emphasized portfolio assessment as a rigorous and robust means of evaluation. Nonformal church-based theological students have been expected to maintain folios (collections) and use presentation portfolios of artifacts and attestations to demonstrate their competencies related to character, ministry skills, and biblical knowledge. These include general competencies expected of everyone and specific competencies unique to them as individuals in specific situations.

Several years ago, BILD was invited to help several large indigenous church-planting movements in India to develop large-scale, nonformal leadership development programs. A comprehensive portfolio assessment system was built to serve all types of leaders in their movements from grassroots church-planters to strategic national leaders. Five templates of portfolio transcripts were created to serve each of these types of leaders. The portfolio transcripts for Type 3, Type 4, and Type 5 leaders eventually became foundational for the Antioch School degree programs.

The <u>academic</u> context for student assessment is related to the strong emphasis within higher education for outcomes assessment. The current emphasis comes from governments wanting to make sure that they are getting their money's worth from financial aid and subsidy of public institutions, accreditation agencies wanting to make sure that institutions are maintaining standards of quality in learning, and stakeholders wanting to make sure that degrees accurately represent what they claim.

Most institutions, including ones that for decades have rested on their stellar reputations and enormous resources, are now focused on outcomes assessment. Accreditation agencies aren't just concerned that you have good resources (e.g. faculty, library), but that you can prove that those resources are being effectively used for the accomplishment of student learning.   A macrostructural shift is taking place in higher education in which the emphasis is changing from teaching (what faculty accomplish) to learning (what students accomplish).

It has been very difficult for many institutions to make the shift to outcomes assessment. However, the Antioch School had this emphasis from its inception because it began with the rigorous and robust evaluation processes already in place through BILD International. Further, there are other academic institutions, such as Western Governors University that began with

radically competency-based approaches to education. Students do not earn degrees by accumulating credits from courses, but by the progressive demonstration of competencies related to their particular field of student. In fact, students can graduate without even taking any courses, as long as they can demonstrate appropriate competencies. And Western Governors University is accredited by numerous agencies, including all U.S. regional accrediting agencies, but it received its initial accreditation from DEAC, the same agency with which the Antioch School is has accreditation. Recognition of the changing face of accreditation, namely its new emphasis on assessment, was our indication that it was time for BILD International University to start its Antioch School so that students could earn degrees along with their outstanding church-based theological education programs.

The practical context for student assessment takes two forms: the ministry context of a student and the BILD Cloud portfolio system. For decades, BILD International has provided excellent resources for church-based theological education. We recognize the need to provide forms of training that serve more than those who are able to take advantage of traditional forms of campus-based (or even distance education). We also recognize the power of in-service learning, particularly for those being better equipped for ministry. We believe that experiential learning turbocharges education, but that situated learning (where the context and the content match) turbocharges experiential learning. No other field of study has the vast, natural potential for situated learning as we find in churches as context for ministry education. Further, we recognize that it is more than just an effective educational approach, but it is aligned with the biblical mandate for the church to be central in the development of its leaders.

Church-based theological education programs using BILD resources are designed to have numerous, multi-faceted forms of assessment related to the development of students. For instance, each student engages in a serious developmental relationship with a local mentor. Classes are not just about the accomplishment of individual academic objectives, but also the building of one-mindedness of a ministry team.

It is in the midst of this context of assessment that particular forms of assessment particularly related to the Antioch School take place. Upon admission, each student is given access to a BILD Cloud account that includes a portfolio transcript for their academic program. There are three stages of assessment in BILD Cloud: 1) Student self-assessment; 2) Local mentor initial review; and 3) Associate Faculty validation review.

First, students engage in self-assessment. They select artifacts and attestations to post in BILD Cloud to demonstrate competencies. Then, they use rubrics to determine if they think their work demonstrates competency by meeting the criteria required by the Antioch School.

Second, local mentors provide an initial review for the purpose of mentoring students. They use the same rubrics to determine if they think the student work demonstrates competency by meeting the criteria. If not, they give advice to the student regarding what needs to be improved. This is not academic evaluation, but peer review by someone who is deeply interested in the student's development. [Note that local mentor initial review is an "opt-in" process, and not mandatory in Antioch School programs. Students are given an opportunity to "opt-in" on their Enrollment Agreement so that local mentors can have access to their work in accordance with FERPA regulations.]

