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**COURSE OVERVIEW**

During the presentation in the ordination rites for deacon, priest, and bishop, the candidate(s) are required to sign an oath that gives expression to the importance of the Bible in the life of the church. The declaration states: I do believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the word of God, and to contain all things necessary to salvation; and I do solemnly engage to conform to the doctrines and worship of the Episcopal Church.” In many respects this course constitutes a commentary on the meaning and implications of that oath for both the clergy and the people of the Episcopal Church, a denomination that is increasingly aware of its place within the world-wide Anglican Communion.

**COURSE OBJECTIVES**

1. To trace how the Bible has functioned in the life of the church since the 16th century;
2. To explore how the Bible functions within the life of the contemporary church throughout the Communion by comparing how scripture can be brought to bear on two of the five “Marks of Mission,” those that deal with the care of the created order and unjust structures of society;
3. To think critically together about what we mean when we talk about the “authority of Scripture” in the life of the church;
4. To consider thoughtfully about how our use of Scripture serves to shape our identity as Episcopalians.

**COURSE OUTCOMES**

Having completed this course you will:

1. Understand, by means of informed discussion and interaction, the complex social, cultural, and theological matrix from which our use of Scripture emerged;
2. Submit and respond to three analysis papers that “exegete” primary texts or illuminate important ;
3. Produce an teaching unit for your own parish that:
4. Assists your congregation in thinking about how Episcopalians use scripture in worship and in ethical decision making;
5. Engages them in biblical study related to the two marks of mission in a way that fits appropriately within the accustomed worship life/praxis of the congregation;
6. Be able to articulate your own understanding of what it might mean to subscribe the oath of conformity at the time of ordination.

**TEXTS**

**Required:**

1. Rowan A. Greer, *Anglican Approaches to Scripture: From the Reformation to the Presen*t (New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 2006). **ISBN:** 10-8245-2368-7
2. Clare Amos, Ed., *The Bible in the Life of the Church*, Canterbury Studies in Anglicanism (New York: Morehouse Publishing, 2013). **ISBN:** 10**-**081922829X

**Online texts:**

1. *Deep Engagement, Fresh Discovery*, Report of the Anglican Communion “Bible in the Life of the Church Project” <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/mission/theology/the-bible-in-the-life-of-the-church.aspx>
2. *Guide to the Resources* from “Deep Engagement, Fresh Discovery” [http://www.anglicancommunion.org/mission/theology/the-bible-in-the-life-of-the-church.aspx](http://www.anglicancommunion.org/mission/theology/the-bible-in-the-life-of-the-church.aspx%C2%A0%28Links%20to%20an%20external%20site.%29)

Other required readings, especially the documents for analysis, will be posted on-line.

**Recommended for reference and purchase consideration:**

1. Charglels H. Cosgrove, *Appealing to Scripture in Moral Debate: Five Hermeneutical Rules* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2002)
2. Frank Wade, *Transforming Scripture*, in Transformations, the Episcopal Church in the 21st Century Series, James Lemler, ed. (New York: Church Publishing, 2008)

**OVERALL COURSE EVALUATION**

Students will be expected to compile a portfolio of work. Pieces include the discussion threads, textual analyses of original sources, peer reviews, and the teaching unit. The compilation will be evaluated according to the following formula:

 Five, two-part discussion postings (5 X 8 points) = 40%

 Three analysis (“exegetical”) papers with peer reviews = 45%

 A parish teaching unit = 15%

**GUIDELINES FOR ENGAGING IN** *&* **RUBRICS FOR EVALUATION OF WEEKLY, ON-LINE DISCUSSION**

1. Students are required to post *TWO* substantive comments every week;
2. Each posting should be no longer than 250 words;
3. The first posting (4 points possible) should arrive by the end of the day (5 p.m.) on Tuesday;
4. The second posting (4 points possible), which engages other student comments and builds upon and extends your initial contribution, should arrive by the end of the day (5 p.m.) on Thursday;
5. Please participate in on-line discussions as you would in constructive, face-to-face conversations;
6. Please be professional and courteous;
7. On-line communication lacks the non-verbal cues that provide much of the meaning in face-to-face interactions. Choose your words carefully, and phrase your sentences clearly. While you will want to keep your sentences and paragraphs brief (see #2 above), a “tweet” is not your aim;
8. State the main point(s) you are going to take up at or near the beginning of your comment whenever possible; yours are not “rambles” toward an idea;
9. Proofread what you intend to post. You may want to use a word processor to draft what you intend to say and then paste your text into the message section of your posting. That way you can be more intentional in your composition, providing you an opportunity to check (and correct) spelling and grammar;
10. Please do not use all CAPITAL LETTERS. It makes it hard to read, and it comes across as if you were shouting;
11. Here’s how I intend to **evaluate your weekly, on-line postings**:

 4 POINTS

* Participant made at least *two* postings to the discussion, one of which was a response to that of a classmate(s);
* Participant’s comments were responsive to the discussion prompts posted by the instructor;
* Participant referred directly to (by quotation or by citing a page number) or showed clear evidence of having read, viewed, or completed the relevant assignments;
* Participant made substantive comments or raised questions that significantly enhanced the discussion and/or stimulated further discussion;
* Participant’s comments provided evidence that s/he had read and conscientiously attempted to engage other classmates’ postings;
* Participant’s postings were constructive and differences of opinion were expressed in a respectful manner.

3 POINTS

* Participant made at least *two* postings to the discussion, but none was in response to that of a classmate;
* Participant’s comments were responsive to some but not all of the discussion prompts posted by the instructor;
* Participant’s comments showed some concrete evidence of having read, viewed, or completed the relevant assignments;
* Participant made comments and raised questions that moved the conversation forward;
* Participant’s comments provided evidence that s/he had read at least a few classmates’ postings;
* Participant’s postings were constructive and differences of opinion were expressed in a respectful manner.

2 POINTS

* Participant made at least *one* posting of a substantive nature;
* Participant’s comments were responsive to at least one of the discussion prompts posted by the instructor;
* Participant’s comments showed some evidence of having read, viewed, or completed only a portion of the relevant assignments;
* Participant’s comments and questions were limited or showed little evidence of direct engagement with the discussion;
* Participant’s comments provided evidence that s/he had read few classmates’ postings;
* Participant’s postings were constructive and differences of opinion were expressed in a respectful manner.

1 POINT

* The participant more or less signed the attendance sheet by weighing in with a “me too” comment that neither demonstrated any degree of reflection nor expanded the conversation in a useful way.

0 POINTS

* Participant offered no comments; failed to join the discussion.

**RUBRICS FOR INSTRUCTOR’S EVALUATION OF EXEGETICAL (ANALYSIS) PAPERS**

10-9 POINTS (A 🡪 A-)

* The paper provided evidence that the author had read and carefully attempted to understanding the primary document under consideration;
* The paper responded fully to the analytical questions posed by the instructor;
* The paper referred to or quoted directly passages in the primary text to support claims and/or to develop its argument;
* The paper offered insightful comments and/or raised probing questions that demonstrated genuine engagement with and mastery of the major ideas of the course unit;
* The paper was clearly organized, well-written and free grammatical, punctuation and spelling errors.
* “High pass”

8.9-8.0 POINTS (B+ 🡪 B-)

* The paper provided evidence that the author had read and mostly grasped the content of the primary document under consideration;
* The paper attempted to respond to all of the analytical questions posed by the instructor, with some responses more fully developed that others;
* The paper’s reference to or quotation of passages in the primary text to support its claims and/or to develop its argument was uneven;
* The paper demonstrated genuine engagement with and passing mastery of the major ideas of the course unit, but insightful comments and/or probing questions were limited;
* The paper’s organization was mostly clear and the writing relatively good, with only a few grammatical infelicities, or errors in punctuation and spelling;
* Clearly, a “passing” effort.

7.9-7.0 POINTS (C+ 🡪 C-)

* The paper suggested that the author had problems understanding the important parts of the primary document under consideration;
* The paper failed to address one or more of the analytical questions posed by the instructor;
* The paper rarely referred to or quoted passages from the primary text to support claims and/or to develop the argument;
* The paper was more or less wide of the mark in linking the assignment to the major ideas of the course unit;
* The paper lacked organizational clarity, or was poorly-written, and/or rife with grammatical, punctuation and spelling errors;
* Borderline “passing” effort

6 POINTS (NOT PASSING)

* The paper revealed that the author did not understand the primary document under consideration;
* The paper mostly ignored the analytical questions posed by the instructor;
* The paper did not refer to or quote passages from the primary text to support its claims and/or to develop an argument;
* The paper failed to make any connections between the assignment and the major ideas of the course unit;
* The paper failed to meet the writing standards of graduate theological education;
* A “failing” effort.

