PHILLIPS THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
SYLLABUS DISCLAIMER

The following syllabus is the teaching and learning guide for the last time this course was taught. It will give you a good idea of the descriptions of the course, how it was taught, the reading, the papers and other assignments, the intended outcomes, and the workload. By examining this syllabus and others, you will be able to form an impression of what graduate theological education at Phillips Theological Seminary requires of students.

Due to periodic curriculum revisions, course names and/or numbers may be different on this syllabus than what the name and/or number of the current offered course may be.

This syllabus is provided for your information only. The faculty reserves the right to revise the curriculum, and each professor reserves the right to decide how best to meet the learning goals of the curriculum. Therefore, the following syllabus is an historical artifact rather than a promise of how the course will be taught in the future, or that the course will be taught again.

By Phillips Theological Seminary copyright policy, the syllabus is the intellectual property of the individual faculty member, with usage rights granted to PTS. Please contact the copyright owner if you seek to use the syllabus, for other than your personal enrichment.
I. GOALS

1. **Program goals:** This course helps students in all masters-level programs (M.Div, MTS, and MAMC) meet the curricular goal of articulating “a theology…that takes into account a liberative hermeneutic and is responsive to key themes in Christian theology.” (see Phillips Theological Seminary Catalog, M.Div, MTS, and MAMC Program Goals). It accomplishes these goals by:
   a. Introducing students to the historical sweep of Christian reflection on the nature of the church, so students may form more informed opinions about what a liberative ecclesiology must contend with; and
   b. Showing the continuity – and moments of disruption – in Christians understanding of the church, and the trade-offs that different ecclesiological models entail; and
   c. Giving students practice in formulating and articulating their theological arguments in authentic, persuasive, polished, edited writing.

2. **Division Goals:** This course helps students meet two curricular goals of the Theology and Ethics Division, according to which students completing coursework in division shall be able to:
   a. “[E]xplain basic vocabulary, topics, and approaches to theology,” and
   b. “[D]ifferentiate and compare theological…arguments from various historical periods and/or social locations[,]”
   c. “[I]ntegrate these studies into a coherent theological/ethical voice of ministry and leadership[,]” which will take place in more advanced courses in the division.

II. OUTCOMES

Upon successful completion of the course, the student will:

1. Be able to consider ecclesiological questions with historical and cultural awareness.
2. Articulate the ecclesiological questions that have endured over centuries, and appreciate the importance of these questions for the student’s own ministerial context.
3. Gain skill in communicating her or his ideas in writing, with precision, thought, authenticity, polish, and poise.

III. DEFINITION OF A CREDIT HOUR

In accordance with regulations announced by the United States Department of Education in October 2010, the PTS faculty defines one semester-hour of academic credit as that which may be granted for successfully completing over the course of a semester a set of required learning activities representing approximately forty-five clock hours of graduate-level study. The workload/credit calculations related to the documentation of student learning are based on projections of the minimum time that a typical PTS student should anticipate spending in each course in direct instruction by the instructor(s), recommended reading and library research, synchronous and asynchronous online discussion, creative theological reflection and writing, content review and testing procedures, and other appropriate educational assignments designed by the instructor to ensure that students achieve the learning objectives of the course as published in the course syllabus.
IV. MEANS OF ACHIEVING OUTCOMES

1. Each new week of the course runs from Wednesday noon to Wednesday noon.
2. Please plan to make at least **3 substantive points** per week that clearly draw upon the reading. (Whether you put all these points in a single post, or distribute them over multiple posts, is up to you.)
3. Please plan, also, to see that at least one of those points is a **reply to someone** else in the class.
4. Unless your schedule truly requires it, please do not make a habit of always completing all of your week’s posting in the final 24 hours of the week, every single week of the semester, as this hinders your ability to receive feedback. If your schedule does require you to consistently post in the final 24 hours of each week for the duration of the semester, please let the instructor know as early as possible.
5. Points count as substantive if they:
   a. Respond to the instructor’s prompt
   b. Demonstrate that the student has completed and thought about the reading assignment.
   c. Are **specific rather than vague**. A substantive post draws attention to, and cites, particular readings/authors/passages.
   d. Are **consistently on topic**.
   e. Are **cordial, charitable, and collegial**, encouraging fruitful conversation for the class as a whole.
6. During some weeks, video posts will be allowed. Written posts are always allowed. Use the format with which you are most comfortable.

