

Pedagogies Of The Oppositional Religious Other:
Theory and Practice

Nathan R. Kollar

January, 2008

Abstract Narrative

Pedagogies Of The Oppositional Religious Other: Theory and Practice

Purpose: The *Other Voices* project provides the principles and tested pedagogies to answer the question “How do we teach to and about those who differ radically from each other religiously in classroom?” **Methodology:** Eight institutions of higher education in upper New York State pooled their resources for eighteen months to enable twelve representatives, six of whom were administrators, to survey and offer focus groups for students and faculty, and to design and test nine pedagogies in response to this question. **Results:** As a result they gathered the opinions of how students and faculty view those who differ religiously from them. They also received opinions of why and how everyone must learn from each other. Through intense dialectical interchange the team brought these opinions together with other contemporary research and produced *Curricular Principles for a Listening Curriculum, Nine Pedagogies for Dealing with the Radical Other*, and other principles for encouraging dialogue among oppositional others as well as possible dangers and limits to such curricula and pedagogies. The summary of the results are found in the body of the paper and the support for these conclusions in the four appendices. **Conclusions:** These pedagogies continue to be used in these institutions and the principles have been implemented in most of the departments. From continued attempts to involve other institutions of higher education in this project the majority of the participants are convinced of its necessity - especially among those who deny the premise of the project, that significant learning occurs from those who radically differ from each other when done with the appropriate pedagogies.

Pedagogies Of The Oppositional Religious Other: Theory and Practice

Nathan R. Kollar

Summary: How do we teach to and about those who radically differ from each other in the classroom? This study reflects upon some of the practical ramifications present in contemporary theories, pedagogies, and institutional demands necessary to hear opposing voices in the classroom. It offers clear principles that lay the foundation for a listening curriculum and nine tested ways (pedagogies) of bringing oppositional voices into actual classes.

Introduction:

People kill others for religious reasons. People control their eating, intake of foods and drink, sexual appetites, and contact with others for religious reasons. Whether they should or they should not makes no difference. They do! A religion points people in a certain direction in how to live and think.

What happens when one religion contradicts all or some of what another religion proposes? What happens when the adherents to these religions enter our classrooms? What happens when those who consciously adhere to no religion enter into the classroom; or, are bored with religionists and non-religionists? Should we do anything about it? What can and may we do?

What follows takes for granted that learning about those who differ radically with us about religion matters. It also takes for granted that we learn a great deal from those who differ from us. We cannot neglect those of different beliefs – religious or otherwise – for several reasons.

Current religious wars and tensions surround us. The *increased religious diversity* in classroom, business, politics, and community demands we seek to know the other in as much depth as possible. Everyday life and professional activities demand that we know the other as the other wishes to be known.

To lack limits is to lack identity. To say who we are is also to say who we are not. An honest description of those who are not us is also an honest description of ourselves. Pedagogies that are truly revelatory of the other faith help us know our own. *We need to understand and relate to the other for personal reasons.*

As rational creatures we seek to understand our own beliefs, feelings, and thoughts. To explain that faith, to have other inquiring minds seek both to understand it and object to it, help us understand our own faith better. How we learn from those with whom we have

radical differences indicates our dedication to the truth we seek and the honesty of our presentation of those who differ from us.

This mutual seeking to understand, though not necessarily agreeing with, the other, places us in a community of learners with the necessary skill demands and personal benefits from being in such a community. *In a pluralistic society such as ours the ability to work together toward the common good with those with whom we do not agree is a necessary skill for survival.*

We are always limited in what we teach and learn. Time, money, shame, and guilt are a few everyday realities in our teaching and learning. Teaching and learning one's faith and the faith of others is no different. These limitations confront us with the foundational issues of truth and honesty as we teach and learn our faith because sometimes limits become means of avoiding dealing with difficult issues. Much like a politician may answer a question by talking at length about something we never asked her or him, so a teacher may teach only what he or she knows or feels strongly about and never face those who radically disagree with him or her - as they are. To not listen to these oppositional voices and/or to misrepresent them may easily deny the truth of one's faith in the present day context and bear false witness to the position of the opposition. *Religious reasons* necessitate learning about those who differ from us.

Even when we wish to listen to the radical other, however, there are many of the limits we mentioned above. How do we listen to the other voices in a world burdened with information overload and degree and certification requirements for graduation? How do we listen in the face of the many inherent limits of what we do and who we are?

It is within this context that eight educational intuitions pooled their resources stimulated by a Grant from the Wabash Center.¹ Their desire was to understand both the theory and practice surrounding bringing the voices of the oppositional other into the classroom and to recognize those that are present in both classroom and institution. They worked at this task for eighteen months. The departments that undertook this challenge were Religious Studies, Theology, and/or Philosophy. Four of the institutions were undergraduate departments and four were the entire institution since they were Graduate Schools of Theology and Ministry. Six of the twelve participants were heads of their department. Purposefully Christian institutions were chosen since our experience was that intra religious conflict was both an historical and present reality. Because intra religious conflict was an ever present concern, a local vibrant Center for Interfaith Studies and Dialogue was regularly consulted for common issues dealing with inter religious conflict.

Each of these institutions has its unique institutional mission advocating and supporting the faith life of the students. Each has its unique set of curricula and pedagogies that enhanced and fostered that mission. We presupposed that not only the public and published curricula of these institutions was important to take into account but also "the hidden curriculum," that set of ideas, words, rituals, normative moral actions, and ways

¹ I would like to thank the Wabash Center for its generous grant (#WC 2005 014) and continued support for this project.

of associating with others that we avoid. What we don't teach is as important as what we teach. This hidden curriculum socializes us into ways of knowing and acting just as surely as the published one does. Discussion of opposing voices frequently surfaced this curriculum especially at the extremes of our ideological spectrum.

Over the months we enhanced and developed the tools for discovering the other voices hidden in our educational systems and used those tools for our investigation and creation of pedagogies. The basic traditional tools for information gathering were essential to our task: printed opinion surveys, focus groups, book, article, and internet research. Arranged in a series of questions the results of our information gathering and mutual critique follow shortly. In addition the reader will find a list of principles that summarize our perspective on the necessary conditions for creating an atmosphere of learning from and with those who differ from us. Our goal was to provide other professionals with models of pedagogies set within actual classroom syllabi. These syllabi and pedagogies are added to these conclusions as well as a series of appendices acting as further explanation of the previous conclusions.

Traditional Pedagogies for Teaching About Religion and Being Taught One's Religion

Memorization of an entire text or parts thereof has been the historical means of formally teaching and being taught one's religion. Students memorized the Quran, the Torah, the Bible, or selections from these texts. They memorized the catechisms. In the twenty-first century this is still the dominant way most Abrahamic religions formally pass down their religion from one generation to the other. It is less so in Europe, the Americas, and some parts of Asia than in the rest of the world but still, it is the most common way. Everyone has learned about their religion within their family and among their peers. They learned how to act, speak, feel, and think regarding the religious realities in their life. With the advent of modern educational techniques the religious education of young, teens, and adults changed wherever these techniques were accepted. Gradually a move away from rote education began, and continues, to evolve.

Formal teaching about another's religion is a recent phenomenon originating in the colonizing done by the Western nations. It has a twofold emphasis: 1) missions and conversion and 2) liberal knowledge, comparing different cultures and therefore their religions. The latter movement, which resulted in the study of the so called world religions, and recent immigration from the colonies into the Western nations, resulted in the necessity for the various peoples within one nation to learn about the other peoples and their religions. This teaching has increased in the United States after the 1963 Supreme Court decision *Abington v Schempp* which, while ruling Prayer and devotional exercises as unconstitutional in public schools, advocated teaching about religion. The pedagogies available for doing this paralleled whatever educational theories were current at the time.

Recent surveys suggest we are still not too distant in our teaching from those ancient centuries ago who passed down their religious teaching from one generation to another.² Today in both teaching religion and teaching about religion the lecture method is used most of the time by most of the professors: 52% use it between 100%-66% of the time. Essay exams are used by approximately the same amount of teachers (56.1%). Term papers were also a favorite for over 66% of the faculty.

More than 66% of the faculty seldom, if ever, used any of the contemporary pedagogical methods. These include the following: Cooperative learning, simulation games, role playing, case studies, field experiences, experiential learning, active learning, team/group exams, computer assisted instruction, use of community resources, portfolios, retreats, journals, group learning, clinical experiences, management teams, learning communities, service learning, field education, internet, debates, internships, independent study, contract learning, and peer teaching peer teaching. It is important to note, however, that these were not unknown pedagogies because over 80% of those surveyed were familiar with the terminology.

Both past and present indicate that we must search for new pedagogies to deal with the new pluralistic realities of contemporary life. This is what we sought to reflect upon and to begin to do something about.

The Institutions and the People involved in this process

The Institutions

Three of the four institutions were founded by clergymen. One was founded by a group of Roman Catholic sisters. All these institutions followed in the footsteps of their founders as being strong advocates for their founders' faith. Two were Roman Catholic and two were Methodist. Today these same institutions struggle to retain their past identity while enticing new students into their hallowed halls. This struggle and past identity has an impact upon which voices are considered authentic in the institution. All have classes in religious studies, with what expertise, depth, and orientation varies. In one of the institutions teachers must swear an oath to uphold the faith of their founders, another solidly affirms its education in a truly Christian manner, and still another publicly proclaims its embrace of all religions in an atmosphere which is both nurturing and maturing for each faith. The last is caught between a majority of faculty searching for a secular institution and a Board of Trustees advocating support for Conservative Catholicism.

² For what follows see *The Rochester Area Religious Studies and Theology Assessment Project (RARSTAP)* (2000) which was a national survey of 390 respondents from AAR, CTS, ATS membership lists. See N. Kollar, "Necessary Cynicism About Contemporary Assessment Methods and Motives," The Council of Societies for the Study of Religion Bulletin 33 (Sept. 7 Nov., 2004) and "Assessing Teachers' of Religion in U.S. Post Secondary Education," in 2006 in ERIC database ED490587. A 2005 Carnegie study on educating clergy by Dr. C. Foster offers the same conclusions.

The four Graduate Schools also reflect many of the contemporary tensions. They easily fall along the gradient of very liberal, moderate, conservative. They prepare individuals for professional work in the Roman Catholic, Episcopal, Methodist and Baptist Churches. Their mission statements (Appendix A) reflect the past denominational history of each institution as well as their present engagement with contemporary culture. Explicit statements advocating and supporting exposure to and learning from other faiths are found either in the institutions' mission, goals or diversity statements. All clearly publicly advocate diversity but, as is often the case, what "diversity" is being referred to is another matter. Usually it refers to diversity of race.

The Faculty . (Appendix B)

A traditional form for examining a religious way of life is to provide descriptions of its verbal, communal, ritual, and prescriptive expressions. The surveys enabled us to gain a sense of how the faculty viewed their own and others' faith life. Both the surveys and the focus groups provided us with a picture of how they understood their pedagogies. Various circumstances resulted in diverse participation in the distribution of the surveys. The result was that the faculty surveys were dominated by the theological schools; the student surveys were dominated by the undergraduate schools. We did a comparison between faculty and students of each institution but these are not included here because of their length.

Well over 90% of the faculty holds that speaking, doing, and gathering regularly with those of the same faith is personally important to them. But when specifics were suggested, e.g. weekly attendance at worship, the percentage of those who saw it important slipped significantly. It is interesting to note that 73% say that they do not agree with the common understanding of their religion.

While 83% say that their curriculum has a purpose there is disagreement as to what that purpose should be. All say it is important to know other religions and 96% say it is important to know dissidents within their own religion. When other faith-perspectives are described as unbelievers 50% say this is not a negative description and only 46% see "heretic" as a negative term. Their teaching methods, in order of priority, are: critical thinking, active learning, term papers, experiential learning, and lecture. It is important to note that the theological faculty and students differ as to what pedagogies are actually used in the classroom.

The entire faculty expressed in their focus groups: a necessity to provide and support pedagogies surrounding the creation of a safe place, listening skills, and modeling of care and concern for the students; a wish to develop referee pedagogies for strongly expressed views in the classroom; a hope that improved ways to assess pedagogies of diversity beside tests and professional reflection would be developed. There were significant differences in pedagogical awareness and usage between the theological and undergraduate schools: the theological schools emphasized the word read, spoken, or written; the undergraduate, experience, community resources, texts and discussion.

The students. (Appendix C)

As mentioned above, various circumstances limited full participation by all the institutions. This also demanded a sensitive interpretation of the data. Each institution, however, was provided with a comparison between what its faculty and students said.

As with the faculty, the students affirmed the importance of the basic indicators of religious life with “doing the right thing” dominating. 70% said the purpose of the curriculum aids them in choosing classes. The importance of other religious voices was affirmed by over 93% of the students. 40% understood “heretic” to be a negative term while 41% did not know what it meant. In order of priority the following were the pedagogies experienced by the students: lecture, active learning, term papers, the use of teams/groups, and cooperative/collaborative learning.

All the student focus groups emphasized the necessity of learning from others while the theological/ministry students saw attending worship services as important to their education. One theological school witnessed divisive behavior surrounding requests for whole school worship led by various denominations.

We were dealing with four diverse types of students: the very certain, the “everything is relative,” the seekers, and the religiously diverse (those from a family composed of membership in different religions). The majority of the team said our goal was to teach them empathy for the other, i.e. appreciation, seeking common ground with others through an imaginative entrance into their “world.” We do this by: sharing “stories,” learning to listen to the other, learning to see the similarities and differences between the religious ways of life, seeing each other as in the process of growth, relating it to each person’s individual religion, and honoring what they already experience.

Several members strongly stated another goal: to exchange data/information about various religions. This is the only way, from their perspective, that a teacher can provide and assess what was provided in large classes with radically differing religious viewpoints.

Theoretical Questions With Practical Consequences

To answer the following questions we said that “Oppositional voices in the classroom,” were those individuals, and the communities they represent, whose beliefs and ways of life either now or in the past rejected other beliefs and ways of life present in the classroom. With this understanding in hand we began to discover through printed questionnaires, focus groups, and project team discussions that many ancient controversies over belief and polity have mellowed for most students; differences of worship stimulate curiosity for many and fear of involvement for some; and, that there is a high degree of controversy and mutual opposition surrounding societal/moral issues such as abortion, homosexuality, social justice, race, war. Many students who practice their religion will speak, in quiet moments, of how there exists a great deal of “anti” in their life. These are words and actions that publicly oppose their present religious way of

life. In many colleges and universities faculty and staff denigrate religion in general or Christianity in particular. This “anti” attitude is found in both their home town as well as higher education. “Oppositional voices” surround us. What do we do with that reality in the classroom? The majority of the team concluded, toward the end of the year, that we should stop using the term “oppositional” because it forced our answers to these questions into an either-or set of answers when they were actually “both-and” responses by most students. Because this clarification happened toward the end of the year many of our responses to the research questions were cast, as we will see shortly, in the “oppositional” voices mode.

Oppositional voices in general may be dealt with through pedagogies of dialectic, description, or inclusiveness. Whether each of these pedagogies is oppositional to the other was part of the team’s on going discussions.

How should we treat the oppositional views in our institutions and classrooms and what should we do to make sure we encourage dialogue rather than diatribe in the class?

We should take into account:

- The various types of students in our classrooms:
 - Those secure and at ease with the language and presuppositions of our classes.
 - Those without formal religious experience or training who are insecure and uncertain with the language and presuppositions present in our classrooms.
 - Subsets within each of the above are:
 - The very certain students,
 - The everything is relative students,
 - The seekers,
 - The students from mixed religious backgrounds.
- The purpose and mission of the institution
- The difference between a graduate and undergraduate institution.
 - Graduate schools of Theology and Ministry have an obligation to form students in the tradition that they represent while treating all equally, with respect, with honor, and without bias.
 - Undergraduate institutions have an obligation to provide more of an “objective” presentation of views.
- The developmental nature of student learning as well as the life-experiences of those involved in the classroom encounters.

We should treat each view / voice appropriately:

- By acknowledging them
- By acknowledging them as their speaker intends
- By helping everyone understand them
- By providing a space and time for interaction between those who hold these views/lead these ways of life

- By establishing an atmosphere of respectful dialogue, for example by beginning with “In my opinion....” “Today, I think...”
- By establishing the hospitality of listening: delay immediate judgment.
- By recognizing voices representative of current or past religious views or ways of life as truly authoritative because of those they represent. E.g. “This view is Lutheran / Muslim. Here is where you can find out more about it.” Support them as legitimate positions that people of good heart and mind could hold, with a substantial following despite their minority status in this class, institution, or culture.
- By taking the opportunity to explain the strengths of the “other’s” point of view and set it in a socio-historical context to demonstrate how people would hold such a view.
- By not pandering or speaking in a condescending manner but by providing the respect shown through critical questioning.
- Our response should model how we expect the students to respond.
- Respect a student’s right to privacy, especially when expressing an opinion contrary to the majority.
- Allow diversity to emerge
- Establish a process with the students, within the classroom: for what to do: what to do when everything is okay; what to do when it is not okay.
- By providing the necessary temporal or physical space to respond, for example by saying “We’ll deal with this next class/week. Till then think about the best way of dealing with: Many teachers want to “fix things” immediately when many things in life take time.
- Be clear to yourself whether you are an advocate or a facilitator: both are necessary.
- By enabling dialogue to be the norm, not diatribe.
- Not tolerance but empathy should be the rule. (Tolerance = “We’ll accept you, but we’re better attitude.” Empathy= appreciation, seeking common ground with the other(s), imaginatively entering into the “world” of the other.

What are the necessary materials, pedagogies, and social interactions we should encourage in our schools to provide students with a broad view of what is happening in our surrounding religious world?

- We should bring representatives of other religious ways of life into the classroom in person or through means of various media.
- We should encourage student use of the internet to come in contact with and /or deepen their knowledge and awareness of the religious others.
- We should facilitate student visits to religious places of worship, activities & places of learning, and work with those in need.
- We should provide panels available to the public of a variety of religious experts and representatives of various religious ways of life so both students and interested public may encounter each other.

- We should make available all school worship and/or gatherings for worship by each religious group in the institution – this includes, for example, the prayer / *salat* of Muslims five times a day or some Christians praying the *Angelus*.
- We should support study abroad for long or short periods of time. These periods of study should include, as part of the program, reflection on the religious dimension of the cultures with which they are engaged.
- We should provide financial assistance for gatherings of autobiographical materials representative of a variety of religious ways of life.
- We should both recognize and encourage student reflection on what they have encountered
- We should be vocal supporters of library budgets that provide various points of view.
- We should provide examples of the power and functional success of the “other” point of view in people’s lives.
- We should do the same for those from the more “familiar” traditions. The “familiar” religious tradition in one school is not necessarily the familiar tradition in the other schools.
- Pedagogies should be interactive, varied, encouraging intellectual experimentation and dissent, taking imaginative leaps into other perspectives, setting perspectives in socio-historical contexts.
- Instructors should be humble in the face of oppositional points of view.

When we allow radically different voices into our institutions and classrooms, or encourage our students to visit those who are radically different than themselves what should be done about the possible dangers and limits to this exposure?

Possible dangers:

Most of the time there are no imminent threats to their physical, psychological, social, and spiritual welfare. However, education itself may be dangerous to some, anxiety filled for many, and an energizing freeing leap to new life for some.

If one is engaged in education, especially a liberal arts education that includes theology/religious studies, one enters into a time and place of liminality (Victor Turner). Liminality is inherently dangerous as one traverses from one, or several, points of view to others. Some movement from one to another may involve a movement from one horizon to another – i.e. conversion experience (Bernard Lonergan). Physical, social, mental and spiritual dangers surround those in a state of liminality. The question is not one of avoidance of dangers but of how to cope with them. We suggest that all the ordinary means of dealing with such dangers in life be used here. The typical responses to danger such as fight, flight, adaptation, and boredom should be discussed if necessary. Unless one becomes involved with religions that are anti-social and/or criminal in behavior the most obvious response is curiosity – which is also a healthy emotion to cultivate and reflect upon.

The limits:

- Institutional limits of engagement with the radically different are those of institutional and/or departmental or program mission statements. We are always within an interpretative community which brings with it the natural limits of time, place, economy, and language. The placement of institutional limits is necessary to protect the freedom of all. Our first amendment is an example of this.
- There are few points of view and ways of life that are so heinous that they do not merit respectful consideration.
- Opinionated words and actions are limited by:
 - The demands of evidence and proof by the academic community among which is critical reasoning.
 - The necessity of hospitality and manners toward all.
 - The requirements of dialogue.
 - The importance of honoring the person while disagreeing with her or his claim.
 - The importance of being open to all views presented without turning the principle of openness into an absolute, demanding anarchy.
 - Individual conscience.
 - One can only do so much, believe so much, know so much. Humans are limited creatures.

*What are the necessary materials that the teacher should share with the students?
How prepare beforehand?*

The preparation and sharing in order to encounter the other is similar to the teacher's preparation for encountering any new source of information and experience. These may be any or a combination of what is itemized below.

- Provide nothing – allow the encounter to take place without any “bias” provided by the teacher.
- Provide some written or media source to be read, listened to, and/or seen that reviews what the students will encounter before going to experience the religious other.
- Orally provide the categories for interpretation
- Orally provide the categories for interpretation and examples.
- Provide a check list in writing to be used in providing a response to the encounter.
- Provide nothing but require a journal entry or some other means of free writing to reflect and express the results of the encounter.
- Require a group discussion about the encounter.
- Require a written, oral, individual and/or group in class feed back. This may also be done with the use of other electronic media.

The necessary pedagogies the teacher should use

These should match the manner in which the encounter will take place, what religious group will be encountered, the expectation of unease between those engaged in the encounter, and the required feedback consequent upon the encounter. For example, role play might be suggested for those who will join with those of a different religion in

worship services or with those engaged in helping those in need because of a social justice issue, incarceration, or immigration.

All the following were found to be helpful, though not necessary, pedagogies: lecture, essay and objective exams, term papers, book reports, group exams, case studies, simulation games, cooperative learning, peer teaching, debates, internet, media of diverse kinds, team and group work, journals, use of community resources, independent study, learning communities, and team teaching. We have quantitative results as to how often these, and others, were used, and the views of students and teachers as to their usage.

One of the most experienced undergraduate teachers strongly stated a warning to us in our endeavor. The teacher said: “We are asking students to be aware of religious voices contrary to their own faith when: 1) they do not understand it enough to know what’s contrary; 2) Their developmental, which would include intellectual, stage is such that they are certain of very little. 3) Perhaps it is better to ask them to listen, and deal with, their inner conflictual voices. Helping them deal with this is really helping them prepare for when they do have to deal more with both inter religious as well as intra religious conflicts.

What are the minimum of inter religious voices and intra religious voices that are necessary in every curriculum in our respective institutions and in theology and religious studies in general?

This is not so much the quantity but the quality of engagement with the other. For learning to take place the following must be taken into consideration: an ability to demonstrate an understanding of the other’s words and actions; a sense of empathy with the other; an ability to compare and contrast one’s way of life with their way of life; an ability to read their writings, to imaginatively share their worship, engage in their polity, and accept their moral perspectives as one’s own; to recognize oneself as “an other;” to be able to listen, to be able to question, an ability to deal with contemporary religious pluralism.

In a theology curriculum, intra religious diversity is probably more essential than inter religious. Theology students must understand their own tradition especially well and this is only possible when they understand its breadth. Still, theology students would benefit from seeing their own tradition in a wider inter religious perspective.

Religious Studies, on the other hand, is necessarily comparative (“to know only one is to know none”) and must be inter religious. It isn’t Religious Studies if it does not include the study of a wide range of religions (exactly how wide is difficult to say and a challenge to operationalize in a small department). Still, Religious Studies students would also benefit from encountering intra religious diversity so they avoid the mistake of thinking of religious traditions in narrow, monolithic, stereotypical terms. Religious Studies students need to realize that all religious traditions are internally diverse.

*What are the **principles upon which a listening curriculum and pedagogy should be built?***

As the team began to consider their response to this question they did so within the context of the preceding months of discussion and their focus on the students, not on religious ideologies and their possible impact upon student, teacher, and institution. In discussions about principles they revealed a desire to speak of “pedagogical affirmations.” or “assumptions and guidelines” instead of principles. Out of the same context they sought to describe what happens in the classroom in another way beside “oppositional voices.”

Three terms were offered as substitutes for “oppositional voices.” These were the following:

- **DIFFERING** voices in a class setting: The different perspectives on an issue that exist in a class setting. This phrase seems neutral on questions such as whether the majority hold one perspective, some voices are less likely to be heard, some perspectives are in strong opposition to one another, etc.
- **MARGINAL** voices in a class setting: The voices of those who hold perspectives different from that (those) held by the majority of the students in the class. Here the question of whether the marginal voices will be heard does arise.
- **CONTRASTING** voices in a class setting: This is similar to “differing voices,” except that it implies that some perspectives are in opposition to one another.

Most of the team favored the use of the term “marginal voices as a better descriptor of what they dealt with in their classes. Our answer to the question is what follows.

Principles for a Listening Curriculum

Pedagogical Affirmations Supportive of Marginal Voices In the Theology / Religious Studies / Religion / Philosophy Curriculum

1. A sense of hospitality, civility, and respect should pervade our institutional culture.
2. The presence of marginal voices in the curriculum enhances an understanding of one’s faith life.
3. The curriculum should foster an understanding of diverse ideas, beliefs, and practices.
4. While acknowledging, respecting, and providing support for each voice, we should also acknowledge, respect and provide support for the ties that bind us together as both an academic and human community.

5. While acknowledging that we should focus on the communal traditions that characterize our academic institution, we also acknowledge that these same traditions are marginal voices in other contexts.
6. The discussion and analysis of these voices should use the methods and language of the academy in general and the method and language of the proper academic discipline in particular.
7. Time for reflection, discussion, and analysis should be allowed for each voice. At the minimum, time for directed reflection must be encouraged for each voice that speaks.
8. Part of the process of listening to, reflection upon, and analysis of marginal voices should also include what is common to all voices.
9. Faculty and staff should model constructive ways of engaging other voices.
10. The curriculum should include learning objectives that challenge the institution to put these pedagogical affirmations into practice
11. Appropriate assessment procedures should be established to evaluate whether these pedagogical affirmations are operative throughout the curriculum.

Are such pedagogies important within the Curriculum design of our institutions.

- Each institution's mission statement reflected their past history and present vision for the future.
- Almost all institutions underwent or will soon undergo Middle States and/or ATS accreditation review.
- Some mission and curriculum changes occurred as a consequence of the preparations for this review.
- The teaching of and about religion underwent changes over the years. The quantity and quality of curricular change depended upon each institutions unique situation. Many of the changes at the undergraduate level occurred in relationship to the core or general education requirements not so much in relationship to the major and/or minor requirements.
- Changes in one graduate school were mandated by their church.
- Conscious change occurred in relationship to subject matter to be covered more than how to "cover" (pedagogy) subject matter.
- The process of change depended upon where the authority for curricular change resided: in one person, in a few persons with a clear process, in many persons (collegial) with a clear process.
- Several institutions had a clearly articulated and documented process for curricular change based upon stated principles.
- The faculty of two of the Graduate Schools reviewed and responded to the syllabus of each new course before it went into effect.

- There was a significant difference between adding and subtracting courses from the curriculum
 - Adding courses involved careful review of whether the course met mission and curricular goals in those institutions that had such public review processes.
 - Deleting courses seemed to occur for two reasons: 1) Not enough students for the course (“not enough” being arbitrarily determined by some administrative official); 2) lack of skilled personnel to teach the course.

In general, pedagogy did not play much of a part in either adding or subtracting a course or modifying the curriculum. Exceptions to this “norm” were found in some core/general education classes that mandated the practice of certain skills (e.g. writing, computation).

How can we turn these theoretical questions into practice? (See Appendix D)

Nine Pedagogies for Dealing with the Racial Other

Much of the team’s discussion and activity revolved around the practical implementation and ramifications associated with the presence of the radical other in the classroom. What follows is the “pedagogy” developed by each team member and represents the practical participation and implementation of each institution in our team’s efforts.

Each “pedagogy” is composed of the following: I. *Pedagogy*, an initial outline of the pedagogy: II. *Detailed description of the pedagogy* answering the following questions: What pedagogy or pedagogies will you design, test, and evaluate that is / are oppositional to the student’s faith life? Why have you chosen this pedagogy? How does this pedagogy fit into your institutional mission and your departmental/institutional curriculum? How will you evaluate what you have done? III. *Syllabus* of the course within which the pedagogy is used. IV. *Evaluation and reflections*. Which is an evaluation of the pedagogy and reflection upon its use by its author?

The following is a list of the pedagogies, their purpose, and the class within which they were used.

<i>Pedagogy</i>	<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Syllabus</i>
Believing the Beliefs of the Religious Other	Increasing empathy among convinced Christians of differing beliefs	Phil 402 Philosophy of Religion
Recognizing Religious Diversity	To respect differences, discover commonalities, make connections	RES 236 Religion in America
Listening to the Listeners	Building consensus around how others’ hear us	PR30 Homiletics
Different religious people; different worship for the same God.	Experiencing worship of different denominations	BHT 513: Experiencing the worship of other Christian traditions

Listening to the convinced conservative other.	Those not energized by any religion.	RES 335, Biomedical Ethics
My changing God	Experiencing past religious change as part of the life cycle	REST 105C Introduction to RomanCatholicism
Co-journeying for otherness	Building awareness of how an other experiences what we say and do in dealing with other spiritualities..	INT 705 Transformative Leadership
Professional Reflection on Otherness	Learning to articulate gender issues as expressed in film and reflecting on these issues.	MS PT 333 The Dance of Women's Spirituality
Communities within communities	Those leaders who wish to listen, learn, and respect other leaders' radical differences.	C/D 205: Contemporary Moral Theology:

APPENDIX A

MISSION STATEMENTS OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

Graduate Schools of Theology and Ministry

A. Five Full Time Faculty

A Roman Catholic graduate and professional school that educates and assists women and men in academic, ministerial, interpersonal and spiritual formation for the purpose of serving the Church through diverse forms of lay and ordained ministries; for theological scholarship; and for Christian service in society.

B. Five Full Time Faculty

We understand our mission is to engage in intentional formation of ecclesial personhood in a community of prayer, so that you are prepared as fully and completely as possible for Christian ministry in a pluralistic world.

