



2015-03-01

Teaching for Conversion: A History of the Fundamentals, the Objective, and the Gospel Teaching and Learning Handbook for Seminaries and Institutes of Religion in The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints

Adam Smith

Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Smith, Adam, "Teaching for Conversion: A History of the Fundamentals, the Objective, and the Gospel Teaching and Learning Handbook for Seminaries and Institutes of Religion in The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints" (2015). *All Theses and Dissertations*. 5579.

<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/5579>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

Teaching for Conversion: A History of the Current Teaching Emphasis, the Objective, and
the *Gospel Teaching and Learning Handbook* for Seminaries and Institutes of Religion in
The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints

Adam N. Smith

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

A. Legrand Richards, Chair
E. Vance Randall
Clifford T. Mayes
Mike Goodman
Casey P. Griffiths

Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations

Brigham Young University

February 2015

Copyright © 2015 Adam N. Smith

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Teaching for Conversion: A History of the Current Teaching Emphasis, the Objective, and the *Gospel Teaching and Learning Handbook* for Seminaries and Institutes of Religion in The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints

Adam N. Smith
Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations, BYU
Doctor of Education

The purpose of this study is to document the history and the contributing factors that led to the formation of the Current Teaching Emphasis (2003), the Objective (2009), and the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook (2012) within Seminaries and Institutes of Religion (S&I) for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. The analysis of this history, contained herein, clearly identifies the principles that have driven the changes in S&I's description of teaching and learning, describes how these adjustments differ from previous approaches, illustrates the significance of this shift, and presents the contemporary issues that influenced the increased clarity and direction from senior Church leaders to S&I.

Keywords: Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, Latter-day Saint religious education, Current Teaching Emphasis, Fundamentals of Gospel Teaching and Learning, Gospel Teaching and Learning Handbook

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I express deep appreciation to my dear wife. Her support, strength, and inspiration are a constant Godsend to me.

I am grateful to each member of my committee for their diligent concern, tutoring, and mentoring. Each is a brilliant scholar. Of far greater import, each is a compassionate, conscientious, and selfless human being. It has been an honor to work with them and to learn at their feet.

I am grateful to S&I for opening the way for the commencement and completion of this degree, and for clearing the path for my research. The organization has been accommodating at every turn. Each person who consented to an interview was helpful, kind, and positive. My immediate supervisors have been exceptionally supportive and encouraging. My association with them is a profound blessing. It is my opinion that I work for the best employer, and with the best co-workers anywhere.

Above all, I thank and recognize the hand of my Heavenly Father. He hears and answers prayers. Without Him, I am nothing and can do nothing. Because of Him and with Him, I can do hard things.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgments	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Description of Dissertation Structure	v
Journal Article: Teaching for Conversion: A History of the Fundamentals, the Objective, and the <i>Gospel Teaching and Learning Handbook for Seminaries and Institutes of Religion</i>	1
A Request from the Brethren	1
Raising the Bar	3
The Current Teaching Emphasis	4
The Objective	9
The <i>Gospel Teaching and Learning Handbook</i>	15
<i>Clarifying the Standard of Teaching and Learning in S&I</i>	17
<i>Connecting the Standard with the Teachings and Expectations of the Brethren</i>	18
Adjusting the Aim	22
Summary and Conclusions	26
Appendix A: Literature Review	33
Appendix B: Methodology Section	76
Appendix C: A Brief Synopsis of the Influence of Latter-day Prophets upon the Educational Philosophy of Seminaries & Institutes of Religion (1912-2000)	83
Appendix D: Addresses Analyzed for Research Project.....	100

DESCRIPTION OF DISSERTATION STRUCTURE

This dissertation is written in the hybrid format. The hybrid dissertation is one of several formats supported in BYU's David O. McKay School of Education. Unlike a traditional "five chapter" format, the hybrid dissertation focuses on producing a journal-ready manuscript which is considered by the dissertation committee to be ready for submission. Consequently, the final dissertation product has fewer chapters than the traditional format, and focuses on the presentation of the scholarly manuscript as the centerpiece. An extended review of literature, a methodological section sufficient for the requirements of an institutional review board (e.g., use of human subjects review, or requirements of the dissertation committee), and any other necessary supporting documentation will follow the manuscript chapter as appendices.

Since "Teaching for Conversion: A History of the Current Teaching Emphasis, the Objective, and the *Gospel Teaching and Learning Handbook* for Seminaries and Institutes of Religion in The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints," is intended for publication in a journal which employs the Chicago format, this dissertation, along with each of its appendices, are written in this format for the sake of uniformity and simplicity.

Teaching for Conversion: A History of the Fundamentals, the Objective, and the *Gospel Teaching and Learning Handbook* for Seminaries and Institutes of Religion

During the 2012 centennial celebration of the formation of the Seminary program, President Henry B. Eyring noted that “Much has happened in 100 years ... Our task has always been and will always be to teach and to learn so that the gospel of Jesus Christ will go down into the heart of the one – the individual son or daughter of Heavenly Father. Our goal is to teach and learn eternal truth in such a way that a child of God can choose to know and to love our Heavenly Father and His Beloved Son.”¹ In the century since their creation, the fundamental goal of Seminaries and Institutes of Religion (S&I) has remained constant. However, with the introduction of The Current Teaching Emphasis in 2003, an updated Objective statement in 2009, and the release of the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook in 2012, there have been several noteworthy refinements to the description of effective teaching and learning methods in S&I. These three significant innovations represent S&I’s response to the increased clarity in direction received from senior Church leaders regarding the elements of teaching and learning that assist an individual student in their process of conversion to the gospel of Jesus Christ. This article explores the history of each of these adjustments and the contributing factors that led to their creation. This article also shows how these adjustments comprise a “set of practical principles,”² elucidated by prophets, that invite, develop, and enhance a student’s journey toward personal conversion.

A Request from the Brethren

Around the turn of the twenty-first century, senior Church leaders began asking S&I to increase their effectiveness in teaching for conversion. Gary Moore, former S&I Administrator, still remembers the Thursday in 2001 that two Apostles visited the Administrative offices of S&I

to express their concern for the youth. Moore noted that “When a member of the Twelve comes to meet with you after you know they have just finished a meeting with the Twelve and the First Presidency, it is critically important to listen and to be ready to go to work. When two [apostles] come together, it gives greater emphasis.”³ Stanley Peterson (CES Administrator of Religious Education from 1990–2001) reported that the Brethren had expressed their concern that S&I needed “to do a better job of instilling in the hearts and souls of our young people the importance of keeping the commandments of God and helping them to be more faithful.” They mentioned to Peterson that “Many young people who attend seminary and institute carry their scriptures; they memorize the verses, but they don’t internalize the doctrine into their spirits. They don’t internalize the gospel into their lives. We are losing too many of them.”⁴ Elder Richard G. Scott and President Gordon B. Hinckley had likewise expressed concerns that the gospel was not going down into the hearts of the students in a way that would lead to deep personal conversion.⁵

In August 2001, Elder Henry B. Eyring of the Quorum of Twelve Apostles also issued a formal call to S&I to do more. Elder Eyring felt that LDS youth needed to gain more spiritual strength as an outcome of their time in S&I classrooms. His call was not for a philosophical shift, but for a clearer focus and a more concentrated effort to bless and strengthen the young Latter-day Saints who participated in S&I. At a 2001 CES conference on the Book of Mormon, Elder Eyring said:

The spiritual strength sufficient for our youth to stand firm just a few years ago will soon not be enough... we must raise our sights ... Students need more during the time they are our students ...

The pure gospel of Jesus Christ must go down into the hearts of students by the power of the Holy Ghost. It will not be enough for them to have had a spiritual witness of the truth and to want good things later. It will not be enough for them to hope for some future cleansing and strengthening. Our aim must be for them to become truly converted to the restored gospel of Jesus Christ while they are with us.⁶

Due to intensified threats to the moral and spiritual strength of young people, the Brethren needed increased effort from S&I to teach in a way that facilitated conversion by and through the influence of the Holy Spirit.

Raising the Bar

Around this same time period, an additional request was made for S&I to increase their effectiveness. Shortly after Elder Eyring's address to S&I, Elder M. Russell Ballard of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles expressed the need to prepare the "greatest generation of missionaries." In the October 2002 General Conference, he told members of the Church that it was time to "raise the bar" in regards to missionary work.⁷ The Church needed young people to be better prepared and have more gospel knowledge before entering the mission field. Elder Ballard's challenge was issued during the development phase of the *Preach My Gospel* manual for missionaries. This manual was printed and distributed in 2004, but had been in the works since 1999.⁸ *Preach my Gospel* was intended to help each missionary teach from their own knowledge and experience, rather than reciting memorized lessons.

