

Course: BU637-M and BU637-MN Group Development & Facilitation  
Credit: 3 Semester Hours  
Semester: Spring 2021, Cycle 6, Course begins May 10 and ends July 2, 2021  
**Instructor Lectures: June 10, 12, 17, 19\***  
**Work for this course begins May 10!**  
Time: \*Instructor Lecture class times: Thursdays 6-9p Saturdays 9-1p  
  
Instructor: Germaine D. Washington DM, MBA  
E-mail: [germaine.washington@calvary.edu](mailto:germaine.washington@calvary.edu)  
Office: (816) 425-6175  
Cell: (816) 572-1603, Students may text

## I. DESCRIPTION

This course features an examination of theoretical bases of group development including group types, group counsel, leadership styles, skills, and application to various populations. Ethical group leadership from a biblical worldview is emphasized throughout the course.

*\* This is a blended class, meaning that both campus and online students take this class together. Campus students attend the classes in person, online students attend the classes via the online classroom. All interaction and assignments for campus and online students are done in the online classroom.*

*\* The instructor reserves the right to make changes to this syllabus at any time during the course, but any changes made will only be done after clearly communicating the need for the change and the specific change to be made via in-class announcement and Canvas announcement.*

## II. OBJECTIVES

A. General competencies to be achieved. The student will be able to:

1. Recognize the importance of varying stages of group development
  - a. Program Objective 4
  - b. Assignments a, c
2. Review models of group decision making
  - a. Program Objectives 1, 3
  - b. Assignments 1, 3

3. Consider group performance measurement tools and procedure
  - a. Program Objectives 2, 4
  - b. Assignments 1, 2, 3
4. Discuss personality types, group roles, member differences, and emotional intelligence in team environments
  - a. Program Objectives 3, 4, 5
  - b. Assignments 1, 2, 3

B. Specific competencies to be achieved. The student will be able to:

1. Evaluate group performance
  - a. Program Objectives 2, 4
  - b. Assignments 2, 3
2. Discuss theories of team development and dynamics, and relate these to practice.
  - a. Program Objective 4
  - b. Assignments 2
3. Exhibit how the components of emotional and social intelligence contribute to team performance.
  - a. Program Objectives 2, 3
  - b. Assignment 2
4. Diagnose and choose appropriate interventions for group problem resolution.
  - a. Program Objectives 1, 2
  - b. Assignment 2

### III. REQUIREMENTS

- A. Complete course assignments
- B. Read text, complete assignments on time, and participate in class discussion..
- C. Complete final paper.

### IV. METHODS

- A. Lecture
- B. Reading and writing assignments
- C. Student Participation – discussion in online forum weekly, and other assigned interaction.
- D. Final Applied Learning Paper
- E. Overall System of Student Evaluation:
  1. Textbook Reading Response Papers 45%

- 2. Discussion, Participation, & Interaction 30%
- 3. Final Applied Learning Paper 25%

## V. REQUIRED MATERIALS

### A. Bible

The Holy Bible, [www.biblegateway.com](http://www.biblegateway.com) (the instructor will use NASB).

Please feel confident in using the Bible you use in other Calvary

University courses (see statement below). Retail price \$0.00.

*The Bible is a required textbook in every course at Calvary University. To facilitate academic level study, students are required to use for assignments and research an English translation or version of the Bible based on formal equivalence (meaning that the translation is generally word-for-word from the original languages), including any of the following: New American Standard (NASB, English Standard Version (ESV), New King James (NKJV), or King James (KJV). Other translations and versions based on dynamic equivalence (paraphrases, and thought-for-thought translations like NLT and NIV) may be used as supplemental sources. Please ask the professor if you have questions about a particular translation or version. The instructor uses NASB and ESV.*

### B. Other Textbooks:

Katzenbach, J. & Smith, D. (2003). *The wisdom of teams: Creating the high-performance organization*. NY: Harvard Business School Press.

