



DIVISION OF ADULT LEARNING

SYLLABUS

CLDR-320: Communication and Interpersonal Skills

Date: 09/01/2016

Table of Contents:

UNIVERSITY MISSION STATEMENT:	3
CATALOG DESCRIPTION:	3
REQUIRED TEXT(S) AND/OR SUPPORTING RESOURCES:	3
PREREQUISITE SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE:	3
COURSE GOALS AND LEARNING OUTCOMES:	3
MAJOR TOPICS:	4
COURSE ASSESSMENTS:	4
EVALUATION:	4
GRADING SCALE:	5
LETTER GRADE EQUIVALENCIES:	5
UNIT AND TIME DISTRIBUTION:	5
POLICIES	6
ATTENDANCE POLICY:	6
ACADEMIC HONESTY POLICY/INFORMATION:	6
LATE POLICY:	6
EXPECTATIONS	7
FACULTY EXPECTATIONS OF STUDENTS:	7
STUDENTS' EXPECTATIONS OF FACULTY:	7
IMPORTANT STUDENT INFORMATION	8
SPECIAL NEEDS:	8
BIBLIOGRAPHY	8
KNOWLEDGE BASE/WORKING BIBLIOGRAPHY (READING LIST):	8

University Mission Statement:

Lee University is a Christian institution which offers liberal arts and professional education on both the baccalaureate and graduate levels through residential and distance programs. It seeks to provide education that integrates biblical truth as revealed in the Holy Scriptures with truth discovered through the study of arts and sciences and in the practice of various professions. A personal commitment to Jesus Christ as Savior is the controlling perspective from which the educational enterprise is carried out. The foundational purpose of all educational programs is to develop within the students knowledge, appreciation, understanding, ability and skills which will prepare them for responsible Christian living in a complex world.

Catalog Description:

This course will focus on the basic principles and concepts of communication and interpersonal skills that influence organizational effectiveness. Self-assessments, case studies, and field studies will provide a framework for testing and observing the principles.

Required Text(s) and/or Supporting Resources:

Required Texts:

Anderson, Keith and Elizabeth Drescher. *Click2Save REBOOT: The Digital Ministry Bible*. New York: Church Publishing, 2018. ISBN: 9780898690316.

Barker, Alan. *Improve Your Communication Skills: How to Build Trust, Be Heard and Communicate with Confidence*, 5th edition. New York: Kogan Page Limited, 2019. ISBN: 9780749498863.

Medefind, Jedd and Erik Lokkesmoe. *UpEnded: How Following Jesus Remakes Your Words and World*. Lake Mary, FL: Charisma House, 2012. ISBN: 9781616386054.

Additional Supporting Resources:

Resources included in the Learning Management System (LMS).

Prerequisite Skills and Knowledge:

None

Course Goals and Learning Outcomes:

PURPOSE

This course has been designed to provide an introduction to the various media used in communication primarily within a ministry setting.

General Objectives (Course Goals):

This course seeks to:

1. Provide students with an understanding of basic communication theory and practice, and to expose them to various means of communication in a ministry setting.
2. Discuss methods and options to better communicate with specific people groups.
3. Develop critical thinking skills when it comes to the preparation of various communication mediums.
4. Clarify one's own thinking prior to communicating through various mediums.
5. Explore all options when it comes to communicating through interpersonal and interactive media.

Specific Objectives (*Learning Outcomes*):

As a result of the activities and study in this course, the student should be able to:

1. Develop an overall approach to communication within the corporate church setting.
2. Critically examine and explain the various forms of communication.
3. Critique technological formats currently being utilized in the modern church, and discern what works and what does not.
4. Evaluate the outcomes of communication mediums and strategically identify those that improve communication effectiveness.
5. Demonstrate ability to design and build interactive communication content that engages audiences.

Major Topics:

- A. A brief history of communication and its models.
- B. Rules for effective conversation.
- C. Principles of communication effectiveness.
- D. Influence of a communication medium on a message.
- E. Impact of the Digital Revolution on communication and ministry.
- F. Responsibility as Christian communicators.
- G. Digital media in ministry.
- H. Importance of digital boundaries and solitude in communication.
- I. Role of the church as the medium for God’s message.
- J. The future of technology in the ministry.