Third, Associate Faculty provide validation reviews for the purpose of granting academic credit. They use the same rubrics to determine if they think the student work demonstrates competency by meeting the criteria. If not, they give guidance to the student regarding how to do so. The Associate Faculty validation review brings academic quality control to the portfolio Antioch School assessment process.

The Antioch School does not try to determine specific percentages or letter grades. We consider them to be something with false precision. For instance, we don't think that there is necessarily a true substantive difference between a 91% and a 92% on most exams. Further, we think that the difference between an A-student and a B-student may have as much to do with the context in which the competency is being applied as to the competency itself. However, we recognize that letter grades are part of the academic economy. Thus, a competency will be considered to have been met when the student demonstrates a high minimum standard of "B-level" achievement. This means that the student has been fully engaged with the learning materials and activities necessary for mastery of the competency, has demonstrated the skills needed to utilize the competency, and has produced work that indicates command of the competency. Further details regarding these distinctions are on the pages to follow.

In most cases, there will be a collegial relationship during the assessment process. Local mentors and students have a strong mutual interest in their development for ministry. However, there may be occasions of disagreement regarding assessment of competencies. For instance, if a student insists that a competency has been demonstrated, but a local mentor won't approve it after several interactions, the student should notify the designated Associate Faculty to get an authoritative third party decision. If a student and/or local mentor think a competency has been demonstrated, but the Associate Faculty does not, the Associate Faculty will provide a thorough explanation. If this is not satisfactory to the student and/or local mentor, the student may

petition to the Academic Dean to have the evidence of competency reviewed by another Associate Faculty member.

Academic Progress Requirements

Students are expected to maintain adequate academic progress. Students who fail to maintain adequate academic progress may be placed on Academic Probation and dismissed from their programs if progress is not made.

Academic progress requirements include:

- Receiving Associate Faculty validation of competencies associated with one Leadership Series during each 12 month period until program requirements are completed.
- Receiving Associate Faculty validation of competencies associated with one Life and Ministry Development course during each 12 month period until program requirements are completed.
- Receiving Associate Faculty validation of competencies associated with Ministry Philosophy and Strategy, Ministry Practicum, or Teaching Practicum during each 12 month period until program requirements are completed.

Help Center

The Antioch School has created a webpage as a Help Center to provide you with support in the use of resources and services (https://antiochschool.zendesk.com/hc/en-us). It contains video tutorials and manuals for students, local mentors, and faculty.

The Content of Assessment for Antioch School Students

This section is intended to guide you through the actual process of assessment in each of the types of competency sets in Antioch School programs. For each competency set, students are expect to meet all required criteria in order to receive academic credit for a demonstration of competency. This section contains all the rubrics needed for all Antioch School programs. The particular content for a specific program is also contained in the BILD Cloud portfolio transcript.

LIFE AND MINISTRY DEVELOPMENT

Motivated Abilities Pattern
Criteria:

- Obtained a MAP from a SIMA Consultant assessment, through the SIMA Computer assessment, or through the SIMA Self-Assessment Process.

	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Obtained a MAP			

Becoming Who You Are Designed to Be (A and B Projects)
Criteria:

- Demonstrates Accurate Understanding. Does the student demonstrate accurate understanding of their MAP in the 10-Step Program? Does the student draw from multiple parts of their MAP? Does the student remain consistent in interaction with their MAP?
- Enhancement of Self Understanding. Does the student demonstrate an enhancement of the student's self-understanding in the 10-Step Program? Does the student explain how they learned something new about themselves (or came to see something about themselves in a new light)?
- Relevant for Life and Ministry. Does the student's 10-Step Program have relevance for the student's life and ministry development? Does the student make reference to a minimum of 3 areas of relevance?

	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Demonstrates Accurate Understanding			
Enhancement of Self Understanding			
Relevant for Life and Ministry Development			

Life ⁿ Initial Plans and Updates

Criteria:

- Clarity. Is it crisp and readable? Can it be readily seen that a particular competency is being addressed (rather than the others)? Is it easy to see strengths and weaknesses related to the other criteria? Does it use subheadings, bolding, and underlining effectively?
- Complete (all parts). Does it address all parts of the competency?
- Directive. Does it provide guidance and direction related to annual, long-term, and lifetime goals? Does it help keep the student on track? Does it help the student make wise decisions, particularly when faced with important and difficult decisions?
- Measurable. Does it helpthe student know how much progress is being made toward the goals? Can others use the plan to see how much progress is being made?
- Up-to-date. Is it current? Has it been updated throughout as needed?
- Report on Mentor Meeting. Has the mentor used the Personal Development Assessment forms as a point of reference in mentoring the student? Has a brief statement been provided (mentor's name, date and place of mentoring, and PDA forms used)? Note that this is mostly about mentoring, not filling out forms.

