

School of Theology and Ministry
Seattle University
901 12th Avenue, PO Box 222000
Seattle, WA 98122-1090

Summer Quarter 2014

COURSE INFORMATION

STMM 5910-02 Education and Media Evangelization

July 21-25, 2014 (M-F, 9am-4pm)

Classroom: TBD

Prerequisites: None

INSTRUCTOR

Mary Hess PhD

Office: (Building and Room)

Office Hours: By appointment

SU Email: hessm@seattleu.edu

Texts and Materials

- Required Texts: *To Know As We Are Known*, Parker Palmer (Harper, 1993); *Faith Seeking Understanding*, Daniel Migliore (Eerdmans, 2004); *The Distraction Addiction*, Alex Soojung-Kim Pang (Little, Brown, 2013)
- Recommended Text: If you are not familiar with digital culture, please read *Click2Save*, by Elizabeth Drescher and Keith Anderson (Morehouse, 2012) before coming to campus.
- Supplemental Texts and Materials: Please see each section of the calendar below for specific recommendations of supplemental materials for each area under study.

Course Description:

- This course is designed to encourage theological reflection around the changes that have occurred in the ways people interact and develop community due to global media cultures. These changes affect the way people view God, themselves and creation; and, correspondingly, they also affect the ways in which people live out their relationship to God and each other; and witness to God's presence and activity in daily life. Accordingly, both lay Christians and public ministers need to be able to interpret and use various media in sharing the gospel message in a needy world.
- Goals and objectives: Demonstrate an awareness of landscapes of media culture with an emphasis on active engagement in creation within those landscapes; Define and describe various theological loci, specifically as they are expressed in public media contexts; Develop and articulate one's own theological arguments using the tools of various media technologies; Demonstrate a capacity for theological formation, religious education, and spiritual engagement within media culture contexts; Begin to develop constructive and appropriate habits for one's own spiritual sustenance in the midst of digital cultures
- Assessment of student learning processes: Please see the end of this syllabus for grading rubrics around class participation, written assignments, and a final project.

Course Requirements:

- Attendance: Given that this course is a short intensive, attendance at all course sessions is mandatory, and absences will reflect negatively on a student's grade. In case of emergency or illness, please notify the instructor immediately.
- Writing assignments: There is one short essay due in advance of the gathering in July, and a final project which will entail writing a project proposal (which is due on July 25th). The final project itself will be multi-media in nature and is due on August 1st. Written Assignments may use any format – APA, MLA, or Chicago Manual – as long as is used consistently throughout a paper and project.
- Presentations: There will be two short presentations each student must offer during the week in which we gather -- a self introduction using the website tackk.com, and a proclamation of a biblical text or theological concept, using animoto.com (or a similar tool, with permission of the instructor). Instructions for these presentations will be made available during the class sessions.
- Participation: Active participation, including in large and small group discussion, is required, and there is a rubric for evaluating that participation included later in this syllabus.
- Experiential Assignment: The primary experiential assignment is to engage in the practices and principles of “contemplative computing” described in Pang’s book. Each day a student should spend at least one hour in the evening focused on those practices. I will discuss with each student which one (or more) of them would be most appropriate given their specific background and prior experience, and we will regularly “debrief” these practices during class sessions.
- Due Dates: There is a short theological essay due on July 14th, one week prior to the intensive gathering (instructions below), and there is a final project due August 1st (again, instructions below). A draft proposal of that project will be due on July 25th to be discussed in class.
- Assessment and grading criteria: Please see the rubrics later in this syllabus.

Grading Weight and Scale

The initial theological essay counts for 10% of the grade, the tackk.com and animoto.com presentations count for 20% of the grade, the experiential assignment counts for 30% of the grade, the final project counts for 30% of the grade, and the remaining 10% will be factored in based on overall class participation.

Grading Criteria can be found on the rubrics later in this syllabus.

Schedule of Course Activities:

- **Pre-gathering (assignment due July 14th)**

Read *To Know As We Are Known*, Parker Palmer; *Faith Seeking Understanding*, Daniel Migliore; *The Distraction Addiction*, Alex Soojung-Kim Pang

If you are not at all familiar with digital culture in the context of communities of faith, please also read *Click2Save* by Elizabeth Drescher and Keith Anderson.