Course Assessments:

- A. **Text/Media.** All text/media is evaluated in the threaded discussions and assignments.
- B. **Threaded Discussions.** The threaded discussions are an opportunity for students to demonstrate their knowledge of the course material and interact with fellow students. Just doing an initial post and/or response will not guarantee any point value. Discussions will be evaluated as follows: a) on the depth of engagement with the discussion topic and/or issue; b) on the depth of understanding of the topic and/or issue; and c) on the depth of interaction with the other students. An initial post is required (evaluation of “a” and “b” above) and then response posts interacting to other students’ initial posts (evaluation of “c” above). Once the discussion deadline is reached, there will be no further opportunity to attain points for that discussion. If you have further questions on how these are evaluated, please contact your instructor.
- C. **Unit Assignments.** Unit Assignments provide students with a more in-depth opportunity to investigate course concepts. Each assignment will be 500-800 words in length and should follow the Turabian (SOR Manual of Style) format.
- D. **Course Project.** The final project involves the application and assessment of the communication principles learned throughout the course.

Evaluation:

A. Threaded Discussions	350
B. Unit Assignments	300
C. Course Project	350

Grading Scale:

The standardized grading scale provides a uniform foundation from which to assess your performance.

Grade	Quality Points per Credit	Score
A	4.0	930 - 1000
A-	3.7	900 - 929
B+	3.3	870 - 899
B	3.0	830 – 869
B-	2.7	800 – 829
C+	2.3	770 – 799
C	2.0	730 – 769
C-	1.7	700 – 729
D+	1.3	670 – 699
D	1.0	600 – 669
F	.0	0 - 599

Letter Grade Equivalencies:

A = Clearly stands out as excellent performance. Has unusually sharp insights into material and initiates thoughtful questions. Sees many sides of an issue. Articulates well and writes logically and clearly. Integrates ideas previously learned from this and other disciplines. Anticipates next steps in progression of ideas. Example "A" work should be of such nature that it could be put on reserve for all cohort members to review and emulate. The "A" cohort member is, in fact, an example for others to follow.

B = Demonstrates a solid comprehension of the subject matter and always accomplishes all course requirements. Serves as an active participant and listener. Communicates orally and in writing at an acceptable level for a cohort member. Work shows intuition and creativity. Example "B" work indicates good quality of performance and is given in recognition for solid work; a "B" should be considered a good grade and awarded to those who submit assignments of quality less than the exemplary work described above.

C = Quality and quantity of work in and out of class is average. Has average comprehension, communication skills, or initiative. Requirements of the assignments are addressed at least minimally.

D = Quality and quantity of work is below average. Has marginal comprehension, communication skills, or initiative. Requirements of the assignments are addressed at below acceptable levels.

F = Quality and quantity of work is unacceptable and does not qualify the student to progress to a more advanced level of work.

Unit and Time Distribution:

The time to complete each unit is approximately 17 hours per week on average for a three hour course. Actual assignment completion times will vary. A more detailed breakdown of each assignment can be found within the course.

POLICIES

Attendance Policy:

At Lee University student success is directly related to the student actively attending and engaging in the course. Online courses are no different from classroom courses in this regard; however, participation must be defined in a different manner.

Online courses will have weekly mechanisms for student participation, which can be documented by submission/completion of assignments, participation in threaded discussions, and/or specific communication with the instructor as outlined within the syllabus.

Academic Honesty Policy/Information:

Cheating is defined as the use or attempted use of unauthorized materials or receiving unauthorized assistance or communication during any academic exercise.

Examples of cheating include:

- Submitting work for academic evaluation that is not the your own.
- Receiving assistance from another person during an examination.
- Using prepared notes or materials during an examination.
- Permitting another student to copy your work.
- Plagiarism.
- Falsification.
- Other misrepresentations of academic achievement submitted for evaluation or a grade.

As stated in the LEE UNIVERSITY Catalog, plagiarism is presenting as your own work the words, ideas, opinions, theories, or thoughts which are not common knowledge. Students who present others' words or ideas as their own without fair attribution (documentation) are guilty of plagiarizing. Unfair attribution includes, but is not limited to, a direct quotation of all or part of another's words without appropriately identifying the source. It is also unfair attribution to have included a source within a Works Cited page without having carefully cited the source within the text of the document.

Plagiarism also includes, but is not limited to, the following acts when performed without fair attribution:

- a. directly quoting all or part of another person's words without quotation marks, as appropriate to the discipline.
- b. paraphrasing all or part of another person's words without documentation.
- c. stating an idea, theory, or formula as your own when it actually originated with another person.
- d. purchasing (or receiving in any other manner) a term paper or other assignment, which is the work of another person, and submitting that work as if it were one's own.