ISBN 978-0060522001 retail price **\$17.95**

Kouzes, J. & Posner, B. (Eds.). (2004). *Christian reflections on the leadership challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. ISBN 978-0787983376

retail price **\$16.95**.

Lencioni, P. (2004). *Death by meeting: A leadership fable*. San Francisco,

CA: Jossey-Bass. ISBN 978-0787968052 retail price **\$18.95**

## VI. COURSE ASSIGNMENTS

- a. Students are to read all three textbooks (Katzenbach, Kouzes, Lencioni) and write a 1000+ word essay on **each** book. That's right! Three essays. Reflect on what you believe to be the most important issues from each assigned reading. Students may write more than 1000 words, but papers with less than this amount will likely receive a grade reduction. Word count is intended to be a guide rather than an absolute standard; however, reflection papers below the minimum word count probably are not thorough enough. **Assignment due: early in the course, check Canvas for details.**
  
- b. Discussion Interactions: During each class, the instructor will give an interaction topics for **all** students to discuss in the online discussion board during each week of class. Students must engage the instructor in each topic given, and respond to at least two classmates. Students must follow guidelines for "Substantive Posts" to receive full credit. Check Canvas for details. **Assignment due: Each week during the Course.**
  
- c. Prepare a written 8- to 12-page Applied Learning Paper detailing how you intervene to develop a group or facilitate change in a group (known by you) by applying your learning outcomes from course materials. At least 75% of the paper should have **application** from course materials, lectures, activities, and exercises. The remaining quarter of the paper should have direct application to your work or ministry. In this section, describe how you intend to take course materials and apply course learning outcomes in the future. Throughout your paper, make clear references to the origins of your learning by citing references as appropriate. (Please see grading rubric at the end of this syllabus.) **Assignment due: July 2, 2021.**

## VII. TENTATIVE CLASS SCHEDULE

Date/Week	Class Topic Description
<b>Thursday</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Course introduction &amp; front matters</li><li>• Historical context</li><li>• Group Development Theory</li></ul>
<b>Saturday</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Overview of working models</li><li>• Facilitation 1</li><li>• Biblical Team Building examples</li></ul>

<b>Thursday</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Textbook examples</li><li>• Team Building</li><li>• Additional Theory</li><li>• Additional use of examples</li></ul>
<b>Saturday</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Exploiting Team Member Characteristics</li><li>• Facilitation 2</li><li>• Wrap-up</li></ul>

*Students with disabilities have the responsibility of informing the Accommodations Support Coordinator ([aso@calvary.edu](mailto:aso@calvary.edu)) of any disabling condition that may require support.*

*Plagiarism is defined as copying any part of a book or paper without identifying the author. This also includes taking another person's ideas and presenting them as your own.*

Organization Development students write papers according to the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, Seventh edition (APA Manual). The instructor suggests that students acquire the manual or resources to produce correct formatting.

The Clark Academic Center ([learning@calvary.edu](mailto:learning@calvary.edu)), located in the library building, is dedicated to providing free academic assistance for all CU students. Student tutors aid with all facets of the writing process, tutor in various subject areas, prepare students for exams and facilitate tests. Please take advantage of this service.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Augsburger, David. (1985). *Caring Enough to Confront*. Ventura, CA: Regal Books.  
ISBN: 978-0830746491
- Briner, Bob, & Psritchard, Ray. (1998). *Leadership Lessons of Jesus*. New York:  
Gramercy Books. ISBN: 978-0805445206
- Cohen, S. M., & Biery, R. M. (2014). *Ministry mess management: Solving leadership  
failures*. Bloomington, IN: AuthorHouse. ISBN: 978-1491871416
- Crocker, H.W. III. *Robert E. Lee on Leadership*. Rocklin, CA: Prima Pub., 1999.  
ISBN: 978-0761525547
- Dana, Daniel. *Conflict Resolution*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2001. ISBN: 978-  
0071364317
- DeBono, Edward. *Six Thinking Hats*. Boston, New York, London: Little, Brown, &  
Co., 1999. ISBN: 978-0316178310
- DePree, M. (1997). *Leading without power: Finding hope in serving community*.  
Holland, MI: Jossey-Bass. ISBN: 978-0787910631
- Elmer, D. (1993). *Cross-culture conflict: Building relationships for effective ministry*.  
Downers Grove, IL: IVP. ISBN: 9780830816576
- Gangel, Kenn *Coaching Ministry Teams*. Nashville: Word Publishing, 2000. ISBN:  
978-1597526579
- Palmer, Donald C. *Managing Conflict Creatively*. Pasadena, CA. Wm. Corey Library,  
1990. ISBN:9780878082315 (Retail price is \$7.99; buy from  
[www.missionbooks.org](http://www.missionbooks.org) )