Write a short essay choosing one theological “locus” from Migliore (you can see specific loci and associated chapters in the calendar of our work below). In this essay you must define the locus, briefly describe what you believe is at stake for your community of faith in that locus, and note at least two fundamental questions you believe digital cultures raise in relation to that locus. This essay should be no more than four pages long, double-spaced, using a font no smaller than 10 pt. This essay is due on July 14th by midnight, sent via attachment to the instructor in one of the following formats (.doc, .docx, .txt, .rtf, or .pdf). If you are from a faith community other than Christian, please be in contact with the instructor prior to the course to ensure that the locus you choose is appropriate for your specificity.

- **Monday, July 21**

Morning: “Knowledge of God and knowledge of ourselves are intertwined”

Review Palmer, review Pang, and review chapter 4 of Migliore. Students will be able to distinguish between an instrumental and an expressive understanding of digital media, and articulate the implications of that understanding for religious education.

Afternoon: “The Good Creation”

Review chapter 5 of Migliore. Students will be able demonstrate one means of doing theological reflection with popular culture, demonstrate the ability to use tackk.com as a means of self introduction, and raise at least two important theological questions about the impact of digital media on our understanding of God’s agency and human agency. Students will leave class clear about the experiential evening assignment.

Additional resources:

Here Comes Everybody (Penguin, 2008) and Cognitive Surplus (Penguin, 2010) by Clay Shirky

Net Smart by Howard Rheingold (MIT Press, 2012)

Small Things Loosely Joined by David Weinberger (Perseus, 2002)

Wealth of Networks by Yochai Benkler (Yale University Press, 2007)

- **Tuesday, July 22**

Morning: “The providence of God and the mystery of evil”

Review chapter 6 of Migliore. Students will be able to distinguish between a “theology of glory” and a “theology of the cross,” and offer illustrative examples from various digital media. Students will demonstrate an ability to explore and reflect upon “contemplative computing.”

Afternoon: “Theological anthropology: all humans are created in the image of God”

Review chapter 7 of Migliore, and review chapters 1 and 4 of Palmer. Students will demonstrate a basic grasp of theological anthropology, and be able to speak constructively to the systemic challenges raised by media culture representations of race, class, gender, and so on. Students will be able to demonstrate an ability to find digital media which offer constructive representations of human relationality.

Additional resources:

Cybertypes by Lisa Nakamura (Routledge, 2002)

Digitizing Race by Lisa Nakamura (UofMN, 2008)

Media Violence and Christian Ethics by Jolyon Mitchell (Cambridge University Press, 2010)

▪ **Wednesday, July 23**

Morning: “Christology: all theology is contextual”

Review Migliore chapters 8 & 9. Students will be able to articulate why all theology must be contextual, and explain why and how “context collapse” emerges within digital cultures. They will be able to enumerate pragmatic challenges of doing pastoral ministry in the midst of social media, with specific responses to such challenges.

Afternoon: “The Holy Spirit is at work”

Review Migliore chapter 10. Students will be able to articulate how to “re-contextualize” using digital social media, and will offer presentations of a specific biblical text or theological concept using animoto.com (or some other tool which allows them to combine music, image and text).

Additional resources:

Michael Wesch on “context collapse” (<http://mediatedcultures.net/projects/youtube/context-collapse/>)

Tweet If You (heart) Jesus by Elizabeth Drescher (Morehouse, 2010)

▪ **Thursday, July 24**

Morning: “The Church”

Review Migliore chapter 11. Students will grasp how social justice is threaded through the church, and will demonstrate an awareness of several recent statements their specific church has made on communication. (The instructor will provide examples from the Roman Catholic Church, but will seek specific illustrations from other communities represented in the class.)

Afternoon: “The Church”

Further review Migliore chapter 11.

Students will be able to design learning experiences for a congregation or other specific community which invite persons to see digital media as constructive resources for healthy ecclesiology.