In 2002, the Missionary Department made a request of S&I. Randall Hall, an S&I Administrator at the time, noted that "the Missionary Executive Committee had asked 'What can S&I do to help students be better prepared to teach the way that we are going to ask them to teach in ... *Preach My Gospel*?'"⁹ This request included a desire for students to gain some experience in "[teaching] by the Spirit and from the heart."¹⁰ Around this same time, Paul V. Johnson (CES Administrator of Religious Education from 2001–2007), was invited to visit President Boyd K. Packer's home. President Packer read to Brother Johnson a draft of the letter that the First Presidency was going to send out on "Raising the Bar" for missionaries. Brother Johnson related that after "He read it through with me [he] said, 'Now what does that mean for

seminary and institute?’ I said, ‘Well, it probably means that we need to step up to the plate.’ He said, ‘That’s right. You’ve got to prepare them better. You’ve got to make sure they’re ready to go on their mission.’”¹¹

The Current Teaching Emphasis

In 2003, S&I responded to these requests of senior Church leaders through the creation of “The Current Teaching Emphasis.” The Emphasis included the following:

- We are to learn and teach by the Spirit. We are to encourage students to learn and teach by the Spirit.
- We are to emphasize more strongly the importance of reading the scripture text for each scripture course of study. We are to help students develop a habit of daily scripture study.
- We are to help students understand the scriptures and the words of the prophets, identify and understand the doctrines and principles found therein, and apply them in their lives in ways that lead to personal conversion.
- We are to help students learn to explain, share, and testify of the doctrines and principles of the restored gospel. We are to give them opportunities to do so with each other in class. We are to encourage them to do so outside of class with family and others.
- We are to emphasize the mastery of key scriptural passages and help students understand and explain the doctrines and principles contained in those passages.¹²

The intent of the Emphasis was to clarify the principles of teaching and learning that would help students “become truly converted to the restored gospel of Jesus Christ while they are with us.”¹³ The Emphasis was not meant to be seen as replacement to what has been done previously in S&I, but rather as the next step required to meet the contemporary challenges facing the youth. Chad Webb explained:

The Teaching Emphasis is an attempt to incorporate and emphasize those principles of learning that we believe will lead to deepened conversion—to help the gospel go from a young person’s head to their heart. We’re not saying that what we have done in the past was not right or that there’s a new way of doing things. What we are suggesting is that we should continue to do all of the good things we’ve always done, as well as working to identify additional principles of learning that will deepen conversion, protect our students against the influences of the world, and prepare them for what the Lord is expecting of them.¹⁴

In the August 2003 Satellite Training Broadcast, S&I presented The Current Teaching Emphasis to the global S&I faculty.¹⁵ Randall Hall, who led the introduction, noted that the Emphasis constituted a “distillation of thoughts, feelings, and ideas flowing from ... various events and circumstances,” including direction from the Brethren that S&I needed to play a more capable role in preparing the Church’s young people to serve missions.¹⁶ Due to the requests from the Missionary Department in particular, the Emphasis deliberately increased the focus on “student participation and the idea of them explaining, sharing, and testifying, because that’s what a missionary does.”¹⁷

Brother Hall also explained that the Emphasis was a response to “the continuing invitation from senior Church leaders to do more to get the gospel from the head to the heart of the students ...”¹⁸ Years later, in his role as S&I administrator, Chad Webb remarked that the Emphasis “was an answer to a question began by those who preside over us, asking how we could help the gospel get more into the hearts and lives of the students.”¹⁹ Thus, through The Current Teaching Emphasis, S&I heard and responded to the requests of the Brethren for both conversion and preparing more capable missionaries.

The Emphasis was not only formulated in direct response to specific requests from prophets and apostles, but the principles embedded in the Emphasis and Fundamentals are founded upon the teachings of prophets as well. Brother Hall, who was a principal figure in the formation of the Emphasis, recalled:

[The Emphasis] was ... a response to what [S&I has] been taught. A fascinating thing was, when we started to go back and look at the talks that had been given [to S&I from the Brethren], back in the 70s and 80s, and even “The Charted Course,” we thought, wow, here it is! And there were some parts of what they had been teaching us that we had sort of assumed were happening, but had not made clear, had not defined with any real degree of clarity. And that is one of the things which I think the Current Teaching Emphasis began to do was to take what had

been taught and to distill it more clearly. Doctrines and principles had been talked about for years. But, it had sort of been taken for granted that it was happening, and it wasn't to the degree [needed] ... If you go back [through the addresses of the Brethren to S&I], there is nothing that is embodied in "Fundamentals of Gospel Teaching and Learning" that we had not been told or encouraged to do by the Brethren.²⁰

Although each principle in the Fundamentals had a long prophetic parentage,²¹ the introduction of the Emphasis marked a significant step in clarifying expectations and refining the standards of success for S&I. No longer would these principles be "something that we sort of took for granted was happening, or hoped was happening."²² Through the Emphasis, the Brethren called for a sharp focus on teaching and learning in a way that would lead to deeper conversion and better preparation to serve the Lord.

Brother Webb told of a conversation that occurred between Paul Johnson and Elder Scott (who was involved with the Missionary Executive Committee) during the formation of the Emphasis. This exchange profoundly connected the purposes of personal conversion and missionary preparation that inspired the Emphasis. It also illustrates the power behind the principles embedded therein. Brother Webb related:

Elder Scott remarked that missionaries are an interesting model of going through an experience that deepens conversion, because you come back a different person. He started to ask what the experiences are that missionaries have that lead to that deepening of conversion. They talked about things like seeking for the Holy Ghost every day, studying, praying for the Holy Ghost, looking for principles and doctrines in the scriptures, identifying them and seeking to really understand them, and then having the opportunity to explain them to people, to share your experiences and testimony with other people, and those kinds of things that missionaries do ... As they talked about the experiences that a missionary has, they asked the question: "How can we create an environment and create an experience for S&I students that would replicate on some level what a missionary goes through that helps them to become more converted?"²³

Through the Emphasis, students were invited to do more than simply attend seminary. They were invited to participate in processes and experiences that would help them progress along a path of

personal conversion. Elder Scott used missionaries as a model to identify principles that aid in this conversion, such as studying sacred scripture in order to identify, understand, and feel the truth and importance of gospel principles, applying and sharing gospel principles, and testifying of their value to others. These elements, which a teacher can incorporate into a classroom setting, assist a student in attaining a personal understanding of, and deeper conversion to the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Following its 2003 release, the Current Teaching Emphasis went through three further iterations, each bringing slight, but significant changes. The first change was to drop the word “current” from the title. The first formal reference to the “Teaching Emphasis” was during the 2005 August CES Satellite Broadcast.²⁴ Randall Hall explained that the decision to drop “current” from the title was based on the realization that “these are basic principles that ... are going to last for a while.”²⁵

In 2009, the “Teaching Emphasis” was officially re-introduced as the “Teaching and Learning Emphasis.”²⁶ It was reduced from 275 words to 63 words, streamlined and simplified for its global audience. Adding “learning” to the title seemed fitting since the role of the learner is a significant part of the Emphasis. This name change came on the heels of three foundational addresses given by the Brethren to S&I.

In February of 2005, Elder Scott delivered his landmark “To Understand and Live Truth” address.²⁷ During his talk, he repeatedly admonished S&I teachers to engage the students in meaningful participation. He memorably cautioned S&I teachers that they should “Never, and I mean never, give a lecture where there is no student participation. A ‘talking head’ is the weakest form of class instruction.”²⁸

The following year, in February of 2006, Elder Bednar delivered his foundational “Seek Learning by Faith” address.²⁹ Elder Bednar opened his remarks by observing that “we emphasize and know much more about a teacher teaching by the Spirit than we do about a learner learning by faith.”³⁰ He then went on to instruct S&I in the doctrine, principles, and implications of facilitating learning by faith through inviting students to fulfill their role in the learning process. He taught that when a student is an active participant in the learning process, the likelihood of meaningful personal conversion is greatly increased.

In addition to these two critical addresses, S&I personnel were invited in February of 2007 to participate in a Worldwide Leadership Training Meeting for the Church entitled “Teaching and Learning.”³¹ Therefore, for three years in a row, the message to S&I from the Brethren was to increase the focus on the role of the learner in order to teach for conversion.

The “Teaching and Learning Emphasis” underwent one further iteration when the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook was released in 2012. The emphasis appeared therein as “The Fundamentals of Gospel Teaching and Learning.”³² The “Fundamentals” state that:

Teachers and students should—

- Teach and learn by the Spirit.
- Cultivate a learning environment of love, respect, and purpose.
- Study the scriptures daily, and read the text for the course.
- Understand the context and content of the scriptures and the words of the prophets.
- Identify, understand, feel the truth and importance of, and apply gospel doctrines and principles.
- Explain, share, and testify of gospel doctrines and principles.
- Master key scripture passages and the Basic Doctrines.³³

These seven Fundamentals are the desired “principles, practices, and outcomes” of teaching and learning in S&I.³⁴ Randall Hall described them as playing “the dominant role in [the] teaching philosophy” of S&I.³⁵

The Current Teaching Emphasis marked the presentation of a unified and concise description of the basic building blocks of teaching and learning which should be present in every S&I classroom throughout the world. The Emphasis was more focused than any earlier commission in describing conditions and factors that would lead to personal conversion and missionary preparation. This Emphasis was designed to help facilitate a teacher in his or her quest to help the “gospel of Jesus Christ ... go down into the hearts of students by the power of the Holy Ghost.”³⁶ It focused on “teaching the scriptures by the Spirit and helping students identify, understand, and apply doctrines and principles of the gospel.”³⁷ And, significantly, it emphasized the need for students to explain, share, and testify of gospel truths rather than being passive listeners. The evolution of the Emphasis into the Fundamentals included a significant perspective in describing the principles and processes that assist conversion as something that “Teachers and students should” experience together.³⁸ Brother Hall recalled that when the Emphasis was presented to the Church Board of Education, which is chaired by the First Presidency, they “responded by giving their endorsement, and the new [emphasis] was characterized as ‘very timely.’”³⁹

The Objective

With the sharpened focus that resulted in the Emphasis, an update to the “why” behind it soon followed. In the S&I *Teaching the Gospel* handbook, which was used from 1994-2012, the organization’s objective and commission appeared as follows:

The objective of religious education in the Church Educational System is to assist the individual, the family, and priesthood leaders in accomplishing the mission of the Church by—

1. *Teaching students the gospel of Jesus Christ* as found in the standard works and the words of the prophets.