C. Seven Full Time Faculty

Responding to God's call as revealed in Jesus Christ, we are an ecumenical and multiracial community of faith and theological inquiry. Embracing the legacy of the Social Gospel, we are enriched by local and global perspectives, and by our historical and continuing ties to the American Baptist Churches. Enlivened by the Holy Spirit, the school seeks to transform persons, church, and society as it prepares women and men for lay and ordained ministry that is pastoral, prophetic, and learned.

D. Six full time faculty

Our mission is to prepare men and women for Christian ministry, both lay and ordained. Rooted in classical Christian faith, the Seminary creatively seeks to equip its students for ministry to contemporary culture.

Undergraduate Schools of Religious Studies and/or Religion/Philosophy

A. Six Full Time Faculty in the Religious Studies Department.
2,148 full time undergraduate; 1,031 graduate.

We are an independent, coeducational, liberal arts college founded in 1924. Historically rooted in the Catholic tradition of its founders the College welcomes men and women of all faiths. Its mission is to educate its students in the liberal arts and sciences and in professional fields so as to foster commitment to a life informed by intellectual, ethical and aesthetic values; to develop skills necessary for the pursuit of a meaningful vocation; and to inspire dedication to the ideal of service to their communities.

B. Five full time faculty in Religion and Philosophy, Division of Religion and Humanities.

1, 346 undergraduate full time; 557 graduate.

As a community of learners committed to historic Christianity we seek to prepare thoughtful, spiritually mature, service-oriented people who will help transform society.

C. Five Full Time Faculty in the Religious Studies Department
2,793 full time undergraduate; 911 graduate.

We are a collaborative community dedicated to teaching and learning in a personalized educational environment. The College is guided by its Catholic heritage, as expressed in the motto of its founders “teach me goodness, discipline, and knowledge.” Through an education rooted in the liberal arts, we prepare individuals for lives of intellectual, professional, and civic integrity, in which diversity and service to others is valued and practiced

D. Fourteen full time faculty in the Philosophy/Religious Studies Department
1, 418 undergraduate, full time.

We are a *Christian Learning Community* that emphasizes preparation of students to become future leaders. We are centered on strong academic programs, and a faith community/fellowship that helps develop conviction, compassion and character. Study abroad programs and global partnerships reflect our commitment to out-of-the-classroom learning, experience and service..

APPENDIX B

Faculty Survey Highlights, Faculty Focus Group Summary, Faculty Survey for Curriculum and Pedagogy

Note: The results of all surveys are available as well as comparisons between faculty and students for each institution as well as for all institutions.

Faculty Survey Highlights

Description of the faculty:

- 70% of replies were from theological faculty
- There was a high degree of satisfaction with their teaching 75% above “average”
- A quick comparison of the faculty and student view of worship reveals a significant divergence. (This may be because the student survey represents primarily undergraduates.
- Is it permissible to interpret “Not doing the right thing” as sin? This is very significant in Q. 30 where 80% say that everyone who belongs to a religious way of life should do the right thing most of the time” – a church of saints?

Expressions of Religion

96% say religious belief is important to them.

96% say worship is important to them.

100% say being good/doing the right thing is important to them.

90% say belonging to and participating with others in a religious way of life is important to them.

BUT

43% say that the way a person speaks her or his religious belief gives clear indication of what they think is important.

53% say weekly participation in worship is important.

70% say any regular, public participation in worship is necessary.

80% say that everyone who belongs to a religious way of life should do the right thing most of the time.

73% say that they disagree with the common understanding of their religion

Curriculum:

83% say their curriculum has a clear purpose. (Q. 37)

66% say part of the purpose should be the students. (Q. 38 b)

43% say part of that purpose should reflect the profession. (Q. 38)

One respondent said the curriculum’s purpose should reflect the church (remember 70% of the replies were from theological schools)

Necessity for Knowledge of Other Religions

100% say it is important to know other religions; 96% say it is important to be aware of dissident in their own religion.

72% say it is very important or important to experience the way of life of another religion

50% do not believe that claiming someone as an unbeliever is a negative term.

46% do not believe that “heretic” is a negative term.

May we conclude then than those who are radically different from each other are seen by half the faculty positively?

Pedagogies faculty say they use (in order of priority) most of the time:

1. Critical Thinking
2. Active learning
3. Term Papers
4. Experiential learning
5. Lecture.

FACULTY FOCUS GROUPS’ SUMMARY

Purpose: to provide qualitative data to supplement the quantitative data of the surveys.

Common to all:

- A necessity to provide and support pedagogies surrounding the creation of a safe place, listening skills, and modeling of care and concern for the students.
- Referee pedagogies for strongly expressed views in the classroom.
- Improved ways to assess pedagogies of diversity beside tests and professional reflection.

Common to Graduate Schools :

- Teaching about those who were different from those in the classroom.
 - (Some saw the opposite to this as indoctrination)
- The ability to teach about difference was provided by objective/scientific/modern theological methods.
- A focus on words, either spoken or textual, when discussing pedagogies.

Common to undergraduate schools:

- Difference was present and sometimes strongly expressed in the classroom.
- World religion courses were well attended and attracted a significant number of students.
- Pedagogies for Religious Studies were similar to those of gender, economics, race, and ideological differences.
- Students expressed more interest in differences in the above rather than in religious belief, organizational forms, and worship.
- Little emphasis upon lecture as a dominant pedagogy.

FACULTY SURVEY FOR CURRICULUM AND PEDAGOGY.

We need your help in finding out how you teach (pedagogy) and how what you teach is connected (curriculum) . It takes ten to twenty minutes to complete the survey. Your time and effort will help us be better teachers.

When you are done place this survey in the self addressed envelope.

Respond by **filling in completely** the circle corresponding to your answer. (*like this*)
Your comments are more than welcome. Please write them on the back of these pages and, if necessary, provide reference to the question upon which you are commenting..

1. My school is private public institution.
2. The number of students attending my school is:
 20,000 or less. 10,000 or less. 5,000 or less 2000 or less. 500 or less.
3. My school has a Religious Studies Department Theology Department
 Religious Studies Program Theology Program
 Both a Religious Studies and Theology Department / Program
 A school of Theology A Philosophy/Religious Study
Dept.
4. I am male female.
5. How many years have you been teaching? _____
6. What level of your profession are you presently at as a professor?
 Full Associate Assistant Instructor Adjunct Other ____
7. How satisfied are you with your teaching?
 Very Somewhat Satisfied Less than Not
8. What is your religion/denomination? _____
9. Were you always a member of this religious way of life? Yes No
10. Are you an active member of this religious way of life? Yes No
11. What was the religion of your family until you were fourteen? _____
12. Was the religion/denomination of your mother and father the same?
 yes No I am not sure
13. If you were to change your religion/denomination which would you choose?

14. Are all those who profess your religious way of life in agreement with your understanding of your religion? Yes No I am not sure
15. Is religious belief important to you? Yes No I am not sure

16. Are the expressions of religious belief, such as creedal statements, important to you?
 Yes No I am not sure
17. Are the sources of belief, such as the Bible, Talmud or the Koran, important to you?
 Yes No I am not sure
18. Does the way a person speaks her or his religious beliefs clear indications of what they think is important?
 Yes No I am not sure
19. Would you be a better person if you associated with those who do not believe as you do?
 Never Sometimes Often Always
20. Is worship important to you? Yes No I am not sure
21. Is the way you worship important to you? Yes No I am not sure
22. Are the traditions related to your worship important to you? Yes No I am not sure
23. Is weekly, public participation in worship services a necessary expression of one's religious way of life? Yes No I am not sure
24. Is monthly participation in worship services a necessary expression of one's religious way of life? Yes No I am not sure
25. Is any regular, public participation in worship services necessary expressions of one's religious way of life? Yes No I am not sure
26. Would you be a better person if you associated with those who do not worship the way you do?
 Never Sometimes Often Always
27. Is being good/doing the right thing important to you?
 Yes No I am not sure
28. I feel I do the right thing: Most of the time, Half the time, Seldom
29. What do you do after you do not do the right thing? _____
30. Should everyone who belongs to a religious way of life do the right thing most of time?
 Yes No I am not sure
31. You would be a better person if you associated with those who do not act the way you do?
 Never Sometimes Often Always
32. Is belonging to and participating with others in a religious way of life important to you?
 Yes No I am not sure

33. How do you participate with others in your religious way of life? (Mark as many as you wish)
- Common Worship
 - Common profession of faith
 - Common action to make life better
 - Participating in your religious organization
 - Other _____
34. Please rate these ways of being religious. Use “1” as the least important and “4” as the most important.
- ____ Religious Words
 - ____ Religious moral/ethical actions
 - ____ Religious ritual actions
 - ____ Religious organizational gatherings and structure

The Religious Studies department or School of Theology has designed a curriculum. We would like your impression of your school’s curriculum.

35. Did you participate in formulating your department’s / program’s curriculum?
 Yes No
36. Do you think it has a clear purpose?
 Yes No
37. Do you think it should have a clear purpose?
 Yes No
38. If it should have a clear purpose, would that purpose emphasize the needs of
- The profession
 - The students
 - The institution
 - The faculty member
 - The culture
 - Other _____
39. If the curriculum were a book, what kind would it be?
 Anthology Novel Poetry History Cartoon Other _____.
40. Do you think it is very important that you know about other religions? Yes No
41. Do you think it is very important that you be aware of dissidents within your own religion?
 Yes No
42. How important is it to experience the way of life of another religion?
 very important important somewhat important not very important
43. How important is it for you to be aware of those who believe and live your religion/denomination different than you do?

very important important somewhat important not very important

44. Would you teach a class in religions/denominations other than your own? Yes No
45. Tell us which one's you think students should know more about.. _____
46. Do you consider "heretic" a negative term? Yes No I am not sure
47. Do you consider "unbeliever" a negative term? Yes No I am not sure
48. Is there any religion you fear? Yes No
49. Is there any religion you consider false? Yes No
50. Is there any part of your religion you ignore? Yes No
51. If "yes" what is/are those part(s)? _____
52. Do you teach opinions you violently disagree with?
 Yes No
53. If you do, would you tell us how you do this? (Use the back of this page, if necessary)

The following deals with the different pedagogies.

How often do you use these methods?

- | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 54. Lecture | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 55. Essay Exams | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 56. Objective Exams | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 57. Term Papers | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 58. Book Reports | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 59. Group Exams | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 60. Active Learning | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 61. Experiential Learning | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 62. Field Experience | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 63. Case Studies | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 64. Role Playing | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 65. Simulation Games | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 66. Cooperative Learning | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 67. Collaborative Learning | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 68. Peer Teaching | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 69. Contract Learning | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 70. Independent Study | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 71. Internships | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 72. Debates | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 73. Audio Visuals | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 74. Internet | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 75. Field Education | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 76. Service Learning | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 77. Learning Communities | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 78. Management Teams | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |

- | | | | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 79. Clinical Experience | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 80. Teams / Groups | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 81. Journals | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 82. Retreats | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 83. Portfolios | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 84. Team Teaching | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 85. Community Resources | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 86. Computer Assisted Instruction. | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 87. Critical Thinking | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |

88. Which department, program, or specialization has the best teachers in your institution?

89. What are the characteristics of a good teacher?

THANK YOU FOR DOING THIS. IT WILL BE OF GREAT BENEFIT TO TEACHING RELIGION AND THEOLOGY.

APPENDIX C

Student Survey Highlights, Student Focus Groups Summary, Student Survey of Curriculum and Pedagogy

Note: The final results of all surveys are available as well as comparisons between faculty and students among all institutions as well as within each institution.

Student Survey Highlights

Profile

90% of respondents are from undergraduate schools

64% are of respondents are juniors or higher.

40% are Roman Catholic.

25 % were not always a part of their present denomination.

70% consider themselves active members of their denomination.

70% consider themselves knowledgeable or more in regard to their denomination.

60% do not ignore any part of their religion

37% experienced religious/denominational diversity among their parents.

Religious expressions

43% do not feel their co-religionists agree with their view of that religion.

79% feel belief is important to them.

72% say worship is important to them.

98 % say doing the right thing is important to them.

BUT

33% say weekly, public worship is necessary.

35% say any regular, public worship is necessary.

Curriculum

48% say the topic is what motivates them in makes a class choice

24% say the curriculum does.

70% say they are aware of the purpose of the curriculum when they chose a class?

Religious Diversity is affirmed

96 % say it's important to know about other religions.

92 say its important to know about those who are dissidents within their own religion.

43% say it's important or very important to experience the way of life of another religion.

95% say they would talk a class in religions/denominations different than their own.

Terminology is unknown

40% say heretic is a negative term.

41% do not know what it means.

Fear and Falsity of another religion

22% fear another religion

42% say they consider some religions false.

Pedagogies in order of priority

1. Lecture
2. Active learning
3. Term papers
4. The use of teams/groups
5. Cooperative/collaborative learning

STUDENT FOCUS GROUPS SUMMARY

Purpose: to provide a human context for the paper surveys numbers; methodologically, to provide a qualitative base for our pedagogies.

Undergraduate Schools agree upon:

- The necessity to learn about other religions and faith stances.
- Understanding Other's faith strengthened our own faith.
- Learning facts (objective) and feelings (subjective) are important to understanding one's own faith and that of others.
 - (One of the other fact/feelings dominated the discussion in each school while both were affirmed in both schools.)

- Lecture was seen as important but not to the exclusion of discussion groups, visits & visitors, and audio visuals.

Graduate Schools agreed upon:

- The education and physical challenge of attendance and participation in the curriculum, i.e. the length of classes and school day.
- Knowledge of one's own faith is necessary for those who are ministers.
- Knowledge of other's faith is necessary because we live and work in a pluralistic environment, ie. small communities where it strengthens all the churches to work together.
- Learning about the other is best done by attendance/participation in other's worship service and meeting individuals of various faith perspectives.
 - (One of the other fact/feelings dominated the discussion in each school while both were affirmed in both schools.)
- There are radical differences in pedagogy among their teachers. Some only lecture, others only have small groups or discussion.
- Some religious faith communities do not want to work with others.

STUDENT SURVEY FOR CURRICULUM AND PEDAGOGY.

We need your help in finding out how you are taught (pedagogy) and how what you are taught is connected (curriculum) . It takes ten to fifteen minutes to complete the survey. Your time and effort will help us be better teachers.

When you are done place this survey in the self addressed envelope.

Respond by **filling in completely** the circle corresponding to your answer. (*like this* **O**)
Your comments are more than welcome. Please write them on the back of these pages and, if necessary, provide reference to the question upon which you are commenting..

90. My school is private public institution.
91. The number of students attending my school is:
 20, 000 or less. 10,000 or less. 5,000 or less 2000 or less. 500 or less.
92. My school has a Religious Studies Department Theology Department
 Religious Studies Program Theology Program
 Both a Religious Studies and Theology Department / Program
 A school of Theology A Philosophy/Religious Study
 Dept.
93. I am male female.
94. Please write your birth date: Day___ Month ___ Year _____
95. How many years have you attended an undergraduate institution? ____

96. How many years have you attended a graduate institution? _____
97. What is your religion/denomination? _____
98. Were you always a member of this religious way of life? Yes No
99. Are you an active member of this religious way of life? Yes No
100. If you were to rate your knowledge of your religion, would you consider yourself ?
 very knowledgeable,
 moderately knowledgeable,
 knowledgeable,
 lacking some important knowledge,
 lacking a great deal of knowledge.,
101. What was the religion of your family until you were fourteen? _____
102. Was the religion/denomination of your mother and father the same?
 yes No I am not sure
103. If you were to change your religion/denomination which would you choose?

104. Are all those who profess your religious way of life in agreement with your understanding of your religion? Yes No I am not sure
105. Is religious belief important to you? Yes No I am not sure
106. Are the expressions of religious belief, such as creedal statements, important to you?
 Yes No I am not sure
107. Are the sources of belief, such as the Bible, Talmud or the Koran, important to you?
 Yes No I am not sure
108. Does the way a person speaks her or his religious beliefs clear indications of what they think is important?
 Yes No I am not sure
109. Would you be a better person if you associated with those who do not believe as you do?
 Never Sometimes Often Always
110. Is worship important to you? Yes No I am not sure
111. Is the way you worship important to you? Yes No I am not sure
112. Are the traditions related to your worship important to you? Yes No I am not sure

113. Is weekly, public participation in worship services a necessary expression of one's religious way of life? Yes No I am not sure
114. Is monthly participation in worship services a necessary expression of one's religious way of life? Yes No I am not sure
115. Is any regular, public participation in worship services necessary expressions of one's religious way of life? Yes No I am not sure
116. Would you be a better person if you associated with those who do not worship the way you do?
 Never Sometimes Often Always
117. Is being good/doing the right thing important to you?
 Yes No I am not sure
118. I feel I do the right thing: Most of the time, Half the time, Seldom
119. What do you do after you do not do the right thing? _____
120. Should everyone who belongs to a religious way of life do the right thing most of time?
 Yes No I am not sure
121. You would be a better person if you associated with those who do not act the way you do
 Never Sometimes Often Always
122. Is belonging to and participating with others in a religious way of life important to you?
 Yes No I am not sure
123. How do you participate with others in your religious way of life? (Mark as many as necessary)
- f. Common Worship
 - g. Common profession of faith
 - h. Common action to make life better
 - i. Participating in your religious organization
 - j. Other _____
124. Please rate these ways of being religious. Use "1" as the least important and "4" as the most important.
- e. ____ Religious Words
 - f. ____ Religious moral/ethical actions
 - g. ____ Religious ritual actions
 - h. ____ Religious organizational gatherings and structure

The Religious Studies department or School of Theology has designed a curriculum, connecting your classes in a purposeful manner. We would like your impression of your school's curriculum.

125. What motivates you in choosing a Religious Studies/Theology class?
 Topic Teacher Time of Day Curriculum Other _____

126. When you make your choice, are you aware of the purpose of the curriculum?
 Yes No
127. If you are aware of it, does it help you make your choices?
 Yes No
128. If the curriculum were a book, what kind would it be?
 Anthology Novel Poetry History Cartoon Other _____.
129. Do you think it is very important that you know about other religions? Yes No
130. Do you think it is very important that you be aware of dissidents within your own religion?
 Yes No
131. How important is it to experience the way of life of another religion?
 very important important somewhat important not very important
132. How important is it for you to be aware of those who believe and live your religion/denomination different than you do?
 very important important somewhat important not very important
133. Would you take a class in religions/denominations other than your own? Yes No
134. Tell us which one's you would like to know more about? _____
135. Do you consider "heretic" a negative term? Yes No I am not sure
136. Do you consider "unbeliever" a negative term? Yes No I am not sure
137. Is there any religion you fear? Yes No
138. Is there any religion you consider false? Yes No
139. Is there any part of your religion you ignore? Yes No
140. If "yes" what is/are those part(s)? _____
141. How many classes in theology/religion have you taken?
 1 2 3 4 Five or more

**The following deals with the different methods teacher's use to teach you.
 How often do your teachers use these methods?**

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| 142. Lecture | <input type="radio"/> Frequently <input type="radio"/> Moderately <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 143. Essay Exams | <input type="radio"/> Frequently <input type="radio"/> Moderately <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 144. Objective Exams | <input type="radio"/> Frequently <input type="radio"/> Moderately <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 145. Term Papers | <input type="radio"/> Frequently <input type="radio"/> Moderately <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 146. Book Reports | <input type="radio"/> Frequently <input type="radio"/> Moderately <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 147. Group Exams | <input type="radio"/> Frequently <input type="radio"/> Moderately <input type="radio"/> Seldom |

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 148. Active Learning | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 149. Experiential Learning | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 150. Field Experience | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 151. Case Studies | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 152. Role Playing | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 153. Simulation Games | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 154. Cooperative Learning | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 155. Collaborative Learning | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 156. Peer Teaching | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 157. Contract Learning | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 158. Independent Study | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 159. Internships | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 160. Debates | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 161. Audio Visuals | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 162. Internet | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 163. Field Education | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 164. Service Learning | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 165. Learning Communities | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 166. Management Teams | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 167. Clinical Experience | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 168. Teams / Groups | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 169. Journals | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 170. Retreats | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 171. Portfolios | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 172. Team Teaching | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 173. Community Resources | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 174. Computer Assisted Instruction. | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |
| 175. Critical Thinking | <input type="radio"/> Frequently | <input type="radio"/> Moderately | <input type="radio"/> Seldom |

176. Which department, program, or specialization has the best teachers in your institution?

177. What are the characteristics of a good teacher?

THANK YOU FOR DOING THIS. IT WILL BE OF GREAT BENEFIT TO TEACHING RELIGION AND THEOLOGY.

A COMPILATION OF PEDAGOGIES PRESENTED AND TESTED FOR THE OTHER VOICES PROJECT 2005-06.

Table of Contents

<i>Pedagogy</i>	<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Syllabus</i>
Believing the Beliefs of the Religious Other	Increasing empathy among convinced Christians of differing	Phil 402 Philosophy of Religion

	beliefs	
Recognizing Religious Diversity	To respect differences, discover commonalities, make connections	RES 236 Religion in America
Listening to the Listeners	Building consensus around how others' hear us	PR30 Homiletics
Different religious people; different worship for the same God.	Experiencing worship of different denominations	BHT 513: Experiencing the worship of other Christian traditions
Listening to the convinced conservative other.	Those not energized by any religion.	RES 335, Biomedical Ethics
My changing God	Experiencing past religious change as part of the life cycle	REST 105C Introduction to Roman Catholicism
Co-journeyer pedagogy for otherness	Building awareness of how an other experiences what we say and do in dealing with other spiritualities..	INT 705 Transformative Leadership
A reflective pedagogy	Learning to articulate gender issues as expressed in film and reflecting on these issues in pastoral ministry.	MS PT 333 The Dance of Women's Spirituality
Communities within communities pedagogy	Those ministers who wish to listen, learn, and respect other ministers' radical differences.	C/D 205: Contemporary Moral Theology:

Introduction

Much of the team's discussion and activity revolved around the practical implementation and ramifications associated with the presence of the radical other in the classroom. What follows is the "pedagogy" developed by each team member and represents the practical participation and implementation of each institution in our team's efforts.

Each “pedagogy” is composed of the following: I. *Pedagogy*, an initial outline of the pedagogy: II. *Detailed description of the pedagogy* answering the following questions: What pedagogy or pedagogies will you design, test, and evaluate that is / are oppositional to the student’s faith life? Why have you chosen this pedagogy? How does this pedagogy fit into your institutional mission and your departmental/institutional curriculum? How will you evaluate what you have done? III. *Syllabus* of the course within which the pedagogy is used. IV. *Evaluation and reflections*. Which is an evaluation of the pedagogy and reflection upon its use by its author?

Note: In order to sustain anonymity for the ERIC report all personal and institutional references were eliminated.

Title: Believing the beliefs of the religious other.

For: Increasing empathy among convinced Christians of differing beliefs.

1. Have each student (e.g., each student in my spring Philosophy of Religion class) fill out a questionnaire identifying her or his religious beliefs on a number of issues.

- The issues might be theological (e.g., the nature of God’s power and knowledge), hermeneutical (e.g., the extent to which the Bible should be considered authoritative, the extent to which religious truth can be found in non-Christian religious texts), and/or social (e.g., the most appropriate religious response to physician-assisted suicide or stem cell research or in vitro surrogate mothering).
2. Collect the questionnaires and pair students who affirm significantly different religious perspectives on one (or more) of the issues.
 3. Have the two students interview each other, each asking the following questions:
 - When and how did you first acquire this belief?
 - Why do you hold this belief now?
 - Does holding this belief make any practical difference in your life?
 - Does it trouble you that other Christians don’t hold this belief? Why do you think other Christians affirm different perspectives on this issue?
 - Do you think it is important to try to convince others to believe as you do on this issue?
 4. Have each student write up a summary of her or his interview (i.e., a summary of what she or he heard the other person saying in response to these questions). Have the student also respond to the following questions in writing:
 - Was encountering “another voice” in this way of value? Why or why not?
 - Was I heard?
 - How can we best foster a climate in which those with differing religious voices can maintain their integrity and yet respect each other and live (worship and act) peacefully and productively together?

Detailed Pedagogical Description

Proposed Pedagogy to Increase Intra-religious Understanding (Empathy)

Q#1: What pedagogy or pedagogies will you design, test, and evaluate that is / are oppositional to the student's faith life?

Exercise:

1. Have each student (e.g., each student in my spring Philosophy of Religion class) fill out a questionnaire identifying her or his religious beliefs on a number of issues.
 - The issues might be theological (e.g., the nature of God's power and knowledge), hermeneutical (e.g., the extent to which the Bible should be considered authoritative, the extent to which religious truth can be found in non-Christian religious texts), and/or social (e.g., the most appropriate religious response to physician-assisted suicide or stem cell research or in vitro surrogate mothering).
2. Collect the questionnaires and pair students who affirm significantly different religious perspectives on one (or more) of the issues.
3. Have the two students interview each other, each asking the following questions:
 - When and how did you first acquire this belief?
 - Why do you hold this belief now?
 - Does holding this belief make any practical difference in your life?
 - Does it trouble you that other Christians don't hold this belief? Why do you think other Christians affirm different perspectives on this issue?
 - Do you think it is important to try to convince others to believe as you do on this issue?
4. Have each student write up a summary of her or his interview (i.e., a summary of what she or he heard the other person saying in response to these questions). Have the student also respond to the following questions in writing:
 - Was encountering "another voice" in this way of value? Why or why not?
 - Was I heard?
 - How can we best foster a climate in which those with differing religious voices can maintain their integrity and yet respect each other and live (worship and act) peacefully and productively together?

Q#2: Why have you chosen this pedagogy?

Basis for choice – Based on key points in our text, our discussions, and the student survey responses, it is important to

1. Allow our students to interact personally with “another voice.”
2. Encourage our students to listen and attempt to understand what “other voices” are saying.
3. Encourage our students to envision ways of living peacefully and productively with “other voices.”

Q#3: How does this pedagogy fit into your institutional mission and your departmental/institutional curriculum?

Curricular fit:

1. A key **General Education objective** is that students be able to “recognize diverse Christian perspectives and explore the relationships between Christianity and other major religious perspectives.”
2. A key **Division of Religion and Humanities objective** is that students be able to “demonstrate an understanding of diverse ideas, beliefs, and practices and respect those who hold ideas, beliefs and practices different from their own.”

Q#4: How will you evaluate what you have done?

Means of assessment:

1. Collect and collate the answers (anonymously) to the two reflection questions noted in (4) above.
2. Reflect together as a class on these responses, with the professor summarizing in writing the class’s thinking on these issues.
3. Both the collated responses and the professor’s summary of the class thinking on these issues will be shared with the faculty focus group and student focus group (which is a different set of students from those involved in the exercise). Both focus groups will be asked to critique the exercise in light of the goals and objectives for intra-religious dialog that were noted in the focus group surveys.
4. Students are graded on a 100-point system (three twenty-point exams, one 20-point paper, and “homework” worth 20 points). This exercise will be worth up to 5 homework points (i.e., it will be worth 25% of the homework grade). The amount students earn will correspond to the extent to which they both completed the exercise and focused seriously on the concepts and issues inherent in this pedagogy.

**SYLLABUS FOR
BELIEVING THE BELIEFS OF THE RELIGIOUS OTHER**

PHL (RST) 402 - PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

Spring, 2006

COURSE DESCRIPTION

The purpose of PHL (RST) 402 is to engage in a philosophical analysis of religious belief. More specifically, we will analyze the following topics: faith and reason, religious language, divine omniscience, divine omnipotence, divine goodness, petitionary prayer, divine immutability, arguments for and against God's existence, and personal immortality.

COURSE GRADE

1. **Reading analyses:** There will be 15 reading analyses worth 1 point each.
2. **“Other Voices” pedagogical exercise:** 5 points.
3. **Exams:** There will be 3 exams worth 20 points each.
4. **Papers:** There will be three 1,500-word (6-page) papers worth 10 points each.
 - a. Each paper will be an analysis of one of the major issues discussed in class. (You can write on any three issues.)
 - b. Each paper will be due **two weeks** after our classroom discussion of the issue has been completed.
 - c. Each paper will be written in accordance with the following format:
 - 1 page summarization of the basic philosophical problem(s).
 - 1-2 page summarization of the basic philosophical perspectives.
 - 2-3 page discussion in which you **state** and **defend** your own position.
 - d. Each paper must **utilize** two sources in addition to the required reading(s) and classroom notes.
5. **Attendance/Participation:** Students are expected to attend class on a regular basis and “participate” in classroom discussions. Failure to do so can result in the loss of up to 15 points.
6. **Grading scale:**

110 -105 A 88 - 85 C

104 - 102 A- 84 - 82 C-

101- 99 B+ 81 - 79 D+

98 - 95 B 78 - 75 D

94 - 92 B- 74 - 72 D-

91- 89 C+ 71 - F

REQUIRED TEXTS:

Peterson, Hasker, Reichenbach and Basinger, Reason and Religious Belief: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion, 3rd edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003). **[Blue book]**

Peterson, Hasker, Reichenbach and Basinger, Philosophy of Religion: Selected Readings, 2nd edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001). **[Yellow book]**

TENTATIVE LIST OF TOPICS [B = Blue book; Y = Yellow book]

1. **Faith and Reason:** What is the proper relationship between the two?

- (B) Chapter 3: questions 3, 5, 10
- (Y) 67-70 (½ page summary; ½ page reaction)

2. **Divine Omnipotence:** What is the relationship between divine power and human freedom?

- (B) Chapter 8: pp. 154-160, questions 3, 5
- (Y) 124-126; 148-156 (½ page summary; ½ page reaction)

3. **Divine Omniscience:**

a. Is divine foreknowledge compatible with human freedom?

- (B) Chapter 8: 160-169, questions 8, 10
- (Y) 136-139; 139-148 (½ page summary; ½ page reaction for each)

b. Can we, by our present actions, change the past?

4. **Divine Goodness:**

a. Does the existence of evil count against God's goodness?

- (B) Chapter 7: questions 3, 5
- (Y) 301-314; 315-326 (½ page summary; ½ page reaction for each)

b. Can God do evil?

c. What is the relationship between God and human ethical standards?

- (B) Chapter 14: questions 4, 5, 9

5. **Immutability:** In what sense(s), if any, can God change?

6. **Prayer:** In what sense does (can) prayer change things?

- (Y) 620-628 (½ page summary; ½ page reaction)

7. **Miracles:**

- (B) Chapter 9: questions 2, 4, 6, 10
- (Y) 417-426; 426-435 (½ page summary; ½ page reaction)

a. Do Miracles occur today?

b. Can we initiate them?