0 POINTS

* No paper was submitted;
* No credit awarded.

**THINGS TO ASK YOURSELF WHEN WRITING A PEER REVIEW**

* Have I made every effort to understand my peer’s paper on its own terms? Have I been able to distance myself enough from *my* paper to give *this* paper its due: a careful, thoughtful, and generous read?
* If I’ve been able to do that…then ask: Has my peer realized the goals of the assignment?
* What’s really good about this paper? Where do I find myself saying, “I wish I had thought of that”? Or, “Wow, that’s really perceptive!”
* Where do I find myself being a “resisting” reader? And why? Has my peer not grappled with all of the issues at stake? Has the paper taken an unexpected turn? Do I disagree with something I’ve read? Does the analysis miss the mark?
* How do I frame my dis-ease? Do I refer back to the instructor’s guidelines? Do I pose some questions? Do I point to a passage?
* If the paper has turned my head around, made me think about the assignment differently, how would I like to continue the conversation? Extend the investigation?
* Overall, did this paper make a compelling case for itself by the way it was organized and by the clarity/precision of its writing?

**RUBRICS FOR THE INSTRUCTOR”S EVALUATION OF PEER REVIEWS**

5 POINTS

* The reviewer’s comments reflected a careful, thoughtful, and generous reading of the peer’s work;
* The reviewer highlighted and praised in some detail the insightful or probing elements of the peer’s paper;
* When appropriate, the reviewer noted insufficient analysis of and/or misunderstanding of the primary text;
* When appropriate, the reviewer directed her/his peer to passages in the primary text that deserved greater attention;
* The reviewer posed trenchant questions for the peer’s consideration;
* The reviewer commented on the paper’s organization, clarity and writing proficiency;
* Overall, the reviewer’s comments were constructive, with differences of opinion expressed in a respectful manner.

4 POINTS

* The reviewer’s comments reflected a mostly careful, thoughtful, and generous reading of the peer’s work;
* The reviewer attempted to highlight and praise insightful or probing elements of the peer’s paper, but only superficially;
* The reviewer took issue with some of elements of the paper, but did not push the criticism toward a more careful analysis of the text;
* The reviewer commented briefly on the paper’s organization, clarity and writing proficiency;
* Overall, the reviewer’s comments were constructive, with differences of opinion expressed in a respectful manner.

3 POINTS

* The reviewer’s comments reflected a somewhat unfocused reading of the peer’s work;
* The reviewer lacked a critical perspective on the peer’s paper; the reviewer found it difficult to identify specific strengths or weaknesses;
* The reviewer’s criticisms or questions were too general or lacked focus; they were grounded neither in the specific passages from the primary text under consideration nor in specific examples drawn from the peer’s analysis;
* The reviewer hardly commented the paper’s organization, clarity and writing proficiency;
* Overall, the reviewer’s comments attempted to be constructive, with differences of opinion expressed in a respectful manner.

2 POINT

* The reviewer’s comments reflected a cursory reading of the peer’s work;
* The reviewer’s comments about the peer’s paper were mostly impressionistic and vague;
* The reviewer posed no specific questions to the peer;
* The reviewer mostly ignored the paper’s organization, clarity and writing proficiency;
* While respectful, the reviewer’s response to the peer’s paper was too superficial to be of much help to the peer or the class.

0 POINTS

* No peer review was submitted, disappointing both the assigned peer and class as a whole.

**ACCOMMODATION**

Iliff engages in a collaborative effort with students who have disabilities to accommodate reasonably their needs in order to support effective learning. Students are encouraged to contact their assigned advisor to initiate the process of requesting accommodations. The Advising Center may be contacted as advising@iliff.edu, or by phone at 303.765.1146.

**WEEKLY TOPICS, READING ASSIGNMENTS** *&* **IMPORTANT DUE DATES**

Each week of this course takes up a new topic for reading, reflection, discussion, and writing. As such, each constitutes a discrete “module”. The required elements are posted under the assignment and discussion tabs.

**SAVE THE DATES: One set of dates to mark on your calendars is October 14-17. These are the Gathering Days at Iliff. I’ll take a poll of the class so that we can find a mutually convenient opportunity for the us to worship and share a meal together in person, face to face.**