	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Clarity			
Complete (all parts)			
Directive			
Measurable			
Up-to-Date			
Report on Mentor Meeting			

GENERAL EDUCATION

General Education "Integrated Core"

Criteria (required)

- Clarity. Is it crisp and readable? Can it be readily seen that a particular competency is being addressed (rather than the others)? Is it easy to see strengths and weaknesses related to the other criteria? Does it use subheadings, bolding, and underlining effectively?
- Complete (all parts). Does it address all parts of the competency?
- Accurate. Is it on target? Does it demonstrate an accurate understanding of the development of thought in the course?
- Supported (or substantiated). Are the ideas supported logically? Is evidence given to support claims that are made? Has a case (or argument) been built? Have explanations been given?

Criteria (only need to meet 1):

- Resource Interaction. Does it include interaction with the articles of the course (and/or other relevant resources)? Does it show engagement of thought, not mere quotations, citations, or bibliographic references? For instance, does it show where ideas came from, comparison of ideas from various authors, and opinions about the contribution of some articles?
- Ministry Reflection (implementation) Does it show reflection on substantial ministry experience in the past or present and/or plans for implementation in an actual ministry setting? Is the student and the student's situation explicit (as almost no one else should be able to write the same paper)?
- Creative. Does it show unique or personal style in its format? Does it use graphics, original charts, or other media? Does it have special literary effects, such as original alliteration or particularly clever phrasing?
- Critical. Does it use standards from the competency as points of reference for evaluation? Does it show exercise of judgment (wisdom) regarding options? For instance, does the ministry reflection include assessment of ministry experience based upon standards related to the competency?
- Collaborative. Does it show the interrelationships of one's ministry with other individuals, organizations, and networks (rather than individual independence)? Note that doing collaborative work with others on the document to be uploaded is not necessarily what is meant by collaboration.

Required	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Clarity			
Complete (all parts)			
Accurate			
Supported (substantiated)			

Only need to meet 1	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Resource Interaction			
Ministry Reflection (implementation)			
Creative			
Critical			
Collaborative			

General Education "Great Books"

Criteria:

- Clarity. Is the reading plan clear in terms of books to read, subjects to consider, and schedule?
- Related to Gen Ed Courses. Is the reading plan connected to various courses in the BILD General Education Integrated Core?
- Implementation Report. Has the reading plan been implemented at a pace of 45 hours of thoughtful reading for each 1 credit?

	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Clarity			
Related to Gen Ed Courses			
Implementation Report			

General Education "Cultural Conversation through Film"

Criteria:

- Clarity. Are the Life Development Film Analysis Guides completed in a manner that makes for easy reference? Are papers crisp and readable, using subheadings, bolding, and underlining effectively?
- Complete (all parts). Are all parts of the assignment done, including Life Development Film Analysis Guides and written projects?
- Accurate. Is the assignment on target? Do the parts demonstrate an accurate understanding of the films, books, and/or articles in the course, particularly in relation to cultural conversations?
- Supported (or substantiated). Are the ideas supported logically? Is evidence given to support claims that are made? Has a case (or argument) been built? Have explanations be given?
- Relation to Gen Ed Core. Is there explicit connections made with some of the BILD General Education Integrated Core courses?
- Resource Interaction. Is interaction with the films, books, and/or articles of the course (and/or other relevant resources) included? Does it show engagement of thought, not mere quotations, citations, or bibliographic references? For instance, does it show where your ideas came from, comparison of ideas from various films and authors, and opinions about their contributions?

	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Clarity			
Complete (all parts)			
Accurate			
Supported (or substantiated)			
Relation to Gen Ed Core			
Resource Interaction			

General Education "Community Service Learning Projects"

Criteria:

- Experience. Does it present experience in terms of what, where, with whom, when, and for how long?
- Observation and Reflection. Does it include observations from the experience that reflect on what went well, what was challenging, etc.?
- Conceptualization of Learning. Does it show lessons learned from the experience?
- Anticipation of Future Experience. Does it address how those lessons might be applied to relevant experiences in the future?
- Relation to Gen Ed Core. Does it connect meaningfully with some of the courses in the BILD General Education Integrated Core?