8. **Religious Experience:** To what extent can we experience God?

- (B) Chapter 2: questions 4, 6
- (Y) 41-55 (½ page summary; ½ page reaction)

9. **Religious Diversity:** Why do sincere, knowledgeable people differ on so many religious issues?

- (R) Chapter 13: questions 2, 4, 7
- (Y) 560-570 (½ page summary; ½ page reaction)

10. **Religious Language:** What is the relationship between terms predicated of both God and humans?

- (B) Chapter 11: 220-228, questions 2, 3 - p. 241
- (Y) 374-379

11. **Traditional Arguments for God's Existence:**

- (B) Chapter 5

a. Pascal's wager

- (Y) 77-80 (½ page summary; ½ page reaction)

b. Teleological

c. Cosmological

d. Ontological

e. Moral

- (Y) 241-246 (½ page summary; ½ page reaction)

12. **Contemporary argument for God's existence:** the belief-forming faculties argument.

- (Y) 355-366 (½ page summary; ½ page reaction)

13. **Theological Issues:**

a. Was Jesus Christ fully human and fully God?

- (Y) 599-607 (½ page summary; ½ page reaction)

b. How can Jesus atone for sins he didn't commit?

c. How can God's will be discerned?

d. Can we live forever?

- (Y) 469-478 (½ page summary; ½ page reaction)

End Of The Year Summary and Reflection on the Pedagogy "Other Voices" Questionnaire

1. Is Capital Punishment biblical?

9 Yes
justifiably disagree
9 No
justifiably disagree
5 Unsure

1 Hold firmly; others can't
15 Hold firmly; others can
4 Don't hold firmly

2. Can a Christian justifiably support physician-assisted suicide?

7 Yes
justifiably disagree
14 No
justifiably disagree
2 Unsure

4 Hold firmly; others can't
13 Hold firmly; others can
6 Don't hold firmly

3. Can a Christian justifiably support the use of frozen embryos (that will never be implanted in a womb) for stem cell research?

4 Yes
justifiably disagree
15 No
justifiably disagree
4 Unsure

9 Hold firmly; others can't
10 Hold firmly; others can
3 Don't hold firmly

4. Can a Christian justifiably continue to support our military presence in Iraq?

15 Yes
justifiably disagree
3 No
justifiably disagree
5 Unsure

5 Hold firmly; others can't
11 Hold firmly; others can
5 Don't hold firmly

5. Will some adherents to other religions (religions other than Christianity) spend eternity in God's presence?

5 Yes
justifiably disagree
11 No
justifiably disagree
7 Unsure

7 Hold firmly; others can't
9 Hold firmly; others can
3 Don't hold firmly

6. Which of the following best represents your own perspective?

0 God always controls all things, including free human choice.

10 To the extent that God grants humans freedom, God gives up control over what occurs.

13 Both of the above statements are somehow true.

3 Hold firmly; others can't justifiably disagree

14 Hold firmly; others can justifiably disagree

4 Don't hold firmly

7. Which of the following best represents your perspective?

4 God knows all that has happened, all that is happening, and can predict much of what

will occur in the future. But God does not know all future events infallibly.

11 God knows all that has happened, all that is happening, and all that will actually occur.

8 God knows all that has happened, all that is happening, all that will actually occur, and

all that would actually happen in every conceivable situation.

1 Hold firmly; others can't justifiably disagree

16 Hold firmly; others can justifiably disagree

6 Don't hold firmly

8. Which of the following best represents your perspective?

9 Because of God's love for us, God has chosen never to do less than God can do to make our lives

as good as possible.

14 Although God loves us, God is under no (self-imposed) obligation to do all that can be done to

make our lives as good as possible.

6 Hold firmly; others can't justifiably disagree

9 Hold firmly; others can justifiably disagree

8 Don't hold firmly

9. Which of the following best represents your perspective?

12 God and humans function in relation to the same set of moral rules (which have their origin in

God's moral nature).

11 God and humans do not necessarily function in relation to the same set of moral rules. We are to

follow the rules set forth by God to guide human behavior. God's behavior is bound by no such rules. Whatever God does is by definition right, even if it is incompatible with the rules by which God would have us live.

4 Hold firmly; others can't justifiably disagree

11 Hold firmly; others can justifiably disagree

8 Don't hold firmly

“Other Voices” Follow-up Exercise

- ◆ Interview your “partner,” asking in relation to each of the two issues on which you disagree the following questions.

1. When and how did you first acquire this belief?

For most, the belief was either (1) bestowed by culture, parents, and/or the church or (2) reached through reflection on a bestowed belief.

2. Why do you hold this belief now?

For most, the basis for current belief was reflection on the issue.

3. Does holding this belief make any practical difference in your life?

“Theological beliefs” make some difference to many; “social beliefs” make little difference to most.

4. Does it trouble you that other Christians don’t hold this belief? Why do you think other Christians affirm different perspectives on this issue?

Most are not troubled.

5. Do you think it is important to try to convince others to believe as you do on this issue?

Most do not consider it important, although it is seen as more important by some with respect to “theological” beliefs.

- ◆ Written follow-up assignment:

1. Write a summary of your interview – i.e., identify the issues and summarize in relation to each what you heard the other person saying in response to the questions.
2. Give brief written responses to the following questions:
 - Was encountering “another voice” in this manner of value? Why or why not?

Almost all thought it was of significant value: (1) to help clarify their beliefs, (2) as a positive challenge to their beliefs, and/or (2) as a means to better understanding differing perspectives.
 - Were you heard – i.e., did the other person listen to and understand what you were saying?

Almost all said they were heard (and appreciated it).

- How can we best foster a climate in which those with differing religious voices can maintain their integrity and yet respect each other and live (worship and act) peacefully and productively together?

See attachment.

How Best to Foster Empathetic Dialogue

- I think that if more people were open with each other, we could very quickly improve our climate. I believe that people are sometimes too stubborn and opinionated to even listen to someone with another view point. . . We are allowed to hold different belief.
- I don't think it is possible fostering a climate where people can respect and live together peacefully. There are too many people unwilling to listen to alternate viewpoints because they are scared and ignorant. As long as they fanatically hold beliefs that they have not thoroughly thought out then they are a danger to religious harmony. I find that people who are educated and hold well thought out beliefs are the most accepting of others.
- I think it is important when having theological discussions to remember that we are all children of God; we are all loved. Someone may disagree with me, but that doesn't make her or him an instrument of the devil. It is important that people keep these discussions in perspective.
- The question of fostering a healthy climate is very complex. . . I believe a large part is taking the time to get past initial gut reactions to our conceptions of their beliefs and the words they use to convey them. We may find that sometimes when we get past them we agree more than we had initially thought. . . It seems the most we can do is to learn where there are differences and dialogue in a way that respectfully disagrees.
- In order to foster a climate in which people of different religions can be respected and heard there needs to be understanding on both sides. . . A deeper understanding of religions would help produce a peaceful and productive atmosphere.
- I believe that proper education is the best tool to fight against ignorance and hostile approaches toward our fellow women and men. We need to learn to look at things from opposing perspectives before we condemn those who hold different views.
- We can foster a climate by finding individuals who can relate to each other personally. We need to get people together who have the same controlled emotions and thoughts. Then there will be more respect and commonality.

- I think that we can foster a better climate if we do not make a big deal out of the fact that there are differences among Christians when the Bible is silent.
- I think that it is hard to foster a climate in which those with differing religious voices can maintain their integrity and yet still respect each other and live peaceably with one another. I think in order for this to happen, there needs to be respect on each side and a willingness to hear what the other one is trying to say.
- I think a big step is to recognize that people *do* have different opinions – it is natural for people to disagree. . . Listening to people with differing views, and honestly and openly trying to understand what they are saying (and where they are coming from) can go *a long way*.
- Too many times doctrine separates us from one another. . . Instead of arguing, we need sensibly to talk things through with love.
- I think it is important to always begin our encounters with anyone with respect and a desire to maintain a respectful and loving (Christ-honoring) attitude throughout. . . We are not the only ones that believe we have the absolute truth, our beliefs regarding election and predestination, no matter which camp we are in, should allow us to be satisfied with being heard, whether the people who heard respond in the way we desire or not.
- Everyone must take the time and put in the effort to get to know what other people are really all about, rather than just judging them or assuming that they know what the other person believes. I think education is important for this -- much disrespect comes from ignorance and a lack of knowledge about what others truly believe.
- I think the biggest thing that we can do is to remember that people who have somewhat different beliefs may be just as valid as we are. Just because I think something is right doesn't make it right. Maybe I'm the one that's getting it wrong, maybe there is no wrong in some situations.
- The only way for harmony to happen between different points of views is to listen and not be stubborn and argue about it. We cannot convince other people, only God can!
- I honestly do not have a solid answer. I know that it is good to listen, and not try to persuade or sell your opinion. When presenting an argument, it is good to have clarification and articulation, not just a bunch of scattered emotions. . . It is also good to ask questions in a manner that does not put the other person down.
- Open communication is the key. Understanding of the complications of the matter is vital to not having a narrow mindset. Presented with this environment, a climate of respect can be maintained towards one another.

Title: Recognizing Religious Diversity

For: To respect differences, discover commonalities, make connections

Pedagogy and Detailed Pedagogical Description

1. Initial in-class focused writing, which invites students to respond to these questions: What do you know about religion in America? How do you know it? In what ways is religious diversity in America evident?
2. A series of seven reflection papers designed to document religious diversity in Rochester (paper 1), to locate oneself on the American religious map by constructing and analyzing one's family tree with a focus on religion and ethnicity (paper 2), and to explore the challenges faced by the nation's religions as each strives to live with religious pluralism without and diversity within (papers 3-7)
3. S series of campus lecturers and in-class speakers who explore the impact of diversity within and among religions: William Shea on "Crossing Boundaries: Catholics and Evangelicals," exploring the theme of intellectual solidarity and its risks; Corinne Dempsey and Shri Chaitanyananda N. Saraswati on "The Goddess Lives in Rush, NY"; Ada María Isasi-Díaz on "The Hispanic Face (and Fate) of the Catholic Church in the USA," as well as adherents of particular religious groups, including women on mission for the Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter Day Saints.
4. Videos and readings that speak to historical and contemporary challenges posed by religious pluralism and diversity across and within religions, e.g. *In the Light of Reverence: Devil's Tower*; *Roots and Wings*; *Beyond the Dream: Immigrants in America*; *Mine Eyes Have Seen the Glory: The Making of A Sub-Culture*.
5. Final portfolio that invites students to revisit their work during the semester by rereading their papers and writing two new pieces: "Family Tree: Second Thoughts" and "Reflections Revisited: Recognizing the Lessons."
6. A final exam question (circulated in advance) that invites students to reflect on the challenges of "encountering difference" – societally and personally.

Reasons for Choosing This Pedagogy

1. I am looking for ways to "personalize" the course and bridge the distance between the academic study of religion and lived experience.
2. While not assuming any religious affiliation or practice, I am trying to create a context in which students can begin to appreciate the fact, the significance and the implications of what Catherine Albanese (the author of one of our texts) calls the "manyness" and the "oneness" of American religions and religion.
3. Offering examples of how many religions have faced and do face the challenges of "other voices" within, the course invites the student to take a deeper look at their own religions of origin and/or commitment to identify and listen for the "other voices." Looking at some religions as an outsider can prompt insights that can inform a second look at religions in which one is an insider.

4. Through a series of readings, viewing and listening experiences, and written and oral reflections, I am trying to highlight the importance of recognizing differences, acknowledging them, realizing how they matter, and identifying some practical strategies for living with these differences – not only between but especially within religions.

5. Recognizing that students have different learning styles, I am trying to “mix-up” and integrate reading and writing, listening and talking about aspects of American religious pluralism and diversity.

Curricular Fit

1. The Religious Studies Department offers these statements as descriptive of its goals:
 - “The program challenges students to confront ethical issues, encourages them to learn how religion has shaped and been influenced by society, and provides them with a rich context for understanding the world's cultures.”
 - “The personal benefits [of studying religion] are many, including the opportunity to investigate questions of human identity, purpose, and meaning; to appreciate the importance and power of religions in the lives of individuals and communities; and to cultivate a mature, intelligent faith coupled with compassionate understanding of the faiths of others.”
2. The department offers courses that focus on particular religions, on particular topics and themes, on methodologies for the study of religion, and on religion and religions in particular geographic areas. “Religion in America” is an example of study with a geographic focus.
3. Religious Studies is part of the Liberal Studies Core and as such is attentive to the intersections between religion and human culture and designed to promote an understanding of the human person as individual and as member of the human community.

Means of Evaluation

1. In-class focused writing at the beginning of the course and at midterm to assess starting points and development of thinking
2. Seven semi-formal reflection papers responding to specific writing prompts
3. Two papers responding to on campus lectures
4. Final portfolio
5. Final Examination

Syllabus for Recognizing Religious Diversity

RES 236 Religion in America*

“Religiosity is a fundamental trait of the American people and has been from the very beginning.”

Jacob Neusner

“Americans during their formative years were a people in movement through space This is the mighty saga of the outward acts, told and retold, until it has overshadowed and suppressed the equally vital, but more somber story of the inner experience. Americans have so presented to view and celebrated the external and material side of their pilgrims’ progress that they have tended to conceal even from themselves the inner, spiritual pilgrimage, with its more subtle dimensions and profound depths.”

Sidney E. Mead

“Telling merely one story, without first telling many stories, is possible only at a considerable cost – that of losing touch with the richness and texture of American pluralism.”

Catherine L. Albanese

“Through listening to our own voices, we seek to share our histories. This effort is meant to be a step in creating cultural bridges, opening dialogue and furthering support among men and women for a liberating persuasion in traditional and emerging faiths today.”

Rosemary Skinner Keller

Course Description

Exploration of the contemporary American religious landscape in the context of key moments, groups and persons in America’s history. Attention to the distinctive character, beliefs and practices of religions, old and new; inter-religious conflict and cooperation; the interplay of religion and politics; religion in the media.

A Perspectives II Course

Perspectives I courses in Religious Studies introduce the foundational stories and distinctive worldviews of a variety of religions as well as the dynamics and components of religion in general. This course focuses on religion and religions in a particular context: the United States. More particularly, this course explores the American religious landscape – past and present – to study how Americans have and do experience religion and to examine the mutual influence of religion and social context. As you study religion in America, you will be building on what you learned as you “explored religion” in your PI course.

Course Objectives

At the end of this course, you should be able to do the following.

- Map the contemporary American religious landscape (the “big” picture).
- Recognize the historical roots of that landscape outside and within America.

- Speak to what is distinctive about America’s religions – their beliefs and practices as well as their individual histories and contributions (the “smaller” pictures).
- Identify and describe the contributions of some men and women who have helped to shape American religion and religions.
- Give evidence of and discuss the implications of the “manyness” of American religion, i.e. the many ways of being religious in America in the past and in the present.
- Give evidence of and discuss the implications of the “oneness” of American religious life, i.e. what Americans share.
- Become a literate observer of and commentator on the American religious scene and on the place of religion in American life.
- Assess the significance of religion in and for American society.
- Engage in informed discussion of some current, even controversial, topics and issues, such as the emergence of new religions; the challenges of religious pluralism and inter-religious dialogue; the growth of fundamentalism; the interplay of religion and politics; the rise of conservative movements; the portrayal of religion in the media; the impact of technology on religion; the debate regarding evolution, creationism and intelligent design.
- Identify and critique ways in which scholars approach, describe and interpret American religion and religions.
- Speculate on future directions of religion and religions in America based your growing familiarity with American’s religious past and present.
- Meet your personal goals for the course as noted:

Teaching / Learning Resources and Strategies

- Background, experience and knowledge of members of the class
- Lectures and discussion; work in small groups and as a class
- Readings: textbook, scholarly essays and primary source material
- Audio-visuals materials which provide opportunities to observe religion as it is lived in America, including *On Common Ground*
- Speakers who share their wisdom and practice.
- Participant observation in the local community
- Informal and formal writing;
- Examinations (objective and essay in format) which test your knowledge and understanding of the vocabulary and concepts of religion and religions as well as religious autobiographies.
- Visits with religious leaders and communities in the local area
- Print and non-print media coverage of religion

Required Texts

Catherine L. Albanese, *America: Religions and Religion*, 3rd Edition (Wadsworth, 1999)

Jacob Neusner, Editor. *World Religions in America. An Introduction*, 3rd Edition (Westminster/John Knox Press, 2003)

Special Events on Campus – Attendance Required

Events sponsored by the William H. Shannon Chair in Catholic Studies:

William M. Shea

“Crossing Boundaries: Catholics and Evangelicals”
“Evangelicals and Catholics Working Together”

Ada María Isasi-Díaz

“CATOLICA – The Hispanic Face (and Fate) of the Catholic Church in the USA”

“Understanding Justice in the 21st Century”

Some Additional Resources

Jon Butler & Harry S. Stout (General Editors), *Religion in American Life Series*, 17 Volumes (Oxford University Press, 1999-2002)

Rosemary Radford Ruether & Rosemary Skinner Keller (ed.), *In Our own Voices: Four Centuries of American Women’s Religious Writing* (HarperSanFrancisco, 1995)

Diana Eck, *On Common Ground: World Religions in America*, 2nd edition, CD-ROM (Columbia University Press (306.60973 Eck, located at Library Media Desk).

<http://www.pluralism.org/>

Religion & Ethics Newsweekly. Produced by WNET New York. Aired locally on WXXI/Channel 21, 11:00 a.m., Sunday.

http://www.pbs.org/wnet/religionandethics/index_flash.html

Speaking of Faith. Produced by American Public Media. Aired locally on WXXI/1370, 6:00 a.m. Sunday. <http://speakingoffaith.publicradio.org/>

Center for Interfaith Studies and Dialogue (CISD). Programs to be announced.

Assorted library holdings.

Course Requirements

Tests	20% and 20%
Reflection Papers	10%
Shannon Chair Events Reports	10%
Formal Writing	20%
Final Exam	20%

Expectations and Policies

I will do all I can to make this course a positive learning experience for you. I value the opportunity to work with you in the classroom and individually. Your questions, concerns, and learning are important to me. Please feel free to see me during office hours or to make an appointment at a mutually convenient time.

If you have a documented learning disability or are a non-native English speaker, please contact me as soon as possible so that we may discuss and implement whatever arrangements are needed in terms of class participation, assignments or exams.

Carefully note the following expectations and policies.

- Attend class regularly. Class attendance is a requirement for success in this course. Attendance implies but is not limited to being physically present. The quality of your presence matters. You are expected to listen, participate and respond. Please note that excessive absences will result in a lower course grade, e.g. B > B- > C+ etc. Absences in excess of two (the equivalent of one week of classes) are considered excessive. In addition, please note that attendance is a prerequisite for “in class work.” See above for section on “Course Assessment.”
- Observe appropriate classroom decorum. Refrain from any behaviors that may be disruptive to others and detract from an environment that is conducive to learning.
- Prepare for class by doing the assigned reading and written work. Coming to class prepared not only promotes your own learning but also enriches your classmates' learning. We learn together. Come ready to share your insights and questions.
- Contribute to class discussion and small group work. You contribute by participating actively. Participation includes speaking and attentive and respectful listening to others.
- Take tests as scheduled. Make-ups *may be* permitted at the discretion of the professor only when, in the judgment of the professor, a *serious* reason for the absence warrants rescheduling.
- Demonstrate satisfactory writing skills. Please note that the staff of the Writing Center is ready to assist you at any point of the writing process. If you need assistance in developing, organizing, and revising your written work, I encourage you to visit the Writing Center.
- Papers and projects are due as assigned. Late papers will be penalized, by one grade-step per day (e.g. B+ to B), including days when classes are not in session. It is essential that you complete and present your project on time – especially since each member of the group has a responsibility to the group as well as the class.
- Demonstrate your commitment to academic integrity by doing your *own* work and acknowledging the work of others as theirs. Do not copy any published or unpublished work, including material from published articles or books, material you find on the Internet, or the work of other students or individuals. Presenting another's ideas or work

as your own is a violation of academic integrity: it constitutes plagiarism. Sources must be cited properly and fully in the body of your text. Direct quotes from another's work (including another student's work) must be identified as such and indicated through the use of quotation marks. You also must cite sources in the text of your papers for passages that are paraphrased. Violations of academic honesty are a serious matter and will result in an "F" for the assignment and may also result in an "F" for the course.

- Complete all course requirements. Satisfaction of course requirements means that all assignments and the final examination have been completed.

General Guidelines for Assessment of Writing Assignments

An "A" paper is well-written (ideas fully developed, appropriate organization, carefully edited and proofread), shows a perceptive and comprehensive grasp of the topic, and demonstrates the ability to use and expand upon, in a creative way, what has been learned. The "A" paper has the mark of originality that clearly distinguishes it from papers that adequately fulfill the assignment.
EXCELLENT

A "B" paper is well written (ideas fully developed, appropriate organization, carefully edited and proofread) and demonstrates that the student has reflected upon and understands what she or he has learned and is able to communicate effectively that understanding to the audience. Of course, the "B" paper fully addresses all the requirements of the assignment.
GOOD

A "C" paper is adequately written (ideas sufficiently explained but not expanded upon, some problems with organization and mechanics) and/or minimally addresses the requirements of the assignment.

SATISFACTORY

"D" and "F" papers do not meet the minimal standards of college level writing and/or demonstrate comprehension of material and/or fail to satisfy the specific requirements of the assignments. These papers may be returned for rewriting. The highest grade that may be assigned a rewritten paper is "C".
UNSATISFACTORY

*The conditions of this syllabus are subject to change as agreed upon by the class and the professor.

CALENDAR PREVIEW*

THE MANYNESS OF RELIGIONS IN AMERICA

Week of January 17:

Getting Started

An Exercise in Mapping and Location

“The Elephant in the Dark”: Introducing Religion(s) in

America

THE ORIGINAL CAST

**Week of January 24:
Traditions”**

“Original Manyness: Native American

Sam Gill: “Native Americans and Their Religions”

**Week of January 31:
Peoplehood”**

“Israel in a Promised Land: Jewish Religion and

Jacob Neusner: “Judaism in the World and in America”

**Week of February 7:
Catholicism”**

“Bread and Mortar: The Presence of Roman

America”

Andrew M. Greeley: The Catholics in the World and in

Justo L. González: “The Religious World of Hispanic Americans”

Presentations by William M. Shea (Attendance Required)

“Crossing Boundaries: Catholics and Evangelicals”

Thursday, February 9, 2006 at 7:00 p.m.

Forum, Otto Shults Community Center at Nazareth College

“Evangelicals and Catholics Working Together”

Friday, February 10, 2006 at 1:30 p.m.

Forum, Otto Shults Community Center at Nazareth College

Week of February 14:

**“Word from the Beginning: American Protestant
Origins and Liberal Tradition”**

Martin E. Marty: Protestant Christianity in the World and in America”

Week of February 21: **“Restoring an Ancient Future: The Protestant Churches and the Mission Mind”**

“Fundamentalist and Evangelical: The Search for Conservative Identity”

Test 1

Week of February 28: **“Black Center: African American Religion and Nationhood” - continued**

Peter J. Paris: “The Religious World of African Americans”

NEWMADE IN AMERICA

Week of March 7: **“Visions of Paradise Planted: Nineteenth-Century New Religions”**

Dell deChant: “World Religions Made in the U.S.A.: Apocalyptic Communities”

Danny L. Jorgensen: “The Latter-day Saint (Mormon) Religion in America and the World”

Week of March 14: **Semester Break**

Week of March 21: **New Religious Movements in the Late Twentieth Century**

Dell de Chant and Danny L. Jorgensen: “The Church of Scientology: A Very New American Religion”

“Homesteads of the Minds: Belief and Practice in Metaphysics”

Dell de Chant: “World Religions Made in the U.S.A.: Metaphysical Communities”

PATTERNS OF EXPANSION AND CONTRACTION

Week of March 28: **“East Is West: Eastern Peoples and Eastern Religions”**
 Nearer East: Eastern Orthodoxy

 Jaroslav Pelikan: “Orthodox Christianity in the World and
in America”

“East Is West: Eastern Peoples and Eastern Religions”
 Middle East: Islam

 John L. Esposito: “Islam in the World and in America”

Week of April 4: **“East Is West: Eastern Peoples and Eastern Religions”**
 Farther East: Hinduism, Buddhism and East Asian
Religion

 Gerald James Larson: “Hinduism in India and in America”

 Malcolm David Eckel: “Buddhism in the World and in America”

 Robert S. Ellwood: “East Asian Religions in Today’s America”
- continued on next page -

Week of April 11: **Test 2**

**“Regional Religion: A Case Study of Religion in
Appalachia”**

Week of April 18: **“Fundamentals of the New Age: An Epilogue on Present-Day
Pluralism”**

THE ONENESS OF RELIGION IN AMERICA

“Public Protestantism: Historical Dominance and One Religion of the United States”

“Civil Religion: Millennial Politics and History”

Andrew M. Greeley: “Religion and Politics in America”

Week of April 25: “Cultural Religion: Millennial Explorations of Dominance and Innocence”

William Scott Green: “Religion and Society in America”

“Danny Jorgenson: “Nature Religions: American Neopaganism and Witchcraft”

“Many Centers Meeting”

Sharing the Wisdom

Week of May 2: Sharing the Wisdom

*This preview is tentative. This outline of topics and readings follows the organization of topics devised by Catherine Albanese in *America: Religions and Religion*. The bolded titles, presented in quotes, are her attempts to name characterize each “player” in the American religious “cast” and to suggest central themes. Unbolded titles, presented in quotes, are titles of essays in Jacob Neusner’s *World Religions in America*.

REFLECTION PAPERS

Reflection papers are an important opportunity to learn. They encourage close reading, exploration of new ideas and thoughtful responses.

Guidelines:

- Reflection papers are due at the beginning of class.

- If a focus question is assigned for the week, please respond to it. If not, focus your attention on an aspect of the week’s reading and prepare your own prompt. In either case, prompts must appear in 10 pt. type at the top of page 1.
- Reflection papers should demonstrate that you are listening, reading and engaging the material of the course.
- Although responses need not represent your final statement on the subject, they should be written with care and attention to grammar and syntax.
- If at all possible, reflection papers should be typed.
- Expected length is 1- 2 typed pages (12 pt. type double-spaced with one inch margins).
- Papers will be marked this way:

plus (+) indicates an excellent response
 check / plus (/+) indicates a very good response
 check () indicates a good paper
 minus (-) indicates an unsatisfactory response

- Reflection papers count for 10% of your final grade.
- To earn an “A” for the informal writing component, you must successfully complete (earn a plus, check/plus, or check) for **2 required reflections** on

1/19	1/26
-------------	-------------

 and **5 additional reflection papers** to be submitted at the beginning of class on your choice of **5** of the following dates:

2/2	2/9	2/16	
3/2	3/9	3/23	3/30
- Reflection papers must be handed in at the beginning of class on the date due. No emailed or late papers will be accepted.
- Keep all reflection papers in a folder, together with your in-class writing. You will be asked to review and reflect on your reflection papers and your responses to in-class prompts before the semester ends.

End of the Year Summary and Reflection on the Pedagogy

Course Overview

The course, which enrolled 23 students in Spring 2006, explores the contemporary American landscape in the context of key moments, groups and persons in America’s history with attention to the distinctive character of religion in America; beliefs and practices of religions, old and new; inter-religious conflict and cooperation; and the interplay of religion and politics. Students read Catherine L. Albanese’s *America: Religions and Religion* (3rd ed.) and *World Religions in America: An Introduction*, edited by Jacob Neusner, as well as a more personal account of

African American religion by Katie Geneva Cannon and an autobiographical essay by Ada María Isasi-Díaz.

Pedagogies

1. **Initial in-class focused writing, which invites students to respond to these questions: What do you know about religion in America? How do you know it? In what ways is religious diversity in America evident?**

What do you know about religion in America?

Students reported a variety of “knowings,” including but not limited to the following: the manyness and diversity of religions (16 of 23), the majority status of Christianity, the variety within Christianity, regional differences in religiosity, the separation of church and state, the freedom of religion, the evidence of declining interest in and practice of religion, the influence of religion and the controversy related to and engendered by religion.

How do you know it?

The most common responses included study and education (particularly religious studies and history courses (18 of 23), personal experience (15), news and media (11), family and friends (9), and observation (7).

In what ways is religious diversity in America evident?

Students cited the presence of religious buildings and religious communities (12 of 23) as well as the celebration of holidays and the exchange of holiday greetings (5). Other ways included but were not limited to observing differences in beliefs and viewpoints as well as in practices.

Conclusion: This was a good way to begin. Next time, I would revisit this initial in-class writing at the end of the semester and invite students to compare what they said then and what they thought now.

2. **A series of seven reflection papers designed to document religious diversity in Rochester (paper 1), to locate oneself on the American religious map by constructing and analyzing one’s family tree with a focus on religion and ethnicity (paper 2), and to explore the challenges faced by the nation’s religions as each strives to live with religious pluralism without and diversity within (papers 3-7).**

Reflection Paper 1

While many students entered the course with an awareness of the manyness and diversity of religions in America, the first reflection paper enhanced students’ appreciation of religious diversity – in America and, specifically, in our area. The writing prompt was:

Using the phonebook’s yellow pages, “map” religion in the Rochester area. Proceed this way in the task and in your report:

- Note what you would expect to find.

- Identify relevant headings.
- Check each of those headings.
- Note and state your findings.
- Analyze these findings.
- Based on the data found in the yellow pages, what conclusions can you draw about religion in the area?

The evidence of many religions represented in the area genuinely surprised all students, including students from larger urban areas, small towns, rural areas and the area itself. In addition to noting the presence of many different religions in the area (Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter Day Saints, Jehovah’s Witnesses etc), they recognized the diversity within Christianity and particularly within the many Protestant denominations as well as the presence of non-denominational churches.

Reflection Paper 2

The second reflection paper invited each student to locate him/herself on the American religious map by constructing and analyzing their family tree with a focus on religion and ethnicity.

This exercise surfaced a number of insights. For some students, it was a recognition of the homogeneity illustrated by their family trees. For others, it was the recognition of diversity introduced by interfaith marriages, conversions, and generational changes. For others, it was the realization of surprising diversity apparent in their own family trees across the generations.

Conclusion: These two reflection papers actually enabled students to put themselves and their families on the American religious map.

Reflection Papers 3-7

The remaining five reflection papers provided students with opportunities to document their thinking on course material. For the most part, students were invited to write their own prompts as they reflected on readings, in-class experiences and lectures heard outside of class. They chose when to write and submit papers during weeks 3-11.

