



THEO 653 Theology of Christ and Reconciliation Winter 2025

Professor: Joel Houston, PhD
Email: jhouston@briercrest.ca
Phone: 306.801.6457
Course Dates: February 17-21, 2025
Course Delivery Method: In-Person Modular

3 Credit Hours

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course examines the person and work of Jesus Christ as the centre of Christian life, faith, and experience. In conversation with historic and current theological literature, the course will outline how the biblical pattern of Christ's birth, life, death, resurrection, and ascension, Jesus Christ reconciles fallen sinners with the Father in the Spirit. Special attention may be given to one or more doctrines such as election, adoption, regeneration, atonement, justification, sanctification, or glorification.

COURSE INTEGRATION

"Who do people say the Son of Man is"? Jesus's beguilingly simple question to Peter (Matt 16:13) is as timely today as it was when the query was first posed. Who, indeed, is the Son of Man, and what was the nature of his ministry? Peter and the Scriptural witness affirm: Jesus is "the Christ, the son of the living God" who "came to seek and save the lost." These pithy statements form the core of what would become two millennia of reflection on the person and work of Jesus Christ.

This course, therefore, seeks to construct a robust Christology from the perspective of the Protestant Evangelical tradition. Special attention will be given to understanding the Scriptural witness of the person and work of Christ, and especially, a biblically justifiable and theologically charitable account of the atonement.

This course also maintains a special interest in the way in which Christology remains a lively and ubiquitous aspect of nearly all aspects of the human experience. The person of Christ "haunts" the arts, humanities, and sciences—indeed, the natural world itself (as G.M. Hopkins stated, "Christ plays in 10,000 places"). Applying the tools of exegetical and theological reflection, this course will seek to uncover the way Christology, almost uniquely, extends beyond the boundaries of traditional systematic theology.

COURSE TEXTS

Ortlund, Dane C. *Gentle and Lowly: The Heart of Christ for Sinners and Sufferers*. Illinois: Crossway, 2020.

O'Connor, Flannery. *The Complete Stories*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1971. [Selected short stories only].

Rutledge, Fleming. *The Crucifixion: Understanding the Death of Jesus Christ*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017.

Selected Articles Available on Canvas

Students are expected to refer to Briercrest Seminary's Format and Style Guides and Guide for Writing Research Papers, available as PDF documents here: <https://www.mybriercrest.ca/seminary/documents/>.

These texts are available in store and online at the Briercrest Bookstore: <http://briercrest.ca/bookstore>.

Students are responsible for course materials and communication on Canvas (<https://briercrest.instructure.com>) and their myBriercrest.ca email account.

COURSE OUTCOMES

Students will...

- 1) Be able to articulate the tenets of an exegetically sound and theologically defensible Christology from the perspective of orthodox Christianity.
- 2) Understand the importance of the Chalcedonian definition of the person of Christ while considering historic and contemporary challenges.
- 3) Appreciate the way in which Christology has exerted, and continues to exert, a profound influence across diverse disciplines, cultures, and theologies.
- 4) Develop strategies to apply key insights concerning the person and work of Christ to contemporary circumstances including preaching, teaching, evangelism, and scholarship.
- 5) Gain insight into the historical development of Christology through the ages and how seminal thinkers in the Christian tradition have contributed to this growth and development.

COURSE OUTLINE AND CONTENT

A comprehensive course schedule with lecture subjects and provisional content will be posted on Canvas by **1 February 2025**.

ASSIGNMENTS

Pre-Course Assignments:

Synthesized Reading Precis, Critique and Reflection – 30%

Students will read Rutledge, *The Crucifixion*, Ortlund, *Gentle and Lowly*, and the following short stories from O'Connor's *Complete Stories*:

- "Parker's Back"
- "A Good Man is Hard to Find"
- "Revelation"

- "The River"
- "The Life you Save May Be Your Own"
- "Greenleaf"¹

Following from these readings, students will write a **6-page** synthesized reading response. The response should include the following elements: a clear understanding of the contents of the work (which may include summative portions, but should not simply be a 6 page summary), a word of critique as to the strengths and weaknesses of the various works, and finally a personal reflection as to which works were most significant for the student and why (note that, of course, it may simply be portions of certain works, as opposed to the entirety). Even distribution for each of the three works should be given, so ample planning should accompany the writing of this paper. Excellent papers will avoid over-long summaries, use page-specific citations, employ thoughtful and nuanced criticism, and evidence careful reflection and integration of the three works.

