



PBC
PERTH BIBLE COLLEGE

STUDY LEVEL: GRADUATE DIPLOMA OF MINISTRY

UNIT CODE: TH805

UNIT TITLE: Theological Orientation for ministry

SEMESTER: Trimester 1, 2025

LECTURER: Dr Andre van Oudtshoorn

CONTACT DETAILS: Phone: 9243 2000
Email: andre@pbc.wa.edu.au

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| UNIT OVERVIEW: | <p>This subject discusses the foundations for successful theological studies and prepares students to understand the unique approaches followed at PBC. Students will consider why we study theology and how to “do theology” rather than learn it. The class will reflect on the authority of the Bible as the foundational source for theology. We will examine the uniqueness of the various theological disciplines and how the different subjects integrate within the course. Students will be introduced to the tension between theory and praxis, which underpins the courses at PBC. Students will consider the relationship between theology and service and develop a vision of what they wish to gain from their studies. Students will also be exposed to reading theology by engaging with N.T. Wright on Scripture and Karl Barth’s views on practising evangelical theology.</p> |
|-----------------------|--|

ACADEMIC DETAILS

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Location in the course: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> core unit for Bachelor of Ministry and Bachelor of Theology <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ministry elective unit <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> elective unit for Certificate of Ministry and Certificate of Theology |
| Workload | This unit carries three credit points. |

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| | The contact hours for this unit are 2.5 hours/week for 12 weeks. Students are expected to study a further 8.5 hours/week for a total workload of 154 hours. |
| Pre-Requisites | None |
| Delivery | Delivery will be via lectures, seminars, research assignments, group work, and class discussion. |
| Summary of Content | This unit will investigate the principles of interpreting the Bible and the varying approaches to developing meaning from the text. The students will be analysing the worlds "behind", "in", and "in front of" the text. |
| Learning outcomes | <p>A. Employ foundational theological knowledge to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discuss the need for-, and dangers in-, studying theology at a theological educational institution. 2. Explain the interaction of different subjects within the theological encyclopedia. 3. Critically analyse the critical interaction between theory and praxis in doing theology. 4. Compare and contrast different theological positions on the Bible as an authoritative source for theological reflection. <p>B. Describe a practical context to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Critically compare and contrast a naïve reading of the Bible with a theologically grounded approach to interpreting the Bible. <p>C. Develop and employ practical methods and actions to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do structural analysis and critically use Bible commentaries to exegete texts in various literary genres. 2. Construct short, targeted messages from the main themes of selected biblical passages utilising hermeneutical bridges to the present. <p>D. Engage in critical personal reflection to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allow the text to challenge their presuppositions and shape their theological thinking. |
| Requirements to complete | To complete this unit, students must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) lodge all assessments required for this unit, and b) obtain a total grade of at least 50% in the unit. |

Assessment Summary

| Assessment Type | When assessed | Weighting | Learning outcomes Assessed |
|---|---------------|-----------|----------------------------------|
| Critical Theological Responses Develop 10 Critical theological responses to the lectures and the prescribed reading. 5,600 words | Weeks 6, 11 | 50 | Unit Outcomes A1-4, D1 |
| Context Analysis (Group work): Conduct a rudimentary context analysis to ascertain how people in local churches view the need for theological education. 500 | Week 5 | 10% | Unit Outcomes B1 |
| Oral Examination | Exam Week | 40% | b, c, e |

Assessments

| Assessment Type | When assessed | Weighting | Learning outcomes assessed |
|---|---------------|-----------|----------------------------------|
| Critical Theological Responses Develop 12 Critical theological responses to the lectures and the prescribed reading. 5,600 words | Weeks 6, 11 | 50 | Unit Outcomes A1-4, D1 |
| <p>General Description and Scope of Assessment Type: This assessment provides an extensive evaluation of the student's understanding of, and critical engagement with, the views developed in the lectures and the textbooks. It provides opportunities for subjective reflection, critical considerations of the lecture and reading contents, group discussion, and independent research. Due to its broad scope and demand for research and independent thinking, the assessment usually carries a significant proportion of the marks in the unit. Students must</p> | | | |

engage with the range of topics covered in class and develop an integrated response to the course as a whole.