Conclusion: It was clear from the reflection papers that the experiences that made the most impact on students were actually hearing “different voices” – both across and within religions. (Also see Pedagogy #3.)

Overall conclusion on this pedagogy: Reflection papers, written throughout the course, are an effective way of identifying starting points and tracking learning. Reflection papers encourage close reading and careful listening. They allow students to voice candid personal observations that they sometimes choose to share in class. For the professor, reflection papers are a way to hear students’ voices and respond to each – one on one.

3. **A series of campus lecturers and in-class speakers who explore the impact of diversity within and among religions: William Shea on “Crossing Boundaries: Catholics and Evangelicals,” exploring the theme of intellectual solidarity and its risks; Corinne Dempsey and Shri Chaitanyananda N. Saraswati on “The Goddess Lives in Rush, NY”; Ada María Isasi-Díaz on “The Hispanic Face (and Fate) of the Catholic Church in the USA”; and adherents of particular religious groups,**

including women on mission for the Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter Day Saints.

In addition to the speakers mentioned above, Captain James Yee – a convert to Islam and former Muslim chaplain at Quantanemo Bay – made a presentation in class and lectured on campus.

Students were required to write papers on the lectures and/or colloquia presented by William Shea and Ada María Isasi-Díaz and encouraged to reflect on presentations by other speakers in their reflection papers. The writing prompts for the two required papers were as follows:

Frame this report as a letter to Professor Shea in which you, as a student of religion in America, reflect on the implications of his discussions of Catholics *and* Evangelicals for your understanding and appreciation of religion in America today.

As you listen to Professor Isasi-Díaz’s presentations, ask yourself how her perspective on religion, especially Catholicism, and her vision of justice in the 21st century are affected by her being a woman, a Latina, and a Catholic. Then let your paper serve as a way to share with the class and your professor your reflection on how who Dr. Isasi-Díaz influences her work and her views as a theologian.

In addition, many students chose to reflect on other public lectures and on in-class presentations by two Mormon sisters on mission in the Rochester area and by Captain James Yee, a convert to Islam and former Muslim chaplain at Quantanemo Bay.

Conclusion:

Hearing speakers who represented “other voices” and reflecting on the reality and experience of “being the other” and “encountering other voices” made a significant impact on most students as evidenced by their papers and written reflections on these presentations, in-class discussion and their retrospective reflections near the end of the course as they reread what they had written in preparation for their final portfolios. See #5 below.

4. **Videos that speak to historical and contemporary challenges posed by religious pluralism and diversity across and within religions, e.g. *In the Light of Reverence: Devil’s Tower; Roots and Wings; Beyond the Dream: Immigrants in America; Mine Eyes Have Seen the Glory: The Making of A Sub-Culture.***

Conclusion: Viewing these videos was an effective pedagogy as evidenced by the student discussion that followed each video. Students noted the clash of worldviews between Lakota Sioux and the mountain climbers who wanted to climb Devil’s Tower, a place sacred to the Indian tribe, and especially so during the month of June; the diversity within Judaism and the tensions between being a Jew *and* an American; the conflicts that emerged between immigrant Catholics and American Protestants and among Catholic immigrant groups of various ethnicities; and the worldview of Christian evangelicals in tension with secular culture and other Christian groups. Students noted and were appalled by the historical record of religious intolerance and the silencing of and violence toward “other voices.”

5. **A final portfolio that invites students to revisit their work during the semester by rereading their papers and writing two new pieces: “Family Tree: Second Thoughts” and “Reflections Revisited: Recognizing the Lessons.”**

The assignment read as follows:

“Family Tree: Second Thoughts”

This will include the original of your family tree and the reflection that you wrote in January. In addition, you will write a “postscript” in which you reflect on your family tree drawing on course work in specific ways to demonstrate how what you have learned sheds light – in religious terms – on your family tree. (1 - 2 pages)

“Reflections Revisited: Recognizing the Lessons”

This will include the original copies of your papers (at least 5 with significant passages highlighted) and a newly written reflection that serves as an introduction to and reflection on the papers you decided to include.

Begin by reading all the papers you wrote this semester. Pay attention to about how you approached the material, the questions you asked, the observations you made, the insights you expressed and the like. Think about what these papers reveal about you as a student of religion in America and what they show about how your understanding of religion in America has developed during the semester. Pay special attention turning points, “aha” moments, key questions, significant insights and the like. Using a highlighter, highlight these passages on your original papers. You may present the papers in any order you choose. Choose the order that best reflects your learning.

Then write a final reflection for your professor and classmates in which you introduce the papers you have included and identify and discuss what you consider to be the three most important “learnings” your papers demonstrate. Be specific in illustrating each learning. (2-4 pages)

“Family Tree: Second Thoughts”

Revisiting their family trees led students to express deepened insight into their own families, informed by what they had read and heard during the course, as illustrated by the following responses:

In taking a second look at this family tree, I see how important immigration has been to my family’s religious background and how influential in determining my own religious preference . . . The diversity that each immigrant group brings to one religious tradition, such as that of having Irish, Italian, and German strands of Catholicism, shows again how manyness is prevalent in the American religious tradition. As a Polish and Italian Catholic, I can now say that my heritage played an integral role in making present the manyness and diversity that is still seen today.

In my original essay, I wrote that the family tree exercise has made me want to continue to research my family tree. I also wrote that I noticed how much traditions have been preserved over the years in my family. Those ideas were reinforced in the readings. I have realized that the traditions of my family are a part of the oneness and the manyness of the African-American church. I am not just part of my biological family. I am also part of a much larger group of people. I am a part of the African American church family. I am also part of a much larger community. My family has something in common with millions of other people. We are a part of the Christian community as well. There are differences, but there are also many

similarities. Some people may not be able to relate to the spirituals we sing of the struggle that we have endured, but many can relate to the belief in Jesus Christ.

Looking at my existing family tree I believe it is missing an important part of my ancestry. The family tree I created in the beginning of the year fails to identify all the groups of Catholics that came before me. My identity is shaped by my religion and my religion was influenced by all the Roman Catholics that preceded me. Leaving those believers off of my tree is neglecting part of my religious background and family history.

In America my relatives have been free to practice whatever religious beliefs they desire because of the way that the nation is constructed. While the main influence in society is Protestantism, there is a separation of church and state that allows the members of the American society to voluntarily choose which religion they wish to practice. Within my family the degree to which individuals wish to practice the religion they are a part of is radically different and the values that different members hold vary, but each member is part of the American religious landscape in their own individual way.

“Reflections Revisited: Recognizing the Lessons”

After rereading their own reflection papers, students introduced the papers they wanted to include in their portfolios and identified some key “learnings.” For example, when one student reconsidered the differences between Catholics and Evangelicals that Professor Shea discussed, she came to new realization:

When the two groups are juxtaposed against one another, each perceives the other as “different.” Professor Shea proposed the solution to this problem lies in crossing the boundaries of perceived differences to create a successful interaction . . . If denominations in the same faith can reconcile their differences, then it might be possible for inter-faith differences to be settled. Achieving oneness does not require that total agreement has to be established; instead, both should work towards establishing an open dialogue and developing a tolerance for distinct interpretations. Even though manyness has always characterized the American religious landscape, there is room for oneness as well, and that oneness can still respect what is distinctive of the “other.”

Another student concluded by saying:

My perception of religion has undergone a great deal of change over the course of the semester. I began by focusing on the specific beliefs of each religious group. I held my own biases about each of the groups based on my Protestant upbringing. As the semester continued and I heard people of different faiths speak to me, I learned to appreciate different beliefs.

One “learning” reported in several portfolios was the realization of the centrality of “community” – both within particular religious groups (for example’ the centrality of *familia* to Latina Catholics which Ada María Isasi-Díaz discussed) and across religious groups.

Another “learning” voiced by several students was expressed by one student in this way: “it is important to get an understanding of different religions in order to better understand your own.”

Conclusion: The opportunity for students to reread their own work is effective insofar as it enables students to observe a deepening in their own analysis and understanding and to make new connections. The portfolio provides students with an opportunity to listen and to respond to themselves and so continue to discover and strengthen their own voices. Almost all students recognized the impact that hearing other voices can have on their own learning. Reading students' portfolios is another way for the professor to hear students.

6. **A final exam question (circulated in advance) that invites students to reflect on the challenges of “encountering difference” – societally and personally.**

The question was phrased this way:

Diana L. Eck has written: “How we encounter religious and cultural difference is certainly one of the most important questions our society faces.”

Respond to this statement in the form of a letter written to your professor and to the class.

- a. **Drawing on specific examples from the course**, illustrate how our society should and should not encounter and respond to religious and cultural difference.
- b. **Getting personal, consider the following:**
 - What does encountering religious and cultural difference mean for you personally?
 - What are the difficulties you encounter in dealing with differences across and within religions?
 - What are the challenges of encountering such differences?
 - What are the resources on which you can draw?
 - What can you contribute to the encounter with difference – across and within religions -as a result of your study of religion in America?

This first part of the question generated responses that revealed that America's own religious intolerance toward particular religious groups (e.g. Native Americans, Catholics) as well as current manifestations of religious intolerance for certain religious groups (e.g. Muslims, Jehovah's Witnesses, Mormons) illustrate how society should not respond to religious difference. Hearing Captain Yee speak about attitudes he encountered as a convert to Islam, recalling Ada María Isasi-Díaz's account of the experience of Latina Catholics, reading Katie Cannon's account of the history of her enslaved ancestors, reading Ada María Isasi-Díaz's admission that she has not found a “home” – neither in native Cuba nor in America – all prompted students to recognize the real life costs of being perceived as “the other.” Most students identified themselves with a pluralist position that not only tolerated but actually valued and celebrated religious difference. Students spoke of the absolute necessity of open-mindedness and respect

The second part of the question yielded self-examination, personal reflection, questioning and even a sense of mission as illustrated by the following responses:

For me, encountering religious and cultural differences means exposing myself to other religions and listening to others' stories. The encountering of different religions has also led me to

questions things in my own faith . . . For example, I don't like the discrimination that women experience in the Roman Catholic religion.

For me personally, encountering religious and cultural difference means not being afraid of it. It means recognizing that there is religious pluralism in America. It means not being negative toward other religions. It is not my role to judge. It also means being respectful of other religions. I would not want people to bash my religion.

People who are different in and out of my religion are not THAT much different . . . The difficulties I encounter in differences in my own religion are asking "why don't you do it like me?" The difficulties across religions are "my way is better than yours."

I personally feel my understanding and knowledge not only my own religion and the multiple parts of it, but also a base on other religions will allow me to face these encounters with an open mind.

For me, personally, encountering religious and cultural differences requires at least an open mind if not also an open heart. These encounters should be viewed as invaluable learning experiences that help to broaden our horizons and enrich our lives. For this to happen, I believe that one must [be] confident and comfortable with oneself and [one's] heritage in order to not feel threatened when faced with these differences.

When I personally encounter difference it means being challenged and confronted with opposing views, all of which I fear. I fear this because it forces me to acknowledge my own prejudices. It is difficult because I want to be right as does the other person. I want to accept the other's right to believe what they choose without compromising my own beliefs and I want to maintain my faith without being judgmental. I can draw on my own Christian faith to love my neighbor. I think that this command which Jesus calls the greatest command, sums up how to respond to any encounter that may pose as a difficult situation. I think that it is important to look for the commonalities rather than focus on the differences, and use what is in common to create a path of understanding. I hope that as I encounter differences I can bring understanding rather than assumptions.

I want to accept the other's right to believe what they choose without compromising my own beliefs, and I want to maintain my faith without being judgmental.

I hope to learn about myself by embracing others.

If your religion has been especially hostile in dealing with someone or something different, you can vow to be the catalyst for change. If your tradition has acted positively, you can find ways to continue or expand upon that behavior.

The challenge I have personally faced when encountering different religions and cultures is being able to step inside another's life and understand their practice or beliefs . . . Another challenge is learning when and where to draw the line of acceptance of a practice or belief which in my view is just not humane . . . Do I respect it as simply a religious practice which I do not share, or do I have the right to disagree? I still don't have the answer to such questions which are certainly challenging and difficult to grapple with.

Students reported that the primary obstacles to encountering difference in a positive way were ignorance and misinformation, stereotypes, fear of difference and fear of offending others. They identified education (especially learning from history and contemporary experience) and experiences (one-on-one conversations and relationships, speakers, videos, autobiographical essays) as the primary ways to encounter differences in a constructive way.

Approximately half of the class addressed the impact of encountering difference across religions *and* within one's own faith.

Conclusion: Students responses illustrate that all students believed that they had deepened their respect for others, discovered commonalities, and made connections to the their own experiences and to their own religious tradition as they listened to and heard other voices.

Two Resolutions for the Next Time Around

- Overall, these pedagogies were effective in stimulating active learning and continuous reflection. I will continue to employ them.

It is clear that the more voices that students hear, the better. Next time, in addition to including speakers, I will require that students read an autobiographical essay for each of the religions we study. I will also offer opportunities for students, who identify with a particular

Title: Listening to the Listeners

For: Building consensus around how others' hear us.

The instructor provides:

Lecture, sample homilies, and assigned readings dealing with: the following subjects: The contemporary homiletic landscape, the new homiletic, language appropriate to the liturgy, how to prepare and design a liturgical homily, the principles of orals communication, preaching in idea, narrative, and images; the pluralistic nature of the contemporary congregation.

The students provide:

- Class discussion of assigned readings (30 or 60 minutes per session)
- Preparation and delivery of two liturgical homilies in a "live" liturgical assembly.
- Assemble a homily preparation group of 6-8 congregants as representative as possible of "otherness" (e.g. gender, psychological type and temperament, culture, political and theological stances, etc.) Where possible, the groups should be significantly different for each of the two required homilies.
- Members of this group will
 - attend a preparation session prior to the actual preaching of the homily which will follow the *lectio* model used in class, and
 - be asked to fill out an evaluation form provided by the professor following the homily.

The homilies are to be videotaped for playback in class. Participants should be provided with a copy of the sermon manuscript for the in-class evaluation. Ideally, the second homily would be preached after the in-class evaluation of the first one has taken place.

During the course of the semester, participants will conduct an interview with one member of their homily preparation group(s), following an outline provided by the instructor. The interview is designed to assist homilists in “listening to listeners” as part of the preaching ministry.

Detailed Description of the Pedagogy

Course: Liturgical Preaching

I will reorient the homiletics course away from the preacher to the listener through carefully chosen texts. These include the following:

Allen, O. Wesley Jr. *The Homiletic of All Believers: A Conversation Approach to Proclamation and Preaching*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005. ISBN 0-664-22860-7. BV4211.3.A425 2005

Jeter, Joseph R. Jr., and Allen, Ronald J. *One Gospel, Many Ears: Preaching for Different Listeners in the Congregation*. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2002. ISBN 0-8272-2716-7. BV4211.J45 2002

Mulligan, Mary Alice, Turner-Sharazz, et.al. *Believing in Preaching: What Listeners Hear in Sermons*. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2005. ISBN 078-0-827205-02-3. BV4211.3.B45 2005

These texts address “diversity” present in the congregation along several lines, including social location, gender, psychological type and temperament, gender, culture, and political and theological stances.

I expect that these texts will stimulate a great deal of discussion to which I typically devote a considerable portion of class time.

Among other pedagogies, participants are also expected to form a “homily preparation group” in the parish(es) where they will be preaching to enrich their process. I will ask them to seek congregants for this group in light of these various aspects of “diversity.” I will also ask students to be aware of “difference” in the preparation of their “practice” homilies which will be preached in live settings. This attentiveness will be a main factor in the in-class feedback as these are viewed on video as well as the parishioner evaluations I will redesign in light of this.

My choice concerns a weakness in much of teaching ministry candidates how” to preach in that the focus is invariably on developing the preacher’s own homiletic “voice.” The

rationale is basically to help overcome this limitation by helping to make the preaching ministry more a “homiletic of all believers.”

As an Episcopal seminary in which theological tensions within the denomination have appeared, it is vital that seminarians explore ways to balance the difficult and, at times, seemingly opposed imperatives of “conviction” and “communion.” Newly-ordained priests know they are entering this fray and the Seminary’s mission is obviously served by attending to it in their academic, pastoral, and spiritual formation.

Evaluation will occur mainly through in-class viewing of two “live” practice homilies which students must have videotaped. I will have focus questions to guide the evaluation by peers in the course as well by reviewing the evaluation forms select parishioners will be asked to fill out. At the end of the course, students themselves will engage in an overall evaluation of the course as to the extent to which this reorientation to the listener has enabled them to begin practicing a homiletic of all believers attentive to the reality of “one Gospel, many ears.”

SYLLABUS

Course Title: *Homiletics*

Course Summary: This course introduces students to the theology and methods of preaching in a liturgical context. Issues addressed include the character of liturgical language, the new homiletic, the influence of personality type on preaching style, use of the Lectionary, developing a homiletic spirituality and attending to listeners as a vital aspect of homily preparation and delivery. In addition to theoretical aspects of liturgical preaching, the course will also provide a practicum to help students develop their homiletic skills and voice.

N.B. This course is also taking part in the Other Voices Project sponsored by the Wabash Center. Please see the attached description for further information.

1) Course Identification:

a) *Semester*: Spring

Academic year: 2006

b) *Course title and number*: PR30 Homiletics

c) *Instructor*:

2) Enrollment Limitations: *none*

3) Pre-requisites: *none*

4) Course Content and Method of Instruction:

a) *Content*:

i) instructor’s input (sample liturgical homilies, lectures)

ii) assigned readings

b) *Style and method*:

lectio divina with the coming Sunday’s readings (N.B. Readings may be obtained at The Lectionary Page; <http://www.io.com/~kellywp/> and The Lectionary or at

<http://satucket.com/lectionary/>; accessed December 17, 2005). Participants must bring the coming Sunday's readings to each class session.

- ii) class discussion of assigned readings (30 or 60 minutes per session)
- iii) instructor's lecture and sample homilies (30 or 60 minutes per session)
- iv) student homilies and peer feedback (60 minutes per homily)

5) Academic Goals:

- to acquaint students with a range of contemporary homiletic thought;
-
- to heighten students' awareness of several important issues bearing on the church's preaching ministry today;
- to help students situate the homily clearly within its liturgical context;
- to assist students in identifying their distinctive homiletic voice and style and method of preparation;
- to discern and enhance students' preaching skills through live preaching
 - experiences and classroom evaluation and feedback;
- vi) to raise awareness of "diversity" among listeners present in the congregation which,
- if not oppositional, are sufficiently "other" to students' faith life and which require
- homiletic recognition and opportunity for voice.

6) Readings:

a) *Required materials to be obtained:*

Allen, O. Wesley Jr. *The Homiletic of All Believers: A Conversational Approach to Proclamation and Preaching*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005. ISBN 0-664-22860-7. BV4211.3.A425 2005

ii) Day, David, Astley, Jeff, and Francis, Leslie J., eds. *A Reader on Preaching: Making Connections*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005. ISBN 0-7546-5009-X

iii) Jeter, Joseph R. Jr., and Allen, Ronald J. *One Gospel, Many Ears: Preaching for Different Listeners in the Congregation*. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2002. ISBN 0-8272-2716-7. BV4211.J45 2002

iv) Mulligan, Mary Alice, Turner-Sharazz, et.al. *Believing in Preaching: What Listeners Hear in Sermons*. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2005. ISBN 078-0-827205-02-3 BV4211.3.B45 2005

v) Schlafer, David J. *Your Way with God's Word: Discovering Your Distinctive Preaching Voice*. Boston: Cowley Publications, 1995.

ISBN 1-56101-118-5
BV4211.2.S365 1995

vi) Taylor, Barbara Brown. *The Preaching Life*. Boston: Cowley Publications, 1993. ISBN 1-56101-074-X
BX5995.T26A3 1993

vii) Wilson, Paul Scott. *Preaching and Homiletical Theory*. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2004.

ISBN 0-8272-2981-X

7) Practicum:

Students will prepare and deliver 2 liturgical homilies in a “live” liturgical assembly – these may include non-Eucharistic services. Prior to the liturgy, the student will seek out a cross-section of 6-8 congregants including, when possible, the presider who will a) attend a preparation session prior to the actual preaching of the homily which will follow the lectio model used in class, and b) be asked to fill out an evaluation form provided by the professor following the homily. It is vital that this homily preparation group be as representative as possible of “otherness” with respect to the homilist’s social location, gender, psychological type and temperament, culture, political and theological stances, etc. Where possible, the groups should be significantly different for each of the two required homilies.

The homilies are to be videotaped for playback in class. Participants should be provided with a copy of the sermon manuscript for the in-class evaluation. Ideally, the second homily would be preached after the in-class evaluation of the first one has taken place.

During the course of the semester, participants will conduct an interview with one member of their homily preparation group(s), following an outline provided by the instructor. The interview is designed to assist homilists in “listening to listeners” as part of the preaching ministry. Students are asked to select a parishioner to interview who in their estimation is likely to be most “other” to them in light of the diversity criteria mentioned above.

8) Written work:

A full written text of the preached homilies is to be submitted along with an accompanying commentary. The commentary should describe: a) the preparation process, including the role played by the homily preparation session with parishioners along with the resources consulted and relevant exegetical comments that were useful in crafting the homily; b) the theological, liturgical and pastoral principles which guided the homilist’s use of language; c) reasons for the homily’s style, structure and content; d) particular issues in liturgical preaching the homily might reflect, and e) the student’s reflection on parishioner evaluation and peer feedback concerning the homily. Proposed revisions to the homily, based on parishioner and peer feedback, are also to be included.

These papers should be 10-12 pages in length with supporting documentation where appropriate. The following guideline is suggested:

- i) summary of the preparation process (2 pp.)
- ii) text of the homily (3 pp.)
- iii) pastoral, theological, liturgical, homiletic commentary (2 pp.)
- iv) reflection on parishioner and peer evaluation; (2 pp.)
- v) proposed revisions (2pp.)

A summary transcript of the interview is to be submitted along with a reflection paper (total 3-5pp) on the challenges of developing “a homiletic of all believers” attentive to “other voices” while at the same time learning to sound out one’s own distinctive homiletic voice.

The homily-with-commentary papers are due 2 weeks after their in-class review – with the exception of seniors whose grades are due on May 5, and hence must submit all

required assignments by May 1. The interview/reflection paper is due on the last day of class, with the same proviso for seniors.

9) Grading:

- a) class participation (10%)
- b) preached homilies (10% each)
- c) written homilies with commentary (30% each)
- d) interview/Reflection paper (10%)

10) Complete Course Outline and Readings

Session 1 (January 30):

Overview of Course

Preaching Experience and Challenges of Participants

Great Preachers Series: Barbara Brown Taylor

The Road to Emmaus: Clues to the Liturgical Homily

Reading for this session: Taylor, *The Preaching Life*

N.B. A chapter from Schlafer, *Your Way with God's Word*, is to be read in sequence for each week's class with journal entries completed, where provided.

Session 2 (February 6):

Overview of the Contemporary Homiletic Landscape

Reading for this session: Day, Ch. 1, 3, 6; Jeter, Chs. 1-2; Mulligan, Ch. 1

Session 3 (February 13):

Theological Foundations of the "New Homiletic"

Reading for this session: Mulligan, Ch. 2; Wilson, Section Two

Session 4 (February 20):

Homiletic Language Appropriate to the Liturgy

Reading for this session: Allen, Chs. 1-3; Day, Part 6; Mulligan, Ch.3

Session 5 (February 27):

Strategies for Liturgical Homily Preparation and Design

Student Homily

Student Homily

Reading for this Session: Day, Ch. 8, 11; Wilson, Section One; Mulligan, Ch. 4

Session 6 (March 6):

Principles of Oral Communication: Rules for Writing for the Ear

Student Homily

Student Homily

Reading for this session: Allen, Chs. 4-5; Day, Ch. 9; Mulligan, Ch. 5

Session 7 (March 13):

Preaching in Idea Form

Student Homily

Student Homily

Reading for this session: Day, Ch. 4; Jeter, Chs. 5, 7; Mulligan, Ch. 6

Session 8 (March 27):

Preaching in Narrative Form

Student Homily

Student Homily

Reading for this session: Day, Chs. 10, 18, 24-26; Jeter, Ch. 4; Mulligan, Ch. 7

Session 9 (April 3):

Preaching in Image Form

Student Homily

Student Homily

Reading for this session: Day, Ch. 2, 17, 19, 20; Mulligan, Ch. 8

Session 10 (April 10):

Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Preaching: Influence of Personality Type and Temperament in Preaching

Student Homily

Student Homily

Reading for this session: Day, Ch. 7; Jeter, Ch. 3; Mulligan, Ch. 9

Session 11 (April 17):

Social Justice Issues in Preaching

Great Preachers Series: Walter Burghhardt

Student Homily

Student Homily

Reading for this session: Day, Chs. 15-16; Jeter, Ch. 5-6; Mulligan, Ch. 10

Session 12 (April 24):

Toward a Homiletic Spirituality: Habits of Highly Effective Preachers

Student Homily

Student Homily

Reading for this session: Day, Chs. 12-14; Wilson, Ch. 8

Session 13 (May 1):

Postmodern Challenges to Preaching

Student Homily

Student Homily

Reading for this session: Day, Part 8; Wilson, Ch. 9

11) Selected Bibliography

Achtemeier, Elizabeth. *Creative Preaching: Finding the Words*. Edited by William D. Thompson. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1980.

Allen, O. Wesley Jr. *The Homiletic of All Believers: A Conversational Approach to Proclamation and Preaching*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005.

Allen, Ronald J., Blaisdell, Barbara Shires, and Johnston, Scott Black. *Theology for Preaching:*

Authority, Truth and Knowledge of God in a Postmodern Ethos. Nashville: Abingdon Press,

1997.

Alling, Roger and Schlafer, David J., ed. *Preaching as Image, Story and Idea. Sermons that Work*

VII. Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse Publishing, 1998.

Baird, William. "Biblical Preaching as Incarnational Preaching." *Lexington Theological Quarterly* 16 (no. 3, 1981): 105-116.

Bausch, William J. *Storytelling: Imagination and Faith*. Mystic, Connecticut: Twenty-Third Publications, 1984.

- . *Storytelling the Word. Homilies and How to Write Them*. Mystic, Connecticut: Twenty-Third Publications, 1998.
- Bonneau, Normand. *The Sunday Lectionary: Ritual Word, Paschal Shape*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998.
- Bowman, Thea. "Justice, Power and Praise." in *Liturgy and Social Justice*. ed. Edward Grosz. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1989, 26-39.
- Bozrath-Campbell, Alla. *The Word's Body: An Incarnational Aesthetic of Interpretation*. University, AL.: University of Alabama Press, 1979.
- Buechner, Frederick. *Telling the Truth: The Gospel as Tragedy, Comedy, and Fairy Tale*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1977.
- Burghardt, Walter J. *Preaching: The Art and the Craft*. New York: Paulist Press, 1987.
- . *Preaching the Just Word*. Cambridge, MA: Yale University Press, 1996.
- . *To Be Just Is To Love: Homilies for a Church Renewing*. New York: Paulist Press, 2002.
- Buttrick, David. *Homiletic: Moves and Structures*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- . *The Mystery and the Passion: A Homiletic Reading of the Gospel Traditions*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- . *Preaching Jesus Christ: An Exercise in Homiletic Theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- . *Preaching the New and the Now*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998.
- . *Speaking Parables: A Homiletic Guide*. Louisville: Westminster/John Know Press, 2000.
- Buttry, Daniel L. *First-Person Preaching: Bringing New Life to Biblical Stories*. Valley Forge, PA: Judson Press, 1998.
- Childers, Jana. *Performing the Word: Preaching as Theatre*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1998.
- Coggan, Donald. *The Sacrament of the Word*. London: Collins (Fount Paperbacks), 1987. Comments on the Revised Common Lectionary. <http://www.montreal.anglican.org/comments/> Accessed December 17, 2005.
- Cormier, Jay. *Heaven Is Like... A Gospel Model for Writing, Preparing, and Delivering the Sunday Homily*. Kansas City: Sheed & Ward, 2000.
- Craddock, Fred B. *As One Without Authority*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971.
- . *Preaching*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1985.
- Crites, Stephen, "The Narrative Quality of Experience." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 39 (September, 1971): 291-311.
- Day, David, Astley, Jeff, and Francis, Leslie J., eds. *A Reader on Preaching: Making Connections*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005.

Donghi, Antonio, McDonough, William, and Serra, Dominic, trans. *Actions and Words: Symbolic Language and the Liturgy*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1997.

Doran, Carol, and Troeger, Thomas H. "Reclaiming the Corporate Self: The Meaning and Ministry of Worship in a Privatistic Culture." *Worship* 60 (no. 3, 1986): 200-210.

Edwards, Paul. *The Practical Preacher: Handy Hints for Hesitant Homilist*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1994.

Edwards, O.C. Jr. *Elements of Homiletic: A Method for Preparing to Preach*. New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1982.

Elliot, Mark Barger. *Creative Styles of Preaching*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2000.

Eslinger, Richard L. *A New Hearing: Living Options in Homiletic Method*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1987.

-----, ed. *Intersections: Post-Critical Studies in Preaching*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994.

-----, *Narrative Imagination: Preaching the Worlds that Shape Us*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.

-----, *Pitfalls in Preaching*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1996.

Fairchild, Richard J. Sermon & Sermon – Lectionary Resources. <http://www.rockies.net/~spirit/sermon.html> Accessed December 17, 2005.

Farris, Stephen. *Preaching That Matters: The Bible and Our Lives*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998.

Flemming, Peter James. "Preaching to the 'Image Generation.'" *Faith and Mission* 3 (no. 1, 1985): 57-65.

Fischer, Kathleen R. *The Inner Rainbow: The Imagination in Christian Life*. New York: Paulist Press, 1983.

Fulfilled in Your Hearing: The Homily in the Sunday Assembly. Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1982.

Goethals, Gregor T. *The Electronic Golden Calf: Images, Religion, and the Making of Meaning*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cowley Publications, 1990.

Green, Garrett. *Imagining God: Theology and the Religious Imagination*. San Francisco: Harper & Row Publishers, 1989.

Gunton, Colin. E. *Theology Through Preaching. Sermons for Brentwood*. Foreword by Christoph Schwöbel. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2001.

Harris, Daniel. *We Speak the Word of the Lord*. Chicago, IL: ACTA Publications, 2001

Hart, Richard. *Preaching: The Secret to Parish Revival*. Mystic, CT: Twenty-Third Publications/Bayard, 2000.