	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Experience			
Observation and Reflection			
Accurate			
Anticipation of Future Experience			
Relation to Gen Ed Core			

LEADERSHIP SERIES COURSES

Bachelors-level must meet the first four criteria plus one additional criteria.
Masters-level must meet the first six criteria plus one additional criteria.

Criteria:

- Clarity. Is it crisp and readable? Can it be readily seen that a particular competency is being addressed (rather than the others)? Is it easy to see strengths and weaknesses related to the other criteria? Does it use subheadings, bolding, and underlining effectively?
- Complete (all parts). Does it address all parts of the competency?
- Accurate. Is it on target? Does it demonstrate an accurate understanding of the development of thought in the course?
- Supported (substantiated). Are the ideas supported logically? Is evidence given to support claims that are made? Has a case (or argument) been built? Have explanations been given? For instance, is biblical teaching used as a point of reference for examining ministry structures and practices in one's own tradition (not merely using verses to provide proof-texted support for one's tradition)?

- Resource Interaction. Does it include interaction with the articles of the course (and/or other relevant resources)? Does it show engagement of thought, not mere quotations, citations, or bibliographic references? For instance, does it show where ideas came from, comparison of ideas from various authors, and opinions about the contributions of some articles?
- Ministry Reflection (implementation). Does it show reflection on substantial ministry experience in the past or present and/or plans for implementation in an actual ministry setting? Are you and your situation explicit (as almost no one else should be able to write the same paper)?

- Creative. Does it show unique or personal style in its format? Does it use graphics, original charts, or other media? Does it have special literary effects, such as original alliteration or particularly clever phrasing?
- Critical. Does it use standards from the competency as points of reference for evaluation? Does it show exercise of judgment (wisdom) regarding options? For instance, does the ministry reflection include assessment of ministry experience based upon standards related to the competency?
- Collaborative. Does it show the interrelationships of one's ministry with other individuals, organizations, and networks (rather than individual independence)? Note that doing collaborative work with others on the document to be uploaded is not necessarily what is meant by collaboration.

	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Clarity			
Complete (all parts)			
Accurate			
Supported (substantiated)			

	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Resource Interaction			
Ministry Reflection (implementation)			

Only Need to Meet 1	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Creative			
Critical			
Collaborative			

PARADIGM TRANSFORMATION PROJECTS "A" and ENCYCLICALS

Criteria:

- Clarity. Is it crisp and readable? Can it be readily seen that a particular competency is being addressed (rather than the others)? Is it easy to see strengths and weaknesses related to the other criteria? Does it use subheadings, bolding, and underlining effectively?
- Complete (all parts). Does it address all parts of the competency?
- Accurate. Is it on target? Does it demonstrate an accurate understanding of the development of thought in the course?
- Supported (substantiated) Are the ideas supported logically? Is evidence given to support claims that are made? Has a case (or argument) been built? Have explanations been given? For instance, is biblical teaching used as a point of reference for examining ministry structures and practices in one's own tradition (not merely using verses to provide proof-texted support for one's tradition)?
- Resource Interaction. Does it include interaction with the main articles of the course? Does it show engagement of thought, not mere quotations, citations, or bibliographic references? For instance, does it show where your ideas came from and comparison of your ideas with the ideas of the author?
- Ministry Reflection (implementation). Does it show reflection on substantial ministry experience in the past or present and/or plans for implementation in an actual ministry setting? Are you and your situation explicit (as almost no one else should be able to write the same paper)? Does it address matters of paradigm change for you personally, in your ministry organization, and/or in your culture?

- Creative. Does it show unique or personal style in its format? Does it use graphics, original charts, or other media? Does it have special literary effects, such as original alliteration or particularly clever phrasing?
- Critical. Does it use standards from the competency as points of reference for evaluation? Does it show exercise of judgment (wisdom) regarding options? For instance, does the ministry reflection include assessment of ministry experience based upon standards related to the competency?
- Collaborative. Does it show the interrelationships of one's ministry with other individuals, organizations, and networks (rather than individual independence)? Note that doing collaborative work with others on the document to be uploaded is not necessarily what is meant by collaboration.