2. *Teaching students by precept and example* so they will be encouraged, assisted, and protected as they strive to live the gospel of Jesus Christ.
3. *Providing a spiritual and social climate* where students can associate together.
4. *Preparing young people for effective Church service.*

The commission of teachers and leaders in the Church Educational System is to—

1. *Live* the gospel.
2. *Teach* effectively.
3. *Administer* appropriately.⁴⁰

In 2009, a new mission statement was introduced to clarify the vision behind the new Emphasis.⁴¹ This mission statement replaced the objective and commission, and is now known as “The Objective of Seminaries and Institutes of Religion.”⁴²

The Objective was a response to two influences. First, it was a response to the Emphasis - including both the concerns of, and training from the Brethren which led to its formation. The second influence came from Elder W. Rolfe Kerr, who was appointed Commissioner of CES in 2005.⁴³ During his three-year tenure, he emphasized, among other things, having a “clarity of focus” and “increasing the impact” which S&I was having by teaching in a way that would change students’ lives.⁴⁴ In connection with Elder Kerr’s teachings, he suggested to Gary Moore (CES Administrator of Religious Education from 2007-2008) that the objective and commission which existed at that time had some gaps in it. Although the change was not mandated by Elder Kerr, Brother Moore took the initiative to assign an administrative team to look at the objective, and even perhaps rewrite it, in order to clarify the focus of S&I.⁴⁵

Chad Webb was assigned to chair the committee to create a new objective, and Grant Anderson was asked to assist him. Both were fulfilling assignments as Assistant Administrators at the time. Brother Anderson reported that not much happened with the objective until the fall of

2008, after Chad Webb was appointed Administrator of S&I. Because of his new responsibilities, Brother Webb asked Brother Anderson to chair the objective committee. Grant Anderson focused almost exclusively on the Objective from October 2008 until March 2009.⁴⁶

In the early developmental stages of the new objective, many sources were consulted. Brother Webb recalled that they reached out for input from the general Church organizations for Young Men and Young Women. Suggestions from teachers in the field were requested as well. Brother Webb still keeps in his office a binder filled with the input gathered from S&I personnel via letters and email. He remarked that suggestions from the field “honestly shaped to some degree the objective statement ... [they] really did influence our thinking.”⁴⁷

Brother Anderson explained that they also referred to articles and books written about forming effective corporate mission statements.⁴⁸ These sources taught that a mission statement should highlight the niche of an organization and how they set themselves apart from other similar organizations. Brother Anderson and Brother Webb began to brainstorm regarding how S&I differed from Sunday School and other youth organizations in the Church. They settled on the fact that S&I taught the scriptures daily and on a deeper level than is possible in other venues in the Church where youth learn the gospel. Though common to all Church organizations, they also felt that the new objective should include an increased focus on helping each individual student to come unto Christ.⁴⁹

As they employed this approach of trying to highlight S&I’s niche, they would send iterations to Elder Paul V. Johnson (who had been appointed Commissioner of CES in 2008) and he would send it back with suggestions. At times, Elder Johnson would suggest that they walk over to Elder Russell M. Nelson’s office and get his input. Their desire was to get a solid draft of the new objective before it was formally presented to the Executive Committee of the Board of

Education, which at the time was chaired by Elder Nelson. Brother Anderson remarked that “this flow between Elder Nelson and Elder Johnson and us happened a lot.”⁵⁰ They created fifty-nine drafts of the new objective within a time span of five months.

Brother Anderson remembers one particular visit to Elder Johnson’s office to review a draft of the objective and see if he felt that it was ready to take to the Executive Committee of the Board. After he reviewed the proposed objective, Elder Johnson asked what it was that they were trying to accomplish. Brother Anderson explained their focus on finding S&I’s niche, to which Elder Johnson responded, “Why do you have to be different than everybody else?” Brother Anderson related that this question changed the way they approached the objective. They realized they did not need to focus on how S&I was different, but rather focus on what they hoped would happen in the life of the S&I student. Brother Anderson stated that this new perspective

turned a corner for us, because our [objective] was still very centered on what the teacher did. [Our initial drafts said]: “Our objective is to teach the young people the scriptures on a daily basis in a way that...” – well, you notice now that the opening statement [of the new objective] doesn’t even mention scriptures. That’s a means to an end. And so we finally landed on that our opening statement ought to be not what we do, but on what we hope happens to students... [and] we knew we had to center it on the Atonement and on Christ ... not just to understand [the Atonement], but to rely on [the Atonement].⁵¹

With the decision to focus on the desired influence of S&I in the lives of students – namely encouraging and assisting their personal journey of coming unto Christ – the new objective began to take shape. Not only was Elder Nelson “heavily involved,” but some drafts of the objective went “unofficially to the Executive Committee.” Each time this happened, it came back with specific suggestions, including the need to incorporate Heavenly Father, the family, and temple and missionary work into the statement. More suggestions came as the Executive

Committee continued to work with the objective, prompting Elder Nelson at one point to say: “That’s enough. This is good enough.”⁵²

Elder Nelson suggested that rather than keep the prior format of an objective with a separate commission, there should be just one objective statement. It was decided that the objective would have an opening statement, and then include some qualifying statements derived from the former commission to “live, teach, and administer.” Brother Anderson noted that although Elder Nelson was heavily involved in the formation of the opening statement of the new objective, “he left it up to us to go back, and he didn’t have as much to say as we crafted the three [paragraphs]: live, teach, and administer.” It was decided that each paragraph would include three sentences that would encompass what an S&I teacher should do in order to achieve the vision captured within the opening objective statement. After having gone through an extensive review process with the Executive Committee, the new objective went to the Church Board of Education, where it “went through without a hitch.”⁵³

An important lesson learned from the formation of the 2009 Objective is how *directly* S&I is led by prophets, seers, and revelators. Most personnel understand that S&I is governed generally by the Church Board of Education. This Board is chaired by the First Presidency, and is comprised of three of the twelve Apostles, a member of the Presidency of the Seventy, the Relief Society General President, and the Young Women General President.⁵⁴ However, the Brethren’s involvement in S&I extends far beyond an organizational formality. Chad Webb observed that “The Church Board of Education is not a token board. They truly oversee the major decisions within our programs, and we do the best we can to carry out their direction and counsel.”⁵⁵ Brother Anderson remarked that “It was interesting to see how hands-on Elder Nelson was with [the Objective] ... I may have written out the document, but ... Elder Nelson’s

guidance about having things like the Father in it and the temple, and saying that we had to include those kinds of things” was deeply influential.⁵⁶ Elder Nelson and the members of the Executive Committee truly helped to mold and shape the opening statement of the Objective. Brother Webb added that “I think virtually every person on the Executive Committee of the Board has a phrase or a word in there that they said to ‘make sure and say it this way, or include this idea.’”⁵⁷

Not only were Elder Nelson and other members of the Board influential, but so too were the addresses given to S&I by the Brethren throughout the years. Brother Webb explained, “We reviewed some things like ‘The Charted Course.’ We reviewed a lot of the recent talks from the evening with a General Authority ... We tried ... to say something that is inclusive of all of them ... There is no question that there is a huge influence from the talks of the Brethren and especially from the evening with a General Authority and the August Broadcast, Symposiums, [and] General Conference talks on teaching and learning.”⁵⁸ Just as with the Emphasis, the Objective encapsulated the direction given to S&I from prophets, seers, and revelators “over the last 20 years.”⁵⁹

The new objective statement was the subject of a “Global Faculty Meeting” released to S&I personnel in April of 2009.⁶⁰ Brother Webb and Brother Anderson introduced the newest encapsulation of their charge, and the vision behind why they do what they do, to teachers and administrators worldwide. The final product consisted of a brief forty-three word statement of purpose, followed by three paragraphs containing three sentences each. These three paragraphs were derived from the previous three-part commission to: “1. **Live** the gospel. 2. **Teach** effectively. 3. **Administer** appropriately.”⁶¹ The opening paragraph of the new objective states: “Our purpose is to help youth and young adults understand and rely on the teachings and

Atonement of Jesus Christ, qualify for the blessings of the temple, and prepare themselves, their families, and others for eternal life with their Father in Heaven.”⁶²

The Objective has now become the definitive statement of vision regarding an S&I teacher’s purpose. Fundamentally, the purpose expressed in the new and old objectives is the same: S&I has always been concerned with helping young people learn and live the gospel of Jesus Christ. The new objective statement, however, represents a more compact and comprehensive description of S&I’s “aim.”⁶³ The Objective begins with a clear and overt focus on a student gaining a personal conviction of and relationship with Jesus Christ, His teachings, and His Atonement. This implies and presupposes that a teacher has gained, and is continuing to deepen the same conviction and relationship. Whereas the old objective highlighted what teachers do, the new objective describes what S&I hopes will happen in the lives of teachers and students. Though subtle, this shift is both significant and profoundly complementary to the Fundamentals. Brother Anderson concluded that the new objective was another direct response to the request, made by Elder Eyring and other Church leaders, for S&I to refocus their efforts at getting the gospel into students’ hearts and teaching for long-term conversion.⁶⁴

In a 2011 address to S&I, President Dieter F. Uchtdorf offered a powerful endorsement of the Objective. Quoting its exact language, he taught that “religious education is all about helping our young people *understand and rely on the teachings and Atonement of Jesus Christ.*”⁶⁵

The Gospel Teaching and Learning Handbook

In consequence of “The Teaching and Learning Emphasis” and “The Objective of Seminaries and Institutes of Religion,” the teaching handbook which had been provided for S&I teachers and administrators was now outdated. This handbook was first printed in 1994 and went by the title *Teaching the Gospel: A Handbook for CES Teachers and Leaders.*⁶⁶ One writer of

the new handbook noted that “the old ... handbook, ... was adequate for its day, in fact it was more than adequate, it was a step forward and helpful, it was perfect for its time.” However, he also noted that the principles embedded in the Emphasis were scattered throughout the handbook in a way that “you would have to dig it out.”⁶⁷ Since each teacher was asked to apply the Objective and incorporate the Emphasis - both of which presented principles of teaching for conversion to be applied by both teachers and students - a handbook built around these guideposts was necessary.