Hethcock, William J. "Using Imagination in Sermon Composition." *St. Luke's Journal of Theology* 32 (no. 4, 1989): 257-263.

- Hilkert, Mary Catherine. *Naming Grace: Preaching and the Sacramental Imagination*. New York: Continuum Books, 1997.
- Honeycutt, Frank G. *Preaching to Skeptics and Seekers*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2001.
- Hughes, Robert G., and Kysar, Robert. *Preaching Doctrine for the Twenty-First Century*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997.
- Jacks, G. Robert. *Getting the Word Across: Speech Communication for Pastors and Lay Leaders*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1995.
- . *Just Say the Word: Writing for the Ear*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1996.
- Janowiak, Paul. *The Holy Preaching: The Sacramentality of the Word in the Liturgical Assembly*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000.
- Jeter, Joseph R. Jr., and Allen, Ronald J. *One Gospel, Many Ears: Preaching for Different Listeners in the Congregation*. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2002.
- Leech, Kenneth. *We Preach Christ Crucified: The Proclamation of the Cross in a Dark Age*. Cambridge, MA: Cowley Publications, 1994.
- Lischer, Richard. "The Limits of Story." *Interpretation* 38 (no. 1, 1984): 26-38. Living Web Lectionary Project. <http://www.livingweb.com/lectionary/> Accessed December 17, 2005.
- Long, Thomas G, and Farley, Edward, eds. *Preaching as a Theological Task: World, Gospel, Scripture. In Honor of David Buttrick*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.
- Long, Thomas G. *Preaching and the Literary Forms of the Bible*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989.
- . *The Witness of Preaching*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1989.
- Lowry, Eugene L. *Doing Time in the Pulpit: The Relationship Between Narrative and Preaching*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1985.
- . *The Homiletical Plot: The Sermon as Narrative Art Form*. Expanded Edition. Foreword by Fred B. Craddock. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- . *How to Preach a Parable: Designs for Narrative Sermons*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1989.
- . *Living with the Lectionary: Preaching through the Revised Common Lectionary*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1992.
- Matera, Frank. *Strategies for Preaching Paul*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2001
- McClure, John S., Allen, Ronald J., et. al. *Listening to Listeners: Homiletical Case Studies*. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2004.

- Miles, Margaret R. *Image as Insight: Visual Understanding in Western Christianity and Secular Culture*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1985.
- Mitchell, Ella Pearson, ed. *Those Preachin' Women: Sermons by Black Women Preachers*. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1985.
- Mitchell, Jolyon. *Visually Speaking: Radio and the Renaissance of Preaching*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 2000.
- Mulligan, Mary Alice, Turner-Sharazz, et.al. *Believing in Preaching: What Listeners Hear in Sermons*. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2005.
- Navone, John. *Seeking God in Story*. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1990.
- Nichols, J. Randall. *The Restoring Word: Preaching as Pastoral Communication*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1987.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *Divine Rhetoric: The Sermon on the Mount as Message and as Model in Augustine, Chrysostom and Luther*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001.
- Prickett, Stephen. "The Status of Biblical Narrative." *Pacifica* 2 (no. 1, 1989): 26-46.
- Ramshaw, Gail. *Christ in Sacred Speech: The Meaning of Liturgical Language*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- . *Liturgical Language: Keeping it Metaphoric, Making it Inclusive*. American Essays in Liturgy. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996.
- . *Worship: Searching for Language*. Washington, DC: The Pastoral Press, 1988.
- Rueter, Alvin C., *Making Good Preaching Better: A Step-by-Step Guide to Scripture-Based, People-Centered Preaching*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1997.
- Rice, Charles L. *The Embodied Word: Preaching as Art and Liturgy*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Robinson, Wayne Bradley, ed. *Journeys Toward Narrative Preaching*. New York: Pilgrim Press, 1990.
- Schlafer, David J. "Image, Narrative, and Argument as Basic Strategies for Shaping Sermons." *Homiletic* 19 (no. 1, 1994): 1-10.
- . *Surviving the Sermon: A Guide to Preaching for Those Who Have to Listen*. Cambridge, MA: Cowley Publications, 1992.
- Sermons That Work. <http://www.episcopalchurch.org/sermons-that-work/> Accessed December 17, 2005.
- Siegfried, Regina, and Ruane, Edward, eds. *In the Company of Preachers*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1993.
- Sloyan, Gerard. "Some Thoughts on Liturgical Preaching." *Worship*, vol. 71, No. 5, Sept. 1997, 386-399.
- Smith, Christine M. *Weaving the Sermon: Preaching in a Feminist Perspective*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox

- Press, 1989.
- Smith, J. Alfred. *The Overflowing Heart*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1987.
- Sussman, Linda. *The Speech of the Grail: A Journey Toward Speaking That Heals and Transforms*. Hudson, NY: Lindisfarne Press, 1995.
- Taylor, Barbara Brown. *Home By Another Way*. Cambridge, MA: Cowley Publications, 1999.
- The Text This Week. <http://www.textweek.com/> Accessed December 17, 2005.
- Thompson, James W. *Preaching Like Paul: Homiletical Wisdom for Today*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Tisdale, Leonora Tubbs. *Preaching as Local Theology and Folkart*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1997
- Troeger, Thomas H. *Creating Fresh Images for Preaching: New Rungs for Jacob's Ladder*. Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Judson Press, 1982.
- , *Imagining a Sermon*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1990.
- , *The Parable of Ten Preachers*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1992.
- , *Preaching While the Church is Under Reconstruction: The Visionary Role of Preachers in a Fragmented World*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999.
- , *Ten Strategies for Preaching in a Multi Media Culture*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996.
- , and Doran, Carol. *Trouble at the Table: Gathering the Tribes for Worship*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1992.
- Untener, Ken. *Preaching Better: Practical Suggestions for Homilists*. New York: Paulist Press, 1999.
- Van Seters, Arthur, ed. *Preaching as a Social Act: Theology and Practice*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1988.
- Wainwright, Geoffrey. "The Sermon and the Liturgy." *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 28 (no. 4, 1983): 337-349.
- Wallace, James A. *Imaginal Preaching: An Archetypal Perspective*. New York: Paulist Press, 1995.
- , *Preaching to the Hungers of the Heart: The Homily on the Feasts and Within the Rites*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2002.
- Wardlaw, Don M., ed. *Preaching Biblically: Creating Sermons in the Shape of Scripture*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983.
- Waznak, Robert P. *An Introduction to the Homily*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998.
- , *Sunday After Sunday, Preaching the Homily as Story*, New York: Paulist Press, 1983
- Wilson, Paul Scott. *Imagination of the Heart: New Understandings in Preaching*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1988.
- , *Preaching and Homiletical Theory*. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2004.
- Wilson-Kastner, Patricia. *Imagery for Preaching*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.

Sermon Evaluation Form for Parish Use

(from the Episcopal Divinity School;

<http://www.episdivschool.edu/academic/3FEEval.html>)

Please circle the appropriate number. 1 = Needs significant improvement 2 = Needs moderate improvement 3 = Adequate 4 = Above average 5 = Excellent NA = Not applicable

Content of Sermon

Appropriate Use of Scripture	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Appropriate Use of Christian Tradition	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Effective connections with human experience	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Clear sermon point	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

Organization of Sermon

Opening	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Development	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Use of language and illustration	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Closing	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Length and quality of ideas, issues, material	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

Delivery of Sermon

Effective use of voice: volume, diction, pace, enunciation, etc.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Secured audience attention: eye contact, gestures, manner of delivery	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Freedom from manuscript, notes, outline, etc.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

Outcome of Sermon

As proclamation of God's word in this parish and community	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
As inspiration and challenge to change attitudes, behaviors, etc.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
As source of relevant information	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
As impact on one's faith and personal spiritual journey	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
As provocative of further personal and/or corporate reflection	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
As an integral part of worship/liturgy	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

Optional question:

I want to offer the following advice and suggestions to the preacher so that s/he might continue to grow in effectiveness as a preacher:

*Sermon Evaluation Form for Class and Seminary Use*¹

Regarding the homily you just heard, indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements. Frankness is appreciated.

1 (Strongly agree) 2 (Agree) 3 (Uncertain) 4 (Disagree) 5 (Strongly disagree)

Area 1: What was the Good News from God in the sermon?

- 1. The homily struck me as "good news." 1 2 3 4 5*
- 2. The homily helped me encounter God. 1 2 3 4 5*
- 3. I was inspired and/or challenged by the sermon. 1 2 3 4 5*

Area 2: Did the sermon honor the integrity of the Bible, the topic, or the liturgical setting?

- 1. The sermon made good use of the readings. 1 2 3 4 5*
- 2. The sermon was well-integrated into the liturgy. 1 2 3 4 5*
- 3. The sermon helped prepare me for the Eucharist. 1 2 3 4 5*

Area 3: Was the sermon theologically adequate?

- 1. The sermon was appropriate to the Christian faith as I understand it. 1 2 3 4 5*
- 2. The sermon was understandable. 1 2 3 4 5*
- 3. The sermon was consistent with other things Christians say and do. 1 2 3 4 5*
- 4. I could seriously imagine the world of the sermon. 1 2 3 4 5*
- 5. The sermon was morally plausible. 1 2 3 4 5*

Area 4: Did the sermon relate the text or topic to the congregation in a responsible way?

- 1. The preacher connected with the congregation. 1 2 3 4 5*
- 2. The preacher spoke to my experience. 1 2 3 4 5*
- 3. The preacher spoke down to us. 1 2 3 4 5*

Area 5: What was the significance of the sermon for the congregation?

- 1. The sermon made specific points of contact with the local context. 1 2 3 4 5*
- 2. The sermon was appropriate to the situation of the congregation. 1 2 3 4 5*
- 3. The homilist helped me and/or the congregation live the Gospel more fully. 1 2 3 4*

Area 6: Did the sermon move in a way that was easy to follow?

- 1. The preacher helped me stay on track throughout the sermon. 1 2 3 4 5*
- 2. The sermon was well-prepared. 1 2 3 4 5*
- 3. The preacher drew me into the sermon with a strong introduction. 1 2 3 4 5*
- 4. The sermon had a clear conclusion. 1 2 3 4 5*
- 5. The sermon was the right length. 1 2 3 4 5*

Area 7: Did the preacher embody the sermon in an engaging way?

- 1. The preacher exhibited a sense of personal faith and spirituality. 1 2 3 4 5*
- 2. The preacher conveyed a sense of presence. 1 2 3 4 5*
- 3. The preacher made good use of voice (clear, audible, modulated, familiar tone). 1 2 3 4 5*
- 4. The preacher referred to notes or manuscript too often. 1 2 3 4 5*
- 5. The preacher maintained good eye contact. 1 2 3 4 5*
- 6. The preacher exhibited good posture. 1 2 3 4 5*

Area 8: Did the preacher exhibit awareness of the varieties of listeners in the congregation?

- 1. The preacher seems capable of transcending her/his own style.*
- 2. The preacher seems attentive to generational differences in the congregation.*
- 3. The preacher seems to allow for typological/temperamental differences in the congregation.*

4. *The preacher accounts for potential gender differences in the congregation.*
5. *The preacher acknowledges potential multicultural diversity in the congregation.*
6. *The preacher affirms theological differences among congregants.*

Area 9 (Second homily – classroom use only)

1. *The preacher has demonstrated improvement in at least one of the above areas.*
2. *The preacher has incorporated feedback from the previous evaluation.*
3. *The preacher seems to be finding “his/her own way with God’s Word.”*
4. *The preacher seems capable of varying hers/his homiletic voice.*

Optional question (Please use back of sheet): I want to offer the following advice and suggestions to the preacher so that s/he might continue to grow in effectiveness as a preacher

Interview Protocol

(cf. McClure, John S., Allen, Ronald J., et. al. *Listening to Listeners: Homiletical Case Studies*. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2004, p. 182. Used with permission. Questions marked with an * not in the original, but should be asked for purposes of this course).

Ethos

Tell me about how you became a part of this congregation.

What are the most important things that happen in this congregation?

Describe a typical Sunday morning in this congregation.

Talk a little bit about your relationship with the pastors and preachers that you have had.

Tell me about a pastor you have had who was also a good preacher.

Tell me what preaching does in this congregation that other things do not do.

What would be missing if there were no sermon?

Tell me about your history as a person listening to sermons. What are some of the high points? What are some of the low points?

*What makes you feel included in a sermon? Excluded?

Was there ever a time you almost walked out?

Logos

What do you think your pastor is doing when she or he preaches?

Tell me about a sermon that you really found engaging.

What was it about that sermon that engaged you.

Tell me about a sermon that did not interest you or that put you off.

What was it about that sermon that engaged you?

What was it about that sermon that left you cold or put you off?

What does God do in preaching?

What role does/should the Bible have in preaching?

What causes you to take a sermon really seriously?

I’ll bet you have heard a sermon that caused you to think or act differently, maybe about some big issue, maybe about some small issue. Would you tell me about that sermon?

What did the pastor say that prompted you to act differently?

Pathos

When the pastor stands up to preach, what do you hope will happen to you as a result of listening to that sermon?

I would like you to describe a sermon that seemed to affect the congregation as a whole, as a community.

What was it about that sermon that seemed to move the congregation.

Would you describe a time when the sermon stirred emotions that made you feel uncomfortable.

Do you think there are some issues that are just too explosive, too dangerous, for the preacher to deal with in the pulpit? Would you name some of them for me and tell me why you think they are dangerous?

Embodiment

Would you please describe for me a preacher whose physical presence in the pulpit was really good – whose delivery was really engaging?

What are some things a preacher does physically (while delivering the sermon) that help you want to pay attention?

How do the physical conditions of being able to hear and see the preacher affect the way you pay attention to a sermon?

If you had one or two things you could tell preachers that would help them turn you on (sic) when you are listening to a sermon, what would they be?

Project Abstract. This project will develop curricular and pedagogical tools for bringing views oppositional to students' faith life into the classroom. Administrators, faculty, and students from five diverse faith institutions (four schools of theology and two religious studies departments) will describe, review, and critique what is currently happening in their institutions in order to design, test, and evaluate curricula and pedagogies that foster inter and intra religious knowledge and relationships.

Course: Homiletics

Semester: Spring 2006

Pedagogical and Curricular Summary

I will reorient the homiletics course away from the preacher toward the listener through carefully chosen texts. These include the following:

Allen, O. Wesley Jr. *The Homiletic of All Believers: A Conversational Approach to Proclamation and Preaching*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005.

Jeter, Joseph R. Jr., and Allen, Ronald J. *One Gospel, Many Ears: Preaching for Different Listeners*

in the Congregation. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2002.

Mulligan, Mary Alice, Turner-Sharazz, et.al. *Believing in Preaching: What Listeners Hear in*

Sermons. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2005.

These texts address “diversity” (voices which, if not oppositional, are sufficiently “other” to the students’ faith life) present in the congregation along several lines, including social location, gender, psychological type and temperament, gender, culture, and political and theological stances.

I expect that these texts will stimulate a great deal of discussion to which I typically devote a considerable portion of class time.

Among other pedagogies, participants are also expected to form a “homily preparation group” in the parish(es) where they will be preaching to enrich their

preparatory process. I will ask them to seek congregants for this group in light of these various aspects of “diversity.”

During the course of the semester, participants will also conduct an interview with one member of their homily preparation group(s) following a suggested outline provide by the instructor. The interview is designed to assist homilists in “listening to listeners” as part of the preaching ministry. Students are asked to select a parishioner to interview who in their estimation is likely to be most “other” to them in light of the diversity criteria mentioned above.

I will also ask students to be aware of “difference” in the preparation of their “practice” homilies which will be preached in live settings. This attentiveness will be a main factor in the in-class feedback as these are viewed on video as well as the parishioner evaluations I will redesign in light of this.

My choice concerns a weakness in much of teaching ministry candidates how” to preach in that the focus is invariably on developing the preacher’s own homiletic “voice.” The rationale is basically to help overcome this limitation by helping to make the preaching ministry more a “homiletic of all believers.”

As an Episcopal seminary in which theological tensions within the denomination have appeared, it is vital that seminarians explore ways to balance the difficult and, at times, seemingly opposed imperatives of “conviction” and “communion.” Newly-ordained priests know they are entering this fray and the Seminary’s mission is obviously served by attending to it in their academic, pastoral, and spiritual formation.

Evaluation will occur mainly through in-class viewing of two “live” practice homilies which students must have videotaped. I will have focus questions to guide the evaluation by peers in the course as well by reviewing the evaluation forms select parishioners will be asked to fill out. At the end of the course, students themselves will engage in an overall evaluation of the course as to the extent to which this reorientation to the listener has enabled them to begin practicing a homiletic of all believers attentive to the reality of “one Gospel, many ears.”

¹ Cf. Ronald J. Allen, *Preaching: An Essential Guide* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002) for Areas 1-7 and Joseph R. Jeter, Jr., and Ronald J. Allen, *One Gospel, Many Ears: Preaching for Different Listeners in the Congregation* (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2002) for Area 8.

Other Voices Project

Context

As an Episcopal seminary in which theological tensions within the denomination have become acute and which threaten relationships within parishes and dioceses, as well as the church’s ongoing membership in the Anglican Communion, it is vital that seminarians explore ways to balance the difficult and, at times, seemingly opposed imperatives of “conviction” and “communion.” Newly-ordained priests know they are entering this fray and the Seminary’s mission is obviously served by attending to relevant issues in students’ academic, pastoral, and spiritual formation – all within its stated ethos of liberal Anglo-Catholicism.

Rationale

Introductory preaching courses often exhibit a weakness whereby their focus ends up invariably on the nascent homilist, i.e. teaching ministry candidates “how” to preach and the way to develop their own homiletic “voice.” The basic rationale for this course was therefore to help overcome this limitation by helping make the preaching ministry more a “homiletic of all believers.”

Pedagogies

As a consequence, I intentionally reoriented the homiletics course away from the preacher to the listener through carefully chosen texts to supplement the usual ones dealing with the “mechanics” of preaching. These included the following:

Allen, O. Wesley Jr. *The Homiletic of All Believers: A Conversationa*

Approach to Proclamation and Preaching. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005.

Jeter, Joseph R. Jr., and Allen, Ronald J. *One Gospel, Many Ears: Preaching for*

Different Listeners in the Congregation. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2002.

Mulligan, Mary Alice, Turner-Sharazz, et.al. *Believing in Preaching:*

What Listeners Hear in Sermons. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2005.

These texts addressed “diversity” present in the congregation along several lines, including social location, gender, psychological type and temperament, gender, culture, and political and theological stances. I hoped that these texts would stimulate a great deal of discussion, to which a considerable portion of class time was devoted.

Among other pedagogies, participants were expected to form a “homily preparation group” in the parish where they would be preaching in order to enrich their process and to bring other “voices” into their preparation. I asked them to seek congregants for these groups in light of the various aspects of “diversity” mentioned above.

Students were also asked students to be aware of “difference” in the preparation of their “practice” homilies which would be preached in live settings. This attentiveness would be a main focus in the second of two in-class peer evaluations when these homilies were viewed on video.

Finally, students were asked to conduct an interview with a “listener” who represented for them significant “otherness” according to a set format.

“End Of The Year Summary and Reflection on the Pedagogy

Evaluation of the pedagogies occurred mainly through in-class viewing of two “live” practice homilies which students had videotaped. The following evaluative questions guided the second of these for the specific purposes of the project:

Did the preacher exhibit awareness of the varieties of listeners in the congregation?

- 1. The preacher seems capable of transcending her/his own style.*
- 2. The preacher seems attentive to generational differences in the congregation.*
- 3. The preacher seems to allow for typological/temperamental differences in the congregation.*
- 4. The preacher accounts for potential gender differences in the congregation.*
- 5. The preacher acknowledges potential multicultural diversity in the congregation.*
- 6. The preacher affirms theological differences among congregants.*

Results

The small class size (8 students) coupled with the generally small congregations in which they preached – marked by an overall homogeneity with respect to both participants and parishioners -- resulted in somewhat meager results. While assigned readings and class discussions kept sensibilities to the “other voice” on the table, students found it difficult to translate this into real-life situations where they ministered. For example, the homily preparation groups did not attain the kind of diversity the syllabus envisioned since the pool was most often very limited from which to draw. This was due not only to the homogeneous character of the respective congregations but also to the difficulty of identifying willing and available congregants to participate. These were generally quite small Episcopal congregations in which participants found themselves.

The in-class evaluations, where the second videotaped homily was compared to the first for overall improvement, helped identify students’ growing sensibilities for developing a “homiletic of all believers.” The areas, however, which received the most attention during peer evaluations were awareness of the importance of gender and typology differences in preaching. “Otherness” of a more contrastive nature as envisioned by the project participants in our monthly meetings did not surface in any very significant ways. Once again, small size and homogeneity proved a hindrance to achieving the goals outlined in the course syllabus and foreseen by the project’s own goals for enhancing theological education.

The interviews conducted by students suffered as well from the limited number of “diverse” candidates to employ this pedagogy effectively. I am including, however, some comments from

transcripts and, where provided, the accompanying student reflections. These provide some data in light of the syllabus and project goals:

Transcript excerpt #1

Q: Tell me about your history as a person listening to sermons. What are some of your high points? What are some of your low points?

A: "For a long time, the Rector we had here preached sermons that were way over my head. I felt like he wrote them for only a few people in the congregation that could understand the language he used. My mind would wander and I really didn't pay attention. After he left, we had an Interim Rector who was nice, but her sermons wandered all over the place and I could never follow her. Then we hired a Rector who preached like he was supposed to be entertaining us, but there was never any substance to what he said. Our current Rector is the best preacher that I have heard. I like the way he talks to us on a personal level. He uses language that is descriptive and poetic. He creates pictures and it is almost like you are there with him. He relates the Gospel to what is going on today. I can relate what he says to my life and I can understand what he is saying."

Q: What makes you feel included in a sermon? Excluded?

A: "I feel like I am saying the same things over and over again, but it is the stories that help me feel a part of the sermons. The stories invite you in and make you feel like you are part of what is happening. I don't like sermons that are highly judgmental or over my head. I don't like feeling like I'm being lectured to."

Transcript excerpt #2

B feels included in a sermon when it uses images and experiences to which she can relate, either in her own life directly or in the lives of those around her. She feels excluded when the sermon makes her feel she can "see effort more than effect, or when [she] see[s] no evidence of either effort or effect." B concludes that questions and answers can work well, but content is what includes the listener.

Transcript excerpt #3

What makes you feel included in a sermon? Excluded?

When the preacher introduces politics, it makes me feel excluded because all preachers tend to be liberals. That's the only time that I get really turned off because sometimes I think it's done to intentionally alienate certain listeners. Sometimes that uncomfortableness seems to be self-serving to the preacher rather than being persuasive to the listeners.

Student reflection

My interview with M helped reinforce my understanding that it is crucial for a sermon to be geared to its listeners. While M was articulate in laying out her requirements for a sermon, she was overtly conscious of the fact that sermons must be congregation dependent. One style of preaching could not possibly fit all situations. She fits herself into this paradigm by ensuring that the church that she attends fits her style of preaching, She is willing to give a preacher an opportunity to display their preaching and leadership skills while she assesses whether or not it is a fit with her requirements and helps grow her faith and relationship with God and fellow human beings. And ultimately, her responsibility is to seek another venue if she is not able to find a good fit.

Transcript excerpt #4

What makes you feel included in a sermon? Excluded?

Congregation's participation. MK has used a white board and asked questions of the people. I took CDI (Congregational Development Institute) and have learned my own way of listening.

Student reflection

Over the course of the semester we have reviewed categories of diversity that occur in congregations. Obvious groupings include age, gender and race. Most are not apparent to the eye, but are learned in relationship with individuals; examples include personality type, sexual preference, and cultural background. Nature of a congregation is learned over time and in relationship. "Nature" might include customs, style of communication with each other, authority issues, political leaning, and community involvement.

Conclusion

While these results might be seen as an overall failure of the pedagogies employed, the fact that the course was in fact reoriented away from the homilist toward the listener is something I consider to be a major improvement over ways I have designed it in the past. I am grateful for the project's stimulating me to make this fundamental change in approach, and I will certainly continue to implement it in the future.

Title: Different religious people; different worship for the same God.

For: Experiencing worship of different denominations.

- Students read and discuss the history and theology of traditions formed during the 16th-century Protestant Reformation, including observations regarding the worship of three denominations in particular: Lutheran, Reformed, and Anabaptist.
- Chapel service by students, professor, and a representative of each of these groups.
 - Students attend three chapel services in their home chapel.
 - Each service is led by a guest representative of each of these denominations.
 - Each leader is asked to lead the experience of worship in such a way that distinctives of his or her particular tradition will be sharpened.
 - All are asked to participate in the service as fully as possible.
- After each service the class discusses with the leader in both formal and informal settings what they have shared.
- A part of a class period is dedicated to a discussion of the similarities, differences, and experiences of the students.
- Each student is required to write a reflection paper dealing with all three experiences.

Proposed Pedagogy to Increase Intra-religious Understanding at Northeastern Seminary

1. Pedagogy for BHT 513: Experiencing the worship of other Christian traditions

a.) Part 1: Three chapel services led by representatives of faith groups with roots in the 16th-18th centuries: Lutheran, Reformed, and Anabaptist.

Part 2: These services will be following by an informal opportunity for face-to-face conversation with the representative from each faith group.

b.) The guest representatives will be alerted to lead the experience of worship in such a way that the distinctives of their particular tradition will be sharpened.

c.) Students will reflect on the experience both in writing and in classroom conversation.

2. Basis for choice

a.) Results from the focus group and Other Voices survey of NES students revealed a felt need for more emphasis on denominational differences.

b.) Results also from the student focus grouped also revealed the pedagogical value that students place on face-to-face contact with persons from other faith groups.

c.) The current curriculum is heavy in the use of *texts* from each of the major Christian faith groups with roots in the 16th-18th centuries, but lacking in opportunity for consistent exposure to *people* from those groups.

d.) This pedagogy proposes exposure to representatives from these faith groups first in the context of worship so that an “aura of ultimacy,” reverence, and respect is engendered; then, this is followed by the opportunity for conversation with the representative about the experience itself as well as the distinctives of her or his faith tradition.

3. Curricular fit

The following key objectives for graduates of the seminary are included in Northeastern Seminary’s “Program Goals and General Objectives”:

- “Demonstrate acquaintance with the broader heritage of the Christian tradition, as well as the specific character and contribution of particular Christian traditions and communities.”
- “Demonstrate ability to formulate and articulate one’s own religious beliefs, in conversation with the traditions of the historic church as well as contemporary theologians.”
- “Demonstrate appreciation for the wide variety of religious traditions, and for the gender, ethnic, and cultural diversity present in the contemporary social context.”
- “Demonstrate concern for and ability to relate openly to other people, especially in regard to personal and spiritual matters.”

4. Means of evaluation

a.) Student reflection papers on each experience will be read by the professor.

b.) Classroom conversation regarding each experience in which students have opportunity to voice their opinions.

c.) Professor will summarize in writing the thinking of the class.

Syllabus for Different religious people; different worship for the same God.

BHT 513 Reformation and Revival in the Church in the 16th through 18th Centuries

Course Description

This course examines the Protestant and Catholic Reformations and the Great Awakening. During this time Western Christianity experienced massive upheavals. The contestants joined battle; and, as a result of reaching different views, new denominations and movements emerged. The crucial issues they debated were:

- The way in which people become Christians

- The way in which they live as Christians
- The nature of the true church in polity, the sacraments, public worship, the ordained ministry, and mission

Unit 1: Historical and Cultural Context

This unit surveys the cultural settings of the Continental Protestant Reformation, the Catholic Reformation, the English Reformation, and the great revival movements of Europe, England, and Colonial America.

Session 1.1: Environments

Unit 2: Sufficiency and Interpretation of the Scriptures

This unit examines the views of the Scriptures held by the reformers, the Free Church movement, the Roman Catholic Church, Wesley, and other great revivalists. The unit will include an analysis of various uses of the Scriptures in the formation of doctrine and the principle methods of biblical interpretation.

Session 2.1: Scripture, Tradition, and Sufficiency

Session 2.2: The Interpretation of the Scriptures

Unit 3: Theological Issues and Contributions

This unit explores the major teachers and church councils of the era in order to understand the principle debates and the theological systems that grew from them.

Session 3.1: The Protestant Reformation, I

Session 3.2: The Protestant Reformation, II

Session 3.3: The Catholic Reformation

Session 3.4: The English Reformation

Session 3.5: The Wesleyan Movement

Unit 4: Church Life and Ministry

This unit explores the development of church life during the Reformation and Great Awakening in church polity, worship, the ministry, discipleship, and mission.

Session 4.1: The Nature of the Church

Session 4.2: The Ministry and the Sacraments

Session 4.3: The Spiritual Life

Unit 5: Application to Ministry in the 21st Century

This unit seeks to facilitate personal, spiritual, and vocational growth through the application of theological insights from the Reformation and Revival era to the concrete and practical problems of ministry in a variety of contemporary cultural contexts.

Session 5.1

End of the Year Summary and Reflection on the Pedagogy

Student Evaluation of Chapel Worship

Winter 2005-2006

During this course, chapel services were led by representatives from three different traditions: With these services in mind, please respond to the following statements using the five-point scale, adding brief comments, where appropriate.

18 of 19 students completed the evaluation (one absent)

4.94 1. Participating in chapel services from three different traditions (Lutheran, Methodist, and Reformed) was *spiritually* meaningful component of this course

decidedly true 5 4 3 2 1 decidedly false

[comment:]

4.72 2. I felt free to “enter in” to the spirit of worship in the chapel times

decidedly true 5 4 3 2 1 decidedly false

[comment:]

4.83 3. Experiencing worship in a particular tradition was a helpful means of *learning* more fully about the tradition

decidedly true 5 4 3 2 1 decidedly false

[comment:]

4.78 4. Participating in chapel services from various traditions was a helpful means of learning more fully about the *similarities and differences* among the traditions

decidedly true 5 4 3 2 1 decidedly false

[comment:]

4.72 5. Participating in the chapel services during this course strengthened my *appreciation* of those from other traditions

decidedly true 5 4 3 2 1 decidedly false

[comment:]

4.72 6. Opportunity for discussion with the chapel speaker after the service was a helpful means of learning about the tradition

decidedly true 5 4 3 2 1 decidedly false

[comment:]

4.72 7. My understanding of the *contemporary expressions* of these traditions was enhanced through participation in the chapel services

decidedly true 5 4 3 2 1 decidedly false

[comment:]

8. In the space below, or on the back, feel free to share any other comments you may wish to pass along about the chapel services in BHT 513.

