

Table Talk

News and Views of the
Student Body of The Lutheran
Theological Seminary at Gettysburg.



Volume XI

January 31, 1975 Issue #7

LETTERS, LETTERS, LETTERS...

Dear Board of Directors:

In order to help you understand the students' feelings concerning the proposed curriculum changes, we feel it is necessary to express our views to you in this open letter.

We commend the faculty for initiating revisions of the curriculum, for we too recognize the need for change. However, we are concerned, not only with some of the specific changes, but also with the way these proposed changes were formulated.

(1) We are disturbed at the lack of student participation in the decision-making process. Only a minority, who were directly involved with curriculum changes, were informed throughout. We realized that this error is "water under the bridge," and we hope that in the future better lines of communication and participation will be established.

(2) We are concerned with how the proposed curriculum changes will affect the improvement of the course content. Will additional courses in a specific field be an expansion of our learning, or a repetition of previously stated ideas? Based on past experiences, we fear that it will be the latter. We also fear that new course titles and calendar changes may be merely a "shifting of furniture on the deck of the Titanic" (to quote Dr. Jenson). We are concerned with the passage of format, without the knowledge of content.

(3) We would like to make the following specific recommendations:

(a) We recommend that the book list be dropped. If the books on the faculty's suggested reading list are vital to our theological education, then they should be incorporated into our required courses.

(b) We recommend that both Greek and Hebrew be taught as two-consecutive quarter courses. We feel that from our experience, two consecutive quarters of a language is more conducive to the learning process.

(c) We recommend that all quarters be ten weeks in length (not including the final examination period). We feel that all quarters should be of equal length to do justice to all courses.

We hope that you, the members of the Board of Directors, will give serious consideration to the matters raised in this letter. If you should have any questions, please talk to any of the students.

Yours in Christ,

(See the Emergency Bulletin
Board for signatures)

To the Editors of Table Talk

It is true that "education is the student's responsibility" as Mr. Nieting states in the previous issue of Table Talk; the student does have the ultimate responsibility for his education. He or she has to make the decision as what to accept and what to reject, what is done and what is not done.

I would like to take a look at the other side of the coin and explore the area of teacher responsibility. First, let's define learning. Learning, according to James Michael Lee, a prominent educator from the University of Notre Dame, is that form of self-activity through which behavior is changed by means of experience. Experience is the most significant point in learning. This realm of experience obviously takes place in the student's environment. Recent empirical evidence demonstrates that the environment exerts an extraordinary influence on learning.

And who is the significant figure in the student's learning environment? Obviously, the teacher is the dominant figure. So, it is the teacher who deliberately, purposively, and affectively structures the learning situation to produce desired learning outcomes. Or to put it another way, learning outcomes flow from the development of specific teacher behaviors. We can conclude that education places a very great responsibility on the teacher.

I would also like to mention that a teacher's affective pedagogical behavior does indeed have a significant effect on enhancing learning. Perhaps, some of our faculty should be made aware of this.

Not having a great deal of teaching experience, I may be a bit bold in making some of these statements. Let me say that I have done some reading in the area

education and since some of our faculty insists that books, per se, enhance education, I feel justified in drawing on my resources.

Lee also points out that the key to effective teaching is dependent on the teacher's awareness of his behavior of his own pedagogical behaviors, an awareness of his behavior on the learner, and skill in controlling his behavior.

All of this material leads to the conclusion that the teacher is the most significant element of the learning environment. As mentioned previously, this implies a great responsibility that cannot be taken lightly nor passed on to the students.

Rodney Burr

To the Editors of TableTalk

Under the headline of "Wacht Auf" your most recent issue of Table Talk has solicited "comments and/or suggestions concerning the current state of affairs about curriculum." Here, then, are such comments and/or suggestions from one student..

If the current curriculum debate resembles a race course, or indeed a rat race, it is only because the students have made it so with their picayune questions, petty petitions, and paranoid outlook. In the two open forums, the faculty representatives have displayed great patience in explaining the proposed changes and answering the students' questions, many of which were redundant and/or irrelevant. The calendar change is quite conservative; indeed, it is nothing new at all, but rather a reversion to an earlier system. The reading list seems necessary; synod examining committees are finding this out. Finally, pre-

ent seminary students have much to gain from the change. As long as we are promised that no change will be interpreted to the disadvantage of the student, we can enjoy the best of both worlds.

My suggestion is that there be less hassle and less resistance to the proposal on the part of the students.

Respectfully,

A. Riethmiller

Letter to the Editors:

For the last couple of months, the major issue on campus has been the curriculum and calendar revision. One of the biggest questions raised during this time has been the charge, by the students, that the revision proposals were done behind the backs of the students, that is, no direct student participation in the revision process. This sore point has been gone over a number of times between students and faculty, as has the whole revision idea. However, to me, outside of the specific proposals, it has been this issue which has pointed out a deeper laying problem, that of the whole concept of closed and confidential faculty meetings.