Required	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Clarity			
Complete (all parts)			
Accurate			
Supported (substantiated)			
Resource Interaction			
Ministry Reflection (implementation)			

Only Need to Meet 1	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Creative			
Critical			
Collaborative			

PARADIGM TRANSFORMATION PROJECTS "B"

Criteria:

- Clarity. Is it crisp and readable? Is it easy to follow and make reference to? Does it use subheadings, bolding, and underlining effectively?
- Complete (all parts) Does it address all parts of the competency?
- Accurate. Is it on target? Does it demonstrate an accurate understanding of the development of thought in the course, particularly related to matters of paradigm transformation?
- Supported (substantiated). Are the ideas supported logically? Is evidence given to support claims that are made? Has a case (or argument) been built? Have explanations been given? For instance, is biblical teaching used as a point of reference for examining ministry structures and practices in one's own tradition (not merely using verses to provide proof-texted support for one's tradition)?
- Resource Interaction. Does it include interaction with the book and articles of the course, as well as other relevant resources? Does it show engagement of thought, not mere quotations, citations, or bibliographic references? For instance, does it show where ideas came from and comparison of ideas with the ideas of the author?
- Ministry Relevance. Does it show relevance for use in student's Major Project artifact?

	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Clarity			
Complete (all parts)			
Accurate			
Supported (substantiated)			
Resource Interaction			
Ministry Relevance			

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY IN CULTURE PROJECTS

Criteria:

- Clarity Is it crisp and readable? Is it easy to see strengths and weaknesses? Does it use subheadings, bolding, and underlining effectively?
- Complete (all parts) Does it address all parts of the competency?
- Accurate Is it on target? Does it demonstrate an accurate understanding of the development of thought in the course?
- Resource Interaction Does it include interaction with the articles of the course (and/or other relevant resources)? Does it show engagement of thought, not mere quotations, citations, or bibliographic references? For instance, does it show where your ideas came from, comparison of ideas from various authors, and opinions about the contributions of some articles?
- Ministry Reflection (implementation) Does it show reflection on substantial ministry experience in the past or present and/or plans for implementation in an actual ministry setting? Are you and your situation explicit (as almost no one else should be able to write the same paper)?
- Supported (substantiated) Are the ideas supported logically? Is evidence given to support claims that are made? Has a case (or argument) been built? Have explanations been given? For instance, is biblical teaching used as a point of reference for examining ministry structures and practices in one's own tradition (not merely using verses to provide proof-texted support for one's tradition)?

- Creative. Does it show unique or personal style in its format? Does it use graphics, original charts, or other media? Does it have special literary effects, such as original alliteration or particularly clever phrasing?
- Critical. Does it use standards from the competency as points of reference for evaluation? Does it show exercise of judgment (wisdom) regarding options? For instance, does the ministry reflection include assessment of ministry experience based upon standards related to the competency?
- Collaborative. Does it show the interrelationships of one's ministry with other individuals, organizations, and networks (rather than individual independence)? Note that doing collaborative work with others on the document to be uploaded is not necessarily what is meant by collaboration.

Required	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Clarity			
Complete (all parts)			
Accurate			
Supported (substantiated)			
Resource Interaction			
Ministry Reflection (implementation)			

Only Need to Meet 1	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Creative			
Critical			
Collaborative			

MINISTRY PHILOSOPHY AND STRATEGY

Criteria:

- Clarity. Is it crisp and readable? Is it easy to see strengths and weaknesses? Does it use subheadings, bolding, and underlining effectively?
- Complete (all parts). Does it address all parts of the competency?
- Accurate. Is it on target? Does it demonstrate an accurate understanding of the development of thought in the course?
- Supported (substantiated.) Are the ideas supported logically? Is evidence given to support claims that are made? Has a case (or argument) been built? Have explanations been given? For instance, is biblical teaching used as a point of reference for examining ministry structures and practices in one's own tradition (not merely using verses to provide proof-texted support for one's tradition)?
- Ministry Relevance. Does it show reflection on substantial ministry experience in the past or present and/or plans for implementation in an actual ministry setting? Is the student and the student's situation explicit (as almost no one else should be able to write the same paper)?