Initially, approval was granted to S&I for a revision of *Teaching the Gospel*. The idea was to update the objective, include the Teaching and Learning Emphasis, and include some quotes from the Brethren that supported these directives. As the revision neared completion, it was sent to select members of the training and curriculum departments for a review. The feedback received was that the revision was inadequate because it tried to explain the Emphasis and the Objective using old tools and old language. Additionally, several quotes from the Brethren were inserted in ways that made the handbook feel like a quote-book rather than a training document. One reviewer reported that it felt “disjointed” and scattered; “like shooting skeet.”⁶⁸

As the principal agents of the revision counseled together, they quickly came to the consensus that approval should be sought for a re-write. Once approval was granted, it was evident that the new handbook needed to clarify the standard of teaching and learning in S&I by explaining this standard in terms of the Objective and the Emphasis. It was also critical that the new handbook illustrate how these standards align with the teachings and expectations of the Brethren.

Clarifying the standard of teaching and learning in S&I. One writer of the new handbook stated that “The primary purpose of this manual is to establish a clear standard and example of how that standard is to be implemented.”⁶⁹ This primary purpose is evident in the very layout of the new handbook. The first chapter is a presentation of the Objective, and therefore, an explanation of the *why* behind what is presented in each chapter that follows. The second and third chapters explain *how* teachers and students achieve the Objective through application of the Seven Fundamentals of Gospel Teaching and Learning. Chapters four and five present ways that a teacher can apply the Fundamentals in lesson preparation and through the use of various teaching skills and methods. To understand the *why* behind a method or skill, one would refer to the previous chapter. To understand *how* to implement a principle of teaching and learning explained in the handbook, one would refer to the following chapter.

Each method or skill in the handbook is tied to one of the Seven Fundamentals of Teaching and Learning, each of which is tied to the Objective. Each of the skills, as with the focus of the Fundamentals, is designed to assist a teacher in creating an environment where students, acting as agents, can learn in a way that would invite conversion through meaningful participation. *Gospel Teaching and Learning* is “custom designed to tie *what, how, and why* together in extreme clarity.”⁷⁰ Regarding the layout, Randall Hall stated that because of the new handbook,

You ought to be able to stop at any time in your lesson and ask the question: “Now, why did I ask that question?” and you ought to be able to go back to one of the Fundamentals and say “this one was what I was trying to accomplish.” And so, the new handbook ... gives ... an understanding of the Objective ... [and] how the Fundamentals [help us to] reach it... And so, we feel that it really, in a very cogent, but in a very logical progression, helps make sense of what we are trying to accomplish.⁷¹

Brother Webb observed that because of *Gospel Teaching and Learning*, S&I has a “common standard and common language to refer to.” When introducing this new handbook to teachers worldwide, he explained that it would “unify us as to what we believe is effective teaching. It will give clarity and definition to a standard of effective teaching for all of Seminaries and Institutes of Religion ...”⁷²

This new handbook not only describes clearly the standard, thereby allowing for greater impact, but it also unequivocally builds the standard upon the foundation of prophetic direction given to gospel teachers.

Connecting the standard with the teachings and expectations of the Brethren. One writer of the new handbook explained that “part of the reason why *Gospel Teaching and Learning* was needed was because we had not tied together as a system, overtly, what the Brethren were teaching as far as the doctrinal underpinnings of the objectives that we are trying to go to ... We had the Teaching Emphasis ... and we had the Brethren who were talking about what needed to happen; but as a system, we were not connecting the dots very well.”⁷³ A clear connection needed to be made between the Emphasis and the Brethren. One writer observed, “If you asked a teacher why they did something that way, a lot of times they would say ‘because it works.’ But they couldn’t give you an answer that would mirror very closely anything that the Brethren were teaching in their talks to us. There was a disconnect in the curriculum between them, there was a disconnect in ... *Teaching the Gospel*, which means the disconnect went to training and in-service.”⁷⁴ The *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook is the connecting bridge between the Objective, the Emphasis, and the Brethren.

One way the writers went about building this bridge was to “get the Brethren in [S&I’s] thinking”⁷⁵ and to clearly position the instruction of the Brethren as the foundation behind the

Objective and the Fundamentals. Through the new handbook, teachers could see the Objective and the Fundamentals “in terms of Elder Eyring, in terms of Elder Bednar, in terms of Elder Scott.”⁷⁶ Brother Hall remarked that “the words of the Brethren are very clear to us, and we’re to do what they have asked us to do ... And so that continued to inform the way we worded things in the handbook and the fact that we included so many quotations of the Brethren.”⁷⁷

By way of illustration regarding the importance of the words of the Brethren in the new handbook, consider the following:

- The 2012 printing of *Gospel Teaching and Learning* contains 82 pages with explanatory text.⁷⁸
- Within these 82 pages, there are 88 citations in *Gospel Teaching and Learning* from prophets and apostles. Taking the average of the frequency of citations in the entire handbook, there is a citation every .93 pages.
- In the chapter on the Objective, there is a citation every .45 pages. In the chapter on the Fundamentals, there is a citation every .64 pages. These numbers highlight a density of citations from the Brethren in the chapters that establish the definition of teaching and learning in S&I.
- Of the 88 citations, 44 come from addresses from the Brethren to S&I, and 26 come from General Conference addresses about gospel teaching.
- Of the 44 citations from addresses to S&I, 23 post-date the publication of *Teaching the Gospel*, 13 are derived from foundational talks to S&I,⁷⁹ and 8 come from talks prior to 1994.

Chad Webb explained the connection between the Brethren and *Gospel Teaching and Learning* in a worldwide internet introduction of the new handbook. He stated:

Over the last 20 years, we have had a handbook that served us very well. And through that time we have continued to learn and to grow as an organization. We have the wonderful blessing of being led by inspired leaders who have taken many opportunities to instruct us about effective teaching. One of the reasons for this new handbook is to have a collection where we have compiled much of what we've learned throughout the years in Seminaries and Institutes of Religion about effective teaching and about effective learning. I am grateful for the opportunity to have the words of living prophets and the things that they are teaching us about teaching gathered together and placed in this wonderful new handbook.⁸⁰

In this citation, Brother Webb asserts that the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* represents the direction and training S&I has received over the past 20 years from prophets, seers, and revelators. The history of the handbook's creation supports this claim.

In a 2013 address to S&I personnel worldwide, Elder Russell M. Nelson gave the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook the following endorsement: "If teachers will incorporate these fundamentals effectively If you do all you can – teach in the way that is outlined in your handbook – you will be doing what you need to do to assist with [the] prophetic priority."⁸¹ *Gospel Teaching and Learning* represents a remarkable effort by S&I to clarify the standard of teaching and learning in S&I, and to demonstrate how the standard aligns with the teachings and expectations of the Brethren.

Gospel Teaching and Learning "was a massive effort . . . in some ways there are 150 people who wrote it."⁸² The project started in 2010, with a goal to present the new handbook at the Area Director's convention in the spring of 2011. However, as that date neared, the handbook was not yet finished and the decision was made to aim for a later release date. Because those working on the project had made such an intense and consuming effort to finish by the initial deadline, the S&I administration decided to step back from the project for a season once it became evident that the desired release date would not be realized. This period of time away from working on the handbook became a blessing for three reasons: First, it allowed S&I to unify some of their efforts with the *Come Follow Me* youth curriculum released by the Church in 2012.⁸³ This unification occurred through a shared introduction to *Gospel Teaching and Learning* and the *Come Follow Me* teacher handbook, as well as through sharing common "Basic Doctrines."⁸⁴

Second, the time taken away from the project allowed the writers to see what was being produced in the handbook through different lenses. One writer was also working on a project to create new S&I curriculum. As he worked to directly incorporate the Objective and the Fundamentals into the new curriculum, he gained insights that improved *Gospel Teaching and Learning*. As another writer, who had responsibilities in the training department, worked to incorporate portions of the new handbook-in-process into training experiences, he too gained insights that improved how the handbook was worded and arranged.⁸⁵

And third, the time away allowed the writers to reflect on all that they had been working on and “let it stew.”⁸⁶ It was after this time away that the decision was made to include in the fifth fundamental the desire for each S&I student to “feel the truth and importance of ... gospel doctrines and principles.”⁸⁷

In May of 2012,⁸⁸ S&I published and distributed *Gospel Teaching and Learning: A Handbook for Teachers and Leaders in Seminaries and Institutes of Religion* as a capstone to the decade of adjustments to the definition of teaching and learning in S&I. The *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook has been distributed to the worldwide cadre of more than 45,000 teachers.⁸⁹ It has been translated into 38 languages.⁹⁰ The content of the new handbook is the foundation of pre-service and in-service training for all full-time personnel, as well as for the volunteer teachers who make up 90% of the teaching corps.⁹¹ *Gospel Teaching and Learning*, therefore, potentially effects not only S&I teachers and administrators, but also more than 740,000 students worldwide.⁹² Brother Webb explained that the handbook “will help to increase the impact that we have on our students while they are with us in our classrooms. That will help them to deepen conversion and protect them from the influences of the world, and to prepare them for the things that lay ahead in their future.”⁹³

Adjusting the Aim

Prophets have led S&I through an important shift in their understanding of teaching and learning in ways that cultivate personal conversion.⁹⁴ The Brethren have always instructed S&I to teach by the Spirit “so that the gospel of Jesus Christ will go down into the heart of the one ...”⁹⁵ However, since the turn of the twenty-first century, the Brethren have repeatedly focused the attention of S&I on helping students fulfill their role in *learning* by the Spirit.⁹⁶ By so doing, the teacher helps the student along the path of personal conversion.