Assessment Type Calibrated for Graduate Diploma of Ministry (AQF 800 level). References: Students must reference at least **nine sources** (including **two journal** articles). This assessment requires students to critically respond to the lecture contents through their voice, the prescribed reading and five other sources. Students must demonstrate independent thinking. This assessment contributes to the **Graduate Diploma of Ministry Graduate Outcomes** (k, pt, e).

MARKING RUBRIC CRITICAL THEOLOGICAL RESPONSES

| GENERAL | A holistic mark will be allocated utilising the following categories and assessment criteria <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Class Notes 2. Critical interaction with other scholars 3. Consideration of the implications for ministry practice 4. Voice 5. Existential engagement | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| CRITERIA | PASS | CREDIT | DISTINCTION |
| CLASS NOTES VALUE: | The students give evidence of grasping the main idea of the lecture and critical arguments employed to substantiate the lecturer's position. | The students give evidence of grasping the main idea of the lecture and critical arguments employed to substantiate the lecturer's position. They have noted some ideas from other students. They can link the ideas developed in different classes together. | The students can articulate the central issue and supporting evidence in each lecture and set these in relationship to previous classes to develop and present a coherent overall perspective of the contents. Students engage critically with the views of other students and evaluate them within the context of their and the lecturer's arguments. |
| ENGAGEMENT WITH OTHER SCHOLARS VALUE: | Students show evidence of engaging with the Bible and the required references, including the prescribed texts. | Students show evidence of engaging with the Bible, the required number of references, including the prescribed texts, and utilising these to engage critically with some aspects of the class lectures. | These students engage responsibly with the Bible as the primary text. They also show evidence of interacting critically and in-depth with a broad range of sources who do not necessarily agree to advance a coherent argument for or against the position taken in class by the lecturer. |
| MINISTRY REFLECTION VALUE | The students provide evidence that they have considered the implications of the lectures for the church's ministry practices. | The students provide evidence that they have considered the implications of the lectures for the church's ministry practices. The students show a necessary awareness of their bias and how this may affect their engagement with the lecture contents and prescribed reading. | The students can consider a wide range of ministry scenarios where the lecture contents may be significant. They can identify possible problems from the praxis for the theory and the dissemination and application of the theory to the praxis. They can consider their presuppositions and how they influence their position on the lectures. |
| VOICE VALUE | The student has indicated how they have been affected emotionally and spiritually by the lecture contents. The students indicate that they are interacting with the lecture contents in the | The student has identified critical instances of how his or her understanding of-and engagement with-, God, the church and other people may be affected by the lecture contents or prescribed readings. | The student engages with the subject contents in the context of their faith, hope and love for God and others and can indicate how the subject contents may result in specific changes in the praxis. |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | context of their faith, hope and love for God and others. The student takes up a considered position on one or more issues raised in the lectures. | <p>The students indicate that they are interacting with the lecture contents in the context of their faith, hope and love for God and others. The student takes up a considered position on one or more issues raised in the lectures.</p> <p>The student can articulate clear arguments for this position while also showing evidence of where their views were modified or changed through the subject contents.</p> | <p>The student takes up a considered position on one or more issues raised in the lectures.</p> <p>The student can articulate clear arguments for a position while also showing evidence of instances where their views have been challenged, modified or changed through the subject contents.</p> <p>The student has identified and critically considered the presuppositions underlying their emotional response to the lecture contents and the prescribed reading.</p> <p>The student has considered how embracing a new theological position may impact their relationship with God, the church, and others.</p> |
| IDENTIFYING GAPS IN UNDERSTANDING | The student has identified issues in the class lectures or prescribed reading that they did not fully understand. | The student has identified issues in the class lectures or prescribed reading that they did not fully understand and has researched further. | The student has identified issues in the class lectures or prescribed reading that they did not fully understand and has done critical research to develop insight. |
| DEVELOPING FURTHER RESEARCH VALUE | The student has identified some issues requiring further research in light of the class lectures and prescribed reading | The student has identified significant issues requiring further research in the class lectures and prescribed reading. | The student has identified some critical issues requiring further research in light of the class lectures and prescribed reading and has articulated the potential significance of doing this research in light of the insights gained in the class lectures or readings. |