Rubric: Synthesized Reading Precis, Critique, and Reflection

Understanding and Synthesis of Readings

- **Excellent (A):** Demonstrates a deep and nuanced understanding of all assigned works. Successfully integrates key themes and ideas across Rutledge, Ortlund, and O'Connor's short stories. Summative portions are clear but concise, avoiding excessive summary. Thoughtfully connects elements from each work.
- **Proficient (B):** Displays a solid understanding of the works, with some synthesis across texts. Summative sections are present but may be uneven in clarity or length. Some connections between the works may be underdeveloped.
- **Satisfactory (C):** Demonstrates a basic understanding of the readings, though connections between texts are minimal or unclear. Some sections may rely too heavily on summary.
- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** Shows limited or incorrect understanding of the works. Summative content dominates the paper with little evidence of synthesis or thoughtful engagement.

Critique of Strengths and Weaknesses (25%)

- **Excellent (A):** Offers thoughtful and balanced critique of each work, addressing strengths and weaknesses with nuance. Criticism is insightful, well-reasoned, and supported by specific examples from the texts.
- **Proficient (B):** Provides a meaningful critique, though some points could be more fully developed or supported. Criticism is generally fair and relevant.
- **Satisfactory (C):** Critique is present but shallow, with limited insight or support. Some sections may be overly general or imbalanced.
- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** Critique is minimal, unclear, or missing. Points are poorly reasoned or lack support from the texts.

¹As an instructor, I take seriously my role in creating a hospitable classroom environment and protecting the "conscience rights" of students. O'Connor's short stories can be a difficult read. Flannery O'Connor (1925-64) wrote within the context of the American South. O'Connor consistently offered a scathing critique of the overt racism that permeated her society and did so (in part) by representing the South as it was: complete with violence, racial slurs, and through the depiction of race relations that some readers may find unjustified, uncomfortable, or offensive. The inclusion of this source *is not an endorsement of its content or language*. If you would like a substitute reading for this assignment, [please do not hesitate to ask](#).

Personal Reflection (20%)

- **Excellent (A):** Engages deeply with the texts through personal reflection, clearly explaining which works or portions were most significant and why. Reflection shows evidence of integration between course themes and the student's own thoughts or experiences.
- **Proficient (B):** Reflection is thoughtful, though some insights could be more fully developed. There is some integration of course themes, though connections may be less explicit.
- **Satisfactory (C):** Reflection is present but superficial, with limited personal engagement or connection to course themes.
- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** Reflection is minimal or absent. Fails to demonstrate personal engagement with the readings.

Organization and Clarity (15%)

- **Excellent (A):** The paper is well-organized, with a clear structure that balances synthesis, critique, and reflection. Transitions between sections are smooth, and ideas are presented coherently.
- **Proficient (B):** The structure is generally clear, though some sections may lack flow or balance. Minor issues with transitions or clarity may be present.
- **Satisfactory (C):** The paper is somewhat disorganized, affecting clarity. Transitions are weak, and the flow of ideas may be unclear.
- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** The paper lacks organization and coherence. Ideas are disjointed, and the structure is difficult to follow.

Use of Citations and Textual Evidence (10%)

- **Excellent (A):** Consistently uses specific, page-referenced citations to support points. Textual evidence is well-integrated into the paper, demonstrating engagement with the material.
- **Proficient (B):** Uses citations appropriately, though some points could benefit from more specific references. Integration of textual evidence is generally effective.
- **Satisfactory (C):** Uses minimal or inconsistent citations. Some textual evidence may be poorly integrated or insufficient to support points.
- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** Citations are missing or incorrect. Little to no textual evidence is provided to support arguments.

