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1. **Introduction**

This Statement of Work is made and entered into August ??, 2024, (the “Effective Date”) by and between PRTS and Grand Valley State University 1 Campus Drive  
Allendale, MI 49401 (GVSU).

The information set forth below is intended to be a framework under which PRTS will sponsor skilled students to complete identified tasks under a time and materials agreement based on the scope identified herein. If the requirements and the tasks need to be modified from time to time, such changes or modifications will be appended in writing in the form of a change order and authorized by both parties.

1. **Term of Agreement**

This agreement covers the period from August 26, 2024 (the “Commencement Date”) and shall terminate on April 26, 2025 (the “Expiry Date”) unless the scope and the activities are extended by written agreement more than 10 calendar days prior to this contract’s Expiry Date. The agreement can be terminated by either party if the other party is materially not meeting its commitments herein.

1. **Scope of work**

The technical effort by the student will be split among the following major areas:

* Participation in technical and design meetings
* Development of feature extraction algorithms to provide qualitative and/or quantitative attributes of a sermon’s delivery, including but not limited to the following:
  + Potential features:
    - Visual: eye contact, posture, gestures
    - Auditory: expressiveness/emotion, vocal variety, smoothness, volume
    - Textual: expressiveness/emotion, structural variety, phrasing
  + Associate extracted features with timespans (or less preferably, timestamps) to allow for more precise feedback and cross-mode analysis
  + For insight into the preaching evaluation process currently used by PRTS, the associated rubrics have been attached as appendices. The content-based categories may be considered out of scope for this work, but the style- and manner-based categories should be relevant for targeted feature extraction. The Poimenics Rubric (Appendix C) should be of particular relevance.
* For realizing the goals described above, the student will employ the following non-exhaustive list of technologies: machine learning techniques, video processing algorithms, cloud hosting infrastructure.
* Perform functional testing of the algorithms to verify feature extraction in varied cases

Furthermore, PRTS provides:

* Source code repository continuously accessible by the student via the Internet where all code changes and other project artifacts will be stored.
* A development environment for the student to develop the applications and provide initial testing.
* A testing environment for the student to test application releases before they are deployed into production.
* A data set of sermon (or speech) videos for feature extraction and analysis

1. **Project Timeline**

Fall 2024

August 26 PRTS provides access to source code repository, development environment, and other tools as described in the scope of work.

August 30 PRTS, advisor, & student have established plan for data set creation/growth, annotation, and usage

September 6 PRTS, advisor, & student have curated list of targeted attributes/features to be extracted

December 4 Student demonstrates feature extraction on limited data set for PRTS faculty; collect feedback on strategy to inform ongoing development and target deliverables

Winter 2025

January 6 PRTS, advisor, & student review gathered feedback, designate continued (or new) feature extraction goals

[Iterative] Student demonstrates feature extraction; PRTS gathers feedback; features are refined or new targets set

April 26 PRTS and student finalize all revisions to feature extraction

1. **Resource Requirements**

GVSU will staff the project with the following personnel:

* One full-time ACI Graduate Assistant - graduate student will work 20 hours weekly during project duration in the GVSU ACI facility.
* Faculty supervisor (R Rafiq) - will monitor GA’s progress and serve as a technical sounding board as needed.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Area Being  Evaluated | Not Meeting Expectations | Minimally Meeting Expectations | Meeting Expectations | Fully Meeting Expectations | Exceeding Expectations |
| *Exegesis*  */30* | Evidences no in- depth study of the text. Comments come from surface observations. No consideration given to context or genre. No evidence of utilizing the original languages. No demonstration of how text generates the outline statements. Length of text is inappropriate for the sermon type. | Evidences some analysis but seemingly all from secondary sources. Minimal reference to context and genre without indication to relevance or how contributes to meaning of text. Text is ignored in terms of outline formation. Explanation of text tends to be only surface. | Gives some consideration to context and genre. The text is of manageable length for the sermon type. Some reference to original languages but without appropriate explanation. Comments on text not always directly on point to support sermon idea. | Clear and accurate handling of the text. The sermon is based on logical or linguistic unit of text and is of manageable length for exposition. Due consideration to context and genre. Reflects analysis of original languages without being obtrusive. Key details are sufficiently addressed and handled. How the text generates and supports the points of sermon is clear. | Achieves all the expectations in an exceptional manner. |
| *Theology*  */25* | No attempt to identify the redemptive function of the text or how it contributes to revelation of Christ. No attempt to set the text or topic within the framework of reformed theology. | References to Christ are forced and beside the point, not clearly flowing from the statements or argument of the text. No attempt to identify the doctrinal truths associated with the text. | Identifies the doctrine of the text and makes some reference to confessional standards. Addresses the redemptive message and Christological application. | Clearly demonstrates the redemptive character of the text. Appropriate and unforced application to the person/work of Christ. Identifies clearly the doctrines in the text according to analogy of faith. Uses confessions. | Achieves all the expectations in an exceptional manner. |
| *Use of Supporting Scripture*  */20* | Other Scripture texts are not used. | Other texts are referred to but without sufficient comment to establish the point of relevance. | Other passages are used at appropriate points but with minimal justification for their use. | Effectively puts the text in its canonical context and employs the analogy of Scripture to interpret. Appropriately refers to other Scripture for illustration or support to reinforce the argument. | Achieves all the expectations in an exceptional manner. |
| *Application*  */25* | No attempt to apply the text to the current context or congregation. | Applications are vague and random, dealing with issues not flowing from the claim of the text. Applications tend to be perfunctory in nature. | Applications are made at the appropriate places and flow clearly from the meaning of the text. | Clear and specific. Directly derived from the claims of the text and can be supported exegetically. Appropriately nuanced in light of the whole of Scripture. | Achieves all the expectations in an exceptional manner. |

**APPENDIX A: Exegesis Evaluation Rubric**

**APPENDIX B: Homiletics Evaluation Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Area Being  Evaluated | Not Meeting Expectations | Minimally Meeting Expectations | Meeting Expectations | Fully Meeting Expectations | Exceeding Expectations |
| Introduction  /10 | Inappropriate length. Fails to create any sense of relevance between the text and current situation. Enters abruptly into main sermon without identifying topic or major purpose. | Length is appropriate but some disconnect between opening remarks and topic. Fails to make a significant link to current situation or needs. The major objective of sermon is not clearly identified. | Topic and proposition are clearly stated and makes attempt to establish relevance of the text to modern setting. The opening remarks do captivate attention. | Arouses interest and commands attention. Clearly defines the relevance of topic and text to current situation. Clearly leads to the proposition setting the goals and direction of the sermon. | Achieves all the expectations in an exceptional manner. |
| Proposition  /15 | Proposition is nonexistent. | Proposition is stated either too briefly to establish clear direction or too complexly to grasp. How it flows from the text is not clear. | Proposition is stated with some reference to the text. | Effectively weds the topic/text and the major sermon objective in clear, concise, easily understood statement | Achieves all the expectations in an exceptional manner. |
| Outline  /20 | The outline has no direct bearing on the text, shows no parallelism of structure, has significant overlapping thought, and evidences no progression or coherency of thought. | The outline is loosely related to the text but does not clearly progress the thought of the proposition. The outline structure lacks parallel development and the points are not clearly mutually exclusive. | The outline flows from the text and is directly related to the proposition. The points are clear but tend to be more fact oriented than homiletical. The points are mutually exclusive and move the idea forward to climax. | The points are textually based and clearly and progressively develop and support the proposition. The points are structured in parallel syntax and are mutually exclusive. The points are homiletically oriented, gnomic. | Achieves all the expectations in an exceptional manner. |
| Transitions  /10 | Presentation is choppy and abruptly moves from one thought to the next. | Transitions exist but tend to be artificial. | Effort is made to move smoothly and logically between points and between exposition and application. | Movement from point to point and from exposition to application or illustration is smooth, logical and not abrupt. | Achieves all the expectations in an exceptional manner. |
| Progression/flow of thought  /20 | Thoughts are disjointed and incoherent. | Thoughts follow the basic direction of the outline but tend to be random and scattered. | Thoughts develop clearly and advance the argument although there is some undue repetition and digression. | Demonstrates coherency and clear direction of purpose, each point building on the proposition. Thoughts are not disjointed but directly support the argument. | Achieves all the expectations in an exceptional manner. |
| Conclusion  /10 | Thoughts are disjointed and incoherent. | Ending is simply a summation. | Ending presses for the major objective as identified in the proposition. | Definite, purposeful, sufficiently climactic, not just a rehash or summary of content but a pressing of the proposition. | Achieves all the expectations in an exceptional manner. |
| Addresses experience  /15 | No attempt to address or direct the message to personal experience. | Handles the text in objective manner with minimal reference to subjective experience. | Makes some attempt to address heart issues. | Effectively aims at hearts of hearers. Personalizes the truths. Shows truth as relevant to life | Achieves all the expectations in an exceptional manner. |