V. ASSESSMENT

**Calculation of Final Course Grade:**

Raw score is calculated as follows:

- Midterm paper (200 points)
- A creative final project, which is your portfolio assignment and as such must generate an artifact that can go in your portfolio (200 points)
- Discussion board posts/participation (100 points possible)

**TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE: 500 points**

Final letter grades correspond to the following percentages:

- **94.00-100% = A**
- **90.00-93.99 = A-**
- **87.00-89.99 = B+**
- **84.00-86.99 = B**
- **80.00-83.99 = B-**
- **77.00-79.99 = C+**
- **74.00-76.99 = C**
- **70.00-73.99 = C-**
- **67.00-69.99 = D+**
- **64.00-66.99 = D**
- **60.00-63.99 = D-**
- **Below 60 = F (no credit)**

**Instructor’s Option to Curve:** If the instructor deems that the distribution of raw scores – whether for a particular assignment or for the entire course – would give more meaningful information and yield a more appropriate grade distribution by being curved, she reserves the right to curve the grades.
### Posting/Participation Rubric

Individual weekly posting is not assigned a numeric grade. Rather, final participation grades will be calculated based on the following rubric (see below). Prior to that, the instructor will send out progress reports in weeks 3 and 8, not for a grade, but just to let people know if their participation is on-track.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has the student consistently completed her/his 3 required substantive points per week, with at least one being a reply to someone else? Has the student generally tried to participate throughout the week, as opposed to habitually chiming in only during the last 24 hours?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the student’s posts reflected that s/he has completed and thought about the reading?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the student’s posts stayed on topic?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the student’s posts been specific rather than vague?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the student been cordial, charitable, and collegial, encouraging fruitful conversation?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total points: 100 raw points (25% of final grade)**
Midterm paper rubric

