Course Syllabus
THEO5140:
Advanced Seminar in Theologies of Disability, Church, and Sacrament
North Park Theological Seminary
Spring 2020, Tuesdays and Thursdays, 8 – 9:15 AM
3 credit-hours (campus)

Instructor Information
Dr. Mike Walker, Th.D., Theology Teaching Fellow
Telephone: (1-773) 441-9653
Email: mawalker@northpark.edu
Office Hours: Tuesdays, 11 AM – 3 PM; Thursdays, 9:15 to 11 a.m. (N-007, Nyvall basement)

Course Identification
Course Number: THEO5140
Course Name: Theologies of Disability, Church, and Sacrament
Course Format: In-class (some online content; see below)
Course Location: TBD, Nyvall Hall
Class Times: Tuesdays and Thursdays, 8 – 9:15 AM
Prerequisites: THEO5110, Intro to Christian Theology

Course Description:
In this course, students will begin to construct their own theologies of disability, in creative dialogue with questions raised by significant historical and contemporary theologians. The course will explore the way that the sacraments of baptism and Holy Communion empower people of diverse abilities to be part of the church, and the ways that human bodies impact past and present Christologies, ecclesiologies, and eschatologies, as well as theologies of sin and theologies of the Holy Spirit. It will also investigate how our theologies of disability impact pastoral and theological questions of eroticism, physical violence, gender inequality, racism, and medical ethics. Students’ work will be assessed via weekly participation, short theological essays, a book-review, a brief accessibility audit, and an integrative essay. This course will follow NPTS’s grading-scale, and will attend carefully to the Seminary’s outcomes for Scripture, Tradition, and Worship.

Course Objectives for North Park Seminary Students:
General Academic Skills:
- Identify and interpret the Church’s mission to people of all body-types in terms of Covenant and systematic theologies.
- Analyze and interpret the relationships among Christian life, ministry, and theologies of disability, within Covenant theology.
- Examine historical and contemporary theologies of disability, in order to connect them to discourses concerning social justice, peace, environmental stewardship, and healing.
- Discuss contextual challenges to the bodies of human beings within the Church, and address those challenges using theological reflection and pastoral experience.
- Create and implement a brief accessibility audit of a Seminary space.
Guiding Questions for this Course:

How do we construct our theologies of disability, and whom do they benefit?
What is your understanding of ableism, and how does it shape your paradigm of people of diverse abilities?
What do inclusion, and an inclusive Church, look like?
What is the role of Jesus Christ in such a church?
How can the Church help people to give voice to their pain?

Required Books (rough page count: 400 pp.):

Required Online Readings (Canvas: rough page count: 710 pp.):
- Yong, Amos. *Theology and Down Syndrome: Reimaging Disability in Late Modernity* (Waco: Baylor, 2007), excerpts (chapters 1, 3, 8, and 9).
**Recommended (but NOT REQUIRED) Reading:**


**Course Method and Evaluation:**

In-class lectures (the lecture notes will be made available online); classroom discussion and in-class pastoral integrative exercises; two short essays; one accessibility audit; one book-review; one integrative essay.

**Short Paper: A Personal Theology of Disability**

January 21st, 2020

Using the Guiding Questions provided within this syllabus as a guide, explain your personal theology of disability in 450-500 words. Write as concisely and effectively as possible! This paper does not require outside research: you need not consult any sources outside of your own understanding of your body and its relation to theological reflection. This paper is meant to help you voice your convictions about your body as a foundation for your in-class learning.

