


## Final Project Proposal Evaluation Guide

Mentor/Reader: \_\_\_\_\_ Student: \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Starting Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Content	Length (approximate)	Evaluation (please circle)				Comments and/or Recommendations
		1 = Poor	2 = Fair	3 = Good	4 = Excellent	
<b>Title Page:</b> reflecting a clear, concise title		1	2	3	4	
<b>Table of Contents</b>		1	2	3	4	
<b>Abstract:</b> brief summary	1 page	1	2	3	4	
<b>Description of Need:</b> context, demographics, people, need, etc.	3-4 pages	1	2	3	4	
<b>Ministry Proposal:</b> ministry statement, 2-4 ministry goals, definitions	1-2 pages	1	2	3	4	
<b>Project Director:</b> resources, 2-4 professional goals	2-3 pages	1	2	3	4	
<b>Doctrinal Foundations:</b> development of 2-4 biblical themes undergirding project	6-10 pages	1	2	3	4	
<b>Alternative Programs:</b> what others have used in attempt to meet similar needs	2-3 pages	1	2	3	4	
<b>Ministry Resources:</b> 8-12 key literary resources informing development	4-6 pages	1	2	3	4	
<b>Project Description:</b> narrative, logical overview, steps, research approach, enlistment, training, activities	3-5 pages	1	2	3	4	
<b>Project Evaluation:</b> criteria, methods, variety	3-4 pages	1	2	3	4	
<b>TOTAL PAGES</b> 						
<b>Appendices:</b> sessions, outlines, teaching plans, etc.		1	2	3	4	
<b>Selected Bibliography:</b> substantial? relevant?		1	2	3	4	

Form/Style	Evaluation (please circle ) 1 = Poor      2 = Fair 3 = Good      4 = Excellent	Comments and/or Recommendations
Turabian/Handbook Format	1 2 3 4	
Grammar	1 2 3 4	
Spelling	1 2 3 4	
Writing style	1 2 3 4	

## Overall Evaluation:

### Content

- High:** excellent in all or most areas
- Satisfactory:** competent work, good quality, though falling short of excellence
- Fail:** substance is inadequate

### Form/Style

- Pass:** errors are of a minor nature, not unduly numerous, and overall do not detract seriously from the Final Project Proposal
- Fail:** errors are more serious in nature and detract seriously from the Final Project Proposal

### Recommendation

- Rejection:** does not constitute a worthy project; return to student for significant revision and redesign of a worthy project; revision must be approved by faculty mentor before submission to ProDOC; see notations above
- Re-submission:** reflects a potentially worthy project, but contains significant conceptual and/or stylistic problems; return to student for correction and re-submission according to notations above
- Re-submission with a Second Reader:** after previous re-submission by student the proposal is still unacceptable. In order to deal with content or form/style issues, the faculty mentor requests a second reader to be assigned by ProDoc.
- Conditional Approval:** easily correctable conceptual and/or stylistic problems; approved conditional on correcting concerns noted above; student may proceed with project while making corrections that will be reflected in implementation and report
- Approval:** worthy, well-written proposal; student may begin implementation