The midterm paper will be graded according to the following rubric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1 pt</th>
<th>2 pts</th>
<th>3 pts</th>
<th>4 pts</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author consistently uses incorrect grammar, spelling, and citations, according to the standards set forth in the PTS Style Guide.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inconsistently uses correct grammar, syntax, spelling, formatting, and citations, according to the standards set forth in the PTS Style Guide. Author overuses passive voice. Writing style is simple, choppy, and repetitive.</td>
<td>Author demonstrates a good command of formal U.S. American English. Consistently adheres to the conventions of the PTS Style Guide with 2 or fewer minor errors in mechanics per page. Word choice and sentence structure are appropriate and interesting.</td>
<td>Has a very good command of formal U.S. American English, with virtually no violations of the PTS Style Guide. Word choice and sentence structure show particular flair, creativity, and complexity.</td>
<td>6X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genre</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not demonstrate an understanding of the conventions of the genre in which s/he is writing.</td>
<td>Demonstrates inadequate understanding of the conventions of the genre in which s/he is writing.</td>
<td>Consistently uses conventions appropriate to her/his chosen genre.</td>
<td>Creatively adapts conventions in a way that shows great facility with the chosen genre.</td>
<td>6X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure of Argument</strong></td>
<td>No clear central claim. Evidence is missing, incomplete, incorrect, or does not support the argument. Does not anticipate good objections.</td>
<td>Identifiable but simplistic central claim. Offers evidence for claims inconsistently. Anticipates some obvious and/or facile objections; or anticipates objections but does not give satisfactory answers.</td>
<td>Identifiable, appropriate central claim that appears in the first page. Consistently supports claims with good evidence. Anticipates &amp; answers good objections.</td>
<td>Identifiable, interesting central claim in the first half-page. Supports claims and addresses objections in a thought-provoking &amp; subtle manner.</td>
<td>12x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insight</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates very little understanding of the argument, historical context, and values of the author(s) and/or document(s) s/he is analyzing.</td>
<td>Demonstrates inconsistent understanding of the argument, historical context, and values of the author(s) and/or document(s) s/he is analyzing; or demonstrates consistent understanding of only some of these areas.</td>
<td>Demonstrates consistent understanding of the argument, historical context, and values of the author(s) and/or document(s) s/he is analyzing.</td>
<td>Demonstrates deep and subtle comprehension of the argument, historical context, and values of the author(s) and/or document(s) whose work s/he is analyzing.</td>
<td>10x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone is not appropriate for the genre in which the student is writing.</td>
<td>Tone is only sometimes appropriate for the genre in which the student is writing.</td>
<td>Tone is consistently appropriate for the genre in which the student is writing.</td>
<td>Tone is not only suitable for a formal essay, but impresses the reader with its poise and confidence.</td>
<td>6x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exposition of argument</strong></td>
<td>An intelligent reader cannot follow the author’s train of thought at all.</td>
<td>An intelligent reader can only partly follow the author’s train of thought.</td>
<td>The author makes the elements of his/her argument clear, such that an intelligent reader can follow the entire train of thought.</td>
<td>The author makes the elements of her/his argument clear to an intelligent reader. In addition, the author shows fluency and creativity in supporting his/her thesis with supporting claims backed up by evidence. Demonstrates awareness of deeper issues raised by his/her chosen subject matter.</td>
<td>10x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE: 200
## Final project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>4 points</th>
<th>3 points</th>
<th>2 points</th>
<th>1 point</th>
<th>0 points</th>
<th>Wt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Content</td>
<td>Project clearly and centrally incorporates material covered in the course, in ways that show remarkable insight, equivalent to that shown in an excellent analytic essay.</td>
<td>Project clearly incorporates material covered in the course, to a degree and depth that is equivalent that displayed a good analytic essay.</td>
<td>Project incorporates material covered in the course, but the incorporation is a bit superficial, hasty, and/or inconsistent.</td>
<td>Project is mostly unrelated to the course content. Course content, if it appears, is misunderstood, misrepresented, and/or included an afterthought.</td>
<td>Project gives no evidence of engagement with or insight about the course content.</td>
<td>14x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Creativity</td>
<td>Project shows remarkable evidence of the student’s having challenged his/her creativity. Student has drawn upon and integrated different and unusual media, sources, and/or materials in particularly original and non-obvious ways. The resulting work is new and unprecedented.</td>
<td>Project shows evidence of the student’s having drawn upon and integrated several diverse sources, media, and/or material, and having challenged her/himself to reject more obvious ideas in favor of less obvious ideas.</td>
<td>Project shows evidence of the student’s having drawn upon one or two sources in ways that do not really break new ground or present a creative challenge. Product, while complete, is a bit obvious and/or the format is overdone.</td>
<td>Project is simplistic and shows little evidence of the student’s having challenged him/herself creatively. Project does not draw on many different media, sources, or materials, and those used are quite obvious.</td>
<td>Project shows no evidence that the student set him/herself a creative challenge or exercised creativity.</td>
<td>12x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Integration</td>
<td>Project shows clear, deep, and remarkable integration of creativity and content, such that each aspect is dramatically enhanced by the other.</td>
<td>Project shows clear integration between creativity and content, such that each aspect is strengthened by the other.</td>
<td>Project shows superficial or inconsistent integration between creativity and content, such that the two aspects only somewhat enhance each other.</td>
<td>Project shows little integration between creativity and content, such that the two aspects do not really enhance each other.</td>
<td>Project shows no evidence of integration between the creative work described in criterion 2, and the content-related work described in criterion 1.</td>
<td>14x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Project is so finely and carefully finished it appears nearly professional, and reflects a remarkable amount of effort.</td>
<td>Project shows appropriate care, and reflects sustained and conscientious effort.</td>
<td>Project is a little rough around the edges. While it reflects some effort and care, one gets the sense that it could benefit from a few more hours’ work.</td>
<td>Project is rough, with noticeable mistakes, omissions, or areas of neglect. One gets the sense that it was thrown together hastily, with insufficient effort.</td>
<td>Project gives no evidence of sustained effort.</td>
<td>10x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total points possible: 200**
VI. ATTENDANCE POLICY

PTS policy mandates that a student who misses more than 20% of a class cannot receive credit for the course. In this course, absence is defined as a lack of posts during a week’s lesson, with the week spanning the dates given on the syllabus.

VII. READINGS

Saint Augustine, *City of God* (Abridged Edition)
Image Classics, 1958
List Price: $14.00

**Place in the class:** We will spend the first half of the semester with this book. With *City of God* we let an influential voice speak to us from the past and make a case for the classical understanding of church and world. Although, presumably, we will not agree with Augustine in his particulars, it is important for us to understand why his model was compelling in context.

Avery Dulles, *Models of the Church*
Image Classics, 1991
List Price: $15.00

**Place in the class:** This is a typical ecclesiology textbook, often assigned in seminary ecclesiology classes. It attempts to give overarching categories of models of church. Everyone in the class is invited and urged to consider what one learns from such an approach – as well as what is concealed.