For your reference, the Guiding Questions are:

1. How do we construct our theologies of disability, and whom do they benefit?
2. What is your understanding of ableism, and how does it shape your paradigm of people of diverse abilities?
3. What do inclusion, and an inclusive Church, look like?
4. What is the role of Jesus Christ in such a church?
5. How can the Church help people to give voice to their pain?

| Exemplary (2.25-2.5 pts) | Competent (2 – 2.25 pts) | Developing (less than 2) |
Clarity: Guiding Questions fully integrated; sentences and paragraphs logically connected

Clarity: some Guiding Questions partly integrated; most sentences and paragraphs logically connected

Clarity: Guiding Questions not well (or not at all) integrated; no clear transitions in writing; most sentences and paragraphs not logically connected

Compassion: writer embraces disability as evidence of God’s diversity

Compassion: writer acknowledges disability as aspect of diversity; presents personal theology of disability partially

Compassion: writer does not acknowledge disability as part of diversity; personal theology of disability unclear

Consciousness / Self-Reflection: author demonstrates self-awareness of many areas of bias or prejudice, and explains biases clearly

Consciousness / Self-Reflection: author demonstrates some self-awareness concerning specific areas of bias, and can explain parts of prejudice

Consciousness / Self-Reflection: author does not offer personal view, or offers same without acknowledging personal bias

Composition: sentences and paragraphs flow together well; paper articulates view of disability with care; paper within word word-limit(s)

Composition: most sentences and paragraphs flow together; paper makes point about disability; paper mostly within word-limit(s)

Composition: sentences and paragraphs do not flow together well; point of paper unclear; paper significantly longer or shorter than word-limit(s)

Weight: 10% of final grade.

**Short Paper: A Revised Theology of the Body**

February 11th, 2020

Continuing to use the Guiding Questions, while also reflecting on the readings we’ve done in class, set out your revised theology of disability in 450-500 words. Again, be as concise and to the point as you can be! Discuss how your views have stayed the same, changed, expanded, become clearer, and so on, in the last couple weeks. While you need not consult your first paper to complete this exercise, please keep it in your mind. Again, this paper is meant to help you in your reflection on your theology of disability.

**This paper requires** no outside research. **Again, the Guiding Questions are:**

6. How do we construct our theologies of disability, and whom do they benefit?
7. What is your understanding of ableism, and how does it shape your paradigm of people of diverse abilities?
8. What do inclusion, and an inclusive Church, look like?
9. What is the role of Jesus Christ in such a church?
10. How can the Church help people to give voice to their pain?

**Second Theology of Disability Reflection Paper Rubric:**

<p>| Exemplary (up to 3 pts) | Competent (2.4 – 2.7 pts) | Developing (less than 2.4 pts) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity (2.7 – 3 pts): Guiding Questions used as guide; sentences and paragraphs logically connected</th>
<th>Clarity (2.4 – 2.7 pts): some Guiding Questions used as signposts to guide reading; most sentences and paragraphs logically connected</th>
<th>Clarity (less than 2.4 pts): Guiding Questions little used or unused; no clear transitions in writing; most sentences and paragraphs not logically connected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compassion: writer embraces disability as evidence of God’s diversity; presents personal theology of disability in unique light</td>
<td>Compassion: writer acknowledges disability as aspect of diversity; presents personal theology of disability only partially</td>
<td>Compassion: writer does not acknowledge disability as part of diversity; personal theology of disability unclear, or presented as derivation from elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness / Self-Reflection: author assesses personal views of disability without judgment or bias</td>
<td>Consciousness / Self-Reflection: author offers personal views on disability with some judgment or bias</td>
<td>Consciousness / Self-Reflection: author does not offer personal view of disability, or offers same without understanding personal bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection: writer builds on previous paper, reflecting clearly on prior concept of disability</td>
<td>Reflection: writer connects previous paper to present paper, with some connection between both</td>
<td>Reflection: writer does not connect previous paper to this one, or does so in unclear ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition: sentences and paragraphs flow together well; paper articulates view of disability with care</td>
<td>Composition: most sentences and paragraphs flow together; paper explains view of disability</td>
<td>Composition: sentences and paragraphs do not flow together well; view of disability unclear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weight: 15% of final grade.