**APPENDIX C: Poimenics Evaluation Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Area Being  Evaluated | Not Meeting Expectations | Minimally Meets Expectations | Meeting Expectations | Fully Meeting Expectations | Exceeding Expectations |
| Overall Impression  /10 | Several issues that distract from message. Lacks authority and personal conviction Scripture. | Some issues that distract from message that minimize pulpit effectiveness. | No major distractions and attempts to demonstrate the sobriety and urgency of the preaching. | Dress is proper. No awkward mannerisms or facial expressions. Strong pulpit confidence; yet humble. | Achieves all the expectations in an exceptional manner. |
| Eye Contact  /10 | Completely disconnected from the congregation. | Looks at the congregation periodically but not sufficiently to establish connection or rapport. | Attempts to make eye contact but favors a particular section. | Effectively engages the entire congregation. Avoids looking above or seemingly through the audience. Effectively connects with the people. | Achieves all the expectations in an exceptional manner. |
| Vocal Variety  /10 | Tends to be monotone without variation in pace or volume.  Significant problems with enunciation. | Minimal variety but not in appropriate places to support the point. Some enunciation problems. | Some variety but could be more effective in terms pace, pitch, or volume. No major problems with enunciation. | Effectively employs variation in pace, pitch, and volume. Variation helpful. Diction is clear and understandable. | Achieves all the expectations in an exceptional manner. |
| Reading of Text  /10 | Far too casual and quick reading of the text. | Shows some deference but rushes through the reading. | Shows deference to the text and attempts to read in a fashion that sets it apart. | Evidences respect for the dignity of the text. Reads authoritatively as it is the Word of God. | Achieves all the expectations in an exceptional manner. |
| Gestures  /10 | No gestures | Gestures are minimal, artificial, too small, or inappropriate to the point. | Attempts to use gestures but lacks variety. | Natural. Helpful. Uses a variety of hand movements that are large enough for the congregation to see. | Achieves all the expectations in an exceptional manner. |
| Use of Notes  /10 | Obvious and constant dependence | Obvious dependence but looks up occasionally | Some obvious dependence but regularly looks up and engages with the congregation. | Completely and consistently unobtrusive. | Achieves all the expectations in an exceptional manner. |
| Spiritual Guidance  /20 | Provides no spiritual guidance. Does not set forth Christ in His beauty and suitability. | Minimal pastoral shepherding. Assumes pastoral homogeneity. Gives pat answers. Uses clichés. | Attempts pastoral guidance. Fails to tie it in compellingly enough with text. Examples are forced or fall short. | Effectively engages a variety of hearers, with differing maturity levels. Makes a real connection instructs with tangibility and concreteness. | Achieves all the expectations in an exceptional manner |
| Experiential Depth  /20 | Provides no experiential teaching. Very little passion in delivery. | Minimal attempt to relate the truth of Scripture to the experience of the hearers. | Some experiential connection. Falls short of compelling link to variety of hearers.  A measure of warmness and passion. | Wonderful depth of experiential application brought in a loving/caring manner. More than textbook knowledge, Good discrimination of saved/unsaved; growth in grace. | Achieves all the expectations in an exceptional manner. |