Phillips, Donald T. *Lincoln On Leadership*. New York: A Time Warner Books, 1992.

ISBN: 978-0446394598

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Founding Fathers On Leadership*. New York: Warner Books, 1997.

ISBN: 978-0446690461

Pickering, Peg. *How To Manage Conflict*. Franklin Lakes, NJ: Career Press, 2000.

ISBN:9781564144409

Sande, Ken. *The Peacemaker*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1997. ISBN:

9780801064852 (price is \$8.49 at [www.christianbook.com](http://www.christianbook.com))

Wheeler, Tom. *Take Command: Leadership Lessons from the Civil War*. New York:

Doubleday, 1999. ISBN: 978-0385495196

Wright, Walter C. Jr. *Relational Leadership*. Carlisle, Cumbria, CA: Paternoster Pub.,

2000. ISBN: 978-1606570258

Yperen, Jim Van. *Making Peace, A Guide to Overcoming Church Conflict*. Chicago:

Moody Press, 2002. ISBN: 978-0802431851

## RUBRIC FOR THE EVALUATION OF WRITTEN ASSIGNMENTS

CRITERIA	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT Minimum Points	SATISFACTORY Medium Points	EXCEPTIONAL Maximum Points
<b>CONTENT</b> 75%	<p>The writer does not demonstrate cursory understanding of subject matter, and/or the purpose of the paper is not stated clearly. The objective, therefore, is not addressed and supporting materials are not correctly referenced.</p> <p><i>48.9 or FEWER POINTS</i></p>	<p>The writer demonstrates limited understanding of the subject matter in that theories are not well connected to a practical experience or appropriate examples, though the attempt to research the topic is evident, and materials are correctly referenced.</p> <p><i>49 to 65.9 POINTS</i></p>	<p>The writer demonstrates an understanding of the subject matter by clearly stating the objective of the paper and links theories to practical experience. The paper includes relevant material that is correctly referenced, and this material fulfills the objective of the paper.</p> <p><i>66 to 75 POINTS    Score:</i></p>
<b>ORGANIZATION</b> Including Readability & Style 20%	<p>Paragraphs do not focus around a central point, and concepts are disjointedly introduced or poorly defended (i.e., stream of consciousness).</p> <p>The writer struggles with limited vocabulary and has difficulty conveying meaning such that only the broadest, most general messages are presented.</p> <p><i>15.9 or FEWER POINTS</i></p>	<p>Topics/content could be organized in a more logical manner. Transitions from one idea to the next are often disconnected and uneven.</p> <p>Some words, transitional phrases, and conjunctions are overused. Ideas may be overstated, and sentences with limited contribution to the subject are included.</p> <p><i>16 to 18.9 POINTS</i></p>	<p>The writer focuses on ideas and concepts within paragraphs, and sentences are well-connected and meaningful. Each topic logically follows the objective and the conclusion draws the ideas together.</p> <p>The reading audience is correctly identified, demonstrated by appropriate language usage (i.e., avoiding jargon and simplifying complex concepts). Writing is concise, in active voice.</p> <p><i>19 to 20 POINTS    Score:</i></p>
<b>FORMAT</b> 4%	<p>The paper does not conform to Turabian or APA style. Students must use one or the other correctly.</p> <p><i>0 POINTS</i></p>	<p>The paper does not conform completely to Turabian or APA style (e.g., margins, spacing, pagination, headings, headers, citations, references, according to the appropriate style guide).</p> <p><i>Up to 2 POINTS</i></p>	<p>The paper is correctly formatted to style (e.g., margins, spacing, pagination, headings, headers, citations, references, according to the <i>appropriate style guide</i>).</p> <p><i>2.1 to 4 POINTS    Score:</i></p>
<b>GRAMMAR, PUNCTUATION, &amp; SPELLING</b> 1%	<p>The writer demonstrates limited understanding of formal written language use; writing is colloquial (i.e., conforms to spoken language). Grammar and punctuation are consistently incorrect. Spelling errors are numerous.</p> <p><i>0 POINTS</i></p>	<p>The writer occasionally uses awkward sentence construction or overuses and/or inappropriately uses complex sentence structure. Problems with word usage (e.g., evidence of incorrect use of Thesaurus) and punctuation persist causing difficulties with grammar.</p> <p><i>0.5 POINTS</i></p>	<p>The writer demonstrates correct usage of formal English language in sentence construction. Variation in sentence structure and word usage promotes readability. There are no spelling, punctuation, or word usage errors.</p> <p><i>1 POINT            Score:</i></p>