| | | | |
|--|--------|-----|-------------------------|
| <p>Context Analysis (Group work): Conduct a rudimentary context analysis to ascertain how people in local churches view the need for theological education.</p> <p>500</p> | Week 5 | 10% | Unit Outcomes B1 |
| <p>General Description and Scope of Assessment Type: This assessment item is closely related to Posters but has a specific purpose of reflecting the student's thoughts shift. Students graphically display the prejudicial concepts in their initial thinking, which reflect the influence of their experiences, culture and theology on the subject. All of these are symbolically displayed and explained in a Poster format. On an advanced level, the assessment will show how new theological information and experiences have challenged or shifted their prejudices over an assigned period. Mapping assesses knowledge (k) existential engagement (e) and can extend to practical theology when incorporating practical experiences (pt) or be used as a useful ministry tool (m).</p> | | | |

Assessment Type Calibrated for Diploma of Ministry (AQF 500 level). References: Students must reference at least **five sources**. This assessment requires students to graphically respond to new information to summarise, distil and communicate theological knowledge to a target audience. There should be a clear and logical information flow with a visual impact. The poster should refer to at least four critical sources. This assessment contributes to the **Diploma of Ministry Graduate Outcomes** (k, m). The **Generic Course Outcomes** [CC TC, TA, TCE, TR, PSG, PSI, I, IL, CL] as per the key and on the relevant AQF level are reflected in the marking matrix.

| MARKING RUBRIC REPORTS AND ESSAYS | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| CONTENT: TOTAL VALUE (30% - 10% per criterium) | | | |
| DISTINCTION: Value 7-10 | CREDIT: Value 6-7 | PASS: Value 5-6 | FAIL Value 1-4 |
| The writer has successfully analysed the topic to identify and has addressed all the critical issues | The writer has analysed the topic to identify and has addressed most of the critical issues | The writer has analysed the topic to identify and address some of the critical issues | The writer has misunderstood the topic and has not identified or addressed the critical issues |
| TOTAL | | | |
| ORGANISATION & IMPACT TOTAL VALUE 20% - 10% per criterium) | | | |
| The ideas are arranged logically to support the thesis or argument, and they flow smoothly from one to another and are linked to each other. The reader can follow the line of reasoning. | The ideas are arranged logically to support the central thesis or argument. They are usually clearly linked to each other. For the most part, the reader can follow the line of reasoning. | The writing is generally arranged logically, although occasionally, ideas fail to make sense together. The reader is reasonably clear about what the writer intends. | The writing is not logically organised. Frequently, the ideas fail to make sense together, and the reader cannot identify a line of reasoning and loses interest. |
| TOTAL | | | |
| EDITING: TOTAL VALUE (15% - 5% per criterium) | | | |
| The writing is free or almost free of errors. | There are occasional errors, but they don't represent a significant distraction or obscure meaning. | The writing has many errors, and the reader is distracted by them. | There are so many errors that the meaning is obscured. The reader is confused and stops reading. |
| Sentences are well-phrased and varied in length and structure. They flow smoothly from one to another. Appropriate punctuation marks are applied consistently. | Sentences are well-phrased, and there is some variety in length and structure. The flow from sentence to sentence is generally smooth. Appropriate punctuation marks are applied generally | Some sentences are awkwardly constructed so that the reader is occasionally distracted. Appropriate use of punctuation marks is sometimes lacking. | Errors in sentence structure are frequent enough to be a significant distraction to the reader. Appropriate use of punctuation marks is sometimes lacking. |
| Word choice is consistently precise and accurate. | Word choice is generally good. The writer often goes beyond the generic word to find more precise and effective words. | Word choice is merely adequate, and the range of words is limited. Some words are misused. | Many words are misused, confusing the reader. |
| TOTAL | | | |
| CITATIONS: TOTAL VALUE (10%) | | | |
| TOTAL | | | |
| STRUCTURE TOTAL VALUE (15% - 5% per criterium) | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| <p>The introduction sets out: the problem to be addressed; the thesis statement; and effectively summarises the major arguments</p> | <p>The Introduction reflects most of the conventions required.</p> | <p>The Introduction contains some of the conventions required.</p> | <p>The introduction does not identify the problem or thesis statement, and it does not summarise the central arguments in support of the thesis statement.</p> |
| <p>The conclusion summarises the problem, thesis and main arguments in support of the thesis so that it leads the reader to appreciate the value of the research. It contains no new information or arguments</p> | <p>The conclusion summarises the problem, thesis and main arguments supporting the thesis. It does not contain new information or arguments but fails to develop the significance of the research.</p> | <p>The conclusion adequately summarises the problem, thesis and main arguments supporting the thesis. It does not contain new information or arguments</p> | <p>The conclusion does not summarise the problem, thesis and main arguments supporting the thesis. It contains new information or arguments</p> |
| <p>Body – Each paragraph contains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● one idea ● a sentence linking it to the previous or following paragraphs ● a topic sentence (mini-thesis statement) that sets out the argument or central point of the paragraph ● links showing how each mini-thesis supports the central thesis of the paper ● supporting arguments as evidence for the mini-thesis statement ● a concluding sentence or two which summarise the arguments in support of the mini-thesis as well as the thesis of the paper | <p>Paragraphs have adequate structure and clarity but at times lack cohesion or coherence</p> | <p>Paragraphs have adequate structure and clarity but lack coherence and cohesion</p> | <p>Paragraphs lack structure, clarity, cohesion and coherence.</p> |
| <p>TOTAL</p> | | | |
| <p>Word Count: (please insert the word count for the paper)</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|---|----------------|------------|---|
| <p>Examination Oral 2 hours</p> | <p>Week 11</p> | <p>40%</p> | <p>Unit Outcomes A1, C1</p> |
| <p>Assessment Type Calibrated for AQF Level 5. The questions focus primarily on testing knowledge (k1,2,3) which replicates information gained from various sources. This assessment contributes to the AQF Level 5 Graduate Outcomes (k). The Generic Course Outcomes [CWO, TC, PSG, PSI, IL] as per the key and on the relevant AQF level are reflected in the marking matrix.</p> | | | |