	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Clarity			
Complete (all parts)			
Accurate			
Supported (substantiated)			
Ministry Reflection (implementation)			

DOCTORAL MAJOR PROJECT

Doctoral Major Project Idea

Criteria:

- Clarity. Is it crisp and readable?
- Ministry Relevance. Does it address a real need in one's ministry context?

	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Clarity			
Ministry Relevance			

Doctoral Major Project Proposal

Criteria:

- Clarity. Is it crisp and readable?
- Ministry Relevance. Does it show reflection on substantial ministry experience in the past or present and/or plans for implementation in an actual ministry setting? Is the student and the student's situation explicit (as almost no one else should be able to write the same paper)?
- Paradigm Issues. Does it address relevant paradigm issues from various PTP courses (or elsewhere)?
- Supported (substantiated). Are the ideas supported logically in the flow of the outline? Is evidence given to support claims that are made? Has a case (or argument) been built? Have explanations been given? For instance, is biblical teaching used as a point of reference for examining ministry structures and practices in one's own tradition (not merely using verses to provide proof-texted support for one's tradition)? Is each paragraph of the project usually represented by one line in the outline?
- Resource Interaction. Does it identify key resources and research that will be core to the project?

	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Clarity			
Ministry Relevance			
Paradigm Issues			
Resource Interaction			
Supported (substantiated)			

Doctoral Major Project Rough Draft

Criteria:

- Clarity. Is it crisp and readable? Is it easy to see strengths and weaknesses? Does it use subheadings, bolding, and underlining effectively?
- Ministry Relevance. Does it show reflection on substantial ministry experience in the past or present and/or plans for implementation in an actual ministry setting? Is the student and the student's situation explicit (as almost no one else should be able to write the same paper)?
- Paradigm Issues. Does it address relevant paradigm issues from various PTP courses (or elsewhere)?
- Resource Interaction. Does it draw on key resources and research at the core of the project?
- Supported (substantiated). Are the ideas supported logically? Is evidence given to support claims that are made? Has a case (or argument) been built? Have explanations been given? For instance, is biblical teaching used as a point of reference for examining ministry structures and practices in one's own tradition (not merely using verses to provide proof-texted support for one's tradition)?

	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Clarity			
Ministry Relevance			
Paradigm Issues			
Resource Interaction			
Supported (substantiated)			

Doctoral Major Project Final Draft and Defense

Criteria:

- Clarity. Is it crisp and readable? Is it easy to see strengths and weaknesses? Does it use subheadings, bolding, and underlining effectively?
- Ministry Relevance. Does it show reflection on substantial ministry experience in the past or present and/or plans for implementation in an actual ministry setting? Is the student and the student's situation explicit (as almost no one else should be able to write the same paper)?
- Paradigm Issues. Does it address relevant paradigm issues from various PTP courses (or elsewhere)?
- Resource Interaction. Does it draw on key resources and research at the core of the project?
- Supported (substantiated). Are the ideas supported logically? Is evidence given to support claims that are made? Has a case (or argument) been built? Have explanations been given? For instance, is biblical teaching used as a point of reference for examining ministry structures and practices in one's own tradition (not merely using verses to provide proof-texted support for one's tradition)?
- Defended. Has the project been presented and defended before a doctoral project committee (and others)?
- Final Approval. Has a final draft been approved?

	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Clarity			
Ministry Relevance			
Paradigm Issues			
Resource Interaction			
Supported (substantiated)			
Defended			
Final Approval			

MAJOR PROJECTS (B.Th., M.Th.)

Bachelors-level must meet the first four criteria plus one additional criteria.
Masters-level must meet the first six criteria plus one additional criteria.

Criteria:

- Clarity. Is it crisp and readable? Is it easy to see strengths and weaknesses? Does it use subheadings, bolding, and underlining effectively?
- Complete (all parts). Does it address all parts of the competency?
- Accurate. Is it on target? Does it demonstrate an accurate understanding of the development of thought in the course?
- Supported (substantiated). Are the ideas supported logically? Is evidence given to support claims that are made? Has a case (or argument) been built? Have explanations been given? For instance, is biblical teaching used as a point of reference for examining ministry structures and practices in one's own tradition (not merely using verses to provide proof-texted support for one's tradition)?

- Resource Interaction. Does it identify key resources and research that will be core to the project?
- Ministry Reflection (implementation). Does it show reflection on substantial ministry experience in the past or present and/or plans for implementation in an actual ministry setting? Is the student and the student's situation explicit (as almost no one else should be able to write the same paper)?