Formatting and Length (10%)

- **Excellent (A):** Meets the 6-page length requirement and follows formatting guidelines (e.g., font, spacing, margins). Citations are accurate and properly formatted.
- **Proficient (B):** Meets the length requirement with minor deviations. Formatting is mostly correct, with only minor citation errors.
- **Satisfactory (C):** Falls short of the length requirement or has significant formatting issues. Citations may be inconsistent or incorrectly formatted.
- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** Does not meet the length requirement and/or has major formatting and citation issues.

Reading Precis, Critique, and Completion: February 17th, 2025

Mid-Course Assignments:

In-Class Presentation: Aspects of the Atonement – 25%

Students will, in groups corresponding to the total class number, present a perspective on the atonement and lead the class in a discussion. Students are expected to develop **seminar-level** presentations which include, but are not limited to, appropriate visuals (e.g. power-point), suitable handouts and appropriate facilitation of class interaction (suggestions for discussion, in-class activities, etc.).

Students will be evaluated for their ability to comprehensively account for the contents of their respective view of the atonement. Additionally, creativity and quality of presentation will account for the grade constitution. Groups will be selected by the instructor and announced via *Canvas*. **After the groups have been announced they are free to select one of the views of the atonement from the list below. Topics will be assigned on a “first come first served” basis.** A suitable presentation will run for 60 minutes of class time (groups should plan to give students a 5 minute stretch break in the middle of the presentation). Presentations should seek to cover the following:

- The essential understanding, or argument, of their respective view of the atonement.
- The scriptural and theological foundation for their view.
- Historic individuals (or denominations within the Christian tradition) that have formulated or advocated for the view.
- Theological or scriptural challenges to the view (or difficulties with the view).
- A personal assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the view.

Students may select one theory of the atonement from the list below:

- *Christus Victor*
- Penal Substitutionary Atonement
- Ransom
- Satisfaction
- Scapegoat
- Governmental
- Moral Influence

Other theories may be considered for presentation *but must be approved by the instructor in advance*. Students will submit their presentation materials to the instructor of record for final evaluation. These materials are **due on the day of presentation**. **Note well: students will need to begin this assignment well in advance of the module.**

Rubric: In-Class Presentation – Aspects of the Atonement

Comprehensive Understanding of the View (30%)

- **Excellent (A):** Thoroughly explains the essential understanding or argument of the chosen atonement view. Demonstrates a deep understanding of the topic, with clear, concise, and insightful explanations.
- **Proficient (B):** Provides a clear and accurate summary of the view, though some areas could be explored more deeply or precisely.
- **Satisfactory (C):** Covers the essential points, but the explanation lacks depth, clarity, or contains minor inaccuracies.

- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** Fails to explain the view adequately, or contains significant inaccuracies or misunderstandings.

Scriptural and Theological Foundations (20%)

- **Excellent (A):** Thoroughly identifies and explains the scriptural and theological foundations for the atonement view. Demonstrates strong engagement with relevant passages and doctrines.
- **Proficient (B):** Identifies appropriate scriptural and theological foundations, though some connections could be more fully developed or refined.
- **Satisfactory (C):** Mentions basic scriptural and theological foundations, but explanations lack depth or clarity.
- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** Inadequate or incorrect reference to scriptural and theological foundations.

Historic Figures and Traditions (15%)

- **Excellent (A):** Identifies and explains key historic figures, groups, or denominations that advocate for the view, with insightful historical context.
- **Proficient (B):** Provides relevant historical examples, though some figures or movements could be explored more deeply.
- **Satisfactory (C):** Mentions relevant individuals or groups, but lacks sufficient context or depth.
- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** Fails to mention or correctly identify relevant figures or movements.

Challenges and Criticism (15%)

- **Excellent (A):** Thoughtfully explores theological or scriptural challenges to the view, showing nuanced understanding of potential difficulties.
- **Proficient (B):** Identifies relevant challenges, though some could be more fully developed or discussed.
- **Satisfactory (C):** Mentions challenges but provides minimal or superficial engagement with them.
- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** Fails to mention significant challenges, or provides incorrect or irrelevant criticisms.