Late Policy:

- No credit is available for postings of any kind made in the **Threaded Discussions** after a given Unit ends.
- If your faculty approves your submission of late assignments, each assignment score will be penalized 10% per day up to five days late. After the fifth day, late assignments will not be

accepted. (Note: An assignment is a paper, a project, a team presentation, etc., **not** a discussion)

- No late assignments will be accepted after the close of the final Unit.

EXPECTATIONS

Faculty Expectations of Students:

- Have consistent access to a computer and possess baseline computer and information skills prior to taking online courses.
- Log into their courses within 24 hours of the beginning of the session to confirm their participation. (Students who register after the session has begun will be responsible for any assignments or material already covered.)
- Take an active role in each unit, participating fully in discussions, assignments and other activities throughout the entire session. If some event interferes with that participation, the student is responsible for notifying the instructor in advance.
- Review the course syllabus and other preliminary course materials thoroughly as early as possible during the first few days of the course.
- Be responsible for raising any questions or seeking clarification about these materials, if necessary, within the first week of the session.
- Frequently check the course calendar for due dates.
- Submit assignments and papers on time, and take tests by the posted dates. Acceptance of late work and any penalties for late submissions are up to the discretion of the instructor, based on the expectations outlined in the course syllabus.
- Contribute meaningful, timely comments to online discussions according to guidelines provided.
- Contribute substantively to group assignments (if required in course).
- Check for University announcements each time you log onto the LMS. These postings are critical.
- Use Lee email address.
- Complete the "Student Survey of Instruction" for each course to evaluate the instructor and the course.

Students' Expectations of Faculty:

- The opportunity to be active participants in a stimulating and challenging education that is global in scope, interactive in process and diverse in content and approach.
- A friendly, respectful, open, and encouraging learning environment.
- A course outline or syllabus that clearly provides information regarding course content, teaching methods, course objectives, grading, attendance/participation policies, due dates, and student assessment guidelines.
- Instructors who are responsive and available to discuss within 48 hours students' progress, course content, assignments, etc. at mutually convenient times from the first day of the session through the last day of the session. (Check the faculty contact information regarding weekends and holidays.)

- Individual instructor's contact information, schedules, availability, and procedural details are located within the course.
- To have access to instructor feedback and grading on projects, exams, papers, quizzes, etc., within ten (10) days of assignment due date so students are able to determine where they have made errors or need additional work.
- Final grade/feedback provided within ten (10) days after the last date of course.

IMPORTANT STUDENT INFORMATION

Special Needs:

Lee University, in conjunction with the Academic Support Office, works to ensure students with documented disabilities have access to educational opportunities. Students who need accommodations based on a disability should visit the Academic Support Office, call (423) 614-8181, or email academicsupport@leeuniversity.edu. It is the student's responsibility to share the Accommodations Form with the instructor in order to initiate the accommodations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Knowledge Base/Working Bibliography (Reading List):

- Christie, Alice. "Using PowerPoint in the Classroom." Print.
- Condrón, Frances. "Using PowerPoint in Teaching." Online tutorial for creating presentations. Print.
- "Evaluating Student PowerPoint Presentations." A series of online guides and rubrics compiled by the Claremont McKenna College Teaching Resource Center. <http://www.cgu.edu/pages/762.asp> Print.
- Howell, Dusti and Deanne Howell. Using PowerPoint in the Classroom. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin P, 2002. Introductory guide for creating slide shows for classroom use; geared mainly for K-12 educators. Print.
- Russell, Michael and Walter Shriner. "Creating Effective PowerPoint Presentations." Discusses best practices for using color, text, and multimedia. Print.
- Sommer, Robert. "Projector Blues." The Technology Source November/December 2003. <http://ts.mivu.org/default.asp?show=article&id=1057>
- Strategies and design tips on using PowerPoint interactively from the Monitor on Psychology.
- "Teaching and Learning With PowerPoint." The Connecticut College Center for Teaching and Learning. <http://ctl.conncoll.edu/pp/>
- WebAIM PowerPoint Accessibility Techniques tutorial. <http://www.webaim.org/techniques/powerpoint/>
- Pedagogy and PowerPoint – Using Presentation Technology in the Classroom. Print.
- Bartsch, Robert and Kristi Cobern. "Effectiveness of PowerPoint Presentations in Lecture." The Guide to Computing Literature 41.1 (June 2003): 77-86. Print.
- Brown, David. "Faculty Practice: Judicious PowerPoint." Syllabus (March 2001), 27. Print.
- Brown, David. "PowerPoint Induced Sleep." Syllabus (Jan. 2001), 17. Print.

Byrne, David. "Learning to Love PowerPoint." *Wired* (Sept. 2003), 12-15. Print.

