

1. Change grading rubric for first draft. Switch steps 1 and 2. Also, adjust presentation 1 grading rubric.
2. Spend time talking about benchmarking and finding research that provides insights concerning how to improve a program. i.e. what journal articles ought students use? How do they find it? How do they apply it?
3. Alongside journal articles, how ought the theological rationale be integrated right from the first draft?
4. In grading rubric in draft one explain how to use elements 3-5 to evaluate current activities. Unclear currently.
5. Grading Rubric – Use the terminology from the book to describe each phase of the presentation and paper.
6. Provide an example presentation.
7. Talk about how to collect data and what data to collect.
8. Talk about the basics of writing surveys.
9. Have an assignment to write a survey for your paper.
10. Benchmarking resources – Willowcreek. Saddleback. Etc.

Why Work for Change?

God's interaction with human's is based on continual improvement. Continual improvement is for the good of the humans who he wants to change.

2 Peter is concerned with defending the ongoing purposes of God for human beings. Change is required because God has purposes for human's to fulfill. The prophets express those purposes. The ultimate purposes of God include the return of Jesus and the final judgment. The opponents of Peter don't want to change, while Peter tells his readers to hurry to change because it leads to sharing in the divine nature and purposes of God. Peter's opponents argue that God does not judge, or to use leadership language, God does not have targets for behaviors and rewards and consequences for missing those targets. His opponents would have included and been strongly influence by popularized Epicurean beliefs, much like today we are strongly influenced by popularized post-modern beliefs such as relativism: "The blessed and eternal being has no trouble himself and brings no trouble upon any other being, hence he is exempt from movements of

anger and kindness' (Diog. Laert. 10.139; see Cicero, Nat. Dior. 1.85; Lucretius, R. N. . . .)''

Neyrey, Jerome. *2 Peter, Jude: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible, Vol. 37c. New York: Double Day, 1993, 122.

Contrary to a belief that the Epicureans were simply hedonists who did not have a philosophy, Epicurean philosophy laid the basis for their avoidance of pain and seeking pleasure in the long term. They believed that a divine being would not trouble him or herself with making humans change, with judging their activities. This process would provoke suffering in the form of anger, frustration, etc. Indeed, when we look in the Bible, we see many expressions of God's frustration with people who refuse to change. Interestingly, even God finds it frustrating to implement change.

2 Peter argues that the purpose of change is the proper or correct ordering of the cosmos, so that everything and everyone functions according to their purpose. As a result, everyone benefits. Since the cosmos and people are disordered, God is simply returning to the created order, a very good intention. But the idea of measuring right actions, of judging right from wrong, ordered from disordered, angers people. No one wants external criteria for their behavior, and the opponents of Peter are no different (see Neyrey, 136).