The desired conversion for each individual teacher and student is described generally in the Objective. Conversion includes not only understanding, but also relying upon the Savior. To “rely” denotes a daily dependence upon the Savior, and a consistent incorporation of His teachings and Atonement into one’s personal progression. The Objective also explains that this conversion should deepen continually, through Church and temple service, until one qualifies for eternal life with Heavenly Father.⁹⁷ Elder Bednar described conversion in the following terms, “The learning I am describing reaches far beyond mere cognitive comprehension and the retaining and recalling of information. The type of learning about which I am speaking causes us to put off the natural man (see Mosiah 3:19), to change our hearts (see Mosiah 5:2), and to be converted unto the Lord and to never fall away (see Alma 23:6).”⁹⁸

Elder Eyring added that the “mighty change” desired for S&I teachers and students “is reported time after time in the Book of Mormon. The way it is wrought and what the person becomes is always the same. The words of God in pure doctrine go down deep into the heart by the power of the Holy Ghost. The person pleads with God in faith. The repentant heart is broken and the spirit contrite. Sacred covenants have been made. Then God keeps His covenant to grant a new heart and a new life, in His time.”⁹⁹

The principles embedded within the Fundamentals represent some of the necessary elements that create an environment where conversion may occur. Elder Bednar explained:

A learner exercising agency by acting in accordance with correct principles opens his or her heart to the Holy Ghost—and invites His teaching, testifying power, and confirming witness. Learning by faith requires spiritual, mental, and physical exertion and not just passive reception. It is in the sincerity and consistency of our faith-inspired action that we indicate to our Heavenly Father and His Son, Jesus Christ, our willingness to learn and receive instruction from the Holy Ghost. Thus, learning by faith involves the exercise of moral agency to act upon the assurance of things hoped for and invites the evidence of things not seen from the only true teacher, the Spirit of the Lord.¹⁰⁰

Consider the several different ways that a student is invited to act “in accordance with correct principles” by a teacher applying the Fundamentals. The student is invited to read and study the scriptures, and identify, explain, share, testify of, and apply gospel principles. By these actions, a student can invite the Holy Spirit to teach, witness, and strengthen them to become what God would have them be.

Regarding the adjustment represented by the Fundamentals, Chad Webb observed that the “biggest change in our approach would probably come down to the role of the student. Is the student actively participating? Is the student discovering things? Are students talking about ways the gospel blesses their lives? Are they sharing their own experiences with gospel principles? Those kinds of experiences with the scriptures and with their peers will help to take gospel principles into their hearts and will prepare them to be able to share it with others.”¹⁰¹ Rather than simply sharing with the students all that he or she has learned about the scriptures, instructor and student are both engaged as teachers and learners who explore together the doctrine and principles of the gospel to learn saving truths for themselves.

The Objective complements and clarifies the Fundamentals by keeping S&I grounded in the primary purpose behind increased student engagement: so that students and teachers might

come to understand and rely on the Savior. Brother Webb explained that the goal is not just to have students participate for participation's sake, but to have students “participating in a very meaningful way.” This means that both teachers and students must “participate in a way that their conversion is deepened and ... they are discovering truths in the scriptures for themselves.” The Objective adds a second witness to the clarification of the role of both teacher and student found in the Fundamentals when it states that the teacher's purpose is to “help the youth,” but it is the learner that must “understand ... rely ... [and] qualify” for the conversion experience.¹⁰² Through the Fundamentals and the Objective, the roles of teacher and student are brought into sharp focus.

S&I teachers have always desired to invite the Holy Ghost to teach students. They have always desired conversion for those they teach. So, what is the shift represented by the Fundamentals and the Objective? Elder Bednar explained that “we emphasize and know much more about a teacher teaching by the Spirit than we do about a learner learning by faith. Clearly, the principles and processes of both teaching and learning are spiritually essential. However, as we look to the future and anticipate the ever more confused and turbulent world in which we will live, I believe it will be essential for all of us to increase our capacity to seek learning by faith.”¹⁰³ Prior to the formation of the Current Teaching Emphasis, the main emphasis of training and instruction provided for teachers by S&I focused primarily on the role of the teacher. While it was not silent on the role of the student, such was not emphasized to the degree now present in S&I. By way of illustration, in *Teaching the Gospel*, the S&I teacher handbook from 1994-2011, three out of forty-four pages were specifically designated to explaining “The Role of the Student in Gospel Learning.”¹⁰⁴ In contrast, the new *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook has been specifically designed to tie each teaching skill and teacher method into the Fundamentals and the

Objective,¹⁰⁵ which have as their driving purpose to invite students to learn by faith through the righteous exercise of their personal agency.

The role of the teacher in the conversion process is vitally important, and has been consistently emphasized in S&I throughout its history. That importance has not diminished, but has been appropriately counterbalanced with an understanding that a “teacher can explain, demonstrate, persuade, and testify, and do so with great spiritual power and effectiveness. Ultimately, however, the content of a message and the witness of the Holy Ghost penetrate into the heart only if a receiver allows them to enter.”¹⁰⁶ Elder Bednar reminded S&I that “the Holy Ghost is the teacher who, through proper invitation, can enter into a learner’s heart,” and that an S&I teacher has an important “responsibility to preach the gospel by the Spirit, even the Comforter, as a prerequisite for the learning by faith that can be achieved only by and through the Holy Ghost (see D&C 50:14).”¹⁰⁷ Therefore a teacher should learn, understand, and apply what Elder Bednar taught, when he said that gospel teachers “are most effective as instructors when we encourage and facilitate learning by faith.”¹⁰⁸ This clarification, born of prophetic instruction, lies at the heart of the Fundamentals, the Objective, and the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook. Elder Bednar’s instruction to S&I in 2006 is emblematic of this clear message from the Brethren:

The most important learnings of life are caught—not taught.

The spiritual understanding you and I have been blessed to receive, and which has been confirmed as true in our hearts, simply cannot be given to another person. The tuition of diligence and learning by faith must be paid to obtain and personally “own” such knowledge. Only in this way can what is known in the mind be transformed into what is felt in the heart. Only in this way can a person move beyond relying upon the spiritual knowledge and experience of others and claim those blessings for himself or herself. Only in this way can we be spiritually prepared for what is coming.¹⁰⁹

Many passages from *Gospel Teaching and Learning* reflect the most recent prophetic counsel given to teachers in S&I to facilitate productive and meaningful student engagement that leads to personal conversion.¹¹⁰ One passage from the new handbook teaches that “Students are edified when they are led through a learning process... Students should be led to search the scriptures for understanding and to discover the truths of the gospel for themselves. They should be given opportunities to explain the gospel in their own words and to share and testify of what they know and feel. This helps to bring the gospel from their heads down into their hearts.”¹¹¹ The new handbook emphasizes that teachers should focus on “helping students fulfill their role.” It states that “As teachers prepare how they will teach, they should stay focused on the learner and not just on what the teacher will do. Rather than merely asking ‘What will I do in class today?’ or ‘What will I teach my students?’ a teacher should also approach lesson preparation thinking, ‘What will my students do in class today?’ ‘How will I help my students discover what they need to know?’”¹¹²

The *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook cements the refinement of focus described in the Objective and the Fundamentals and ties it inextricably to the instruction given to S&I by the Brethren. Prophets, seers, and revelators have not only highlighted the need for greater student conversion, but have also taught the *why* and the *how* regarding teachers facilitating student conversion.

Summary and Conclusions

The Savior taught: “And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou has sent” (John 17:3). Since the turn of the twenty-first century, the Brethren have taught S&I, with increased clarity and urgency, the principles and practices which would meaningfully impact a student’s journey toward “eternal life with their Father in

Heaven.”¹¹³ The Brethren have focused S&I on helping a student individually connect with their Heavenly Father and choose to “understand and rely on the teachings and Atonement of Jesus Christ”¹¹⁴ *for themselves*. Building a personal relationship with a loving Father in Heaven is of far greater importance than teacher knowledge, presentation, and charisma. President Eyring taught S&I that their job is “to teach eternal truth in such a way that a child of God can choose to know and love our Heavenly Father and His Beloved Son.”¹¹⁵ The Current Teaching Emphasis in 2003, the Objective in 2009, and the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook in 2012, represent S&I’s response to prophetic direction. These advances have established a clear standard and have brought increased focus on the principles and processes that effectively help the learners fulfill their role in the learning process so that they might progress along the path of personal conversion to the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Conversion is a deeply personal process that comes in the Lord’s time and in the Lord’s way. Elder Eyring reminded S&I teachers that “True conversion depends on a student seeking freely in faith, with great effort ... Then it is the Lord who can grant, in His time, the miracle of cleansing and change ... Whether the miracle occurs in a moment or over years, as is far more common, it is the doctrine of Jesus Christ that drives the change.”¹¹⁶ Although conversion cannot be forced, coerced, or manufactured, when the principles embedded in *Gospel Teaching and Learning* are applied, an environment is created which fosters both personal conversion and preparation for future family and Church responsibilities.

Each individual chooses for himself or herself whether or not they will rely on the Savior, and each should be invited to do so by an effective teacher. S&I teachers should “teach out of [their] own changed hearts.”¹¹⁷ They should expect and encourage, through their very teaching methods and constructs, each student to “[seek] freely in faith, with great effort” while they are

enrolled in S&I. Elder Bednar tersely reminded S&I teachers that their students “really are the young people that have been reserved for these latter days. Let’s quit telling them that and start treating them like that, and expecting them to come through.”¹¹⁸

The success of S&I depends upon the application of the principles and processes that have been taught with increased clarity by prophets, and are the heart of *Gospel Teaching and Learning*. Understanding these principles and processes precedes effective application. Each teacher should personally pay the price to know the new handbook. It should inform their preparation, teaching, and administering. Elder Maxwell once noted to S&I personnel that “God is giving away the spiritual secrets of the universe,” and then asked: “are we listening?”¹¹⁹

Notes

¹ Henry B. Eyring, “A Foundation of Faith: 100 Years of Seminary,” si.lds.org.