Gordon Lathrop, *Christian Assembly: Marks of the Church in a Pluralistic Age*
Augsburg Fortress, 2004
List Price: $19.00

**Place in the class:** This is a book of ecclesiology from a tradition that isn’t the same tradition as most of PTS’ students. Yet the tradition named therein is still considered by many to be in the mainline. Reading it will help students notice subtler differences than just “mainline”/ “evangelical”

Parker Palmer, *A Hidden Wholeness*
Jossey-Bass, 2009
List Price: $19.95

**Place in the class:** This book provides an interesting contrast to *Christian Assembly* and *Models of the Church* because it doesn’t announce itself as being for any very specific sort of community. Its usefulness is meant to lie in its broad applicability. We will be discussing the differences in approach between Dulles, Lathrop, and Palmer, and what those differences mean for ministry and theology.

Flannery O'Connor, *Wise Blood*
Farar, Straus and Giroux 2007 reprint
List Price: $15.00
Place in the class: This book shows how understandings of the church work their way into literature and not just into formal books on ecclesiology. O'Connor wrote in personal letters that only a Catholic could have written *Wise Blood*, even though it is a book about a kind of Protestant saint. What does she mean by that, and how can we tell from the book?
VIII. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES:
Phillips Theological Seminary is committed to providing equal access to its programs of graduate professional education for all qualified students with learning, physical, medical, or psychological disabilities. The Seminary aims to provide reasonable accommodation for qualified individuals with a disability (based on clinical documentation) to ensure their access and participation in the Seminary programs. For details, see “Disabilities Policies and Procedures” in the Student Handbook. Please contact the Associate Dean for Admissions and Student Services for consultation.

IX. INCLUSIVE LANGUAGE
Please use gender-inclusive language for humanity in your written work, avoiding terms like “mankind” or “the brotherhood of man” unless they occur in a direct quotation from a source you are citing.

X. ACADEMIC INTEGRITY
Plagiarism includes, but is not limited to:
- Failing to give appropriate credit for someone else’s words.
- Not citing where you got a fact, even if it doesn’t appear in a direct quote.
- Neglecting to give footnotes for ideas that aren’t general knowledge, even if you aren’t quoting them directly.
- Copying and pasting something you’ve previously written, without also giving a footnote indicating where the material originally came from.

If you’re not sure about what plagiarism involves, please take the steps necessary to learn. Discovered plagiarism results in a grade of 0 for the assignment.

XI. CHANGES TO SYLLABUS
If it serves the course goals, I reserve the right to make changes to the syllabus in response to problems or new circumstances that come to light during the semester. To the extent that it is in my power, I will only make such changes as work to the benefit of as many students as possible.
XI. CLASS CALENDAR

Class periods run from Wednesday at noon Tulsa time to the following Wednesday at noon Tulsa time. I will post a video lesson/lecture for each class session by Wednesday noon. Please watch the lecture and complete the assigned readings before posting.

Week 1: August 27-September 3

Reading assignment: Please read through the abridged version of Augustine’s *City of God* – but not too closely. (Plan to spend around 4.5-5 hours, no more, and pace yourself so that you look over it all in that time. This is a flyover, not an on-the-ground inspection.) Skim the parts that don’t make sense, noting, if you can, the source of your confusion. Jot down the points you think he’s trying to make, and draw upon what you already know to form hypotheses about why he structures his argument the way he does.

Posting assignment: Please share with the class the following:

- Your best guess as to what Augustine is generally up to here, and the evidence you base those guesses on.
- Some of the things that truly confused you, and be as specific as possible – understanding that you were only asked to skim, not to read closely.
- Three questions that, if you could have them answered, would help you understand the book better when you pick it up again to read more closely.
- *(optional)* If you consulted any outside sources – which you are not required to do – which sources those were, and why you chose them.

Video postings are allowed this week.

Please also provide thoughtful and empathetic responses to your colleagues’ insights and questions.

Week 2: September 3-September 10

Reading assignment: Refer to the questions you raised for yourself during the previous week’s discussion. With those in mind, please *closely* read Part I of *City of God*. This time, if you come upon something that seems like an important point, but whose meaning or significance is lost on you, see if you can find the answer – or if not the whole answer, at least part of the answer. If nothing confuses you, a) lucky you! 😊 and b) try to find some instances where the world Augustine inhabited is clearly influencing his understanding of the church.

Posting assignment: Please share with the class the following:

- What became clearer to you the second time around, reading more closely?
- Try to come up with a coherent story that includes the following four things: (1) The historical data we have about Augustine’s own life story and the world in which he lived; (2) The things he wrote about polytheism in *City of God*; (3) your perception (if any) of God’s activity in the world, in Augustine’s day and in our own; (4) Augustine’s legacy and influence in the intervening centuries between his day and our own.
- What, if any, questions came up for you in your reading that you were able to answer through your own digging? What sources did you consult, and how did you choose them?
What questions remain for you at this point?