Additional resources:

Faith Formation 4.0 by Julie Lytle (Morehouse, 2013)

Mashup Religion by John McClure (Baylor University Press, 2011)
The Parent App by Lynn Schofield Clark (Oxford University Press, 2013)
The Social Media Gospel by Meredith Gould (Liturgical Press, 2013)

- **Friday, July 25**

Morning: “Concluding ideas”

Students will work together to create collaborative representations of their learning to share beyond the class, and will discuss their final project proposals.

Afternoon: “Concluding rituals”

Students will share their collaborative representations as part of closing prayer.

- **Post-gathering work (due August 1)**

Final projects, based on project proposals discussed on July 25th, will be due to the instructor by midnight of August 1st. These projects will be placed at Vimeo.com, Animoto.com or YouTube.com and made available to the public, unless another arrangement has been explicitly approved by the instructor through the project proposal process.

Your final project should be a piece which uses music, image and text to offer an engagement with at least one of the theological loci we’ve engaged in this class. It might be simplest if you work with the locus you wrote about in your first, pre-gathering, paper. Projects will most likely be created in iMovie or using an extended version of Animoto.com (I have an educator’s license and can make it possible for you to construct something at that site which is longer than 30 seconds). Please be certain to include a list of citations for the images, music and text you use (even if you create all of them yourself – just cite yourself!). These projects should be under 10 minutes in length, unless other arrangements have been approved through the project proposal process.

Policies

- As noted above, participation in all aspects of this short intensive is mandatory, as it is essential to the collaborative nature of our learning. Missing even one half of a day’s meeting will result in a half grade reduction, unless there are extenuating circumstances or other arrangements have been made in advance. Please be aware that in addition to the time spent in class there is the assumption that you will spend an additional two hours in the evening on preparation for our time together.
- Failure to meet a deadline will result in a half grade reduction for every two days an assignment is late.
- Academic Honesty (including plagiarism): The School of Theology and Ministry strictly adheres to the academic policy regarding Academic Integrity as indicated on the Seattle University Registrar website, as noted in the box below.
- Disability: If you have, or think you may have, a disability (including an ‘invisible disability’ such as a learning disability, a chronic health problem, or a mental health condition) that interferes with your performance as a student in this class, please see related note in the box at the end of this syllabus.

Rubrics for grading:

Rubric for Assessing Class Participation	Superior	Good	Sufficient	Failure
Reasoning	Raises thoughtful questions which emerge from the assigned reading and presentations; is charitable to others in discussing issues.	Most positions are supported by evidence in the readings; comments and ideas generally contribute to class understanding of the material and concepts; is charitable to others.	Class contributions most often are based on personal opinion/anecdotes or fuzzy thinking. Comments suggest difficulty in following complex lines of argument; student's arguments are convoluted and hard to follow.	Frequently resorts to extraneous comments which fail to connect in any recognizable way to the reading or lecture; illogical comments without substantiation are frequent; not charitable to others.
Listening	Deepens the discussion by drawing on other readings, or comments from others; Offers in depth analysis of complicated theological terms and ideas that aid in understanding.	Usually listens well to others as evidenced by clarifying questions, making connections to earlier readings and lectures; responds to comments of others in ways that open and deepen conversation	Has difficulty consistently listening well as evidenced by repetition of questions asked earlier or extraneous comments unrelated to the topic. Is occasionally distracted by electronic media.	Frequently appears distracted; distracted by computer or cell phone; shows no evidence of listening or understanding the comments of others
Reading	Student has carefully read and understood the readings, followed up on footnotes and outside sources and comes to class prepared with questions and critiques.	Student has read and understood all assigned material as evidenced by prepared questions. Contributes regularly and well.	Student has read most of the material but comments demonstrate little thought or misunderstanding some main points. Work demonstrates inconsistent preparation. Contributions are infrequent & inconsistent.	Unable to understand basic concepts and is frequently unprepared as evidenced by inability to respond to foundational questions or contribute. Consistently does not contribute.