² Richard G. Scott, “How to Obtain Revelation and Inspiration for Your Personal Life,” *Ensign*, May 2012, 45-47.

³ Barbara Morgan, Garry Moore, LaNell Moore, “Seminaries and Institutes of Religion,” in *Religious Educator* 11, no. 3 (2010): 181-213.

⁴ Stanley A. Peterson. “Carrying the Scriptures unto the Hearts, Not Just into the Hands, of Students,” CES Conference on the Book of Mormon, 14 August 2001.

⁵ See Elder Richard G. Scott’s account of speaking with President Hinckley about these concerns in “To Understand and Live Truth,” *Address to CES Religious Educators*, February 4, 2005.

⁶ Henry B. Eyring, “We Must Raise Our Sights,” *CES Conference on the Book of Mormon*, August 14, 2001, 1- 2.

⁷ M. Russell Ballard, “The Greatest Generation of Missionaries,” *Ensign*, November 2002, 46.

⁸ Benjamin Hyrum White, “The History of Preach My Gospel,” in *Religious Educator* 14, no. 1 (2013): 129-158.

⁹ Randall Hall, Interview with Adam Smith, October 14, 2013, copy in author’s possession.

¹⁰ Randall Hall, Personal writings, copy in author’s possession.

¹¹ Casey Paul Griffiths, Interview with Paul V. Johnson, January 19, 2010, copy in author’s possession.

¹² Randall L. Hall, “The Current Teaching Emphasis: An Update,” *CES Satellite Broadcast*, August 2003, 8.

¹³ Eyring, “We Must Raise Our Sights,” 1- 2.

¹⁴ Chad H. Webb and Kenneth L. Alford, “Serving Students: A Conversation with Chad H. Webb,” in *Religious Educator* 10, no. 3 (2009): 237-246.

¹⁵ Robert A. Ewer, “Seminaries and Institutes of Religion timeline: A century of seminary,” si.lds.org, 5.

¹⁶ Hall, “The Current Teaching Emphasis: An Update,” 8.

-
- ¹⁷ Hall, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ¹⁸ Hall, Personal writings.
- ¹⁹ Kenneth Godfrey, Chad Webb Interview, May 18, 2010, copy in author's possession.
- ²⁰ Hall, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ²¹ This phrase is borrowed from President Eyring in Henry B. Eyring, "To Know and to Love God," *Address to CES Religious Educators*, February 26, 2010, 3.
- ²² Hall, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ²³ Chad Webb, Interview with Adam Smith, November 8, 2013, copy in author's possession.
- ²⁴ Paul V. Johnson, "Follow the Lord's Path," *CES Sattelite Training Broadcast*, August 2005.
- ²⁵ Hall, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ²⁶ Randall L. Hall, "2009 June Global Faculty Meeting-The Teaching and Learning Emphasis," si.lds.org.
- ²⁷ Richard G. Scott, "To Understand and Live Truth," *Address to CES Religious Educators*, February 4, 2005.
- ²⁸ Scott, "To Understand and Live Truth," 3.
- ²⁹ David A. Bednar, "Seek Learning by Faith," *Address to CES Religious Educators*, February 3, 2006.
- ³⁰ Bednar, "Seek Learning by Faith," 1.
- ³¹ See "Worldwide Leadership Training Meeting: Teaching and Learning, February 10, 2007," in *Ensign*, June 2007.
- ³² Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Gospel Teaching and Learning: A Handbook for Teachers and Leaders in Seminaries and Institutes of Religion* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 2012), 10.
- ³³ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Gospel Teaching and Learning*, 10.
- ³⁴ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Gospel Teaching and Learning*, 10.
- ³⁵ Hall, Personal writings.
- ³⁶ Eyring, "We Must Raise Our Sights," 1-2.
- ³⁷ Hall, "The Current Teaching Emphasis: An Update," 8.
- ³⁸ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Gospel Teaching and Learning*, 10.
- ³⁹ Hall, Personal writings.
- ⁴⁰ The Church Educational System, *Teaching the Gospel Handbook* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1994), 3-4.
- ⁴¹ Grant Anderson, Assistant Administrator to Adam Smith, email, November 13, 2013.
- ⁴² Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Gospel Teaching and Learning*, 10.
- ⁴³ Ewer, "Seminaries and Institutes of Religion timeline: A century of seminary,"
- ⁴⁴ W. Rolfe Kerr, "Clarity of Focus and Consistency of Effort," *Address to CES Religious Educators*, February 3, 2006.
- ⁴⁵ Grant Anderson, S&I Assistant Administrator, Interview with Adam Smith, September 25, 2013, copy in author's possession.
- ⁴⁶ Anderson, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ⁴⁷ Webb, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ⁴⁸ Regarding the sources accessed, Grant Anderson stated: "Unfortunately, I didn't keep any documentation of what we looked at, it included articles from business magazines, books, etc." Grant Anderson, Assistant Administrator to Adam Smith, email, October 15, 2014.
- ⁴⁹ Anderson, Interview with Adam Smith.

-
- ⁵⁰ Anderson, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ⁵¹ Anderson, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ⁵² Anderson, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ⁵³ Anderson, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ⁵⁴ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, “Church Board of Education and Other Officers,” Official Memo, September 11, 2013. (In author’s possession).
- ⁵⁵ Webb and Alford, “Serving Students: A Conversation with Chad H. Webb,” 239.
- ⁵⁶ Anderson, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ⁵⁷ Webb, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ⁵⁸ Webb, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ⁵⁹ Chad Webb, “Welcome To The New S&I Handbook. A Video From Brother Chad H. Webb,” si.lds.org.
- ⁶⁰ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion. “2009 April Global Faculty Meeting-The Objective of Seminaries and Institutes of Religion,” si.lds.org.
- ⁶¹ The Church Educational System, *Teaching the Gospel Handbook*, 3-4.
- ⁶² Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Gospel Teaching and Learning*, x.
- ⁶³ Eyring, “We Must Raise Our Sights,” 2.
- ⁶⁴ Grant Anderson, Assistant Administrator to Adam Smith, email, November 13, 2013.
- ⁶⁵ Dieter F. Uchtdorf, “A Teacher of God’s Children,” *Address to Religious Educators*, January 28, 2011, 7 (emphasis added).
- ⁶⁶ The Church Educational System, *Teaching the Gospel Handbook*.
- ⁶⁷ Interview with the principal writers of the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook conducted by Adam Smith on September 18, 2013. These writers requested to remain unnamed. They did not want to assume undue credit for their contribution to a handbook. Although the handbook was the outcome of input from many sources, there were three principal writers who worked under the supervision of Chad Webb and Elder Paul V. Johnson. A transcript of each interview is in the author’s possession.
- ⁶⁸ Principal writers of the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ⁶⁹ Principal writers of the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ⁷⁰ Hall, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ⁷¹ Hall, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ⁷² Webb, “Welcome To The New S&I Handbook. A Video from Brother Chad H. Webb.”
- ⁷³ Principal writers of the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ⁷⁴ Principal writers of the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ⁷⁵ Principal writers of the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ⁷⁶ Principal writers of the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ⁷⁷ Hall, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ⁷⁸ This includes the introduction and subtracts one page that displays the Objective and one page that contains only an illustration of the First Vision.
- ⁷⁹ An address must fit the following criteria in order to be considered foundational: 1. The source is an LDS prophet or apostle, 2. The address was included in *Charge to Religious Educators*, which was a portion of the Seminary pre-service curriculum from 1981-2004, and 3. The address is included in *Teaching Seminary: Preservice Readings*, which is a portion of the Seminary pre-service curriculum from 2004-Present.
- ⁸⁰ Webb, “Welcome To The New S&I Handbook.”