**Book Review**

- In 1200-1500 words, review one of the following four books, some copies of which will be placed on course reserve at the library:
  - Kathy Black’s *Healing Homiletic: Preaching and Disability,*
  - Jennie Weiss Block’s *Copious Hosting: a Theology of Access for People with Disabilities,*
  - Molly C. Haslam’s *Constructive Theology of Intellectual Disability: Human Being as Mutuality and Response,* or
  - Jean Vanier’s *Becoming Human.*
- For clarity’s sake: you may not choose a book to review outside this list.
- Please choose the book that you are most interested in reviewing. Which book helps you to engage the course-readings and discussions? The following criteria will guide evaluation:
  a. Has the student demonstrated a solid grasp of the author’s core argument?
  b. Does the student discuss the book’s important themes and/or parts?
c. Does the student critically and generously engage the author’s argument, and does the student use the course-materials to interact with that argument?

d. Does the student ask, and answer, critical questions concerning the author’s position?

The basic outline of a book review has three components:

A. Your summary of the author’s argument;

B. Your brief use of other sources to complement the author’s position;

C. Your very brief addition of your own thoughts about the author’s claims.

Put it this way: tell me what s/he thinks about theologies of disability, and outline his/her argument; tell me what others might add to his/her argument; and then, and only then, tell me what you think of what you’ve read.

If you have questions, please come see me, or write me an email.

Book Review Assignment Rubric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Exemplary (4.5 – 5 pts)</th>
<th>Competent (4 – 4.5 pts)</th>
<th>Developing (fewer than 4 pts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Argument</td>
<td>Student explains author’s thesis and argument clearly, with reference to other parts of text</td>
<td>Student explains parts of author’s thesis and argument somewhat clearly, with some possible reference to other parts of text</td>
<td>Student explains author’s thesis and argument with little clarity, and/or misses parts of text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes and Parts</td>
<td>Student integrates author’s major themes well, and writing flows well from section to section</td>
<td>Student understands most or all of author’s major themes, and writing flows well</td>
<td>Student comprehends very few, if any, major themes or parts of text, and/or no flow to writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Appraisal</td>
<td>Student engages author with evident charity, and uses course-materials to interact with argument</td>
<td>Student engages author with some charity, and uses some course-materials to interact with argument</td>
<td>Student engages author with little charity or generosity, and/or rarely uses course-materials to interact with argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Questions</td>
<td>Student shows how s/he would transform or improve author’s argument with grace and clarity</td>
<td>Student shows how s/he would transform author’s argument, with some clarity</td>
<td>Student does not show, or shows very unclearly, how s/he would transform or improve author’s argument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weight: 20% of final grade.

Accessibility Audit of Isaacson Chapel, with Paper

Paper DUE on April 28th!!
In mid-April 2020, the class will be taking a “field trip” to Isaacson Chapel to assess some of its physical features, including: is the space level? Which areas are wide enough for wheelchair access? How wide are the doorways? What is the light quality? How are the acoustics, in light of people with low aural capacity? How would people with autism, intellectual disabilities, and mental-health needs integrate into this space?

After that ninety-minute long field trip, students will reflect on their discoveries, and—in conjunction with class discussions and readings—will produce a paper of 750 to 1500 words, describing their engagement with the following questions (again, in light of the course readings):