- I really enjoyed them.
- As a minister it was nice to be ministered to.
- Due to Dr. ?? strong lecture style in class, I did not benefit from his presenting a sermon in chapel.
- Having Chapel in a separate time and venue from the classroom helps to move into a worshipful attitude.
- I would encourage weekly chapels whenever possible as part of the PSF component
- Definitely!
- RE: #6. This was a great feature.
- Chapel services are always inspiring. I am so encouraged to move forward. I love the different backgrounds
- Continue to share other Religious faith and traditions with students

Title: Listening to The Convinced Conservative Other

For: Those not energized by any religion.

- Set up the issue(s) during the first week :
 - How should one express religiously based convictions in public discourse?
 - How does one account for her/his religious convictions when one has to work with others to achieve one's religious ends?
 - How should persons of religious conviction address themselves to the wider public? How should the general public, in a society that values diversity, receive the views of those who address public issues on the basis of their specific religious tradition?
 - Our examples will deal with bioethics.. Students will read Courtney Campbell's "Religion And Moral Meaning " C.S Campbell , Hastings Cent Rep., Vol.20 No. 4 Jul-Aug.1990, Pp.4-10.. An essay on Christian bioethics by George Khushf, "Illness, the Problem of Evil, and the Analogical Structure of Healing: On the Difference Christianity Makes in Bioethics," chapter six in Stephen E. Lammers and Allen Verhey, On Moral Medicine: Theological Perspectives in Medical Ethics, Eerdman's (2005). It contains a section on the tension religious people experience between accessibility and meaning in public discussions of bioethics.
 - In the light of that reading they will read an essay reflecting a strict conservative approach to bioethical questions: by Stanley Hauerwas, "Rational Suicide and Reasons for Living" in *On Moral Medicine: Theological Perspectives in Medical Ethics*, ed. Stephen Lammers and Allen Verhey. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987.
- After reading these essays they will be broken down into groups of five. In these groups they will be asked to:
 - Identify the key moral values or norms of each author (the "ought" statements);
 - Trace how those values or norms are related to the author's religious convictions. Show how the moral "oughts" make sense because of a religious worldview.
- A week after the group discussion each student will write and hand in a reflection paper containing the following:
 - A summary of your group's conclusions about the two readings.
 - Discuss whether the moral values and norms your group identified could be argued for without using the religious worldview supporting these norms. The answers to the following questions will help your discussion.
 - Could a person who does not share the religious worldview be persuaded to share the moral norms and values?

- If so, on what grounds might one make such a case? What, if anything, is lost or gained by making this move to more generic public arguments?
 - If it is not plausible that people who lack the author’s religious perspective could be convinced to share his/her moral position, explain why that is and discuss the implications both for the “religious” author and the general public.
 - What is it like to hold a powerful moral conviction and know that a great many people can’t possibly be expected to agree because of divergent worldviews?
- The day the papers are handed in there is a class discussion using the questions that were asked the first week.

Pedagogical Detail: Taking the Christian Conservative Seriously”

Course: RES 335, “Biomedical Ethics”

Spring 2006, two sections

The “oppositional perspective” that I’m attempting to bring to the fore: the person of deeply held, and socially conservative, religious conviction. It is the widespread observation of faculty members in my department that Nazareth students are quite civil and open to religious difference, but are so on the basis of being rather “secularized,” apathetic, and religiously uninformed. Students of firm religious conviction, especially those of a more “conservative” or “exclusivist” version, are not well understood and are a very quiet minority here. I want to bring this type of “religious other” into the spotlight, forcing students to take this perspective seriously and perhaps along the way encouraging students who hold this perspective to own it publicly. The course deals mostly in Christian sources, and the students are overwhelmingly Christian, so it is the Christian conservative perspective we will be analyzing in particular.

It is in keeping with the college’s Mission Statement to attempt this project in that we claim to explore moral and spiritual values. One of the expressions of this theme is that all Religious Studies majors are required to take at least one course in religious ethics, and all Physical Therapy majors are required to take at least one course in biomedical ethics (this course satisfies these requirements).

Pedagogical Process

1) Setting up the issue at the beginning of the course.

Early in the term students will read Courtney Campbell’s essay on Christian bioethics from the course anthology (Stephen E. Lammers and Allen Verhey, On Moral Medicine: Theological Perspectives in Medical Ethics). It contains a section on the tension religious people experience between accessibility and meaning in public discussions of bioethics. That is, the tension between a need to communicate, compromise, and set public policies together with diverse others (through generally accessible values and arguments) and the

value of having the identity, significance, and meaningfulness one gains through devotion to the specific practices, convictions, and ways of life of a religious tradition.

The problem I am posing to myself and the students: how to account for religiously based convictions within public discussions of biomedical ethics? How should persons of religious conviction address themselves to the wider public? How should the general public, in a society that values diversity, receive the views of those who address public issues on the basis of their specific religious tradition?

2) Twice during the semester students will read essays that reflect a rather strict (“conservative”) religious perspective on some matter of biomedical ethics (e.g., abortion, physician-assisted suicide, assisted reproduction technology, genetic research and therapy)

Students will discuss the essays in small groups. They will be asked to:

- Identify the key moral values or norms of the author (the “ought” statements);
- Trace how those values or norms are related to the author’s religious convictions. Show how the moral “oughts” make sense because of a religious worldview.

Students will then write reflection papers:

- Reporting these group findings;
- Discussing whether the moral values and norms they identified could be argued for in a more “secular” fashion.
 - Could a person who does not share the religious worldview be persuaded to share the moral norms and values?
 - If so, on what grounds might one make such a case? What, if anything, is lost or gained by making this move to more generic public arguments?
 - If it is not plausible that people who lack the author’s religious perspective could be convinced to share his/her moral position, explain why that is and discuss the implications both for the “religious” author and the general public. What is it like to hold a powerful moral conviction and know that a great many people can’t possibly be expected to agree because of divergent worldviews?

There would then be a class discussion of the reflection papers.

The reflections papers will be factors in the student’s course grade (approximately 15% each). Students’ participation in group discussions will be a factor in the “participation” grade in the course.

Assessment

Indicators of success of the project will include:

- The quality of the group discussions;
- The quality of the student reflection papers;

- Improved levels of understanding and sophistication in class discussions and student papers from the first round of the exercise to the second;
- The willingness of some students to publicly identify themselves as identifying with the tensions of “accessibility vs meaning;”
- Positive student evaluations of the course and this component of it.

Syllabus Biomedical Ethics
Religious Studies Departmental Web Site:

COURSE DESCRIPTION AND OVERVIEW

This is a course in applied ethics. The term “applied ethics” means ethical theory is being applied to a specific area of human concern; in this case, health care. In this course we will examine several major biomedical issues from a variety of religious and philosophical perspectives. Because this is a Religious Studies course, we will attend to the interplay between religious belief and ethical reflection on biomedical issues. To make these complicated issues more manageable, and as a concession to the background and interests of the largest number of students, our focus will be especially upon the Christian traditions and their theological reflections on biomedical issues.

Our classroom approach to this study will be a mixture of professor’s lectures, informal writing and discussions, and group case studies.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

At the end of the course, you should be able to:

- identify and comprehend the central elements in religious ethics and moral deliberation as applied to health care including key concepts and terms;
- identify, comprehend, and compare major types of ethical theories, how they function, their strengths and weaknesses, and their implications for selected biomedical issues;
- recognize and assess major lines of argument on selected biomedical issues of our day;
- face new moral dilemmas with a set of helpful questions and considerations, a deeper pool of experience and self-understanding, and a widened imagination.

REQUIRED TEXTS

Available from the bookstore:

Stephen E. Lammers and Allen Verhey, On Moral Medicine: Theological Perspectives in Medical Ethics, 2nd edition.

Ronald Munson, Outcome Uncertain: Cases and Contexts in Bioethics.

Additional readings will be supplied by the professor.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

1. completion of three tests and a final examination (15% of course grade each, 60% total);
2. completion of two formal reflection papers (10% of course grade each, 20% total);
3. regular attendance and participation in class, completion of informal writing assignments and Blackboard discussion board posts (20% of course grade).
 - o Students are asked to complete eight substantive posts to the Blackboard discussion board over the course of the semester. That's a little more than one every two weeks. Examples of appropriate posts that count toward your eight:
 - responses to questions I will post to the discussion board;
 - responses to posts from other students;
 - your thoughts on matters from class or from the readings;
 - your thoughts on matters relevant to this course in current news events, your personal history, or topics you are studying in other courses.

“Substantive” means of significant length, with well developed thoughts, based upon or making connections to course material. Posts that simply state a personal opinion without demonstrating careful thought about material from this course do not count toward the eight (this is to be a scholarly discussion, not just your personal blog). Posts that do little more than praise someone else for something well said, while nice, do not count toward the eight (posts should keep the discussion moving forward, breaking new ground). If you are uncertain whether your posts are “substantive” enough, feel free to consult with me.

Pace yourself! Please complete at least four of these posts by March 10.

OTHER NOTES AND POLICIES

1. Note that I am available to meet with you on an individual basis. Please allow me to assist your learning as best I can, and allow me the pleasure of getting to know you.

2. Completion of the course requirements means that all formal assignments have been submitted and the final examination has been completed.

3. Examinations are to be taken on dates announced. Make-ups may be permitted in cases of dire urgency (as determined by the professor). Generally, taking an examination early will be preferred to taking it late.

4. If you need any accommodations in accordance with the ADA of 1990 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, please feel free to discuss these needs with me.

5. Formal papers are to be typed, double spaced, in a 10 or 12-point font. Margins should be one inch all around. Papers are due as assigned: late papers will not receive full credit.

6. Plagiarism (presenting another's thoughts or work as one's own; that is, the failure to cite sources properly) is punishable by an "F" for the assignment and the course.

7. Excessive, unexcused absences will result in the reduction of the course grade.

8. The conditions of this syllabus are subject to change as agreed upon by the class and the professor

COURSE CALENDAR

RES 335, Spring 2006

Date	Topic
	<i>Reading assignment</i> <i>L&V = Lammers and Verhey, <u>On Moral Medicine</u></i> <i>M = Munson, <u>Outcome Uncertain</u></i>
Week of 1/16	Introduction to the Course
 Part I: Religion, Health, and Health Care	
	Religion and Medicine <i>L&V, 5-6, 12-41</i>
Week of 1/23	Theology and Medical Ethics <i>L&V, 46-63, 72-89</i>
	Theology and Medical Ethics (cont.) <i>L&V, 46-63, 72-89</i>
Week of 1/30	Life and Its Sanctity <i>L&V, 153, 158-192</i>
	Health and Healing <i>L&V, 241, 247-253, 262-266</i>
Week of 2/ 6	Death and Its (In)dignity <i>L&V, 195-209</i>
Friday, 2/10	Nature and Its Mastery <i>L&V, 269, 283-308</i>
Week of 2/13	Test #1

Week of 2/20

Week of 2/27

Part II: Ethics, Ancient Questions, Contemporary Issues

Week of 3/ 6

Ethical Theories
M, 357-81, 387-422

Friday, 3/10

Ethical Theories (cont.)
M, 357-81, 387-422

Week of 3/20

Autonomy, Truthfulness, Confidentiality
L&V, 376-386, 390-412, 423-428
L&V, 756-777, 796-815
M, chapt. 2

Week of 3/27

Research and Informed Consent
L&V, 890-903, 932--942
M, chapt. 1

Week of 4/ 3

Test #2

Week of 4/10

Euthanasia and Physician-Assisted Suicide
L&V, 642-647, 650-655, 663-678
M, chapt. 10

Monday, 4/17

Abortion
L&V, 586-599, 600-611, 617-632
M, chapt. 9

Week of 4/17

Technological Reproduction
L&V, 469-495, 505-524
M, chapt. 6

Week of 4/24
(and 5/ 1)

Genetic Control
L&V, 547-561, 569-582
M. chapt. 5

Test #3

Race, Gender and Medicine
M, chapt. 4

Scarce Resources
M, chapt. 7

Paying for Health Care
L&V, 946-960, 974-1004
M, chapt. 8

Dr. Thomas Donlin-Smith

Survey on “Christian Medical Practice”

Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements about how Christians should understand and practice medicine.

1 = strongly disagree

5 = strongly agree

Christian medicine is unique in its goals and ways of practice: that is, it is different from medicine practiced in a secular manner.

1 2 3 4 5

Christians should understand their practice of medicine as a form of evangelism.

1 2 3 4 5

Healing the body for its own sake, while good, is secondary to addressing the deeper cause of our suffering: sin.

1 2 3 4 5

Only the Christian gospel provides an ultimately effective way to overcome the absurdity of evil and suffering.

1 2 3 4 5

Anyone who is serious about healing should be helping people reconcile with God.

1 2 3 4 5

Christian medicine, compared to more secular forms of medical practice, will be less interested in pain management, since Christians understand pain and suffering as ways of coming to better understand ourselves and God.

1 2 3 4 5

Christian medicine, compared to more secular forms of medical practice, will be less interested in guaranteeing and restoring patient autonomy, since Christians understand weakness and dependency as ways of coming to better understand ourselves and God.

1 2 3 4 5

RES 335 Reflection Paper #2
Spring 2006
Paper Due Date: Mon., 4/3/06

Background

This assignment is based on the essay by Stanley Hauerwas (“Rational Suicide and Reasons for Living”) in On Moral Medicine. Its purpose is to help us think carefully about the relationship between Christian ethics and the practice of medicine. Also at stake is the “tension” Courtney Campbell identifies between “accessibility” and “meaning” in Christian bioethics.

Our discussion in class on Monday, 3/27/06, focused on these questions:

Identify Hauerwas’ key beliefs, moral values, or moral norms concerning suicide

What does he believe?

What does he value?

What does he think is right/wrong, good/bad?

Trace how those beliefs, values or norms are related to Hauerwas’ religious convictions.

How do his moral “oughts” make sense because of his religious worldview?

Would they make sense without his religious assumptions?

Your formal reflection paper should be about four pages in length. In it you should:

1. Summarize your findings about Hauerwas’ beliefs, values and norms regarding suicide and their religious basis (the questions from the class discussions). That is, how does Hauerwas think suicide should be regarded and how is this related to his Christian faith? To what degree do you agree with him?

2. Discuss whether the values and norms regarding suicide you identified could be argued for in a more “secular” fashion. That is, could a person who does not share Hauerwas’ religious worldview be persuaded to share his norms and values about suicide?

- Do you think Hauerwas would even be interested in making such a case?
- If so, on what grounds might Hauerwas make such a case?
- What, if anything, is lost or gained by making this move to more generic public arguments?
- If it is not plausible that people who lack Hauerwas’ religious perspective could be convinced to share his moral position on suicide, explain why that is and discuss the implications both for the “religious” author and the general public.
- Reflect on what is it like to hold a powerful moral conviction and know that a great many people can’t possibly be expected to agree because of divergent worldviews.

Assessment Criteria for Reflection Papers:

Key Assessment Traits	Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Criteria
	Excellent/very good answer	Satisfactory Answer	Incomplete answer
<i>Writing Mechanics</i> Writer uses correct spelling, grammar, and syntax.	Spelling is perfect or almost perfect. Grammar and sentence structure are correct. 10 points	A few misspelled words, grammar errors, and/or syntax errors. 5 points	Several misspelled words, grammar errors, and syntax errors. 0 points (paper may be rewritten)
<i>Supporting Evidence</i> Ability to quote liberally from the sources in support of answers.	Writer: uses <u>several relevant</u> quotes from the assigned sources. Source page numbers are identified. 30-25 points	Writer: uses a <u>few</u> relevant quotes from the assigned sources. 20-15 points	Writer: uses no quotes or quotes that bear little relevance to the assignment. 0-10 points
Analysis Answers are thorough, thoughtful, accurate, and interpret sources appropriately.	Answers: indicate <u>deep</u> and <u>detailed</u> analysis of the questions and sources; are free of factual error; and exhibit creative and insightful interpretation of sources. 30-25 points	Answers: indicate reflection about the meaning of the questions and sources; are free of serious factual error; and exhibit adequate interpretation of sources. 20-15 points	Answers: indicate cursory reflection about the meaning of the questions and sources; contain factual errors; and/or make little use of the sources. 0-10 points
Assessment Answers are articulate and fair, making reasonable arguments based on course sources, relevant values and personal experiences, and anticipating possible rebuttals.	Answers: respond directly to the questions, argue carefully and fairly, and anticipate possible rebuttals. 30-25 points	Answers: address the questions, argue generally appropriately. 20-15 points	Answers: fail to respond to the questions, and/or argue in a careless or unfair manner. 0-10 points

Evaluation and Reflections Pedagogy Project

The “Other Voices” pedagogy project involved student discussions and papers based on two essays: George Khushf’s “Illness, the Problem of Evil, and the Analogical Structure of Healing: On the Difference Christianity Makes in Bioethics” and Stanley Hauerwas’ “Rational Suicide and Reasons for Living.” Both essays were chosen for the pronounced and socially conservative religious positions taken by the authors.

Student work on the Khushf essay was preceded by administration of a “Survey on ‘Christian Medical Practice’” which asked students to state their level of agreement to a number of positions stated or implied by Khushf. Predictably, general student reactions to these positions were very negative, although there were a small number of students who revealed more positive reactions. This exercise was very successful in demonstrating both the general weight of student opinion in the class as well as the fact that there are students within our classes who are “marginalized” by their more conservative, traditional religious and social perspectives. These students were willing to identify themselves in class discussions and articulated well their views.

My original document proposing this project described indicators of success. My assessment of how well the project met these criteria:

- ***The quality of the group discussions.*** Student discussions were excellent in terms of their ability to reveal a wide range of student opinions on both theological and social issues. Students found the Hauerwas essay easier to comprehend and so class discussion proceeded more easily to a higher level. Student understanding of the Khushf essay was widely flawed, and so necessitated greater intervention and explanation by the instructor.
- ***The quality of the student reflection papers.*** In both writing exercises, student papers were generally high in quality. They wrote well in terms of meeting the requirements of the detailed rubric they were given. However, student papers about the Khushf essay were hampered by a widespread lack of comprehension of Khushf’s concept of sin. Significantly, this problem allowed the more conservative students a chance to “shine” in class as they were the ones who understood him and were able to explain to others what he meant.

In both writing exercises, a very common student conclusion was that they could understand the positions and reasoning of the authors while maintaining their own contrary views. I considered this a most gratifying end result: comprehension of the “other” in a way that gave him/her credit for holding an intelligent point of view while understanding better their own perspective and how and why it differed from that of the “other.”

- ***Improved levels of understanding and sophistication in class discussions and student papers from the first round of the exercise to the second.*** This improvement was evident although it might have been partially attributable to the differences in the two essays from which they worked. Many students simply

found the second essay more comprehensible as well as more in line with their own opinions.

- ***The willingness of some students to publicly identify themselves as identifying with the tensions of “accessibility vs meaning.”*** The project was highly successful in bringing the “other voices” of theologically and socially conservative students out into the open in the classroom. Interestingly, few of these students seemed to identify with the “accessibility vs meaning” dilemma as posed in the Campbell essay which provided the basis for the project. They thought it applied better to their experience as college students than to their experience in American politics and culture in general.
- ***Positive student evaluations of the course and this component of it.*** Students gave positive feedback regarding both the course and the assignments inspired by the “Other Voices” project.

Title: My Changing God

For: Experiencing Past Religious Change as part of the life cycle

I. Pedagogy

- Ask students to answer a series of open ended questions the first day of class. These questions are used in writing a three – five page paper.
- They are asked to write a three – five page reflection paper dealing with God. Please include the following in that paper.
 - Draw a picture of God.
 - Describe how your image of God may have changed. What are some of the stories about your relationship with God that may have changed your mind about who/what God is?
 - What events or circumstances may have caused/affirmed your doubts about the existence of God?
- The paper is handed in to the teacher.
- Before handing it back the teacher reviews Fowler’s theory of faith development.
- After reviewing the paper the teacher hands it back to the individual student.
- In the same class that the paper is handed back teams are formed to discuss and report on the following:
 - What was each participant’s faith development up to this point?
 - Was there any agreement among the team member’s as to faith development in their life?
 - Each team reports to the entire class regarding their experience.

II. Detailed description of the pedagogy

Possible Enrollment (40+)

- 1) *What is the pedagogy or pedagogies will you design, and evaluate that is/are optional to the student's faith life?*

For the most part the course is geared towards first and second year students who will probably be mostly Roman Catholic who have less than an adequate knowledge of the history and teachings of the RC tradition. There will a smaller number of those non-RCs who are interested in the topic.

The pedagogical approach is essentially based on Paulo Freire's pedagogy. It is important for the learner-teacher to have an understanding of one's development. Dialogue must take place within and between persons who struggle to "admit to" and attempt to "bring about change" of any kind.

Fowler's theory of faith development and past classroom experiences supports my concept that students hold views that are oppositional in their faith life. (e.g., I will use an autobiographical approach in "describing my <each student> understanding of God over my life time" to test this.)

I will also use journal assignments by which the student will use material from the readings, assignments, and class discussions to reflect critically on the material and, perhaps/hopefully, confront his/her thinking about differing elements of Roman Catholicism. There will also be a paper in which the students will deal with their concept of church/community and the reality.

I will use small group sessions in almost all class periods to allow for dialogue about shared papers, movies, readings, and class lectures.

- 2) *Why have you chosen this pedagogy? (Provide some rational reason for this choice. This could be based on the surveys, focus groups, readings, or whatever else you may offer as reasons why you are doing what you are doing.)*

I have chosen this pedagogy because it allows the student to reflect about different views and express them in writing or in discussion. It is pedagogically a sound and positive way of learning if promoted and monitored. I will offer written thoughts and reactions to the various journal and paper submissions; join in the various group discussions; monitor the outcomes of some of the discussions through written group reports.

- 3) *How does this pedagogy fit into your institutional mission and your departmental/institutional curriculum?*

The College speaks of collaborative learning and diversity of ideas to contribute to a world beyond the classroom in its Mission Statement.

The REST Department similarly fosters the academic study of religion in all its diversity in order to equip students to live in and appreciate a culture of religious pluralism.

- 4) *How will you evaluate what you have done?*

The papers and journal articles will be read and graded as well as class presentations and discussions.

A pre and post questionnaire will be administered.

A portfolio of all written work will be submitted at the end of the course for further evaluation of the course and its pedagogy

**AS WE BEGIN, WHAT ARE YOUR THOUGHTS?
(in 25 words or less)**

NAME.....

SPRING 2006

- 1) The best description of “God” that I can think of is
- 2) When talking with others about “God” I often
- 3) The best description of “church” that I can think of is
- 4) People who believe differently from me make me
- 5) Compared to my first year in high school, my religious beliefs
- 6) On a basis of 1-5 (being excellent), I rate myself at in my knowledge of the Roman Catholicism.

III. Syllabus

COURSE DESCRIPTION: A presentation of the various options of belief, history, worship, moral action, views of the Church, and ways of life present in Roman Catholicism. (cf. page 4”Perspectives, Area 2 description and goals)

OBJECTIVES:

- 1) Provide a background and perspectives for a better understanding of Roman Catholicism (Are there different ways to look at RC teachings?);
- 2) Using the tools of historical methodology explore the contemporary religious and cultural views of ritual and morality within the Roman Catholic tradition;
- 3) Examine the dialogue between faith and reason (Do I need to be afraid to think?);
- 4) Provide tools for responsible, personal decisions in the maturing life of a contemporary “Seeker.”(How can I make a difference in the world?)

REQUIRED TEXTBOOKS:

What Makes Us Catholic: Eight Gifts for Life (Thomas Groome)
Catholic Catechism (www.usccb.org/catechism/text)

REQUIREMENTS:

- 1) Midterm projects. Completed by Feb. 20th
- 2) A reflection paper (5 pages). Due: Feb. 22nd.
- 3) Journal entries based on lectures, readings, tapes, class discussions. Due March 27th.

- 4) Active participation in Group Discussions.
- 5) Attendance at each class is required (and, hopefully, participation in the discussions of the issues); **an unreasonable number of unexcused absences (more than 2)** will be construed to mean that the student desires an **FA** by reason of lack of attendance.
The approach to learning the course material is collaborative: the teacher and students; students with other students. Your attendance affects the class and, especially, your group. We depend on each other for a good learning experience.
- 6) The final grade for the course will be the sum of the midterm projects, the reflection paper, and the group discussions. For those taking the course on a “pass/fail” basis, the sum must be a D (=65) or better plus regular attendance at class.
- 7) **CAVEATS:** Papers are due on the assigned dates. Unless the necessary arrangements are made, late papers will not be accepted. Promptness is important for group work and class participation. Cell phones, beepers, snacks and drinks, taking a “break” during class to run errands, etc. interrupt the flow of discussion. Please contribute to a professional setting for a well-rounded learning experience.

SOME FURTHER EXPLANATIONS

** Midterm Projects:*

- 1) 3-5 page reflection paper: The History of My Relationship With God (This paper should include your earliest concept of God and how it has changed over the years. You can include how that relationship has changed given your concept(s) of God. Has this relationship made a difference in your life? Why/Why not?)
Due Jan. 18th. **(10 credits)**
- 2) 3-5 page reflection paper: Various Problems I Have With the Roman Catholic Religion (This paper should reflect an overall view of your difficulties with the various Roman Catholic teachings, historical events, rituals, etc. The paper is an honest attempt to look critically at your view of the Roman Catholic Church from your experiences <personally or as your friends see it>. How do you deal with these issues from the perspectives of faith and reason?) Due Feb. 6th. **(10 credits)**

*** Practical Research Visit*

- 3) Visit a Roman Catholic Church for some liturgical event (Mass, Baptism, etc.). Describe its floor plan, its decorations, architecture, choice of music, read the Sunday bulletin. How do these best express your idea of what a Roman Catholic community is or should be? (5 pages) Due Feb. 22nd. **(15 credits)**

**** Research Reflections (major paper)*

- 4) 10 journal entries (about 200 words) dealing with class material. Each journal entry should deal with readings/lectures/discussions. **At least 3** of the entries should deal with assigned readings (designated by “Groome or CCC” in the proposed schedule)

summarizing the main thesis of the chapter and your response. Due March 27th. (30 credits)

5) Group Discussions (25 credits)

*** *Groups Discussions (TBA)*

During the semester (but, especially after the introductory material is covered) there will be discussions “for credit.” To receive credit for group discussions one must be in class and actively participating. **Absence=0. (20 credits)**

Each group will choose a “saint” from the liturgical calendar for a class presentation (15-20 minutes) to include the historical time, cultural milieu and major religious focus of the time. The life and writings (if any) should reflect the historical/religious venue of the time and circumstances of the saint the group chooses. Provide an outline, references, and at least one possible discussion question (1 page for each student/professor). (5 Credits)

*****Completed Portfolio (5 credits; Wednesday, April 19th)*

REWRITES

I allow for rewrites (papers #3 and #4) on these conditions:

- 1) the original assignment was submitted on time;
- 2) the student has regularly attended class;
- 3) the original paper(s) demonstrated an attempt at good grammar, spelling, precise thought and a sincere attempt to fulfill the original requirement;
- 4) some discussion with the professor how the paper might be improved.

SPECIAL NEEDS

In compliance with College policy and applicable laws, appropriate academic accommodations are available to you if you are a student with a disability. All requests for accommodations must be supported by appropriate documentation/ diagnosis and determined reasonable by the College. Students with documented disabilities (physical, learning, psychological) who may need academic accommodations are advised to make an appointment with the Coordinator of Services for students with disabilities in the Office of Academic Affairs. Late notification will delay requested accommodations.

BASIS FOR GRADES

In an effort to give some rubrics to the various grades assigned for the *various papers, presentations, reflection periods*, the following is offered. It will be assumed that all assignments are finished on mutually acceptable dates.

A	B	C	D	F
100	80	60	40	20
50	40	30	20	10
20	15	10	5	0
10	7.5	5	2.5	0

A=

exceptionally defined thesis; clearly articulated
 synthesized from a variety of sources (readings, lectures, independent research)
 in an exceptionally organized fashion
 with proper grammar and free of any typographical errors
 documented according to an acceptable format
 delivered or written in a style that is professionally acceptable
 creatively thought out (advancing a new way of examining an issue)
 with possible further thought-provoking questions for the reader/listeners

B=

a thesis that lacks clarity, but is articulated
 some sources are included, but seem to be more analyzed than synthesized
 organized well
 with occasional mistakes in grammar
 documented in proper fashion
 delivered and/or written with some obvious errors in professionalism (haltingly, lack
 of neatness, e.g.)
 lack of creativity, more a report of someone else's ideas
 offered questions for discussion, but did not attempt to break new ground

C=

thesis not clearly defined, nor articulated for ease of understanding
 sources were used, more copied than analyzed
 lack of clearly defined organization
 elementary grammatical and typographical errors
 lack of suitable documentation
 delivered and/or written with lack of awareness of the content or the audience
 no creativity
 questions for further reflection were poorly framed

D=

no clear thesis for the paper/presentation
 sources were poorly used and no adequately understood
 poor organization, wandering without focus
 many grammatical and typographical errors consistently repeated
 documentation was lacking and, when used, poorly referenced
 delivered and/or written with no skill or awareness of lack of skill
 creativity was sorely lacking
 no suitable questions or final thoughts worth discussing

F=

lack of thought or skills to articulate any material in the paper or presentation
apparent lack of preparation or research
hardly worth reading beyond the first paragraph or few minutes of the presentation

Tentative Schedule

Week One: Introduction. What are the key differences between, faith, theology and religious studies? Is it okay to question my beliefs?

Read: Chpt 1 (Groome)
CCC: Paragraphs: #144-184

Week Two: The Bases of Roman Catholicism: Scripture and Tradition. What are the Old Testament (Hebrew Scriptures) and the New Testament (Christian Scriptures)? How are they connected?

Read: CCC: Paragraphs: #101-152

Assignments: Discussion of Chpt. 1 (Groome)
Paper One (My History of God)

Week Three: Tradition and the Creeds. What do we believe as Christians? Do Roman Catholics believe different teachings? Who is God?

Read: Chpts. 2 and 3 (Groome)
CCC: Paragraphs: #228-231; 261-267; 315-324;350-354;413-421

Week Four: Creed (cont.) Who is Jesus Christ? What is the Church?