- ⁸¹ Russell M. Nelson, “Teaching Youth in the Day of the Wave,” *Seminaries & Institutes of Religion Broadcast*, August 6, 2013, 3.
- ⁸² Principal writers of the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ⁸³ *Teaching the Gospel in the Savior’s Way: A Guide to ‘Come, Follow Me: Learning Resources for Youth* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 2012).
- ⁸⁴ See Matthew O. Richardson, “Come Follow Me: Learning Resources for Youth,” in *Religious Educator* 14, no. 3 (2013), 23-47, and Barbara J. Morgan, “Improving Learning and Teaching: A Conversation with Russell T. Osguthorpe,” in *Religious Educator* 15, no. 3 (2014), 78.
- ⁸⁵ Principal writers of the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ⁸⁶ Principal writers of the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ⁸⁷ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Gospel Teaching and Learning*, 10.
- ⁸⁸ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, “The New Gospel Teaching and Learning Handbook,” Official Memo, May 28, 2012, si.lds.org.
- ⁸⁹ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Seminaries and Institutes of Religion Annual Report for 2013*, 1-5.
- ⁹⁰ Paul Murphy, Curriculum Department for S&I, to Adam N. Smith, email, September 13, 2013.
- ⁹¹ Webb, “Welcome To The New S&I Handbook.”
- ⁹² Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Seminaries and Institutes of Religion Annual Report for 2013*, 1-5.
- ⁹³ Webb, “Welcome To The New S&I Handbook.”
- ⁹⁴ Elder Eyring asked S&I to adjust their aim in “We Must Raise Our Sights,” 2.
- ⁹⁵ Eyring, “A Foundation of Faith: 100 Years of Seminary.”
- ⁹⁶ This focus was emphasized in Eyring, “We Must Raise Our Sights,” Henry B. Eyring, “Inquire of the Lord,” *Address to CES Religious Educators*, February 2, 2001, Hales, “Teaching by Faith,” Henry B. Eyring, “The Spirit Must be our Constant Companion,” *Address to CES Religious Educators*, February 7, 2003, Richard G. Scott and Henry B. Eyring, “Discussion with Elder Richard G. Scott and Elder Henry B. Eyring,” *CES Satellite Broadcast*, August 1, 2003, Scott, “To Understand and Live Truth,” Bednar, “Seek Learning by Faith,” and Jeffrey R. Holland, “Teaching and Learning in the Church,” *Worldwide Leadership Training Meeting: Teaching and Learning*, February 10, 2007, to name a few.
- ⁹⁷ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Gospel Teaching and Learning*, x.
- ⁹⁸ Bednar, “Seek Learning by Faith,” 3.
- ⁹⁹ Eyring, “We Must Raise Our Sights,” 3.
- ¹⁰⁰ Bednar, “Seek Learning by Faith,” 3.
- ¹⁰¹ Webb and Alford, “Serving Students: A Conversation with Chad H. Webb,” 240-241.
- ¹⁰² Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Gospel Teaching and Learning*, x.
- ¹⁰³ Bednar, “Seek Learning by Faith,” 1.
- ¹⁰⁴ The Church Educational System, *Teaching the Gospel Handbook*, p. 13-15.
- ¹⁰⁵ Hall, Interview with Adam Smith.
- ¹⁰⁶ Bednar, “Seek Learning by Faith,” 1.
- ¹⁰⁷ Bednar, “Seek Learning by Faith,” 4.
- ¹⁰⁸ Bednar, “Seek Learning by Faith,” 4.
- ¹⁰⁹ Bednar, “Seek Learning by Faith,” 5.
- ¹¹⁰ For illustrative examples of this see Robert D. Hales, “Teaching by Faith,” *Address to CES Religious Educators*, February 1, 2002; David A. Bednar, “Seek Learning by Faith,” *Address to*

CES Religious Educators, February 3, 2006; and Richard G. Scott, “To Understand and Live Truth,” *Address to CES Religious Educators*, February 4, 2005.

¹¹¹ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Gospel Teaching and Learning*, 55.

¹¹² Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Gospel Teaching and Learning*, 57.

¹¹³ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Gospel Teaching and Learning*, x.

¹¹⁴ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Gospel Teaching and Learning*, x.

¹¹⁵ Eyring, “To Know and Love God,” 1.

¹¹⁶ Eyring, “We Must Raise our Sights,” 3-4.

¹¹⁷ Eyring, “We Must Raise our Sights,” 3.

¹¹⁸ David A. Bednar, “A Discussion with Elder Bednar,” August 2, 2011, si.lds.org.

¹¹⁹ Neal A. Maxwell, “The Creators Cosmos,” *CES Conference on the Doctrine and Covenants and Church History*, August 13, 2002, 2.

Appendix A

Literature Review

Instruction in The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS) is shifting. In recent years, significant changes have been made in materials for both amateur instructors such as missionaries (*Preach my Gospel*)¹, and Sunday School teachers (“Come Follow Me”)², as well as for the professional and volunteer instructors of the Seminaries and Institutes of Religion (*Gospel Teaching and Learning*)³. This study focuses on the changes which have characterized instruction in the recent history of Seminaries and Institutes of Religion (S&I) and what caused these changes.

The Formation of Seminaries and Institutes of Religion

Education and learning have always been an important element of Latter-day Saint theology and culture. Early revelations to the Prophet Joseph Smith stated that “The glory of God is intelligence” (DC 93:36), and exhorted the Saints to “seek learning, even by study and also by faith” (DC 88:118). The LDS people instituted schools and organized education in their various settlements since the earliest days of the Church. After a difficult migration west, the Latter-day Saints first arrived in the Salt Lake Valley in July of 1847. They established schools within a few months after their arrival, opening the first school in October of 1847.⁴

Due to the belief of the Latter-day Saints that “The glory of God is intelligence” (DC 93:36) and that all truth “proceedeth forth from the mouth of God” (DC 84:44), they also believe that knowledge is not divisible and cannot be compartmentalized into public and private or religious and secular. Brigham Young taught that every “good and perfect gift cometh from God. Every discovery in science and art that is really true and useful to mankind has been given by direct revelation from God, though but few acknowledge it.”⁵ Karl G. Maeser, a contemporary of

Brigham Young and the first Superintendent of Church schools believed that “all knowledge was fundamentally religious; there could be nothing religiously neutral about truth.”⁶ The ideal LDS school system would, therefore, teach all knowledge as spiritual. Each subject matter would be approached from an eternal perspective of faith and divinity. These ideals engendered in early Church leaders a desire to educate their own youth. The Church was the major provider of education for the Latter-day Saints up until the early 1900s. William E. Berrett noted that “Secondary education in Utah was largely provided by the Church before 1907.”⁷

One way the Church provided education was through “Church Academies.” These academies were supported by the tithes of the Church and operated on a Stake level.⁸ When Brigham Young appointed Karl Maeser as the principal of the Brigham Young academy in Provo, which would later evolve into Brigham Young University, he gave Brother Maeser brief and concise instructions: “You ought not to teach even the alphabet or the multiplication tables without the Spirit of God. That is all. God bless you. Good-bye.”⁹ This advice reflects accurately the Latter-day Saint views of knowledge and learning.

Another reason for the formation of LDS Academies was to “counteract the effect of the Protestant and Catholic secondary schools” established near the saints.¹⁰ Legrand Richards noted that “Enemies of the Church saw public education as a way to undercut the Church’s overall influence in the territory. Both political and denominational opponents of Brigham [Young] sought ways to influence Utah children away from Mormonism.”¹¹ As the threat from outside forces increased, so did the Church’s education efforts.

In 1888, the Church Board of Education was organized with Karl G. Maeser appointed as superintendent of Church schools. This Board was created to supervise the Church’s educational efforts, which included a growing number of academies.¹² This same year, letters were sent to

each stake in the Church calling upon them to organize an academy, as well as “Religion Classes” in every ward and branch for those youth who could not attend an academy.¹³ From the outset, the Church academies enrolled a minority of LDS children. Since not all children could have the privilege of attending a Church school that integrated the gospel into all aspects of the curriculum, the Church sought to “supplement public education by providing religious training outside of school hours” through these “Religion Classes.”¹⁴ These efforts at religious education were seen as a critical defense against a sweeping wave of secularism, as well as the missionary efforts of the Protestant schools upon LDS children and youth.

The academies served their purpose well for a time. However, they quickly became an ever-growing financial burden to the Church which could not be sustained, especially as Church leaders looked at the cost of providing school for an ever-growing LDS population. As these burdens increased, so did the prevalence of public schools in Latter-day Saint settlements.¹⁵ As the public school system grew and the political landscape of Utah changed, “the Church had to support a system of public education that could not reach the highest ideals of [an LDS education] because of legal restrictions.”¹⁶ In addition to the financial burden and legal restrictions placed upon the Church, the academy system presented a different type of burden to the LDS people. Griffiths noted that “it became increasingly difficult for LDS families to support [the] two different systems” of a tax-based public school system and a private system of Church schools.¹⁷ T. Edgar Lyon noted that Church schools imposed financial requirements upon LDS families of tuition costs and, in some cases, providing for the teacher.¹⁸ Although the move towards public education would be a concession of the ideal LDS education, it was a political, legal, and financial reality of the day. It did not mean, however, that the Church would abandon the religious education of their youth.¹⁹

Originally, the Church had offered religion classes to supplement the education of the LDS youth attending public school during the era of the academies. The religion classes, however, were not a perfect solution. In addition to imposing an additional burden of time upon LDS families, the religion classes tended to duplicate the work of Church's Sunday School organization. With the overlap experienced through the religion classes, and the financial and logistical factors associated with the move away from the academy system, there was a need for something different. The time was ripe for the formation of the seminary program, which "evolved out of ... 'The Religion Class.'"²⁰ Bennion observed that "seminaries ... gradually replaced the academies, and after the close of most of the academies in 1922, the seminary movement developed rapidly."²¹

The idea for what would come to be known as seminary came to a man named Joseph F. Merrill, who at the time was the second counselor in the Granite Stake presidency. Inspired by his wife's love and knowledge of the scriptures, which she attributed to her time as a student at a Church academy, Brother Merrill wanted the same blessing for the youth of his stake.²² Being "deeply moved" by his wife's experiences, Merrill

immediately began contemplating how other children attending public schools could receive the same kind of spiritual training as his wife. He became obsessed with the idea of providing students with a religious experience as part of the school day, regardless of what kind of school they attended. A few weeks later he presented the rough idea for a new religious education program to the stake presidency.²³

After making the necessary arrangements with both the Granite Stake and Granite High School, the first seminary class got underway in the fall of 1912. Granite Seminary, held adjacent to Granite High School, began with 70 students enrolled.²⁴

Seminary was different from an academy since it was located adjacent to a public high school and students would come over to the seminary for one class period during the day. The

only subjects taught were theological in nature. The course of study in seminary that first year was the Bible.²⁵ Seminary was different than the religion classes since it was incorporated mainly into the hours and schedule of the school day and was held adjacent to the public school. Seminary created no significant burden on families. The seminary program cost the Church a fraction of the costs of maintaining the academy system.²⁶ It also brought greater consistency and order than the religion class.²⁷

The financial burden of maintaining Church schools was a major factor that led to the formation of LDS institutes of religion as well. Due to financial concerns, the Church Board of Education voted in a 1926 meeting to turn over to the states most of the Church-sponsored colleges.²⁸ This led to increasing numbers of LDS college students “attending colleges and universities away from home, [who] would now be without weekday religious training.”²⁹ It was feared that these young adults would become deeply immersed in secular studies at the cost of their faith. In 1926, Elder Stephen L. Richards of the Church’s Quorum of Twelve Apostles proposed that the Church open a “senior college seminary.” This suggestion led to the opening of the first Institute of Religion in Moscow, Idaho in 1926.³⁰ Although the term “institute” had been used in Church Education by Karl G. Maeser as early as 1873, the Moscow, Idaho institute is credited with being the first institute formally organized under the direction of the Church Board of Education.³¹ This “first” institute in Idaho in 1926 had an opening enrollment of twenty-five students.³² Within 30 years, the number of institute programs and had grown to 18.³³

Seminaries and Institutes Establish an Identity within the Church

From 1912 to 1919, Seminary classes were a function of the individual LDS stakes.³⁴ However, in 1920 the Church Board of Education proposed the closure or transfer to state control of nearly all the remaining Church academies. This change would necessitate a major

expansion of the seminary program in order to meet the needs LDS youth. Following the closure of most the academies, the number of seminaries grew. By the end of the 1920s, the number of operating seminaries grew from 20 to 81.³⁵ Now that the Seminary program was no longer a stake run program, but was a Church-wide program which fell under the auspices of the Church Educational System, a new level of expectations was engendered.