a. What about Isaacson makes you feel at home? That is, which features are accessible (4 pts)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.6 - 4 pts</th>
<th>3.2 – 3.6 pts</th>
<th>Fewer than 3.2 pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student writes about accessibility and comfort of space easily and well; paper displays no typographical errors; paper integrates numerous course readings at appropriate times; student understands access intuitively.</td>
<td>Student engages with comfort/accessibility of space with ease and at some depth; paper displays few or no typos or grammatical errors; student engages some readings; student mostly grasps concept of access.</td>
<td>Student writes in ambiguous ways about comfort or accessibility of space; unclear grammar and spelling errors evident; student uses few or no readings to engage with accessibility of space; student misunderstands, or misuses, concept of accessibility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Which parts of the chapel would likely provide difficulties for people with multiple disabilities, including blindness/low visual acuity, D/deafness or low aural acuity, mobility issues (e.g., cerebral palsy, Parkinson’s), autism and other sensory processing disabilities, intellectual disabilities other than autism, dementia, and/or mental-health needs such as anxiety and depression (4 pts)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.6 - 4 pts</th>
<th>3.2 – 3.6 pts</th>
<th>Fewer than 3.2 pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student writes about navigable difficulties of space easily and well; paper displays no typographical errors; paper integrates numerous course readings at appropriate times; student understands navigable difficulties of space intuitively.</td>
<td>Student engages with navigable difficulties of space with ease and at some depth; paper displays few or no typos or grammatical errors; student engages some readings; student mostly grasps concept of difficulties or roadblocks en route to access.</td>
<td>Student writes in ambiguous ways about navigable difficulties of space; unclear grammar and spelling errors evident; student uses few or no readings to engage with difficulties of space; student misunderstands difficulties faced by people with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Which parts are inaccessible to those people described above (4 pts)?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.6 - 4 pts</th>
<th>3.2 – 3.6 pts</th>
<th>Fewer than 3.2 pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student writes about inaccessible parts of space easily and well; paper displays no typographical errors; paper integrates numerous course readings at appropriate times; student understands significance of multiple barriers to access intuitively.</td>
<td>Student engages with inaccessible parts of space with ease and at some depth; paper displays few or no typos or grammatical errors; student engages some readings; student mostly grasps significance of multiple barriers to access.</td>
<td>Student writes in ambiguous ways about inaccessible parts of space; unclear grammar and spelling errors evident; student uses few or no readings to engage with inaccessible parts of space; student misunderstands significance of multiple barriers to access.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.7 – 3 pts</th>
<th>2.4 – 2.7 pts</th>
<th>Fewer than 2.4 pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student writes about transformation of given space easily and well; paper displays no typographical errors; paper integrates numerous course readings at appropriate times; student understands significance of transformative access intuitively.</td>
<td>Student engages with transformation of given space with ease and at some depth; paper displays few or no typos or grammatical errors; student engages some readings; student mostly grasps significance of transformative access.</td>
<td>Student writes in ambiguous ways about transformation of given space; unclear grammar and spelling errors evident; student uses few or no readings to engage with proposed transformation of space; student misunderstands significance of transformative access.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. Therefore, what would you change about Isaacson if you could? Why? (3 pts)

Weight: 15% of final grade.

**Integrative Paper**

**April 21st, 2020**

In 2250-2500 words (roughly, ten to twelve pages), please describe your revised theology of disability at length, using as your basis a part of the Christian tradition with which you substantially agree. Make your argument for your theology of disability based on:

A. **The course readings**, with substantive and clear reference to texts from the course (here you must show the professor that you understand the history of ideas related to your chosen/developed theology of disability).

**This part means this: based on the reading you’ve done…**

- How does your theology of disability relate to the concept of ableism?
- How does your theology relate to inclusion, and an ecclesiology of disability?
- How does your embodied theology impinge on, or embrace, intellectual disability?
- How does your theology of disability incorporate Jesus, and/or the sacraments?
- In what ways does your embodied theology address issues of lament and healing?
- How does your theology of the body relate to an embodied eschatology?

B. The book you have chosen for review. The same sort of criteria apply here as in the bullets above. How does your theology of disability relate (or not) to the views of the author in question?

While no additional research outside these crucial sources is necessary, it is both permitted and most welcome. Please consult the professor should you wish to do additional research. This paper absolutely must contain a thesis, argument, and conclusion, use proper reference-technique, and append a bibliography.