**Video postings are allowed this week, but you may want to write down your “story” for your own reference, as you will refer to it next week.**

Please also provide thoughtful and empathetic responses to your colleagues’ insights and questions.

**Week 3: September 10-September 17**

**Reading assignment:** Please do the same thing you did last week with Part I, only this time do it with Part II.

**Posting assignment:** Please share with the class the following:
- Consider the story you crafted last week – the one that included historical data, Augustine’s own words, your perception of God’s activity in the world, and Augustine’s enduring legacy since the time that he lived. Now that you’ve read Part II more closely, what would you add or change?
- How might this story – which I realize we are still honing – be valuable to you in your ministry context? How might it give you resources to draw on as you seek to live your vocation?

Please also provide thoughtful and empathetic responses to your colleagues’ insights and questions.

**Video postings are allowed this week.**

**Week 4: September 17-24**

**Reading assignment:** Please do the same thing you did last week with Part II, only this time do it with Part III.

**Posting assignment:** Please share with the class the following:
- Again, return to the story you are crafting, the one that accounts for the historical data, Augustine’s words and arguments, your perception of God’s activity in the world, and Augustine’s influence/legacy. Now that you’ve read Part III more closely, what would you add or change?
- Think of what you said last week about how this story – which, again, is still in progress – might be valuable to you in your ministry context. What is one step you could take to help those in your ministry context access that value?

Please also provide thoughtful and empathetic responses to your colleagues’ insights and questions.

**Video postings are allowed this week.**

**Week 5: September 24-October 1**

**Reading assignment:** Please do the same thing you did last week with Part III, only this time do it with part IV.
Posting assignment: Please generate a rough plan/outline/concept map for your first paper, which will flow naturally from the posting you’ve been doing so far. The first paper will consist of two parts:

1. The “story” you’ve been working on; or, more to the point, your well-thought-out understanding of how Augustine’s *City of God* reveals itself to be a product of its time and culture, yet still continues to influence how today’s Christians experience God’s activity in the world.
2. The value that *City of God*’s concepts might have for people in your ministry context, and your plan for facilitating their access to that value.

Your posting this week should, therefore, give your colleagues a rough idea of what you plan to say in your paper, and which parts you still don’t have a plan for. It should also clearly incorporate material from Part IV, and if that material has deepened your understanding, please let us know how it has done so.

Please also provide thoughtful and empathetic responses to your colleagues’ insights and questions.

Only written posts this week, but if you make a hand-drawn concept map, you may scan/photograph and upload it as an attachment, instead of trying to type it.

Week 6: October 1-October 8

Reading assignment: Please do the same thing you did last week with Part IV, only this time do it with Part V.

Posting assignment: Referring to your outline from last week, and taking into account the feedback from your colleagues, please write 250-500 words of your paper. It need not be the first 250-500 words; it can be the part you have clearest in your mind. When you introduce the sample for your colleagues, please say a bit about whether the material in Part V confirmed what you had planned to write about, or made you change your approach, and why.

Please also provide thoughtful and empathetic responses to your colleagues’ insights and questions.

Only written posts this week.

Week 7: October 8 – October 29 [minus Oct 13-24, which is the concentrated course session]

Reading assignment: Please do the same thing you did last week with Part V, only this time do it with Part VI.

Posting assignment: Please post your completed, 1100-1500 word paper! You may post it as an attachment or just in the body of a regular post. And then rest, and congratulate yourself on having mastered one of the most important, but difficult, theological works in history. (And, as always, please also provide thoughtful and empathetic responses to your colleagues’ insights and questions.)

Only written posts this week.

Week 8: October 29-November 5:
**Reading assignment:** Remember the first week when you skimmed *City of God*, not for understanding (yet) but just to pick out major landmarks? Please do that again, this time with two books – Dulles’ *Models of the Church* and Lathrop’s *Christian Assembly*. As before, plan to spend no more than 5 hours. Skim the parts that don’t make sense, noting, if you can, the source of your confusion. Draw upon what you already know to form hypotheses about what these two authors are up to -- and, if you can, what distinguishes them from each other.