I can appreciate the desire for confidentiality of faculty meetings, especially for the discussion of grades and specific individuals. However, when it has been demonstrated that the faculty can (and possibly would have) make major changes in the everyday policy of this seminary without the students really knowing what was happening, then the concept of confidentiality has been pushed past its proper limits.

The solution to this problem does not seem to be all that difficult to determine. The Board of Directors, who is the ruling body of the seminary, has quite wisely opened its meetings to the students, even before being required to do so by recent legislation. The result of this decision has increased cooperation and communication with the Board. Yet with only two meetings a year on campus, this group can hardly be considered as making daily decisions as to what happens here. Why then cannot the faculty, who are in this type of position, follow the lead of the Board? Even more to the heart of the matter, why are not these policy decisions made with direct student voice and bote through a joint governing body? This would seem to solve the dilemma of having the faculty needing to meet in confidence and opening the day to day decisions to the seminary community as a whole.

With all due apologies to the Student Government Association Officers, I must say that from what I can observe and read about the SGA, it seems that it is a politically and policywise powerless organization. The major committees are presently student/faculty oriented. It is, therefore, quite logical that they should be serving a joint student-faculty governing body.

A government such as I have suggested was implemented the Spring of 1970 at Lehigh University to the basic improvement of the political situation of all. While this may not be the cure-all, it is a step towards responsibility for both parties and a way to develop a sense of unity within the entire community.

Jim Roth

TABLE TALK STAFF

Diane Burn
Bob Dealey

Bob Mitchell
Kathy Reed

Terry Robichaud
Glenn Schoenberger

Next issue: February 14th

"A Sleep Of Prisoners"
Reviewed by: Kathy Reed

Even if Gettysburg was not the cultural desert that it is, the Chancel Players' production of Christopher Fry's "A Sleep of Prisoners" would still be considered outstanding and worth seeing.

The contemporary British drama, described as being "explicitly religious but not Christian," revolves, very circularly, around the dreams of four prisoners-of-war billeted in a church. Man's struggle against man, man's penchant for taking sides, and man's inability to cope with the concept of a God that won't arbitrate are the beasts of sleep that each prisoner wrestles with during the night.

The cast of characters portrayed both ably and with sensitivity is as follows: Jon Ahnquist as Private David King, John Ranney as Private Peter Able, Mark Radecke as Corporal Joseph Adans, and Bill Halsey as Private Tim Meadows. James Drury took on the formidable task of directing this play in the chapel, and Dr. Robert Jenson is the faculty advisor for the project.

A January term project, the play opened last night and will run through today and tomorrow, curtain at 8 p.m. The audience is invited to stay after the play for discussion.

An Open Letter to the Community:

My wife and I wish to publically acknowledge the help we received during our recent fire. We are happy to report that "community" is alive and well at the seminary. The response in the three days following the fire was overwhelming.

Before the evening of 6 November 1974 was over, we were in temporary living quarters in A-3 Baughman Hall. A large amount of our furniture had been moved and most of our remaining kitchen furnishings and food stuffs removed from the apartment.

We are especially thankful to Blackie, Don and Cindy Edwards, Fred and Ann Romig, Jerry and Eileen Schaertel, Bob and Sarah Collins, Roy and Terry Christell, Ann and Jerry Smith, Frank and Kathy Fitch, Duane and Janet Steele, Charles and Sheryl Polm, Dennis and Susan Ulrich, Bill Cox, Mike and Cathy Brown, Jack and Linda Stennett, Duane Neuman, Eric Roberts and Bif Shearer, and the many others who helped us or endured the noise and dirt while our apartment was being repaired.

We owe a special thanks to Matt Mndeme for allowing us to store much of our furniture in his cage while the apartment was being repaired.

To Mr. Benson and staff, we say thanks for pushing the contractor to finish to the extent that we could move in on the 23rd of December 1974.

Our thanks go to Dr. and Mrs. Heiges, and the faculty for the support we received while adjusting to the situation.

I know there were more people involved but at present the names I cannot recall; for this we apologize, for we wish to slight no one to whom recognition is due.

Yours in Christ,
Adrian, Joyce, and Eric Shearer

A Winter Retreat
By: Ardelle Singer

Have you been seeking the spirit of Koinonia? One place where you are likely to find it is the winter retreat being held for seminarians (and their spouses) at the Marian Fathers Novitiate in Brookeville, Md. on Feb. 7-9 (For those with Sunday morning commitments which must be met, it will be possible to leave around 9 p. m. Sat., Feb. 8.) Under the leadership of Stan Jones (Director of Seminary Ministries, Faith at Work), we will existentially explore a relational-style ministry.

As persons preparing for ministry in the name of Christ, we will undoubtedly find that the person most capable of ministering to another is one who has been able to accept ministering from someone else. At the heart of the retreat will be sensitivity in Christ, through which we may achieve openness, trust, and mutuality. After spending some time examining the Scriptural basis for a life of sharing and then building trust through sharing, the retreat will close with an agape feast and some form of covenanting.