I shall mark this integrative essay compassionately, in light of the presence of the following five criteria:

- **Charity**: how well do you integrate the views of those with whom you disagree, as you argue for your theology in this persuasive essay? (up to 6 pts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.4 - 6 pts</th>
<th>4.8 – 5.4 pts</th>
<th>Below 4.8 pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper displays very clear integration of sources; student clearly and simply states opposing arguments, and strives to integrate even disagreeing views into paper.</td>
<td>Paper engages several sources, and displays some charity towards interlocutors, especially those with whom student disagrees; arguments fairly represented.</td>
<td>Paper does not engage sources, or engages few; little or no compassion displayed towards those with whom paper disagrees; arguments unfairly represented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Consciousness / Self-Reflection**: how vulnerable are you as you address your own view of disability, and how open to the transformation of that view will you be? (6 pts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.4 - 6 pts</th>
<th>4.8 – 5.4 pts</th>
<th>Below 4.8 pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper displays very clear integration of personal experiences; paper dedicated to change in ableist structures; argument cites multiple sources for disability theology outside medical model.</td>
<td>Paper displays some integration of personal experience; paper’s argument open to change relative to beginning of class. Paper includes several views of disability outside medical model.</td>
<td>Paper indicates little or no integration of personal experience with disability; paper argues rigidly, or view very little changed from beginning of class; paper integrates no or few accounts of disability outside the medical model.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Course Content**: how well do you tie your own experience, and your personal theology of disability, to the things you’ve learned in the course? (up to 6 pts)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.4 - 6 pts</th>
<th>4.8 – 5.4 pts</th>
<th>Below 4.8 pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper displays very clear integration of course resources (readings and lectures); paper integrates methods of theologies of disability; argument cites multiple sources from course materials.</td>
<td>Paper displays some integration of course resources. Paper uses, but may not fully integrate methods of theology of disability. Argument cites sources from course materials.</td>
<td>Paper indicates little or no integration of course resources; paper does not integrates methods of theologies of disability; argument cites few or no course materials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Creativity:** How willing, and able, are you to colour a little outside the lines as you reflect on an embodied theology? (up to 6 pts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.4 - 6 pts</th>
<th>4.8 – 5.4 pts</th>
<th>Below 4.8 pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper displays very clear integration of strategies to integrate disability as embodied difference; argument and reflection demonstrate student’s desire to contribute to end of ableism.</td>
<td>Paper displays some desire to integrate strategies that include disability as embodied difference; most arguments and reflections emerge from transformed biases vis-à-vis disability.</td>
<td>Paper demonstrates little or no desire to integrate strategies that integrate disability as an embodied difference; reflections on ecclesial and other structures continue to reflect ableist bias.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Composition (up to 6 pts):** can I tell that these are clear sentences? Can I demarcate the parts of your argument, and can you use rhetoric in not only clear but constructive ways? Have you, in fact, argued a clear thesis, and written an argument with beginning, middle, and end? (4 pts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.4 – 6 pts</th>
<th>4.8 – 5.4 pts</th>
<th>Below 4.8 pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most or all sentences and paragraphs flow together; writing demonstrates high degree of logical integration, if not mastery of subject; argument thoroughly logical, and premises begin and end in sequence. Argument very clearly connected to class experiences and readings; paper shows clear command of subject material and flows well.</td>
<td>Most sentences clear and linked together; sentences and paragraphs demonstrate logical structure of paper; argument clearly begins and ends. Argument mostly connected to class experiences and readings; paper exhibits clear and consistent flow; some specific sections discernible intro and conclusion.</td>
<td>Some or most sentences unclear; sentences and paragraphs do not reflect logical structure; unclear thesis, or thesis not discernible; hard to see where argument starts and ends. Argument mostly feels disconnected from class experiences and readings; paper does not flow well, or displays little integration; no or few sections, to break up thought; no discernible introduction or conclusion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
That’s it. Show me how well you can write, and how creative you can be. May the odds be ever in your favour!

Weight of Integrative Paper: 30% of final grade.

**Participation (10% of final grade):**

The shared learning-experiences of this class depend on each learner’s fullest participation (that includes your professor!). That said, “participation” means not simply the frequency with which one talks in a classroom setting, but how one’s discourse adds to the classroom’s culture. This mark will be twofold. Half of it (5%) will depend on your writing me the 3-2-1 reflective essays, which have their own rubric.