Personal Assessment (10%)

- **Excellent (A):** Provides a thoughtful and well-reasoned assessment of the view's strengths and weaknesses. Demonstrates critical thinking and personal engagement with the material.
- **Proficient (B):** Offers a solid personal assessment, though some insights could be further developed or refined.
- **Satisfactory (C):** Provides basic personal opinions, but lacks depth or nuance in assessment.
- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** Minimal or unclear personal assessment, with little critical engagement.

Presentation Delivery and Visuals (10%)

- **Excellent (A):** Presentation is engaging, polished, and well-organized. Effective use of visuals (e.g., PowerPoint) enhances the presentation. Delivery is clear and confident.

- **Proficient (B):** Presentation is mostly organized and engaging, though some sections may be less polished. Visuals are used effectively, with minor improvements needed.
- **Satisfactory (C):** Presentation is somewhat disorganized, and delivery is inconsistent. Visuals are present but could be better utilized or developed.
- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** Presentation lacks structure and clarity. Visuals are absent or poorly executed.

Class Interaction and Engagement (10%)

- **Excellent (A):** Facilitates class discussion effectively with thoughtful questions, in-class activities, or interactive elements. Encourages meaningful participation.
- **Proficient (B):** Provides solid opportunities for class interaction, though some activities or questions could be more engaging.
- **Satisfactory (C):** Some class interaction is present, but activities or questions are minimal or underdeveloped.
- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** Little to no class interaction, or attempts to engage the class are ineffective.

Submission of Materials (5%)

- **Excellent (A):** All presentation materials are submitted on time and meet expectations for quality and completeness.
- **Proficient (B):** Materials are submitted on time, with minor issues in completeness or quality.
- **Satisfactory (C):** Materials are submitted late or with noticeable gaps in quality or content.
- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** Materials are missing, incomplete, or significantly lacking in quality.

In-Class Presentations Due: Throughout the Week of February 17th—21st

Post-Course Assignments:

Who Cares About Heresy? – 15%

The first few centuries of the church were marked with a great many controversies surrounding both the Trinity, and the person and work of Jesus Christ. It can be difficult to appreciate why exactly it took so long to understand the nature of Christ and his ministry, and why there was such strident disagreement over seemingly insignificant points of doctrine.

Students will write a **4-page** paper that explains why understanding Christological heresies are important for today. Why should the contemporary believer care that Jesus “came in the flesh”? Does Christ have one will, or two (or more?!) and why does that matter? How does it affect faith and practice?

The focus of this work is *contemporary application*, not historical recollection. This is to say that the paper is decidedly not an exercise in detailing historical theology—rather, it is the measured, thoughtful *application of it*. Students are encouraged to select one, or perhaps two, significant Christological heresies and argue for the orthodox understanding today. Excellent papers will show a thorough understanding of the nature of the Christological heresy under investigation, the conditions that gave rise to the particular view, the danger that it poses to an orthodox understanding of Christ, and why the contemporary believer is better served by holding the orthodox confession.

Rubric: Christological Heresies and Contemporary Application Paper

Understanding of Christological Heresy

- **Excellent (A):** Demonstrates a thorough and nuanced understanding of the chosen heresy (or heresies), including the conditions that gave rise to it. Clearly explains the nature of the heretical view and why it deviates from orthodox Christology.
- **Proficient (B):** Shows a good understanding of the heresy, though some aspects of its development or nature could be more clearly articulated or expanded.
- **Satisfactory (C):** Provides a basic understanding, but key elements of the heresy's development or significance are unclear or underdeveloped.
- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** Demonstrates little understanding of the chosen heresy, with significant inaccuracies or omissions.

Contemporary Application and Relevance (30%)

- **Excellent (A):** Insightfully explains the relevance of the heresy to contemporary faith and practice. Argues persuasively for why believers today are better served by holding to the orthodox confession. Draws meaningful connections between doctrine and everyday faith.
- **Proficient (B):** Provides a solid discussion of the contemporary relevance, though some arguments could be more fully developed or connected to real-life application.
- **Satisfactory (C):** Mentions the relevance of the heresy but lacks depth or specific examples. The application to contemporary faith is present but underdeveloped.
- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** Provides little to no discussion of the heresy's relevance today, or arguments are weak and unclear.