**Posting assignment:** Please share with the class the following:

- Your best guess as to what these authors are up to, and how they compare and contrast with one another, as well as the evidence you base these guesses upon.
- Some of the things that truly confused you, and be as specific as possible – understanding that you were only asked to skim, not to read closely.
- Three questions that, if you could have them answered, would help you understand the books better.
- *(optional)* If you consulted any outside sources – which you are not required to do – which sources those were, and why you chose them.

Please also provide thoughtful and empathetic responses to your colleagues’ insights and questions.

**Video posts allowed this week.**

**Week 9: November 5-November 12**

**Collaborative reading and posting assignment:** I will have divided the class up into two groups by this point, one for the Lathrop book and one for the Dulles group. (I will try to honor student preferences, but we need two roughly equal groups, so some people may not get their first choice.) Using Moodle, in group forums that I will set up, please work collaboratively to produce a brief (1-2 pages) “reader’s guide” to your group’s book. I’m choosing not to give any serious direction on how the reader’s guide should be formatted, since I’m hoping you will take the cues given by people’s responses the preceding week. What did it seem people wanted to know about your book? What confused them? What didn’t?

Feel free, in the groups, to divide up close readings and the writing of different sections. And please let me know how I can use Moodle to meet your group’s needs.

Also, please note: I realize that group work has the potential to be assessed unfairly. You are assessed only based upon the rubric I’ve provided in the syllabus. (In other words, if your participation is exemplary but the group implodes and fails to produce a reader’s guide, that will be unfortunate, and we should probably debrief about what happened, but you won’t “get a zero for the week” or anything like that.)

**Posts may be written within Moodle, or they may be completed in an application like Word, Powerpoint, Prezi, etc. But they should be heavily text-based.**

**Week 10: November 12-November 19**

**Reading assignment:** Please read *A Hidden Wholeness*, parts I – VI. This is a different sort of book than the others we have read so far, and to be honest I don’t know if it will accomplish what I hope it will. I’m hoping that the assigning of this book will coincide with students being ready to integrate the material from the course into their understanding of their respective vocations. But I am aware that the connection to the first part of the class is potentially tenuous,
and may get lost. Therefore, as you read, please be on the lookout for moments in the text that you can connect two either of two things: (1) Your identity and vocation, in the many contexts you inhabit, including those where you are a recognized leader; and (2) The readings from earlier in the semester.

**Posting assignment:** Begin by discussing what you understand Palmer to be doing here, and then move on to the items I asked you to look for while you completed the reading. Did you find any of the connections mentioned above? If so, please share them. If not, please think about why you might be having trouble finding them. What else would you need in order to be able to draw those connections?

Please also provide thoughtful and empathetic responses to your colleagues’ insights and questions.

**Video posts allowed this week.**

**Week 11: November 19-December 3 [minus Thanksgiving recess]**

**Reading assignment:** Please finsh *A Hidden Wholeness* and begin *Wise Blood*. (Chapters TBD) Think about whether and how Flannery O’Connor’s novel – and her life as a writer – tie together a lot of the ecclesiological themes we’ve been working with all semester. For example, she is profoundly Catholic, but the figure of Hazel Motes is a kind of Protestant saint. The novel shows a clear awareness of different ways one can define “church,” and the effects of doing so. (In *Wise Blood* this is often exaggerated to the point of grotesqueness. Why do you suppose that is?) She is haunted by some of the same things Augustine is haunted by, but takes a different approach to the haunting. And she arguably exemplifies many of the things Parker Palmer talks about – though perhaps she challenges them as well.

**Posting assignment:** Looking at the issues I’ve raised above in the reading assignment description, try to:

1. Situate *Wise Blood* in relation to the other readings, and O’Connor in relation to the other authors – doing outside research as you find it necessary to answer your own questions;
2. Imagine what it might look like if you put your ecclesiology into a creative work, as O’Connor has done with *Wise Blood*. Given your context, vocation, community, context, and knowledge – the latter of which has increased since the beginning of the semester, one hopes -- what medium would best speak the ecclesiological insights that you have to offer the world? Can you imagine using that medium for your final project for the class?

Please also provide thoughtful and empathetic responses to your colleagues’ insights and questions.

**Video posts allowed this week.**

**Week 12: December 3-December 10**

**Reading assignment:** Finish *Wise Blood*.

**Posting assignment:** I’m going to leave this one undecided for now, because I would like to see a bit more about how the semester goes and what people’s gifts are before I decide how best to celebrate what we’ve learned with the final posting assignment. So stay tuned!
Final projects due December 15, 5PM, with a blanket grace period until midnight, Tulsa local time.