**Gross misuse of the leniency of this criteria may result in grade reduction greater than stipulated here. Students MUST proofread their work.**

### **What is a Substantive Post? © 2016**

By Skip Hessel, D.M.

In a world of social media and text-messaging, proper interaction between student and teacher and other students is increasingly important. However, scholars begin to blur the boundaries of academic substance. Students want to make good grades and receive fair treatment. Instructors want to share principles of their discipline. In an effort to clarify how to post thoughts in an interactive forum, these instructions attempt to define substance.

A substantive post conveys a complete thought with academic rigor. Student scholars must take into account the wide variety of readers in a social media setting and communicate appropriately. One cannot assume that every reader has had exactly the same training or even similar experiences. Ergo, one must write complete thoughts to overcome any inadequacy. Similarly, academic rigor forgoes any thoughtless conclusions. While expressing new ideas and exercising academic freedom, contributors must consider what is known about the subject and include known knowledge in academic writing. Writers should consider the level of knowledge and use certain amount of judgement too. Substance requires balance. Scholars should consider their readers and communicate as well as possible.

Because today's academic environment includes many cultures, writers must consider the inappropriate use of metaphors and colloquialisms. An expression or satire may not make sense to a reader from a culture in another part of the same country or on the other side of the world. Students posting substantive responses avoid using expressions and phrases with vague meanings that the reader could misunderstand.

Substantive posts also cite sources. When using the ideas of others, a scholar gives appropriate in-text citations when responding to forum. For example,

Blackaby and Blackaby (2011) found many believers get frustrated with technology and media that has become commonplace; however, believers must “embrace technology with gusto” (p. 8).

Others who express innovative thinking should receive credit for their ideas and intellectual property. Additionally, readers should have the opportunity to consider source materials themselves. A substantive post will include such citations.

Students often ask for specific guidelines. Unfortunately, students sometimes put minimum requirements ahead of quality responses. At the risk of students falling into this trap, the instructor believes a substantive post will contain one or two complete paragraphs that include approximately 300 words. Some substantive posts convey meaning with less; however, many require much more. Moreover, a substantive post will demonstrate the scholar’s attempt to grow. Therefore, assigned reading materials and other sources are found as in-text citations and as references. At a minimum, each substantive post will contain at least one. Students expecting great evaluations should include at least one citation in a 300+ word post.

In many ways, participating in a forum raises tremendous opportunity. The asynchronous learning environment allows students to consider the thoughts of others, to research the subject, and to respond in their own time. Students should take advantage of this unique opportunity. Your instructor will gently correct you and evaluate you along your journey. But, great students will consider how they can practice these skills from their very first post.

Reference: [No need for page break in substantive post.]

Blackaby, H., & Blackaby, R. (2011). *Spiritual leadership: moving people on to God's agenda*. B & H Publishing: Nashville, TN.