- Creative. Does it show unique or personal style in its format? Does it use graphics, original charts, or other media? Does it have special literary effects, such as original alliteration or particularly clever phrasing?
- Critical. Does it use standards from the competency as points of reference for evaluation? Does it show exercise of judgment (wisdom) regarding options? For instance, does the ministry reflection include assessment of ministry experience based upon standards related to the competency?
- Collaborative. Does it show the interrelationships of one's ministry with other individuals, organizations, and networks (rather than individual independence)? Note that doing collaborative work with others on the document to be uploaded is not necessarily what is meant by collaboration.

	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Clarity			
Complete (all parts)			
Accurate			
Supported (substantiated)			

Resource Interaction			
Ministry Reflection (implementation)			

Creative			
Critical			
Collaborative			

MINISTRY PRACTICUM

Criteria:

- Experience. Does it present the student's experience in terms of what, where, with whom, when, and for how long?
- Observation and Reflection. Does it include observations from the experience that reflect on what went well, what was challenging, etc.?
- Conceptualization of Learning. Does it show lessons learned from the experience?
- Anticipation of Future Experience. Does it address how those lessons might be applied to relevant experiences in the future?

	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Experience			
Observation and Reflection			
Conceptualization of Learning			
Anticipation of Future Experience			

TEACHING PRACTICUM

Criteria:

- Experience. Does it present your experience in terms of what, where, with whom, when, and for how long?
- Observation and Reflection. Does it include observations from the experience that reflect on what went well, what was challenging, etc.? What impact was had on those who were taught?
- Conceptualization of Learning. Does it show lessons learned from the experience? What was learned about the skills of teaching? What was learned about the content taught?
- Anticipation of Future Experience. Does it address how those lessons might be applied to relevant experiences in the future?

	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Experience			
Observation and Reflection			
Conceptualization of Learning			
Anticipation of Future Experience			

TEACHING PRACTICUM (Leadership Series Courses)

Required Criteria:

- Clarity. Is it crisp and readable? Can it be readily seen that a particular competency is being addressed (rather than the others)? Is it easy to see strengths and weaknesses related to the other criteria? Does it use subheadings, bolding, and underlining effectievely?
- Complete (all parts). Does it address all parts of the competency? Accurate Is it on target? Does it demonstrate an accurate understanding of the development of thought in the course?
- Supported (substantiated). Are the ideas supported logically? Is evidence given to support claims that are made? Has a case (or argument) been built? Have explanations been given? For instance, is biblical teaching used as a point of reference for examining ministry structures and practices in one's own tradition (not merely using verses to provide proof-texted support for one's tradition)?
- Resource Interaction. Does it include interaction with the articles of the course (and/or other relevant resources)? Does it show engagement of thought, not mere quotations, citations, or bibliographic references? For instance, does it show where ideas came from, comparison of ideas from various authors, and opinions about the contributions of some articles?
- Ministry Reflection (implementation). Does it show reflection on substantial ministry experience in the past or present and/or plans for implementation in an actual ministry setting? Are you and your situation explicit (as almost no one else should be able to write the same paper)? Specifically, does it present your experience in terms of what, where, with whom, when, and for how long? Does it include observations from the experience that reflect on what went well, what was challenging, and what impact was had on those who were taught? Does it show lessons learned from the experience (about the skills of teaching and/or the content taught)? Does it address how those lessons might be applied to relevant experiences in the future?

- Creative. Does it show unique or personal style in its format? Does it use graphics, original charts, or other media? Does it have special literary effects, such as original alliteration or particularly clever phrasing?
- Critical. Does it use standards from the competency as points of reference for evaluation? Does it show exercise of judgment (wisdom) regarding options? For instance, does the ministry reflection include assessment of ministry experience based upon standards related to the competency?

- Collaborative. Does it show the interrelationships of one's ministry with other individuals, organizations, and networks (rather than individual independence)? Note that doing collaborative work with others on the document to be uploaded is not necessarily what is meant by collaboration.

Required	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Clarity			
Complete (all parts)			
Accurate			
Supported (substantiated)			
Resource Interaction			
Ministry Reflection (implementation)			

Need to Meet Only 1	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria
Creative			
Critical			
Collaborative			