Analysis of the Danger Posed by the Heresy (20%)

- **Excellent (A):** Clearly and thoughtfully explains the theological and practical dangers of the heresy for today's believer. Provides strong, well-supported arguments for why an orthodox view is necessary.
- **Proficient (B):** Identifies key dangers posed by the heresy, though some points could be more fully explored. Arguments are generally well-supported.
- **Satisfactory (C):** Mentions potential dangers but lacks depth or clarity. Arguments may be general or lack sufficient support.
- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** Fails to adequately address the dangers posed by the heresy, or arguments are unclear or unsupported.

Clarity, Organization, and Focus (10%)

- **Excellent (A):** The paper is well-organized, with a clear structure and logical flow. Each section builds on the previous one, and the argument is focused throughout. Writing is polished and precise.
- **Proficient (B):** The structure is generally clear, though some sections may be less organized or focused. Minor improvements in flow or clarity could strengthen the paper.
- **Satisfactory (C):** The paper is somewhat disorganized, affecting clarity and focus. Ideas are presented inconsistently or without logical flow.
- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** Lacks organization and focus. Ideas are jumbled and difficult to follow.

Use of Supporting Evidence and Citations (5%)

- **Excellent (A):** Integrates relevant theological sources, scriptural references, and scholarly works to support arguments. Citations are accurate and properly formatted.
- **Proficient (B):** Uses appropriate evidence, though some arguments could be better supported. Minor citation errors may be present.
- **Satisfactory (C):** Relies on limited or weak evidence. Citations are inconsistent or incorrectly formatted.
- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** Little to no use of supporting evidence. Citations are missing, incorrect, or insufficient.

Formatting and Length Requirements (5%)

- **Excellent (A):** Meets the 4-page requirement precisely and follows formatting guidelines (e.g., font, spacing, margins).
- **Proficient (B):** Meets the length requirement with minor deviations. Formatting is mostly correct with small errors.
- **Satisfactory (C):** Falls short of the length requirement or has significant formatting issues.
- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** Does not meet the length requirement and/or has major formatting issues.

"Who Cares About Heresy?" Paper Due: March 21st, 2025

Atonement Theology / Theological Christology Paper – 30%

Following the course, students will write an **8-page** paper on one of the following topics.

EITHER:

1. A position paper on the nature of the atonement.

OR

2. A paper that presents the Christology of a prominent theologian or theological movement (Liberation, Black, Queer, Marxist, etc.).

In the case of option 1 (the nature of the atonement) students are expected to not only advance the argument for the superior theory of the atonement, but also, must demonstrate *why* the theory advanced is superior (according to what criteria), and account for the way in which other theories interact with each other.

In the case of option 2 (Christology of a prominent theologian or movement), students must restrict the scope of their investigation to a particular aspect of Christology so as to ensure sufficient coverage of the topic in the paper. **Students must approve their topic with the instructor of record by February 21st, 2025**

Rubric: 8-Page Paper – Nature of the Atonement or Christology of a Theologian/Movement**Understanding and Depth of Topic**

- **Excellent (A):** Demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the chosen topic, whether it is the nature of the atonement or a specific Christological focus. Shows in-depth knowledge and insight into complex theological ideas.
- **Proficient (B):** Displays a solid understanding of the topic, though some aspects could be explored more deeply or thoroughly.

- **Satisfactory (C):** Provides a general understanding, but with some gaps or oversimplifications. Key concepts may be underdeveloped.
- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** Shows limited or superficial understanding, with significant errors or misunderstandings.

Argumentation and Analysis (For Option 1: Atonement Paper) (30%)

- **Excellent (A):** Advances a persuasive, well-supported argument for the superiority of the chosen atonement theory. Clearly explains the criteria used to determine superiority. Insightfully analyzes how different theories interact with or critique each other.
- **Proficient (B):** Provides a solid argument, though some areas could be more fully developed. Criteria for superiority are present but may lack precision. Interaction between theories is discussed but not fully explored.
- **Satisfactory (C):** Presents an argument, but it may lack depth, clarity, or sufficient support. Criteria for superiority are unclear or underdeveloped. Interaction between theories is minimally addressed.
- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** The argument is unclear, unsupported, or poorly reasoned. Fails to engage with other theories meaningfully.