…and half of this mark (so, 5%) depends on your active participation in on-site class experiences. As you interact with your classmates in real-time, and as you write your essays, please reflect: have you engaged the texts for the day deeply, hospitably, and critically? Are you trying to broaden your classmates’ horizons? Are you listening to, respecting, and engaging with the ideas of your colleagues, and helping your colleagues to examine their own areas of inquiry? Are you willing to ask for help when you don’t know how to engage with an idea or argument? Rightness is only one (small) facet of courteous conversation.

Should you have questions, I’m happy to talk or write with you about that.

Rubric for Participation Marks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance (4.5 - 5 points): the student is almost always in class! Awesome!</td>
<td>Attendance (4 – 4.5 pts): the student is regularly in class! Wicked.</td>
<td>Attendance (fewer than 4 pts): the student is not often, or not usually, in class. We need to talk!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions (2.25 – 2.5 pts): student frequently engages with class material by asking clear and critical questions</td>
<td>Questions (2 – 2.25 pts): student often asks clear questions on class material</td>
<td>Questions (fewer than 2 pts): student does not usually ask questions of class material, or does so unclearly. Are they doing the readings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity (2.25 – 2.5 pts): student engages compassionately with classmates in class settings</td>
<td>Charity (2 – 2.25 pts): student usually evinces compassion with classmates in class settings</td>
<td>Charity (less than 2 pts): student infrequently or never shows compassion to classmates in class settings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5% of your participation mark depends on an **800-word-minimum** reflective paper, due every two weeks of class until April 4th, on Canvas, at class-time. These reflective essays will obey the following “3-2-1” rubric:

- **3 things I learned from lecture/class time on a specific range of topics:**
  1. (150 words min.)
  2. (150 words min.)
  3. (150 words min.)
• 2 things you read from textbooks that connected to something discussed in class:
  1. (150 words min.)
  2. (150 words min.)

• 1 new question I have:

• The 3-2-1 essays will be broken down as follows:
  • The first essay, due on January 23rd, will engage issues of ableism, from either of the first two classes;
  • The second essay, due on February 13th, will engage any issues related to Vanier and intellectual disability;
  • The third essay, due on February 27th, will concern either the student’s reflections on issues of euthanasia, or the student’s understanding of Jesus’ place in an ecclesiology of disability;
  • The fourth essay, due on March 19th, will engage with either the place of the sacraments in an ecclesiology of disability, or the place of lament in such an ecclesiology
  • …and the fifth and final essay, due on April 2nd, must deal with either the student’s understanding of healing in light of an ecclesiology of disability, or the student’s understanding of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Grading System:
*Grade percentages operate as follows: A (93+), A- (90-92.9), B+ (87-89.9), B (83-86.9), B- (80-82.9), and so on.

Late Work: Graduate students at this University are expected to hand in assignments by the date given in the course outline. Again, this means a loss of a letter-grade per day late (A becomes A-, A- becomes B+, B+ become B…). This penalty is not applied to students with medical or compassionate difficulties; students facing such difficulties are kindly requested to consult with their faculty advisor or academic dean, who should make a recommendation on the matter to the instructor. The absolute deadline for the course is the examination day scheduled for the course.

All papers are to be submitted electronically, on Canvas or directly to the professor (mawalker@northpark.edu) on the day that they are due. Papers must be sent as a .doc or .docx file from a North Park email address (absolutely not as PDF or RTF files, and not from a personal email address). Papers should contain numbered pages, and be doubled-spaced. Please note this course’s late policy: approval for an assignment extension must be obtained at least 48 hours before that assignment’s due-date; otherwise, papers will face a deduction of one-third of a letter-grade each day (that is, A becomes A-, B+ becomes B). Extensions are granted only in emergency situations; computer or device issues do NOT constitute an emergency.