The cost of the retreat is \$10.00. Those planning on going should send five dollars with their registration to Ardelle Singer. You will need to bring a sleeping bag. Car pooling is a possibility, so note whether you will need a ride or if you will be willing to drive when you register.

Comments by seminarians who have participated in similar retreats may be found in the pamphlet on the bulletin board in Valentine Hall and in the May, 1974 issue of Seminary Soundings. For further information, contact Ardelle Singer, Baughman B-2 (tele. ext. 38 or 334-2036).

Seminary B-Ballers
By, Denny Moore

The Seminary Community Cagers have just completed their first round of league action and now foster a 2-4 record. This inconsistent performance has largely been attributed to the attendance of the players' wives and fiancées. It seems that when Ted Hummel and Paul Schoffstall are accompanied by their betrothed they reach new heights with their shots (30 and 18). But such inspiration is not limited to the singles, for in times of utter chaos one small voice cries out "Get it Ralph!" And the excitement is spreading. Our attractive audience has even stimulated the "over-the-hill" gang which is lead by our team captain and "old man of the team", Greg Pile, who turned in a 22 point performance in our victory over Gettysburg, National Bank.

Can you believe that this year's team has not had a technical foul called on them (not bad considering that last year we averaged two per game.) Neither is this team divorced from the Christian spirit of giving. The old adage "Tis better to give than to receive" is carried out to the letter by our cagers. One of the main reasons for our 2-4 record is the great number of times that we have given the other team the ball. But things are looking up. The second half schedule is not as dragged out as was the first round and if luck holds, we may win a few more before the play-offs. So, come out and help us cheer the team on to victory or yell at the refs. For you stat enthusiasts, here's how the team looks: (See page 6)

B-Ballers Stats:	<u>Player</u>	<u>Average Points Per Game</u>
	Ted Hummel	15.33
	Ralph Boyer	13.0
	Greg Pile	11.0
	Paul Schoffstall	7.4
	Jerry Cobb	5.0
	Al Riethmiller	3.33
	Harold Hand	2.0
	Rich Scheu	2.0
	Bernie Carl	1.66
	Fred Neiderhisher	1.0
	Bob Ward	0.0
	Jerry Abraham	0.0
	Team Total Averages	61.72

Adiaphora

- Fri., Jan. 31st, and Sat., Feb. 1st: Play: "A Sleep of Prisoners," Seminary Chapel, 8 p.m.
- Mon., Feb. 3rd: Second Semester Classes begin (for the last time)
- Tues., Feb. 4th: Board Committee Meetings begin. All students are urged to attend the Board meetings. Students meet with Board concerning curriculum, Rm. 309, at 7:30 p.m.
- Tues., Feb. 4th through Thurs., Feb. 6th: Internship Auction, begins at 7:30 p.m.
- Wed., Feb. 5th through Fri., Feb. 7th: Management Audit Team
- Thurs., Feb. 6th: Cuthbertson Display (all day), Coffeeshop Basketball, 8 p.m.

WELCOME

The Staff of "Table Talk" wishes to extend a hearty welcome to Dr. and Mrs. Arden. May your stay in Gettysburg be both successful and rewarding.

Coming Soon!

Theolog is set for printing in March. In order to allow the printer enough time to produce the issue for March we request that all articles be submitted no later than Feb. 21. Poems, essays, research papers, artwork, etc. are welcome. A few items have been contributed, but many more are needed to make the first printing a success. Remember, faculty, staff, and administrators as well as family members may contribute. The publication is not restricted to the work of students. Editorial awards will be presented for the contribution in each category that has been judged outstanding by the editors. Awards will also be given for those articles judged worthy by members of the Seminary community. Don't be afraid to share your literary work--however brief, long, simple or deep.

* The minutes of monthly SFRC meetings are to be published in "Table Talk" so that students and faculty are kept informed at all times.

Course Evaluation

The process of individual course evaluation has been carried out at Gettysburg Seminary for a number of years. During that time, various forms have been used, but through all the revisions, there has been a consistency of purpose for the evaluative process. Evaluations are designed to help an instructor gain a perspective on the strengths and weaknesses of his teaching, the effectiveness of the course as he has designed and executed it and the quality of his relationships with students.

The procedures for course evaluation have been as follows: (1) a student representative distributes and gathers forms; (2) completed forms are read by the Dean and passed on to the President; (3) the President returns them to the Dean, who places them in the hands of the instructor of the course. The instructor retains them for his own examination and future use. Where major difficulties have been revealed in a course, the evaluations form the basis of consultation between the Dean and the instructor.

Students should be assured that the completed forms are given serious attention by both faculty and administration. It would be possible to cite many instances where the evaluations of one year have substantially affected the structuring of a course in a subsequent year. There is at least one instance of change in the proposed new curriculum which has been produced by response to a consistent pattern of course evaluations.

The reason for stressing these matters is to encourage students to give the evaluation forms thoughtful attention as they complete them, realizing that they simply do not fade off into academic limbo.

The next meeting will be held on Feb. 24th at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John D. Ranney
Recording Secretary