Focused Exploration (For Option 2: Christology Paper) (30%)

- **Excellent (A):** Focuses clearly on a particular aspect of Christology, demonstrating a nuanced understanding of the theologian or movement. Engages deeply with relevant theological concepts and context.
- **Proficient (B):** Provides a well-focused exploration, though some elements could be further developed. The discussion remains within the scope but lacks some nuance.
- **Satisfactory (C):** The exploration is somewhat focused, but the scope may be too broad or lack depth. Important details are underdeveloped.
- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** The paper lacks focus and depth, with unclear or overly broad exploration of the topic.

Use of Supporting Evidence and Sources (20%)

- **Excellent (A):** Skillfully integrates theological sources, scripture, and scholarly works to support arguments. Demonstrates engagement with primary and secondary sources relevant to the topic.
- **Proficient (B):** Uses appropriate sources, though some areas could benefit from more or better-integrated evidence.
- **Satisfactory (C):** Relies on limited or uneven sources. Some evidence is insufficiently connected to the argument or topic.
- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** Uses little to no supporting evidence. Sources are irrelevant, incorrect, or missing.

Organization and Clarity (10%)

- **Excellent (A):** The paper is well-organized, with a logical structure and clear flow of ideas. Transitions between sections are smooth, and writing is precise and polished.
- **Proficient (B):** The structure is generally clear, though some sections could be more cohesive. Minor issues with flow or clarity.
- **Satisfactory (C):** Somewhat disorganized, affecting the flow of ideas. Transitions may be weak, and writing may lack precision.

- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** Lacks organization and clarity, making it difficult to follow the argument or narrative.

Formatting and Length (10%)

- **Excellent (A):** Meets the 8-page requirement precisely, following formatting guidelines (e.g., font, spacing, margins). Citations are accurate and properly formatted.
- **Proficient (B):** Meets the length requirement with minor deviations. Formatting is mostly correct, with small citation errors.
- **Satisfactory (C):** Falls slightly short of the length requirement or has significant formatting/citation issues.
- **Needs Improvement (D/F):** Does not meet the length requirement and/or has major formatting issues.

Atonement Theology / Theological Christology Paper Due: April 18th, 2025

STATEMENTS ON THE USAGE OF AI

AI Use in this Course: Instructor Statement

In this course, I utilize AI tools, including ChatGPT, to assist with the development of course materials such as syllabi, assignments, rubrics, and other content. These tools are also used as part of the ongoing evaluation process throughout the course. However, please note that while AI may assist in generating content or providing insights, I personally review, modify, and make all final decisions regarding presentations of course material, assignments, grading, and feedback to ensure alignment with the course objectives and standards. AI tools are used to enhance the efficiency of course management but do not replace my direct involvement in the educational process.

AI Use in this Course: Guidelines for Students

In this course, you are encouraged to explore the use of AI tools, including ChatGPT, image generators, and other technologies, to assist with research, brainstorming, and creative exploration. These tools can enhance your learning experience by providing additional perspectives, generating ideas, or helping you organize your thoughts. However, it is essential to approach AI usage thoughtfully and ethically.

Please keep the following guidelines in mind:

1. **Ownership and Responsibility:** While AI can assist with generating ideas or materials, you remain the primary author of your work. AI should serve as a tool to support your learning, not replace your role in the creation process. Your submissions must reflect your understanding and meet the academic integrity standards of Briercrest Seminary.
2. **Transparency:** If AI has meaningfully contributed to your work (e.g., generating outlines, suggesting solutions, or creating images), acknowledge its use in your submission. For example, a note in the footnotes or an appendix could explain how the AI assisted you. Where appropriate, use Chicago style citation format.
3. **Critical Engagement:** AI-generated content may not always be accurate, complete, or aligned with academic expectations. It is your responsibility to review, refine, and ensure the final

product meets the standards for the assignment. Thoughtful editing and critical thinking are required to make AI-supported work truly your own.