Carello, Christy. "Hi-Tech Presentations: Are they Powerful or Pointless." *Teaching with Technology Today* 9.3 (Nov. 27, 2002). <http://www.uwsa.edu/ttt/articles/carello.htm>

Creed, Tom. "PowerPoint, No! Cyberspace, Yes." *The National Teaching and Learning Forum* 6:4 (1997), 5-7. http://www.ntlf.com/html/pi/9705/creed_1.htm

Daniels, Lisa. "Introducing Technology in the Classroom: PowerPoint as a First Step." *Journal of Computing in Higher Education* 10:2 (Spring 1999), 42-56. Print.

Rankin, Elizabeth L. and David J. Hoas. "The Use of PowerPoint and Student Performance." *Atlantic Economic Journal* 29:1 (March 2001), 113. Authors found no significant effect in terms of student performance. Print.

Gallagher, Eugene and Michael Reder, "PowerPoint: Possibilities and Problems." *Essays on Teaching Excellence: Toward the Best in the Academy*. Published by the POD Network 16.3 (2004-2005). Print.

"Getting Feedback on Your Uses of PowerPoint and Other Presentation Software: A Flashlight Study Package." <http://www.tltgroup.org/resources/presentation/intro.html>

Jones, Dianne et al. "A Parade of Games in PowerPoint." <http://facstaff.uww.edu/jonesd/games/> A collection of game examples and downloadable PowerPoint templates.

Keller, Julia. "Is PowerPoint the Devil?" *Chicago Tribune* Wed. Jan. 22, 2003. <http://www.siliconvalley.com/mlid/siliconvalley/5004120.htm>

Kelley, Rebecca. "Getting Everybody Involved: Cooperative PowerPoint Creations Benefit Inclusion Students." *Learning and Leading With Technology* 27:1 (Sept. 1999), 10-14. Print.

Mantei, Erwin. "Using Internet Class Notes and PowerPoint in the Physical Geology Lecture." *Journal of College Science Teaching* 29:5 (Mar-Apr 2000), 301-5. Author found PowerPoint and online notes improved students' test scores. Print.

Mason, Ralph and Denis Hlynka. "PowerPoint In The Classroom: What Is The Point?" *Educational Technology* 38:5 (Sept/Oct 1998), 45-8. http://www.umanitoba.ca/centres/ukrainian_canadian/hlynka/papers/ppt_point.html

Mason, Ralph and Denis Hlynka. "Powerpoint In The Classroom: Where Is The Power?" *Educational Technology* 38:5 (Sept/Oct 1998), 42-5. http://www.umanitoba.ca/centres/ukrainian_canadian/hlynka/papers/ppt_power.html

Murray, Bridget. "Tech Enrichment or Overkill?" *Monitor on Psychology* 33:4 (April 2002). <http://www.apa.org/monitor/apr02/tech.html>

Parker, Ian. "Absolute PowerPoint." *New Yorker* 28 May 2001: 76 - 87. Print.

Pence, Harry. "PowerPoint and Cooperative Learning: An Ideal Instructional Combination." *The Technology Source* July 1997. <http://ts.mivu.org/default.asp?show=article&id=527>

Rocklin, T. (1999). "PowerPoint is Not Evil." *The National Teaching and Learning Forum*. <http://www.ntlf.com/html/sf/notevil.htm>

Rozaitis, William and Paul Baepler. "Active Learning with PowerPoint." Print.

Shwom, Barbara L., and Karl P. Keller. "The Great Man Has Spoken. Now What Do I Do?": A Response to Edward R. Tufte's *The Cognitive Style of PowerPoint*." *Communication Insight* 1.1 (October 2003): 1-16. Print.

Szabo, Attila and Nigel Hastings. "Using IT In The Undergraduate Classroom: Should We Replace The Blackboard With Powerpoint?" *Computers and Education* 35.3 (Nov. 2000): 175-87. Empirical study of PowerPoint vs. lecture; found that PowerPoint itself made no difference in student learning. Print.

Tomei, Lawrence and Margaret Balmert. " Creating An Interactive Powerpoint Lesson For The Classroom." THE Journal 28:1 (Aug 2000), 69-71.

<http://www.thejournal.com/magazine/vault/A2964.cfm>

Tufte, Edward R. The Cognitive Style of PowerPoint. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press LLC. 2003. Print.

Tufte, Edward R. "Power Corrupts. PowerPoint Corrupts Absolutely." Wired (Sept. 2003), 118-119. An excerpted version of Tufte's monograph, The Cognitive Style of PowerPoint. Print.