OTHER POLICIES
ACCESSIBILITY STATEMENT
North Park is committed to creating an inclusive learning environment. If you anticipate or experience any barriers to learning in this class related to a disability, contact the Center for
Student Engagement by email at ada@northpark.edu or phone at 773-244-5737 to schedule an appointment with the Disability Access Specialist. You can also stop by the Center for Student Engagement, located on the first floor of the Johnson Center.

**TITLE IX**

Students who believe they have been harassed, discriminated against, or involved in sexual violence should contact the Title IX Coordinator (773-244-6276 or TitleIX@northpark.edu) for information about reporting, campus resources and support services, including confidential counseling services.

As members of the North Park faculty, we are concerned about the well-being and development of our students and are available to discuss any concerns. Faculty are legally obligated to share information with the University’s Title IX coordinator in certain situations to help ensure that the student’s safety and welfare is being addressed, consistent with the requirements of the law. These disclosures include but are not limited to reports of sexual assault, relational/domestic violence, and stalking.

Please refer to North Park’s Safe Community site for reporting, contact information and further details, at [http://www.northpark.edu/Campus-Life-and-Services/Safe-Community](http://www.northpark.edu/Campus-Life-and-Services/Safe-Community).

**ACADEMIC HONESTY**

In accordance with our Christian heritage and commitment, North Park University is committed to the highest possible ethical and moral standards. Just as we will constantly strive to live up to these high standards, we expect our students to do the same. To that end, cheating of any sort will not be tolerated. Students who are discovered cheating will receive a failing grade on the assignment and are subject to discipline up to and including failure of a course and expulsion.

*Our definition of cheating includes but is not limited to:*  
- Plagiarism – the use of another’s work as one’s own without giving credit to the individual. This includes using materials from the Internet.  
- Copying another’s answers on an examination.  
- Deliberately allowing another to copy one’s answers or work.  
- Signing an attendance roster for another who is not present.

For additional information, see the [Seminary Academic Catalog](http://www.northpark.edu/Campus-Life-and-Services/Safe-Community), pp. 25–27.

**Back-up copies.** Please make back-up copies of assignments before handing them in.

**Obligation to check email.** At times, the course instructor may decide to send out important course information by email. To that end, all students are required to have a valid North Park email address. Students must have set up a North Park email address which is entered into Canvas and WebAdvisor. Information concerning information technology is available through the Centre for Online Education. Students should check their North Park email regularly for messages about the course. Forwarding your North Park email to a Hotmail, Gmail, Yahoo or other type of email account is not advisable. In some cases, messages from North Park addresses sent to Hotmail, Gmail or Yahoo accounts are filtered as junk mail, which means that emails from your course instructor may end up in your spam or junk mail folder.

**Email communication with the course instructor.** The professor aims to respond to email communications from students in a timely manner. All email communications from students
should be sent from a North Park email address. Email communications from other email addresses are not secure, and also the instructor cannot readily identify them as being legitimate emails from students. The professor is not obliged to respond to email from non-NPU addresses. The instructor will seek to respond to any email in a timely fashion during the work week (Monday through Friday). Emails sent on the weekend may be replied to during the next workweek.

Course Website(s)
Canvas: https://northpark.instructure.com
This course uses Canvas, North Park’s learning-management system. To access it, go to the website above, and login using your North Park and password. Once you have logged in to the portal using your username and password, look for the My Courses module, where you’ll find the link to the website for all your Canvas-based courses. (Your course registration through WebAdvisor gives you access to the course website at Canvas.) Students who have trouble accessing Canvas should ask their professor for further help.

Weekly Schedule:
Week One:
January 14th, 2020: Welcome to the Course! Reading syllabus; talking about hopes, dreams, and expectations for the class. What is ableism?
January 16th, 2020: How do we construct our theologies of disability? Whom do our theologies of disability benefit? Note: no readings during this week.

Week Two:
January 23rd, 2020: Shame and Exclusion, Part Two: How do we define inclusion in an accessible Church? What does the ecclesiology of an inclusive church look like? Please read for January 21st: Reynolds ch. 1; Canvas: Betcher, Introduction. 3-2-1 #1 DUE on 23rd!