4. **Avoiding Over-Reliance:** While AI is a helpful resource, learning in this course depends on developing your own skills. Ensure that AI use enhances—rather than undermines—your ability to engage with the material independently.
5. **Respect for Intellectual Property:** When using AI for creative purposes (such as generating images or texts), be mindful of any copyright, ethical, or citation requirements. Even when AI generates content, it may still draw on pre-existing work that carries intellectual property implications.

By following these guidelines, you can use AI tools in a way that aligns with academic integrity and fosters personal growth. If you have any questions or uncertainties about using AI for a specific task, please reach out for guidance.

SEMINARY CALENDAR

Students are expected to be aware of the policies that govern course work at Briercrest Seminary, all of which are published in the current Seminary Calendar:

<https://www.briercrestseminary.ca/academics/calendar/>.

Attendance Policy

In order to benefit fully from a seminary education, to be good stewards of time and finances, and to be considerate of their classmates and faculty members, students must be in class at every opportunity.

Modular Courses

Students are expected to attend 100 per cent of each modular for which they register. If this is impossible due to extenuating circumstances, arrangements must be made with the course professor before the first day of class. If extenuating circumstances prevent a student from attending class, a maximum of one (1) full day of class can be foregone. If additional time is missed, the student will fail the course unless they first request to withdraw from the course or move the course to an audit.

Online Courses

If extenuating circumstances prevent a student from attending scheduled meeting times, then up to 20% of meeting time can be foregone. Students missing scheduled meeting times should make every effort to inform the course professor prior to any time missed. If additional time is missed, the student will fail the course unless they first request to withdraw from the course or move the course to an audit.

Semester-Based Courses

All students missing more than two full weeks of a particular course from registration to the last day of classes will receive an automatic fail (0%). A student may appeal a course failure due to excessive absences. Successful appeals will be granted only in rare cases where all absences are clearly beyond the student's control. Appeals must be made through the Academic Appeal Process.

Modular Course Schedules

Classes begin at 9:00 a.m. on Monday morning and run a minimum of 30 hours through the course of the week. The schedule is determined by the course professor. Students should check the syllabus for specifics. When the syllabus does not state class times, students are responsible to check with the professor prior to making travel plans.

Assignment Submission

All assignments must be submitted no later than eight weeks after the last day of class as stated in the syllabus. The correct due dates will be clearly noted in the syllabus and each faculty member will state in their syllabus how assignments should be submitted. Assignments submitted within a week after the due date will be accepted with a 10 per cent penalty. For additional information refer to the late assignment policy or the extension policy in the [academic calendar](#).

Return of Graded Assignments

Professors are expected to return graded assignments within six weeks of the due date. If they fail to do so, students may submit an inquiry to the [Seminary](#). If an extension is granted, the professor is no longer obligated to meet this deadline.

Academic Honesty

As members of the Briercrest learning community, students have a responsibility to conduct themselves with integrity and honour. Students who cheat on exams, plagiarize, inappropriately collaborate, or use generative AI without instructor authorization violate the trust placed in them by their instructors, fellow students, and the seminary. Any such actions constitute a breach of academic honesty and will result in serious consequences, such as failure of an assignment, failure of a course, or expulsion from the seminary.

Plagiarism, whether intentional or involuntary, is the submission of the work of others, published or unpublished, in whole or in part without acknowledgment or proper documentation. All information, ideas and/or direct quotations taken from other primary or secondary sources must be documented appropriately.

Students are responsible for ensuring they are using their sources and completing their assignments with transparency and honesty. For more details, consult the [Seminary Calendar](#) and the Briercrest Format Guide. In addition to being familiar with these pages, instructors assume that you have completed the Briercrest Academic Integrity course on [Canvas](#) and understand the information contained in it.

Academic Accommodations

Any student with a disability, injury, or health condition (mental or physical) who may need academic accommodations (permanent or temporary) should contact the ARC Coordinator in person (L234 in the Library), by phone (1-306-801-6159), or by email (arc@briercrest.ca). Documentation from a qualified practitioner will be required (i.e., medical doctor, psychologist, etc.). It is recommended that students meet with their professors to discuss the requirements of their accommodations (i.e., how the student will receive lecture notes, or how the professor wants to receive extension requests).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A full bibliography will be posted to *Canvas*. Note: students are encouraged to contribute to the posted bibliography.