Read: CCC: Paragraphs: # 422-455;479-483; 508-511;561-570;
619-623; 629-630; 636-637; 636-658; 777-780; 802-810;
866-870; 934-945; 960-962;

Week Five: Sacraments: What are they? How Many? Why?

Read: CCC: 1113-1134;1275-1284; 1315-1321; 1406-1419; 1483-1498;

Assignments: Discussion of Groome (Chpt. 2 & 3)
Paper Two (Issues with the Church)

Week Six: Sacraments (cont.)

Read: Chpts. 4 and 5 (Groome)
CCC: 1526-1532; 1590-1600; 1659-1664

Assignment: Paper Three (Church Visit)
Week Seven: Liturgical Times, Places, and Celebrations

Read: Chpts. 6 and 7 (Groome)
CCC: 1110-1112; 1187-1199

Week Eight: Prayer: Kinds and Purpose

Read: CCC: 2590-2597; 2644-2649; 2680-2682; 2692-2696; 2720-2722

Assignment: Discussion of Groom (Chpt. 6 and 7)

Week Nine: The Lord's Prayer

Read: Chpts. 8 (Groome)
CCC: 2761-2865

Week Ten: The Moral Life of the Christian

Read: CCC 1699-1729; 1737-1761; 1975-1802; 1833-1845; 1870-1876;
1890-1896; 1918-1927; 1943-1948; 1975-1983

Assignment: Discussion of Groome (Chpt. 8)
Journal Entries due

Week Eleven: The Moral Life (cont.)

Read: Chpt. 9 (Groome)
CCC: 2052-2330

Week Twelve: The Moral Life (How do we live a moral life?)

Read: CCC: 2331-2550

Assignment: Discussion of Groome (Chpt. 9)

Week Thirteen: Evaluations and Possible Further Study

INTRODUCTION TO ROMAN CATHOLICISM *FINAL SELF-EVALUATION*

NAME.....

GROUP.....

Midterm Papers: 1)..... 2)..... = (out of 20)

Reflection on Church Assignment: (out of 15)

Journal Reflections: (out of 35)

Portfolio: (out of 5)

GROUP: 1)..... 2)..... 3)..... 4)..... 5)..... =.....(out of 25)

SELF-EVALUATION (see below for guidelines) TOTAL = final grade.....

Attendance: Excellent Very Good Good Poor

Group Evaluation: = (rate each member of the group on the
..... = basis 1-5: 5 being excellent participation
..... = and preparation)
..... =
..... =

=====

Professor’s Grade (based on the above and other criteria: attendance, participation):

(The Professor can challenge your self-evaluation.)

Some Guidelines for self-evaluation:

5= perfect attendance, read all the assigned readings, played a leadership role in the discussions, integrated the material into my lifestyle

4= very good attendance, read most of the material, contributed to the discussions, talked about the material with my significant other and made the decision to make a difference in my lifestyle

3= good attendance, skimmed the readings, made occasional contributions in the groups, thought about the material when I was in class

2= good attendance, read over a few of the assignments, showed up for class discussion but was not well prepared, was physically present

1= signed up for the course and attended class (I knew the time and place.)

IV. Evaluation and reflections.

(This course is offered in the Spring semester. This semester there were 41 students enrolled; 36 claimed a connection with the Roman Catholic Church seeking a better understanding of the religion into which they were baptized and “not always well educated.” The remaining 5 students enrolled in the course to find out more about the Roman Catholic Church and its beliefs. Most of the students were in their first or second year at the College.)

REPORT: At the beginning and end of the semester the same survey was distributed consisting of 6 incomplete statements. The final 2 statements were:

1. Compared to my first year in high school, my religious beliefs...

At the *beginning*: 9 indicated “stronger”; 20 indicated “same”; the remaining indicated weaker to non-existent.

At the *conclusion*: 30 indicated “stronger”; 2 indicated “same”; the remaining indicated little change to non-existent.

2. On a basis of 1-5 (being excellent), I rate myself at....in my knowledge of Roman Catholicism.

At the **beginning** the class average was 2.98; at the **conclusion** it was 3.63.

COURSE DESCRIPTION: A presentation of the various options of belief, history, worship, moral action, views of the Church, and ways of life present in Roman Catholicism.

Our College is a collaborative community dedicated to teaching and learning in a personalized educational environment. The College is guided by its Catholic heritage, as expressed in the motto of its founders: “Teach me goodness, discipline, and knowledge.” Through an education rooted in the liberal arts, we prepare individuals for lives of intellectual, professional, and civic integrity, in which diversity and service to others are valued and practiced.

(Since this Mission Statement was adopted 3 years ago, there have been many efforts to use it as a measuring stick for assessment of courses and any planning within the College. The course, Introduction to Roman Catholicism, has been planned around the current Mission Statement.)

PROFESSOR’S OBJECTIVES:

- 1) Provide a background and perspectives for a better understanding of Roman Catholicism (Are there different ways to look at RC teachings?);
- 2) Using the tools of historical methodology explore the contemporary religious and cultural views of ritual and morality within the Roman Catholic tradition;
- 3) Examine the dialogue between faith and reason (Do I need to be afraid to think?);
- 4) Provide tools for responsible, personal decisions in the maturing life of a contemporary “Seeker.”(How can I make a difference in the world?)

PEDAGOGIES:

(Because students learn differently, I have chosen a variety of pedagogies to encourage ways of dealing with the “different voices” of the students. My emphasis for the semester was to deal with the “different voices” that surface within the life of the individual student. At times these voices are in dialogue with others who are experiencing similar “differing voices.” What are their experiences in this dialogue?

- 1) A Questionnaire

At the beginning and again at the conclusion of the course the students filled out a questionnaire with the same six open ended statements. (copy attached)

- a) **The best description of “God” that I can think of is**

At the beginning of the course most saw God as a creator, forgiving and merciful; 5 described God specifically as a male. At its conclusion, 15 described God as a creator; 9 saw God as showing *himself* through others; 7 described as someone watching over me; 3 described God as the Trinity. (One described God “as an imaginative higher being”; another as “a frequent topic of conversation in discussions in organized religion.”)

(In the discussion at the beginning of the course, when asked as a group to picture God almost all described God as male/father: a traditional view.)

b) When talking with others about “God” I often

In the initial survey, 13 speak of “their” beliefs; 9 listen more; 7 avoid discussion; a few others are having a difficult time understanding what their beliefs are at this time. At the conclusion, 15 articulate their beliefs, 4 avoid any discussion; of the remaining responses: 2 realize they share similar beliefs; 2 different beliefs; and 5 are “open minded” to the beliefs of others.

c) The best description of “church” that I can think of is

At the beginning of the course, 23 defined church as a place (usually a “house for God”); 11 defined it as a community of people; others as a gathering place for organized religion. At the end of the course, 16 defined it as a place and 24 as a community of believers.

d) People who believe differently from me make me

In the initial survey, 18 listen respectfully; 7 are curious; 5 try to understand; 6 experience nothing; 4 feel different. At the conclusion, 20 try to understand the other; 6 remain indifferent; 2 are curious and confused; 3 become upset if the other is too “preachy”; 6 are prompted to ask questions.

2) Journaling

As a major requirement the students submitted 10 journal entries (about 200 words) dealing with class material. Each journal entry should deal with readings/lectures/discussions. At least 3 of the entries should deal with assigned readings (designated by “Groome or CCC” <CCC=New Catholic Catechism> in the proposed schedule) summarizing the main thesis of the chapter and your response.

For the sake of this study, I choose 10 portfolios randomly (every 4th portfolio) for review.

I have chosen some key themes that help to underline the “other voices” in dialogue within the individual and within the class.

a) the use of small groups allow for individual reflection (provided time is set aside for writing down some key thoughts); group interaction to listen to differences, but also to test out similarities (“I am not the only one who thinks this way.”); whole group discussion (explanation/discussion of background or for clarification); encouraging further written reflections later in their journals or “with someone over dinner”

b) journals allow students, in an unthreatening way, to ask further questions of themselves (and even admit there are no simple answers)

c) many new faith questions flow from further conversation and subsequent reflection on those conversations about one's own experiences as well as from a respectful listening to the questions or "thoughtful" opinions of others

d) students learn from assignments that challenge groups to work together and discover creative approaches for presentations (they tend to listen to each other more than to a text or to a lecture from a teacher)

e) a welcoming, hospitable classroom and textbook allows space for questions

f) a growing awareness of self and one's own struggles allow for a deeper awareness of others' struggles; possibly leading to a respect for the other

g) trying out "new things" (such as an assignment to attend a church service) helps give perspective and can encourage more basic questions

3) Reflective Writing (essays)

Before midterm, three reflective essays were written. The students shared their essay in small groups; themes emerged and discussed in small groups and in the entire class.

3-5 page reflection paper: The History of My Relationship With God (This paper should include your earliest concept of God and how it has changed over the years. You can include how that relationship has changed given your concept(s) of God. Has this relationship made a difference in your life? Why/Why not?)

After discussing the results of this essay, the students had an opportunity to read and discuss a brief article describing Fowler's Stages of Growth.

a) a general agreement that there is a growth similar to that suggested by Fowler; students were amazed how similar their stories were to others in the group/class (this information surfaced in the class discussions and journal entries)

b) parents' beliefs and practices influence the students in their early years especially, but then comes the age of rebellion when "I can do things on my own" (in many cases there was a dialogue going on between them and their parents OR within their own minds)

c) in some cases there is a sense of guilt because I have "fallen away" but a hope that through continued conversations with others "I might return to my roots" (a need for a "home")

d) growth in prayer and conversation with God (especially because of tragedies or successes) seems to be the norm (but there are conversations with The Other)

3-5 page reflection paper: Various Problems I Have With the Roman Catholic Religion (This paper should reflect an overall view of your difficulties with the various Roman Catholic teachings, historical events, rituals, etc. The paper is an honest attempt to look critically at your view of the Roman Catholic Church from your experiences <personally or as your friends see it>. How do you deal with these issues from the perspectives of faith and reason?)

- a) many of the concerns/problems were more misunderstandings or lack of knowledge
- b) some reflected a conservative cry to return to “the good old days”; others wondered why the church was not more open to change
- c) questioning the church’s stand about celibacy, gay marriages, abortion, birth control, women’s ordination were the most mentioned issues
- d) most said that despite their problems/issues, they would remain faithful to God and the gospel message as they interpret it (and even the religion of their birth despite its problems)

Visit a Roman Catholic Church for some liturgical event (Mass, Baptism, etc.). Describe its floor plan, its decorations, architecture, choice of music, read the Sunday bulletin. How do these best express your idea of what a Roman Catholic community is or should be? (5 pages)

- a) most saw the connection between faith/community expressed in liturgy and daily life (such as service to people)
 - b) the liturgy and “coming together” helped to solidify a sense of belonging to something bigger
 - c) announcements, bulletin articles, etc. showed that the church reached out beyond the building
 - d) concerns about traditional and progressive liturgies surfaced often BUT hospitality of the parish community (conversations before and after the liturgy, warm greetings, sign of peace, e.g.) made the difference (the “welcoming” of others was key)
- 4) Small Group Discussion

During the semester (but, especially after the introductory material is covered) there will be discussions “for credit.” To receive credit for group discussions one must be in class and actively participating. **Absence=0. (20 credits)**

Each group will choose a “saint” from the liturgical calendar for a class presentation (15-20 minutes) to include the historical time, cultural milieu and major religious focus of the time. The life and writings (if any) should reflect the historical/religious venue of the time and circumstances of the saint the group chooses. Provide an outline, references, and at least one possible discussion question (1 page for each student/professor).

The presentations:

- a) helped cement the group relationship
- b) seeing the humanness of the saint helped students understand the “saints” from a broader perspective beyond the spiritual alone
- c) lives/biographies do make good teachers; an excitement about the assignment; good attention by the other students during the presentation
- d) helped the students think about commitment to ideals/people (most did not think they could give of themselves unselfishly unless “I knew the person (family, friend, e.g.) I was helping”)
- e) the discussion of Saint Michael and angels provided the most discussion for challenging beliefs/myths/scriptures (Christian and others)

Some Preliminary and Tentative Conclusions

- 1) The methodologies worked because there were discussions (small and large group) summarized and then the professor gave further input or clarified the issues that surfaced.
- 2) The variety of experiences challenged students to look at their “inner voices” in order to discuss with “other voices.”
- 3) Individual meetings with the students helped clarify some issues (but difficult with 40+ students); written feedback and questions on the written assignments allowed the professor to add a third voice (but not always enough).
- 4) The methodologies were those that students found in other courses (cf. initial questionnaire administered to select students) and those that the professor has tested in other courses.
- 5) The course methodologies and outcomes were congruent with the mission of the college and the goals of the professor.
- 6) A clearer set of rubrics for the various methodologies are being developed to achieve clearer responses (underlying the “fact” versus “opinion” approach).
- 7) Assignments that allow students to experience different/other voices can be helpful if there is further written reflection and discussion. They often challenge one’s own biases and offer a different/other perspective.

Co-journeyer pedagogy for otherness

For: Building awareness of how an other experiences what we say and do in dealing with other spiritualities

I. Pedagogy

The teacher explains what the role of a co-journeyer is (having a safe place/relationship to say out loud what you are thinking and feeling). In this pedagogy the co-journeyer is to provide a safe place to think and feel about “other” spiritualities as offered through texts, discussion, and experiential learning exercises.

- Two classes are spent modeling and practicing the necessary skills for co-journeying.

The teacher reminds the students throughout the semester of her/his availability for improving these skills and or discussing the co-journeyer pedagogy

Among these skills are: respectful listening, open ended questions, and suggestions of spiritual practices.

- Keeping a journal is particularly necessary for this pedagogy.
- The student will:
 - Do the readings, participate in the experiential exercises, class discussion, and requirements..
 - Chose a co-journeyer.
 - Meet at least once a week with this co-journeyer to discuss their encounters with the “spiritual others” presented in class..
 - Include in her or his journal the following “Signposts”
 - Inclusion of 3 journal entries per-week.
 - Brief Summary of the week’s writings; one to two paragraphs in length.
 - At mid-term, the **ONE PAGE Spiritual Biography**: a reflection on a wounded part of your soul.
 - The portions of the journal that you have discussed with your Co-journeyer should be highlighted.
 - Varying lengths of the entries in your journal is a signpost. Not all of the topics dealt with in the course will delight, challenge or cause you to struggle. But if you are open, feeling, thinking, praying, some will. Your journal will reflect evidence of your dance with the topics, challenges and invitations found in the readings for the week.
- Provide the teacher with the journal when requested. The teacher reads only the summary paragraphs.
- The teacher will:
 - Provide explanations and model co-journeying.
 - Provide the texts and experiences of the spiritual others that provide the basis for the co-journeying process.
 - Meet with individuals, and her or his co-journeyer if necessary, to assess the success of the pedagogy.

- Provide informal assessment when requested or seen as necessary.
- Provide formal assessment at mid term and at the end of the term.

II. Detailed description of the pedagogy & III. Syllabus

THE DANCE OF WOMEN'S SPIRITUALITY MS PT 333

OVERVIEW:

The course is designed to invite Master Level Students to explore, develop, stretch and enhance spiritual knowledge and practices. This is an elective course.

COURSE OBJECTIVE:

The purpose of the course is to dance. As leaders in faith communities we need to learn ways to tend to our spiritual journey, while we are tending to the spirits of others. This course will offer students a variety of tools, approaches, methodologies and practices to engage as dance partners for their life journey. It is impossible to exhaust this topic in one three-credit course. Therefore, the intent of this course is to lay a foundation and to invite students to continually and proactively filling the well of their spiritual self.

FORMAT AND METHODOLOGY:

The format will be a three-credit course taught in the Fall Semester, meeting once a week. The methodology includes lecture, class reflection/discussion, experiential learning and practices.

I Co-journeyer Pedagogy:

The dance of this class will move to the rhythms of lecture, reflection/discussion, experiential learning, practices, and a Co-journeyer relationship.

A co-journeyer is a confidential relationship that you have with one member of the class. You are to meet weekly for a time of listening. Tilden Edwards in his classic book, Spiritual Friends, Reclaiming the Gift of Spiritual Direction, speaks of having a safe place/relationship to say out loud what you are thinking and feeling. The Co-journey's task is to listen, with judgment suspended and offer compassion, openness and ask questions for clarification and on occasion challenge or suggest a spiritual practice. Please note, the Co-journeyer is *not* a Spiritual Director – you are to walk beside each other in this relationship, one is not leading the other. Time will be spent in the first two class sessions to model and practice the co-journeyer pedagogy. Further, the profession is willing to meet with co-journeyers throughout the term, if the need arises.

The co-journeyers will engage the “other” as she/he is revealed in the curriculum of the course. The “other” will be Celtic, Native American, Feminist and Womanist Spirituality, Earth Religions, Anchorites, Mystics and Beguines. Each student is also required to

present on a spirituality, community or spiritual individual, thereby adding to the list of “others” encounter in the class.

Grade for the course is determined by completion of the following:

COURSE REQUIREMENTS:

1. Complete reading requirements.
2. Keep a journal.

Three entries a week is the minimal requirement, which shall include a brief summary paragraph at the close of each week. The journal will be handed in, but only weekly summaries will be read. (Please highlight your summaries) The journal will serve as the bases of two face-to-face meetings with the Professor, 30 minutes in length. One meeting at mid-term, and one at the conclusion of the course, during finals week. Before the mid-term meeting each student is to hand in a ONE PAGE Spiritual Biography. Please note the list of Journal Signposts, upon which the journal will be graded. The journal represents 30% of the final grade.

3. Be open to experiential learning that will invite all participants to create a spiritual journey map, take a spiritual gifts inventory, engage in spiritual practices, silence, breath prayers, meditation, labyrinth walks,...
4. The dance of this class will move to the rhythms of lecture, reflection/discussion, experiential learning, practices, and a Co-journeyer relationships. A co-journeyer is a confidential relationship that you have with one member of the class. You are to meet weekly for a time of listening. Student’s presence in class, involvement in class and with their Co-journeyer is 30% of the grade.
5. FINAL PROJECT: 10 to 15 pages in length shall be an exploration of a spiritual person, practice or community, and is 30% of the grade.
6. A class presentation of the topic of your Final Project is 10% of the grade.

REQUIRED BOOKS:

The Celtic Way by Ian Bradley

The Star in My Heart by Joyce Rupp

The Gift of Julian of Norwich by Karen Manton and Lynne Muir

Simple Living by Jose Hobday

Journey to the Well by Vasti M. McKenzie

True Balance by Sonia Choquette

Heart of Flesh - A Feminist Spirituality for Women and Men by Joan D. Chittister

RECOMMENDED READINGS:

Little Pieces of Light ... darkness and Personal Growth by Joyce Rupp

Addicted To Hurry - Spiritual Strategies for Slowing Down, by Kirk Byron Jones

Sisters of Dust, Sister of Spirit by Karen Baker- Fletcher

Out of the Depths by Miriam Therese Winter

The Singer and the Song by Miriam Therese Winters

Prayers to Sophia by Joyce Rupp

The Artist Way by Julia Cameron

In Sweet Company by Margaret Wolff

Women’s Spirituality- Resource for Christian Development, 2nd Edition Edited

by Joann Wolski Conn
Family Faith Stories by Ann Weems
When Women Were Priest by Karen Jo Toresen
Celtic Women's Spirituality; Accessing the Cauldron of Life by Edain McCoy
Adventure Inward by Morton T. Kelsey
The Other Side of Silence by Morton T. Kelsey
Listening for the Soul, by Jean Stairs
Spiritual Friends; Reclaiming the Gift of Spiritual Direction, by Tilden Edwards

JOURNAL SIGNPOSTS

1. Inclusion of 3 journal entries per-week.
2. Brief Summary of the week's writings; one to two paragraphs in length.
3. At mid-term, the *ONE PAGE Spiritual Biography*: a reflection on a wounded part of your soul.
4. The portions of the journal that you have discussed with your Co-journeyer should be highlighted.
5. Varying lengths of the entries in your journal is a signpost. Not all of the topics dealt with in the course will delight, challenge or cause you to struggle. But if you are open, feeling, thinking, praying, some will. Your journal will reflect evidence of your dance with the topics, challenges and invitations found in the readings for the week.

Why have you chosen this pedagogy?

Before our students are able to hear and honor the voice of the other, they must claim their own voice. The co-journeyer relationship is a safe space for a student to clarify and claim their voice, and thereby be receptive and respectful of the voice of the other.

How does this pedagogy fit into your institutional mission or your institutions curriculum?

We seek to prepare leaders to be *pastoral, prophetic and learned*, as well as leaders who are whole and aware of boundary issues. One way to invite wholeness is through self – care. Self-care is the intentional tending to one's spirit, body and mind. It should include such basic practices as daily prayer, proper rest, proper diet, Sabbath time, personal and/or Family time and study. Self-care is a skill that we encourage and challenge our students to carry with them into their professions ministry. The co-journeyer relationship attends to spiritual self- care.

IV How shall you evaluate what you have done?

The students will participate in two face-to-face meetings with the Professor, 30 minutes in length. In these meetings the fruits of co-journeying will be discussed as well as other aspects of the dance of this class. The first meeting will occur at mid-term, and second meeting at the conclusion of the course, during finals week. In each meeting students will be ask to discuss the ways they have been stretched and challenged by the course. They will be expected to articulate the voice of the “other” and their voice in response. Further, at the second meeting, students will be ask to respond to the following question;

Did the co-journeyer relationship provide you with a safe space to encounter and challenge the “other” encountered in the curriculum of this course. Further, did you find your voice, define your voice and were your views changed in any way? Antidotal evidence will be gathered to determine the effectiveness of this pedagogical approach.

IV. Evaluation and reflections.

OVERVIEW:

The course is designed to invite Master Level Students to explore, develop, stretch and enhance spiritual knowledge and practices. This is an elective course.

COURSE OBJECTIVE:

The purpose of the course is to dance. As leaders in faith communities we need to learn ways to tend to our spiritual journey, while we are tending to the spirits of others. This course will offer students a variety of tools, approaches, methodologies and practices to engage as dance partners for their life journey. It is impossible to exhaust this topic in one three-credit course. Therefore, the intent of this course is to lay a foundation and to invite students to continually and proactively filling the well of their spiritual self.

FORMAT AND METHODOLOGY:

The format will be a three-credit course taught in the Fall Semester, meeting once a week. The methodology includes lecture, class reflection/discussion, experiential learning and practices.

I. Co-journeyer Pedagogy:

The dance of this class will move to the rhythms of lecture, reflection/discussion, experiential learning, practices, and a Co-journeyer relationship.

A co-journeyer is a confidential relationship that you have with one member of the class. You are to meet weekly for a time of listening. Tilden Edwards in his classic book, Spiritual Friends, Reclaiming the Gift of Spiritual Direction, speaks of having a safe place/relationship to say out loud what you are thinking and feeling. The Co-journeyer's task is to listen, with judgment suspended and offer compassion, openness and ask questions for clarification and on occasion challenge or suggest a spiritual practice. Please note, the Co-journeyer is *not* a Spiritual Director – you are to walk beside each other in this relationship, one is not leading the other. Time will be spent in the first two class sessions to model and practice the co-journeyer pedagogy. Further, the profession is willing to meet with co-journeyers throughout the term, if the need arises.

The co-journeymen will engage the “other” as she/he is revealed in the curriculum of the course. The “other” will be Celtic, Native American, Feminist and Womanist Spirituality, Earth Religions, Anchorites, Mystics and Beguines. Each student is also required to present on a spirituality, community or spiritual individual, thereby adding to the list of “others” encounter in the class.

IV. How shall you evaluate what you have done?

The students will participate in two face-to-face meetings with the Professor, 30 minutes in length. In these meetings the fruits of co-journeymen will be discussed as well as other aspects of the dance of this class. The first meeting will occur at mid-term, and second meeting at the conclusion of the course, during finals week. In each meeting students will be asked to discuss the ways they have been stretched and challenged by the course. They will be expected to articulate the voice of the “other” and their voice in response. At the second meeting, students will be asked to respond to the following question; Did the co-journeymen relationship provide you with a safe space to encounter and challenge the “other” encountered in the curriculum of this course. Further, did you find your voice, define your voice and were your views changed in any way? Antidotal evidence will be gathered to determine the effectiveness of this pedagogical approach.

Evaluation of the Co-journeymen Pedagogy

1. There were 18 students in the class; nine pairs that co-journeymen through the term.
2. All students meet with the Professor at mid-term and at the close of the term for 30-minute sessions
3. The mid-term session focuses on the struggles of being faithful to the practice of the pedagogy and anxiety or delight about the focus of the course.

a. Issue **of the practice of the** pedagogy. Weekly meetings, at times difficult

Balancing the time, so that each person spoke and listened.

Issues of trust, can I say anything to my co-journeymen?

Can we meet for longer than one hour?

Do we need to keep minutes of our meetings?

Can I use this relationship to discuss other issues in my life. My co-journeymen doesn't understand me –do they need to?

b. **Anxiety or delight about the focus of the course.** “The course is spiritual rather than intellectual. What a relief”

“It felt good to gather in the Celtic tradition in the woods, and that made me nervous.”

“I am forced to ask what do I feel, rather than what do I think.” “Keep hearing the

Biblical warning about cults in my head.” “The dance and the drums beating connected my body and soul.” “I wonder if my ordination committee would appreciate this course?”

“I never understood or appreciated other spiritual practice, but now I am beginning and it feels holy.”

4. Post mid term meetings the class had a general discussion about the practice of the pedagogy and anxiety or delight about the focus of the course. It was determined that we

understood the pedagogy and the course. Now it was time to engage the “other” in the co-journeying relationship. The concept of confidentiality that was created the first day of class was reviewed and a few additions were made.

5. At the close of the term the second round of 30-minute sessions were held with each student. The following questions were asked: Did the co-journeyer relationship provide you with a safe space to encounter and challenge the “other” encountered in the curriculum of this course. Further, did you find your voice, define your voice and was your view changed in any way?

a. Did the co-journeyer relationship provide you with a safe space to encounter and challenge the “other” encountered in the curriculum of this course.

All participants agreed that the co-journeyer model offered them safe space and the opportunity for encounter with and to be challenged by the “other”. But all participants did not consider all the materials from the class “other”. Lastly, about one fourth of the participants never fully engaged their co-journeyer or the materials. /

b. Further, did you find your voice, define your voice and was your view changed in any way?

All participants expressed some degree of self-discovery and change. The following are quotes from meetings with students.

“I heard myself saying things that I read about the Cells and it was not them speaking but me.”

“I can respect the teachings of the Long House Tradition, and I now understand and am curious, but I am more sure than ever about what I know and believe”

“I will be a better pastor because what I’ve come to know. Now I am beginning to understand that women seek connection and relationship in worship and in community.”

“I sense a deepening of what I believe and less fear of what others believe.”

“This course got me to compare different cultures and the ways spirituality is perceived in different cultures.”

6 An unexpected outcome from this pedagogy was that three of the nine co-journey relationships have continued after the class had concluded.

A reflective pedagogy

For: Learning to articulate gender issues as expressed in film and reflecting on these issues in pastoral ministry.

I. Pedagogy

- Read assigned books dealing with gender issues.
- View the films listed below.
- Write a paper responding to the questions, below, attached to each film.
- Engage in the class discussion about each film.
- Write a one page response to your previously written paper following the classroom discussion guided by the following questions.
- How did the conversation transform your thinking, challenge or stretch or affirm your reflection and the gender issues discussed?

- Are their growing edges, i.e. places for further reflection or study, which you can identify?
- Imagine the classroom conversation anew; what points would you make this time in the conversation?

Required Films:

Million Dollar Baby

- What gender stereotypes are found in this film?
- What beliefs, understanding or faith stance of yours or of your community have been affirmed or challenged by this movie?

Whale Rider

- This movie is about a girl who feels called to claim her place as a practitioner of the rites and ritual of her people; a place that is traditionally reserved for boys and men. But more than a place, she is certain that she is chosen for special role in a unique time of trial for her community. Shall she deny her call, and obey her culture? What is the role reserved for men? How does she perform it? How do the people react to her performance?

Sideways

- Can men be weak?
- Is it really that much of a privilege to be a white-middle class male?
- What are the stereotypes in the movie?
- What is the price one pays for not acting on such stereotypes?

Boys Don't Cry

- What are the expectations of gender rites and boundaries?
- What are the stereotypes regarding transgender individuals?
- How does the principal character of the movie fit/not fit these stereotypes?
- How do we react when someone crosses those boundaries?
- How do we treat those who don't fit the "mold"?
- What pretense does our culture insist upon in order to feel comfortable?
- What's our fear?
- And what is the price for crossing the boundary?

II Detailed Pedagogy and III. Syllabus

Gender Analysis for Transformative Leadership INT 705
 Doctor of Ministry Seminar

Overview

The psychology of women, the advent of men's studies, the politics of homophobia, new pastoral understandings of women and men, issues of sexual abuse and harassment, an emerging appreciation of gender myths and the escalation of violence, new

appreciations of different styles of knowing have all transformed pastoral care and pastoral theology. This course will examine the voices and challenges.

This is a Doctorate of Ministry Course and is required for those seeking the D. Min Degree.

Objectives:

- 1) To become acquainted with some of the most influential literature in the area of gender studies as it impacts pastoral theology;
- 2) To reflect on how pastoral care and pastoral theology have been transformed by awareness of gender issues;
- 3) To reflect critically on how issues of gender enter/will enter into participants' exercise of pastoral ministry and transformative leadership.

Required Films:

Million Dollar Baby – The role of woman and women's right to make choices about her life and her death is the focus of this movie

Whale Rider – This movie is about a girl who feels called to claim her place as a practitioner of the rites and ritual of her people; a place that is traditionally reserved for boys and men. But more than a place, she is certain that she is chosen for special role in a unique time of trial for her community. Shall she deny her call, and obey her culture?

Sideways – A guy flick that deals with male bonding and social expectations of men to be strong, macho, in charge and in control. Can men be weak? Is it really that much of a privilege to be a white-middle class male? It deals with what it means to be a man. It looks at stereotypes that are pervasive in our culture and the price one pays for not fitting in.

Boys Don't Cry – How strong are the expectations of gender rites and boundaries? How do we react when someone crosses those boundaries? How do we treat those who don't fit the "mold"? What pretense does our culture insist upon in order to feel comfortable? What's our fear? And what is the price for crossing the boundary? These are the questions raised in this movie about a transgender youth.