Rubric for Assessing Paper	Superior	Good	Sufficient	Failure
Argument & Analysis	Clear statement of the thesis and main conclusion of the paper. Thesis is well documented. Highly accurate and elegant. The argument is compelling and elegant. Clearly breaks argument into relevant parts.	Thesis is obvious but not stated; the summary description is fairly accurate and has textual support. The argument is interesting and relevant.	Thesis is present but must be discovered, and is only somewhat relevant. The conclusion does little more than restate the problematic introduction. Integrates some parts but other connections are muddy.	There is no coherent thesis. Essay has no clear organizational pattern. The argument is unclear, unsupported, and riddled with inaccurate statements. Parts simply reflect personal opinion.
Sources	Evidence is used from a wide range of sources, including course reading and personal experience. Student also consults multiple scholarly books, websites, journal articles, etc. not explicitly discussed in class.	Evidence is used from many sources, but author relies heavily on a more limited set of sources. Effort has been made to go beyond material presented in class.	Uses only a few of the sources provided in class. If outside sources are used, they are primarily non-scholarly (i.e., intended for a general audience).	Poor use of sources in general; only minimally uses sources provided by instructor, and/or relies exclusively on non-scholarly outside sources.
Clarity and Style	All sentences are grammatically correct and clearly written. All information is accurate and up-to-date. Paper clearly has been spell-checked AND proofread, and contains no errors.	All sentences are grammatically correct and clearly written. All information is accurate and up-to-date. Paper clearly has been spell-checked AND proofread, and contains no more than a few errors.	A few sentences are grammatically incorrect or not clearly written. Several words are misused. Not all information is accurate and up-to-date. Paper contains several errors.	Paper is full of grammatical errors and bad writing. Many words are misused. Not all information is accurate and up-to-date. No evidence that the paper has been spell-checked or proofread, and contains numerous errors.

Rubric for Assessing Project	Superior	Good	Sufficient	Failure
Authenticity of theological reflection	The argument is clear, well-founded, creative, compelling and elegant. The argument evokes a strong feeling of authenticity in several readers/viewers/or other people engaging it.	There is a clear theological statement in the project. Viewers/readers or other people engaging the project respond well to it.	Theological reflection is present but must be discovered, and is only somewhat relevant. Viewers/readers/ or other people engaging the project cannot tell if it is authentic.	There is no coherent theological reflection. The project has no clear organizational pattern. Readers/viewers/or other people engaging the piece feel manipulated.
Authoritative engagement with resources	Authority is built using a wide range of sources, including biblical content, elements from the faith tradition, and contemporary experiences. Student draws on resources – for example, scholarly books, websites, journal articles, television shows, films etc. not explicitly discussed in class.	Authority is built using several sources, but the student relies heavily on only one genre (biblical, traditional, etc.). Effort has been made to go beyond material presented in class.	The student relies on personal authority to carry the argument of the project. If outside sources are used, they are primarily print-based.	Poor use of sources in general; only minimally uses sources provided by instructor, and/or relies exclusively on personal assertion.
Creative agency	The project is compelling, multi-sensory, and layered in approach. Care has been given with regards to editing and there is an openness to interpretation which invites participatory meaning-making.	The project is interesting, and can withstand more than one viewing/read/engagement. The student respects the genre of the project, and has clearly taken care in production.	The project is complete, makes a coherent point and some care has been expended in producing it.	The project appears sloppy and incoherent. It appears to function on one level only, constraining meaning rather than opening it up.

University Resources and Policies

Academic Resources

- Library and Learning Commons (<http://www.seattleu.edu/learningcommons/>)
 - *(This includes: Learning Assistance Programs, Research [Library] Services, Writing Center, Math Lab)*
- Academic Integrity Tutorial *(found on Angel and SU Online)*

Academic Policies on Registrar website (<https://www.seattleu.edu/registrar/academics/performance/>)

- Academic Integrity Policy
- Academic Grading Grievance Policy
- Professional Conduct Policy *(only for those professional programs to which it applies)*

Notice for students concerning Disabilities

If you have, or think you may have, a disability (including an 'invisible disability' such as a learning disability, a chronic health problem, or a mental health condition) that interferes with your performance as a student in this class, you are encouraged to arrange support services and/or accommodations through Disabilities Services staff located in Loyola 100, (206) 296-5740. Disability-based adjustments to course expectations can be arranged only through this process.