Week Three:
February 4th and 6th: the Place of People with Intellectual Disabilities, Part One. What does inclusion look like for people with intellectual disabilities in particular? How can the Church become more “heart” and less “head”? Please read for February 4th: Vanier, Becoming Human chs. 1-3, Reynolds ch. 2; Canvas: Yong, chapter 2

Week Four:
February 11th and 13th: Intellectual Disabilities, Part Two: L’Arche as exemplar. This session will examine Jean Vanier’s idealistic group of global communities integrating intellectual and physical disability. How do L’Arche communities contribute to our growing theologies of disability? Please read: Reynolds ch. 4; Vanier, Becoming Human chs. 4-7; Canvas: Calvin. Short Paper #2 DUE Feb. 11th! 3-2-1 #2 DUE February 13th!
Week Five:
**February 18th and 20th**: Euthanasia. What are some ecclesial stances on assisted deaths, or “mercy killing”? Please read: Canvas: Yong, chapter 3; Bonhoeffer.

Week Six:
**February 25th and 27th**: Contextualizing Jesus. What promise does Jesus hold for human beings who have varied abilities? A Christology of disability. Please read: Reynolds ch. 5; Canvas: Eiesland chapter 5; Nakashima Brock. 3-2-1 #3 DUE February 27th!

Week Seven:
**March 3rd and 5th**: the Place of the Sacraments. What do they do? What kind of communities are we trying to form around these rituals? Please (re)read for March 3rd: Canvas: Eiesland chs. 5 and 6; Smith; White; Weborg. **Book review due March 3rd!**

March 9th – 13th: Reading Week! No classes!

Week Eight:
**March 17th and 19th**: the Ecclesial Place of Lament. What does it mean for human beings to cry out to God, and their community, in pain? How can we the Church help that to happen? What part does the sacrament of Holy Communion play in the amelioration of lament? Please read: Canvas: Swinton, chapter 6. Book review due March 17th! **3-2-1 #4 DUE March 19th!**

Week Nine:
**March 24th and 26th**: Healing. What does it mean for human beings with different abilities to want healing? Should healing and normalization mean conformity? How do the sacraments aid us in our longing for healing? Please read: Canvas: Swinton, ch. 4; Yong, chapter 8.

Week Ten:
**March 31st and April 2nd**: the State of the Question: the ADA 1991-2019. What is the Americans with Disabilities Act? How does it apply to the Covenant? How is the Act enforced, or not, today? Please read: Canvas: Shapiro, chapters 2 and 10. **3-2-1 #5 DUE April 2nd!**

Week Eleven:
**April 7th and 9th**: Embodied Eschatology. What does it mean for us to be part of tikkun olam, or world-repair? How can a Church inclusive of disability promote glimpses of God’s Reign? Please read: Reynolds ch. 7; Canvas: Yong chapter 9, esp. pp. 270-95.

Week Twelve:
**April 14th and 16th**: Inclusive Design. What would a church sanctuary constructed with diverse bodies in mind look like? Field Trip to Isaacson Chapel. Please read: Canvas: Shapiro, ch. 5; Lathrop, ch. 5.

Week Thirteen:
**April 21st**: Part One: Debrief of Inclusive Design Field Trip (21st). What have we learned about our physical spaces? How can we apply it to our experiences in life and ministry within the Covenant? Part Two: Disability Pride! What is “disability pride”? How can we create an
inclusive culture here at North Park? Please read: Canvas: Charlton. Reminder: **integrative papers April 21st! NO CLASS on April 23rd**, because of **Nyvall Lecture**.

**Week Fourteen:**
**April 28th and 30th:** That’s a Wrap. What have we learned in this class? How can we apply these lessons about the church as a community to our lives and congregations? No readings. **Accessibility Audit of Isaacson DUE on Canvas on April 28th!**