Film/Reflection Pedagogy:

- 1.) Watch the film *Million Dollar Baby* and write a 2-3 page reflection paper in which you give evidence of understanding and engaging the gender implications of the work, in light of the readings you have done in preparation for this course (note list of required readings below). What beliefs, understanding or faith stance of yours or of your community have been affirmed or challenged by this movie? This paper is due at the beginning of the first class.

- 2) Write *daily* reflection paper about the film watched in class, write a two pages reflection paper following the guidelines outlined above. These will be one due Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday mornings.
- 3) Write a one page daily response to your own reflection paper following classroom discussion. How did the conversation transform your thinking, challenge or stretch or affirm your reflection and the gender issues discussed? Are their growing edges, i.e. places for further reflection or study, which you can identify? Imagine the classroom conversation anew; what points would you make this time in the conversation?

Required Reading: There is a wide variety of required reading assigned. Listed first are those books, which you are required to read in their entirety. Listed next are the books from which you will read selections. “Additional resources,” listed at the very end of the syllabus, will add to your depth and understanding, but they are not required reading. You may only want to purchase those books you are reading entirely; it’s up to you.

Read entirely:

Carol Lakey Hess. *Caretakers of Our Common House: Women’s Development in Communities of Faith*. Abingdon Press. 1997. Weaves theological, psychological, and biblical sources to address the need for an educational process in faith communities that nurtures women.

Virginia Ramey Mollenkott. *Omnigender: A Trans-religious Approach*. Pilgrim Press, 2001. A look at the perniciousness of the bipolar gender system.

Christine Cozad Neuger & James Newton Poling, eds. *The Care of Men*. Abingdon, 1997. Collection of essays about men’s issues in the local church.

Katherine H. Ragsdale, ed. *Boundary Wars: Intimacy and Distance in Healing Relationships*. Pilgrim Press, 1996. A collection of essays from conflicting points of view about the necessity and ethics of boundaries and boundary talk in pastoral relationships

Read Selections from:

Lyn Mikel Brown. *Raising Their Voices: The Politics of Girls’ Anger*. Harvard, 1998. Nuanced look at girl’s creative resistance to cultural norms of femininity, with attention to class issues.

Susan Faludi. *Stiffed: The Betrayal of the American Male*. William Morrow & Co. 1999. Asks the question: If men feel powerful when abusing women, why do they feel powerless the rest of the time? A look at the social, economic and cultural forces that have impinged on U. S. men since World War II.

Elaine Graham. *Making the Difference: Gender, Personhood and Theology*. Fortress, 1996. Strong theoretical discussion of the notion of gender.

Nancy Linton and Elizabeth Morgan, eds. *Home Is Where You're Going: Crossing Borders and Risking Solidarity through Women's Studies*. Heart and Lungs Press. 2005. An anthology designed for those interested in the integration of mind and spirit that puts many voices at the table-white, African-American, Asian, Latina, and African, dealing with topics that pertain to men as well as women. Contains articles by well-known writers in the fields of gender studies and theology as well as new voices.

William Pollack. *Real Boys: Rescuing Our Sons from the Myths of Boyhood*. Owl Random, 1999. Examines the role of mothers, fathers, schools, friendships, and sports in boys' lives and looks at the harmful effects of cultural norms of masculinity on boys.

Susan Willhauck and Jacquelyn Thorpe. *The Web of Women's Leadership: Recasting Congregational Ministry*. An alternative model to traditional hierarchy in church leadership.

Read One of Two: (see # 3 below)

Louise Erdrich. *The Last Report on the Miracles at Little No Horse*. Perennial, 2002. Father Damien writes a series of reports to the Pope, informing Rome of life among the Ojibwe people whom "he" loves and serves-or is it "she"? Issues of gender, truth telling and ministerial leadership make this a great novel!

Or:

Robb Forman Dew. *The Family Heart: A Memoir of When Our Son Came Out*. Ballantine Books. 1994. Real-life memoir of a parent of a gay man

Read One of Three: (see # 6 below)

Mary Louise Bringle. *The God of Thinness: Gluttony and Other Weighty Matters*. Abingdon, 1992. Food and fleshiness matter in Christianity. Our notions of sin and sacrament begin with food. Yet our current epidemic of eating disorders and increasing obesity reveals and theological and gender crisis we have not faced.

Or:

Terrance Real. *I Don't Want to Talk About It*. Scribners, 1997. Powerful, if popular, analysis of men's pain and depression.

Or:

Pamela Cooper-White. *The Cry of Tamar*. Fortress, 1995. Practical advice on what pastors should do when encountering sexual abuse.

Grading

This is a doctoral level course, and all work is expected to demonstrate the ability to think, write and respond at this level. Work must be completed on time or a decrease of one grade will be automatically assessed for each day late. Exceptions must be negotiated with the professor *in advance*.

Course requirements will be graded as follows:

Class discussion and participation: 30%

Film reflections: 15 %

Novel/memoir reflection: 10 %

Class leadership of discussion on dysfunction: 10 %

Final paper: 35 %

Why have you chosen this pedagogy?

We value a multiplicity of voices. Through films we are able to engage the voices of the culture in the classroom and through theological reflection and in class discussion we are able to dialogue with those voices.

How does this pedagogy fit into your institutional mission or your institution's curriculum?

As we prepare Transformative Leaders for the church and society, skills are required to engage a multiplicity of voices, in ways that are caring and life give. Employing the arts, and films in particular, we shall invite the use of imagination: as we honor and tell our stories and try on new or developing understandings/beliefs, as well as honor and listen to the story and understandings/beliefs of the other.

How shall you evaluate what you have done?

Evaluation shall occur at the mid-point of the course and at the end of the course. At the mid-point students will be asked to evaluate the pedagogy. Are we asking the right questions, are there other questions that would be more helpful, do they believe there is adequate classroom time to discuss the issue raised, in what ways have the reflection papers before and after the discussion helped or hindered the engagement of the "other" in the films? At this point adjustments will be made, (if necessary) to the pedagogy. At the close of the course the students will be asked to respond in their written course evaluation to the following question: In what ways have the reflection papers before and after the discussion helped or hindered the engagement of the "other" in the films? The responses will be collated and reported.

IV. Evaluation and Reflections

Overview

The psychology of women, the advent of men's studies, the politics of homophobia, new pastoral understandings of women and men, issues of sexual abuse and harassment,

an emerging appreciation of gender myths and the escalation of violence, new appreciations of different styles of knowing have all transformed pastoral care and pastoral theology. This course will examine the voices and challenges.

This is a Doctorate of Ministry Course and is required for those seeking the D. Min Degree.

Objectives:

- 4) To become acquainted with some of the most influential literature in the area of gender studies as it impacts pastoral theology;
- 5) To reflect on how pastoral care and pastoral theology have been transformed by awareness of gender issues;
- 3) To reflect critically on how issues of gender enter/will enter into participants' exercise of pastoral ministry and transformative leadership.

Required Films:

Million Dollar Baby – The role of woman and women's right to make choices about her life and her death is the foci of this movie

Whale Rider – This movie is about a girl who feels called to claim her place as a practitioner of the rites and ritual of her people; a place that is traditionally reserved for boys and men. But more than a place, she is certain that she is chosen for special role in a unique time of trial for her community. Shall she deny her call, and obey her culture?

Sideways – A guy flick that deals with male bonding and social expectations of men to be strong, macho, in charge and in control. Can men be weak? Is it really that much of a privilege to be a white-middle class male? It deals with what it means to be a man. It looks at stereotypes that are pervasive in our culture and the price one pays for not fitting in.

Boys Don't Cry – How strong are the expectations of gender rites and boundaries? How do we react when someone crosses those boundaries? How do we treat those who don't fit the "mold"? What pretense does our culture insist upon in order to feel comfortable? What's our fear? And what is the price for crossing the boundary? These are the questions raised in this movie about a transgender youth.

Film/Reflection Pedagogy:

- 1.) Watch the film *Million Dollar Baby* and write a 2-3 page reflection paper in which you give evidence of understanding and engaging the gender implications of the work, in light of the readings you have done in preparation for this course (note list of required readings below). What beliefs, understanding or faith stance of yours or of your community have been affirmed or challenged by this movie? This paper is due at the beginning of the first class.
- 2) Write *daily* reflection paper about the film watched in class, write a two-page reflection paper following the guidelines outlined above. These will be due Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday mornings.
- 6) Write a one page daily response to your own reflection paper following classroom discussion. How did the conversation transform your thinking, challenge or stretch or affirm your reflection and the gender issues discussed? Are their

growing edges, i.e. places for further reflection or study, which you can identify? Imagine the classroom conversation anew; what points would you make this time in the conversation?

How shall you evaluate what you have done?

Evaluations shall occur at the mid-point and the end of the course. At the mid-point students will be asked to evaluate the pedagogy. Are we asking the right questions, are there other questions that would be more helpful, do they believe there is adequate classroom time to discuss the issues raised, in what ways have the reflection papers before and after the discussion helped or hindered the engagement of the “other” in the films? At this point adjustments will be made, (if necessary) to the pedagogy. At the close of the course the students will be asked to respond in their written course evaluation to the following question: In what ways have the reflection papers before and after the discussion helped or hindered the engagement of the “other” in the films? The responses will be collated and reported.

1. At the mid-point of this weeklong intensive class students were asked to evaluate the pedagogy. Their comments were all favorable. They especially appreciated the opportunity to reflect in writing on the movie before the class discussion. Further, the students appreciated the second paper, after the discussion. The second paper was a place to expand their thinking or to articulate an “aha!” moment from the classroom discussion.

When asked about possible changes to the pedagogy, none were suggested.

2. At the close of the course the students will be asked to respond in their written course evaluation to the following question: In what ways have the reflection papers before and after the discussion helped or hindered the engagement of the “other” in the films? The following are the students’ responses:

** This assignment helps me develop a more in depth understanding of the cultural and societal views through movies. The societal messages are given and articulated because of the reflections.*

**Both “before and after” papers were very helpful opportunities for engagement with the films and the gender issues. The class discussions shed new light and perspective that enhanced my own reflections. I thought this was a very effective pedagogy.*

**The films put me right into an unfamiliar context in each case. There was an immediacy, a sense of first-hand rather than “reported” experience. Both the initial reflection and the review were eye-openers*

**The reflection paper (#1) gave us an opportunity to respond from our own perspective. It was great to respond again after hearing conversations with the class. Usually the second response detailed a theme or point that I either missed or did not deem as important until it was discussed from another angle. Great idea. Keep both pre and post conversation film reflections.*

**Reflection papers helped me to crystallize my thoughts from the film and correctly communicate them from my context. Please do more of this style of teaching. Assignments like this are practical and useful for the ministry in the 21st Century.*

**The reflection papers were necessary to gauge my understanding of the issues. The first provided a baseline, what I was able to articulate. After the discussion my reflection papers contained at least one thing that I had not considered in my initial writing.*

**The reflection papers before and after the class helped to bring a greater sense of awareness to the “other” in the film; often the after discussion made one aware of issues and others not originally noticed. The discussion allowed one to be intentional and focus in detecting “others” and their issues; the film allowed the student to give voice to the other.*

**At first I wondered about the value of a second reflection paper on each of the films, in hindsight it was one of the best learning tools in the class – it required me to make cohesion of our discussion and to think further.*

**Writing helps me clarify thinking and issues. Helped to articulate further questions also*

Community within community pedagogy

For: Those ministers who wish to listen, learn, and respect other ministers’ radical differences

I. Pedagogy

The first day of class these graduate ministerial students are asked: “What is the most contentious issue your church faces today?”

- In a subsequent class groups are formed in which each group is similar because everyone in the group belongs to the same denomination but different in that they hold diverse opinions regarding this “contentious issue.” The teacher offers a brief reflection on the necessity of dialogue, genuine listening, and sensitivity to deeply held convictions.
- Each group prepares a written “group stance” representing the Pro and Con positions on the contentious issue. This written agreement is given to the instructor.
- At the next meeting each group will review the written paper in the light of any comments made by the instructor. A very general class discussion is then held dealing with any general disagreements with the positions held in one’s group. At the end of this discussion the groups are re-configured.

- The new groups are similar in ideology (Pro or Con) regarding the contentious issue but mixed as to denomination. Each of these groups are charged with the task of perfecting their stance regarding the contentious issue.
- Depending on the size of the class, all the “pro” positions gather to present their argument; all the con positions gather to present their position.
- The positions are briefly presented. Discussion continues until everyone believes that those who hold the other position understand their position.

II. Detailed description of the pedagogy

INTRODUCTION: The situation and the issue.

Consistent with the current era characterized by philosophical, theological and experiential pluralism and the fragmentation of culture and worldview, students in course C/D (Theology/Pastoral) 205, Contemporary Moral Theology responded variously to a question put to them in the first class. The question was: “In your opinion, what is the most contentious issue your church faces right now?” Issues mentioned by the students included the discrepancy between religious and societal moral values, stem cells, status of women and other minorities in some traditions, and issues surrounding ministry and gay and lesbian people.

Members of the class include 28 students, of whom 5 are preparing for ordained ministry in the Episcopal Church, 20 are preparing for some form of diaconal or lay ecclesial ministry in the R.C. Church, one is a Quaker and one is preparing for ordination in the UCC Church (one student describes herself as ‘non-denominational’ and two have yet to appear!).

I have decided to focus primarily on the question of accepting gay people for church ministry. This issue is primarily a pastoral one, but it has implications for moral reflection regarding gay and straight life and carries with it a range of methodological issues relating to moral theology. It has also gained public attention recently in both the Episcopal and RC Churches, and has been prominent in other Christian churches as well.

Members of the class are not of one mind on this question, but represent a spectrum probably consistent with the broader public. The two major churches represented in the class, Episcopal and RC, have responded to the question in nearly opposite ways. Some students from each denomination agree with the official stance taken by their church and others dissent from it.

QUESTION 1: What pedagogy or pedagogies will you design, test, and evaluate that is oppositional to students’ faith?

My goal in the matter is for students to hear, understand and respect the position that is other than the one they now hold. They will know they have achieved this goal when they can explain the other position to one who holds that view to his or her satisfaction.

The pedagogy will combine elements of peer teaching, group learning, and collaborative learning.

Steps to be taken in undertaking this pedagogy will be:

1. Formation of learning groups which include members holding opposite views on this question, from the perspective of his or her denomination. Episcopalians in a group of 5, RC's in 4 or 5 groups, with Quaker and UCC and non-denominational members joining with one of the groups.
2. Each group will prepare a 'group stance' representing both the Pro and Con positions on the question. Groups will submit their position in writing to the Instructor, and will engage in a session in which the two positions will be explained. Participants can question and comment on the work of those representing the 'counter' position.
3. Finally, those representing both groups will question members of the other group and will assess the others' understanding and appreciation of their own position.

QUESTION 2: Why have you chosen this pedagogy?

The issue chosen has been indicated by a significant number of students as the "most contentious" one in their church today. The goal of understanding and respect will provide students with an experience they can carry forward as this issue promises to continue to occupy the congregations in which they will worship and serve.

The activity of preparing a formal statement about one's own belief will allow clarity and the chance for self-critique. The activity of listening to the other's prepared statement will afford objective clarity about the other position. Locating the dialogue among peers rather than 'outside experts' is intended to foster respect within the group and facilitate the possibility of critically reviewing one's own stance in light of the other.

Participation in the structured conversation intended should provide an opportunity to move beyond "my assumptions about your position" toward real understanding of "your actual position" and demonstrate for participants the value of genuine listening in shattering sometimes false assumptions about another.

Providing feedback to the "hearer" can allow for continuing clarification, correction if needed, and a more accurate assessment of one's own appreciation of the other's stance. I take the feedback portion to be the measure of whether or not the learning has taken place and the goal achieved.

QUESTION 3: How does this pedagogy fit into your institutional mission and your departmental/institutional curriculum?

Our school prepares people for Christian ministry. Today students face service among parishioners often holding views different from their own on contentious issues. True preparation for ministry requires clarity about one's own stance and acceptance of the fact that others often hold views opposite from one's own. Listening and responding are skills required for true ministry.

QUESTION 4: How will you evaluate what you have done?

1. Student questionnaire regarding the goals, objectives, process and outcome.
2. Professor oral assessment of experience and outcomes described for students and reported to WABASH group.

III. Syllabus

D 205: Contemporary Moral Theology: Foundational concepts of Christian ethics and moral decision making within the American context e.g. conscience, use of Scripture, sin and virtue, etc. Case studies and selected issues as a context for elaborating on inclusive methodology.

Instructor:

DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES:

The course will analyze some of the foundational issues of Christian ethics, especially from the perspective of Roman Catholic moral theology. Special attention will be given to the topics of sin, moral formation and character, the sources of moral wisdom, moral decision making, the person as moral agent, moral norms, and conversion and discernment.

COURSE GOALS:

1. Students will understand the fundamentals of making moral decisions in light of the Christian faith;
2. Students will perceive in their moral experience the dynamic and interdependent relations among character, communities, and choices;
3. Students will achieve a foundation for listening to and analyzing their own and others' moral experience in pastoral situations.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS:

1. Attendance and active participation in class.
2. Preparation for each class: required readings from texts and other materials assigned during the course.
3. Submission of 4-5 page essays on the following topics:
 - Sin: moving from a foundation in acts to a foundation in relationships: why it makes sense, **due Jan. 26.**
 - Hays on abortion, homosexuality, war, relations with Jews, or divorce: his argument, today's application—or not **due Feb. 16**
 - Making a moral decision: how method matters **due March 16**

- One eight page paper on a particular issue of interest to you, presented as a pastoral case. **Due at final class but decided upon by Mar. 1**

Required texts:

Richard Gula S.S., *Reason Informed by Faith: Foundations of Catholic Morality*, New York: Paulist Press, 1989.

Richard Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: Community, Cross, New Creation. A Contemporary Introduction to New Testament Ethics* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997) ISBN 0567085694 Paper pp. xviii + 508.

Russell B. Connors Jr. and Patrick T. McCormick, *Character, Choices & Community: The Three Faces of Christian Ethics*, New York: Paulist Press, 1998.

Other works tba.

METHOD OF THIS COURSE:

The course will follow a lecture and discussion format over the course of 13 classes. We will at times employ small group discussion, videos, streaming video, the web, guest lectures.

Jan. 12, 2006:

TOPIC: Sin. READ: Gula, Ch. 7 & 8.

Jan. 19, 2006:

TOPIC: Moral growth and development. READ: Gula, Ch. 4, 5, & 6.

Jan. 26, 2006:

TOPIC: Sources of moral wisdom: Law and Scripture. READ: Gula, Ch. 12 & 17. Hays, part three. **Due: paper on sin.**

February 2, 2006:

TOPIC: Sources of moral wisdom: Tradition, Reason, Experience, Sciences and Arts. READ: Gula, Ch. 11, 14.

February 9, 2006:

TOPIC: Making moral decisions: Christological and Natural Law methods. READ: Gula, Ch. 15 & 16.

February 16, 2006:

TOPIC: Hays' issues and Scripture—small groups. **Hays paper due.**

February 23, 2006:

TOPIC: Making moral decisions: Situation ethics READ: Gula, Ch. 18, 19, 20.

March 2, 2006:

TOPIC: Discernment, conversion, conscience, and reason, imagination, intuition and the senses of faith. READ: Gula, Ch. 21, 1, 2, & 3.

March 9, 2006:

TOPIC: Communities, character formation and human choice. Liberation theologies, READ: Russell and McCormick.

March 16, 2006:

TOPIC: Issues today: end of life questions, abortion and public policy. Principle of Cooperation. READINGS TBA **Moral decision making paper due**

March 23:

TOPIC: Issues today: Social teaching and the Christian churches, genetics, stem cells. READINGS TBA

March 30:

TOPIC: New reasons for waging war, relationship of Church and World in various traditions READINGS TBA

April 6:

TOPIC: Class interest, summary Case paper due

IV. Evaluation and reflections.

Description of the project:

Our Graduate School of Theology trains students who will serve in various lay and ordained ministries. While students are predominantly Roman Catholic, the extension site also prepares men and women for ordination in the Episcopal Church. The course title is “Contemporary Moral Theology.”

The original proposal, to ask students to develop a position on whether or not persons openly engaged in homosexual relationships should be ordained to the priesthood had to be abandoned. Ironically, the reason for this was that members of the Episcopal Diocese of Albany had been instructed by their bishop not to discuss this issue. This Diocese has withdrawn from communion with other Episcopal churches in the U.S. following the ordination of an openly gay Bishop in New Hampshire, and considerable controversy still surrounds the issue in the Church of Albany. Catholics in the class could well appreciate the tension, since the previous Roman Catholic Pope had restricted Catholics from publicly discussing the matter of the ordination of women. These restrictions to as basic an American right as free speech provided an ironic and difficult context for the “other voices” project.

The new project focused on a question from medical ethics: whether or not to treat a pneumonia that had developed in a young man who had sustained a severe brain injury

years before and had remained comatose for several years. The case included information about the effects of the coma on family members and care givers over several years.

The project involved reading the case and forming an initial response to the question of whether or not to treat Tom Haven's pneumonia. Students were asked to research the case and hand in an 8-page paper developing reasons for the decision taken, using theological and other sources to develop the argument presented. Then, students formed groups which met to present and listen to each other's points of view. Each group included representatives of both perspectives: to treat Tom, and not to treat Tom. Groups were instructed to hear one another's points of view. Individuals were to discuss and question one another until each member was assured that his or her position had been heard and understood by group members. While the format obviously resembled that of a debate, students were encouraged to actively listen to the other rather than to debate the position taken.

The students are all part time students, and scheduling the discussions, which were held outside of class time, proved to be difficult. Thus, five groups formed, but the number in each group varied: one group had 8 members, two groups had 5, one had 4 and one had only 3. After the discussions had taken place, each student handed in a three-page paper describing the exercise and what had happened to him or her during the session.

Positive comments about the process (numbers indicate the size of the group):

We asked questions and repeated statements so we could clearly understand each person's argument. It was a very interesting and educational exercise in understanding each other's points of view and how they either arrived at them or how they chose to defend them. (5)

Although we held steadfast in our position, I felt I was most definitely understood. It was actually very empowering knowing that I had been heard. (8)

Three different faith traditions seemed to meld into a common thought mode around this question...I don't know if, given enough time, we would come to a common understanding or viewpoint, but we certainly blended the best of our individual thoughts. (5)

I felt enormous compassion for Rich at this point and felt deep gratitude that he was being so honest. It was at this point that our conversation became more genuine. (5)

This form of discourse differs from a model involving argument, debate, winning/losing and right/wrong perspectives. It welcomes alternative ways of collective reasoning. It fosters respect and appreciation for conflicting ideas in a safe environment that requires attentive listening. (4)

My group honored the process of respectful dialogue by agreeing on the order of speakers, by not interrupting while another person spoke and by evaluating a person's perception of being heard, before proceeding to another presentation. However, I must admit that my desire to challenge interfered at times with my effective listening. I had to consciously stop myself from creating argumentative responses in my mind while other

group members were speaking. The win/lose paradigm was difficult for me to naturally and automatically disregard. (4)

On how questions of personal confidence affected the meeting:

As the first person spoke, my heart sank and I felt threatened and insecure about how I had defended my own decision. My first thought was, "Oh, no, I might have made the wrong decision." I felt really conflicted. (8)

I was fearful that I might offend a visibly upset person with my position (5)

I guess my problem is that I'm still not sure how much I should push forward or pull back when I find myself disagreeing with others. I wonder how much of myself I'm tamping down or leaving out for fear of offending someone or being seen as "not really ministry material." I really showed my weakness in this exercise. (5)

On the new learning and awareness that emerged:

Overall, I was surprised at how differently each of us approached the project. (8)

Overall, I found the experience to be very enlightening. I tend to listen to all sides of an issue. Therefore, the "other voices" portion of the exercise was not new. But I know I will take what I have learned doing this assignment with me. (5)

From this lesson I take away the very powerful realization that if we are to live a life of love, we all must first listen to each other. (8)

As I heard the participants in my group discuss the case, I learned about Christian understanding and spirituality in a new way which is humbling and touching. (5)

The process was a great learning tool from several perspectives. It not only provided insights into alternate points of view; it also provided insights to alternate approaches for the same point of view. As the evening went on I sensed a mellowing in the points of view as each participant mentally digested the others' perspectives on treating or not treating Tom. Although at the end no one rushed out the door to rewrite their paper, it was clear that each of us had a great learning experience from the encounter and that it provided us with new insights to this difficult question. (5)

It was quite clear that we were learning from each other and what we had to say, and that we were fine tuning our own perspectives based on what the others had to say. (5)

We need more group dynamics as students of pastoral care. I enjoy studying theology immensely. But as a servant, my belief in the importance of self-monitoring has deepened here. (5)

I was surprised that different people could utilize similar concepts, yet arrive at different interpretations and conclusions. No one purported to have all the answers. We spoke about the need for ongoing formation of conscious. We made room for hearing other voices in the future. (4)

The other voices project became a venue for story-telling/story-listening. (4)

On reaching for deeper sources from experience in the process:

One's personal experience plays the more vital role in moral decision making and pastoral advisors must always be humble and compassionate. (4)

When my turn came, I felt less apprehensive about my lack of technicality and emphasis on philosophy. The 'debater,' who sat next to me, quietly heckled me with her looks of disapproval and disagreement as I presented my paper. Flexibility seemed impossible for her. As we told stories of our own personal experience with death, we began to embrace one another. Even the 'debater' opened up a wound so deep that all defenses dropped. Compassion and support were offered. This became for me the most valued experience of the class. It made very real the importance of community for someone embracing a Christian spirituality. (8)

After we spoke of personal experiences of this type. (4)

In our group, we had a counselor, a nurse, a physician, and a social worker, so all those perspectives came into view. Each approach was unique to the person, his or her background, and what he or she does for a living, or in ministry. (5)

On being influenced by "the other side"

I find myself back on the fence I had perched on at the outset of writing the original 'pro' side of the argument. (8)

At the end, I could also see their position and argue in favor of their views. But I would still stick to my position of not treating Tom. (8)

I don't think anyone changed his or her mind because of what others had to say.

However, we all listened and I felt I understood why the others in the group had taken the position, and I felt that I was also heard by the others. (3)

My staunch position to treat Tom shifted just slightly toward the 'don't treat' position when Joe talked about his father's pain.

None of the opposing viewpoints was sufficient to change my mind. I was impressed by the compassion and thoughtfulness of the material presented. I was not in the least swayed by the other perspectives. (5)

On actually hearing the other and being heard:

It was difficult to attend to a viewpoint that was opposed to my own. I had to continually stop myself from formulating arguments to counter what was being said, instead of actively listening. It was hard, but valuable, to tone down my passion enough so that I could hear another voice. (3)

I "confess" that after the formal part of our meeting, when the three of us concluded that we had heard the other voice, I proceeded to try to convince Joe that there were better answers for the family than euthanasia. (3)

Finally, I thought it was a great exercise. Even the presentation-in-class model seems kind of static when compared to this exercise. This model forces us to think about other points of view and provides a dynamic challenge to accept counter positions and consider them in reformulating your own perspective. This process provides a significant learning tool in that the student will integrate not only multiple perspectives but that each of these perspectives were mutually modified during the exercise. So it provides a kind of

synergistic process that I think causes the individual to react to and deal with alternative points of view. (5)

I asked her if she felt heard (Because I certainly was hearing her!) She seemed stunned, and I told her that I thought that was the purpose of the exercise: to feel heard. I think she was taken aback and uncomfortable. I did not want to appear mean-spirited....I believe everyone agreed that they did feel heard. I recall I had to keep returning to that question and presenting it to the group. The reason, frankly, was that I felt Eleanor had a huge agenda of her own, that seemed to foster disinterest in the others.(5)

I tried to listen to the others' views in an attempt to understand them without putting those views into the context of my own. That proved difficult to do, however, as I found myself automatically arguing against those views in my mind or seeing how they bolstered my own case. While I did come to an intellectual understanding of each of the others' views, my own view wasn't swayed at all. (4)

I came away feeling very much understood in my own position and sympathetic to the views of the others. I came away also with some new skills to hone in explaining my views on such sensitive topics and in listening to the views of others. (4)

Group dynamics: negative

People who agreed to "stick together" as a subgroup. (8)

Especially one person whose views were vehement. (8)

Body language, facial expressions, tone of voice, volume of speech, style of delivery. (8)

Nonverbal cues created animosity and made me disinclined to interiorize the arguments of the other side. (8)

One person can color the emotional impact of the overall group experience. (8)

I perceived disdain, which actually felt very hurtful to me. I'm still feeling interior grumbling, five days later. I didn't realize the depth of my emotional reaction until I sat down to write this reflection. (8)

It's very enlightening that emotions played such a huge part in this fictional situation.

We got slightly sidetracked at several points in our discussion. (8)

Two of our members were quite confrontational. (8)

One member became tearful and emotionally upset (5)

I stayed within my own bias and perspective. I found the counter positions irritating for the most part. (5)

The whole thing erupted into a free for all at first. We had several self-proclaimed leaders, and few listeners. The so-called leaders created tension and I could sense feelings of hurt and anger... Some felt they were being attacked or not listened to.... It was a spectacle to see adult seminary students acting like middle schoolers at lunchtime. Finally, we adopted a more democratic process, and I really felt heard...(8)

I was judging others, they were judging me, and I was judging myself. It was singularly uncomfortable. I don't know if they felt that way. (5)

My experience by this time was feeling much unheard, unlistened to, and treated with complete disinterest by two women who seemed to be off on their own journey. (5)

When she tried to turn it into a debate, it felt like the old win/lose stuff of patriarchy. I am not fond of it. I find it destructive. I was feeling like the saying my Native American

friends speak of when they talk about feeling invisible. I did not and do not want people to feel invisible. I do not want to feel invisible. (5)

My biggest struggle came during my presentation when I felt that my ideas and my research were being disregarded as unimportant. I felt violated when one group member went to reheat her dinner. Clearly, she was not listening to the counter position. (4)

Summary: the students were exposed to a view opposed to their own on a question of common interest and personal ‘investment.’ That perspective was represented by a peer, not an ‘authority figure.’ Students were instructed to *hear* the ‘other voice,’ not debate it. The success of the endeavor was measured by whether or not participants felt heard, and whether they felt that they had heard and understood the other.

As such, success indicated by these criteria seemed to be influenced by factors other than the intellectual content of what was presented by each ‘side.’ Personal considerations like self-confidence and openness to the effort carried significant influence, as did the atmosphere created and the dynamic within each group.