LECTURE SYLLABUS

| Week | Content | Pre-reading |
|-------------|---|---------------------------|
| 1 | Introducing theological studies | Van Oudtshoorn 1/ Barth 1 |
| 2 | Learning theology and doing theology | Van Oudtshoorn 2/ Barth 2 |
| 3 | The Bible as the foundation for theological studies | Van Oudtshoorn 3/ Barth 3 |
| 4 | Other sources for theology | Van Oudtshoorn 4/ Barth 4 |
| 5 | Theological encyclopaedia | Van Oudtshoorn 5/ Barth 5 |
| 6 | A systems approach to doing theology | Van Oudtshoorn 6/ Barth 6 |
| 7 | Theology and praxis | Wright - Chapter 1 |
| 8 | The eschatological bi-polar tension between theory and praxis | Wright - Chapter 2/ |
| 9 | Theology and the church | Wright - Chapter 3 |
| 10 | Practical skills required for doing theology | Wright - Chapter 4 |

Students should have a *working* knowledge of **PBC's Assessment Policies (www.pbc.wa.edu.au)** and then *Student Portal/Useful Links/Policies & Procedures/ Assessment Policies*) to assist in completing this unit.

Prescribed Readings

Barth, K *Evangelical Theology*, DTL2

Van Oudtshoorn, A 2019, *A Taste of Glory: An Introduction to Theological Studies*, Snowgoose.

Wright, NT *Scripture and the Authority of God*, DTL2

Recommended Readings

Barth, K 2011, *The Word of God and Theology*, T&T Clark.

Carson, D.A 2016, *The Enduring Authority of the Christian Scriptures*, Wm. B. Eerdmans.

Casey, AF, 2020, *Peoples on the Move: Community Research for Ministry and Missions*, Wipf and Stock.

Cunningham, W 1990 *An Introduction to Theological Studies*, A Press.

Heyns, L. M, & Pieterse, H.J.C 1990, *A Primer in Practical Theology*, Gnosis.

Lawrence, M 2010, *Biblical Theology in the Life of the Church: A Guide for Ministry*, Crossway.

Orji, C 2015, *An Introduction to Religious and Theological Studies*, Wipf & Stock.

Wilkens, MJ & Thoennes, E 2018, *Biblical and Theological Studies: A Student's Guide*, Crossway.