Adam S. Bennion was appointed Church Superintendent of Education in 1920 and served until 1928.³⁶ During his tenure, he placed great emphasis on the training of seminary teachers over the summer, as well as creating a useful curriculum.³⁷ He had succeeded in making “the salaries of religion teachers and administrators comparable to those paid public high school teachers and administrators. This change was made to draw the best teachers and administrators into the Church Educational System.”³⁸ Superintendent Bennion was determined that these teachers not only be paid like professionals, but that they be trained like professionals as well. Griffiths observed that Bennion “took seriously the question of how this new breed of educators in the Church should be trained.”³⁹

In the summer of 1920, Bennion organized a summer school in order to produce more standardized training and curriculum for the seminary system. In 1921, Bennion invited several General Authorities to provide training for the seminary teachers in attendance. Among those invited were Melvin J. Ballard, Joseph Fielding Smith, George F. Richards, Anthony W. Ivins, and David A. Smith.⁴⁰ Thus a pattern emerges from the earliest days of the formal Church-wide seminary program of seeking training from the Brethren.

William E. Berrett, who later would become the administrator for Seminaries and Institutes for seventeen years, remembered attending these summer school sessions.⁴¹ Berrett first attended one of these sessions in 1927.⁴² This was also the first year that these summer

sessions were moved to “Aspen Grove in the North Fork of Provo Canyon.”⁴³ Berrett recalled that “many of the General Authorities’ addresses at the summer school sessions concerned the clarification or interpretation of LDS doctrine, rather than matters involving educational methodology.”⁴⁴ These meetings were held periodically for the next twenty years.⁴⁵

In the early 1930s, there was a sentiment among some within the institute programs, and the religion department at BYU, that Latter-day Saint professional educators should be leading out in the field of academic theology. Elder Boyd K. Packer noted:

There was encouragement, both for the men in the institute program and for the teachers of religion at Brigham Young University, to go away and get advanced degrees. “Go study under the great religious scholars of the world,” was the encouragement, “for we will set an academic standard in theology.” And a number of them went. Some who went never returned. And some of them who returned never came back. They had followed, they supposed, the scriptural injunction: “Seek learning, even by study and also by faith” (D&C 88:118). But somehow the mix had been wrong. For they had sought learning out of the best books, even by study, but with too little faith. They found themselves in conflict with the simple things of the gospel. One by one they found their way outside of the field of teaching religion, outside of Church activity, and a few of them outside of the Church itself.⁴⁶

This group of teachers to which Elder Packer is referring sought higher degrees from the University of Chicago’s Divinity School.⁴⁷ Although not all of these teachers fell away, the larger impact upon religious education in the Church was negative. Griffiths noted that “Church leaders began to be skeptical of the liberal spirit of the Chicago school and worried that its approach to the scriptures could undermine the faith of the students.”⁴⁸ Some teachers who returned from the Divinity School criticized Church leadership and taught in ways considered controversial by the Brethren. “General Authorities soon began to publicly respond to some of the more heretical attitudes appearing among religion teachers in the Church.”⁴⁹

The First Presidency responded to these concerns by assigning J. Reuben Clark, a member of the Presidency, to address S&I personnel. As part of his duties in the First

Presidency, Clark had made a thorough review of the curriculum materials being used in both the Church schools and S&I at the time. He was concerned about the “secular” principles present in these materials, which seemed to him to rob both the teachings and Church of Jesus Christ of their divinity. President Clark was sensitive to protecting religious truths from secular dilution from his experiences studying with east coast New Testament scholars and intellectuals.⁵⁰

On assignment from the First Presidency to address this area of profound concern, President J. Reuben Clark addressed religious educators at a summer school session at Aspen Grove. The date was August 8, 1938. President Clark wasted no time and minced no words. He put forth clearly the expectation:

In all this there are for the Church, and for each and all of its members, two prime things which may not be overlooked, forgotten, shaded, or discarded:

First—that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, the Only Begotten of the Father in the flesh, the Creator of the world, the Lamb of God, the Sacrifice for the sins of the world, the Atoner for Adam’s transgression; that He was crucified; that His spirit left His body; that He died; that He was laid away in the tomb; that on the third day His spirit was reunited with His body, which again became a living being; that He was raised from the tomb a resurrected being, a perfect Being, the First Fruits of the Resurrection; that He later ascended to the Father; and that because of His death and by and through His resurrection every man born into the world since the beginning will be likewise literally resurrected...

The second of the two things to which we must all give full faith is that the Father and the Son actually and in truth and very deed appeared to the Prophet Joseph in a vision in the woods; that other heavenly visions followed to Joseph and to others; that the gospel and the Holy Priesthood after the Order of the Son of God were in truth and fact restored to the earth from which they were lost by the apostasy of the primitive Church; that the Lord again set up His Church, through the agency of Joseph Smith; that the Book of Mormon is just what it professes to be ...

The first requisite of a teacher for teaching these principles is a personal testimony of their truth. No amount of learning, no amount of study, and no number of scholastic degrees can take the place of this testimony, which is the *sine qua non* of the teacher in our Church school system. No teacher who does not have a real testimony of the truth of the gospel as revealed to and believed by the Latter-day Saints, and a testimony of the Sonship and Messiahship of Jesus, and of the divine mission of Joseph Smith—including, in all its reality, the First Vision—has any place in the Church school system. If there be any such, and I hope and pray there are none, he should at once resign; if the Commissioner

knows of any such and he does not resign, the Commissioner should request his resignation. The First Presidency expect this pruning to be made.⁵¹

The response to President Clark's message was strong on both sides. While his Brethren in the leading quorums of the Church thanked and praised President Clark for his efforts, some teachers tendered their resignations that night.⁵² Regardless of the divisive response, the talk had its intended effect; the message was unmistakable that there was a "pruning to be made."⁵³ President Clark "made it clear that the talk was not a reflection of his personal views, but a message directly from the First Presidency."⁵⁴ In the months after the delivery of this address in 1938, there were both organizational and curricular changes that followed.⁵⁵

President J. Reuben Clark's address, entitled "The Charted Course of the Church in Education," has become a landmark address for all S&I personnel. Boyd K. Packer has repeatedly referred J. Reuben Clark's address as scripture.⁵⁶ This address served to clarify the objectives of the organization and describe what it is that a professional teacher in the Church should be teaching, and how they should be teaching it. President Clark's address greatly influenced the formulation of S&I's identity within the Church. His words were a clarion call:

You teachers have a great mission. As teachers you stand upon the highest peak in education, for what teaching can compare in priceless value and in far-reaching effect with that which deals with man as he was in the eternity of yesterday, as he is in the mortality of today, and as he will be in the forever of tomorrow ...
I say once more, you must teach the gospel. You have no other function and no other reason for your presence in a Church school system.
You do have an interest in matters purely cultural and in matters of purely secular knowledge, but, I repeat again for emphasis, your chief interest, your essential and all but sole duty, is to teach the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ as that has been revealed in these latter days. You are to teach this gospel, using as your sources and authorities the standard works of the Church and the words of those whom God has called to lead His people in these last days. You are not, whether high or low, to intrude into your work your own peculiar philosophy, no matter what its source or how pleasing or rational it seems to you to be. To do so would be to have as many different churches as we have seminaries- and that is chaos.
You are not, whether high or low, to change the doctrines of the Church or to modify them as they are declared by and in the standard works of the Church and

by those whose authority it is to declare the mind and will of the Lord to the Church. The Lord has declared that he is “the same yesterday, today, and forever” (2 Nephi 27:23).

... You are not to teach the philosophies of the world, ancient or modern, pagan or Christian, for this is the field of the public schools. Your sole field is the gospel, and that is boundless in its own sphere.⁵⁷

This charge to religious educators came at a time when a clear definition of their role and function was sorely needed.

Berrett must have been deeply influenced by the opportunity to be taught by prophets, seers, and revelators during the summer. When he became the administrator of the Seminaries and Institutes in 1953⁵⁸, he “secured permission from the Church Board of Education to call all Seminary and Institute teachers into a five week’s summer school session at BYU for the first term of school, 1954.”⁵⁹ These sessions became the first in a series as Berrett created a summer inservice training schedule that would continue every other summer from 1954 to 1970. These trainings were held on the BYU campus at Provo, Utah.⁶⁰ Berrett ensured that the bulk of the instruction received during these summer sessions came from the Brethren. Some of those invited to speak over the years were Harold B. Lee, Joseph Fielding Smith, J. Reuben Clark, Mark E. Petersen, Marion G. Romney, Delbert L. Stapley, and Richard L. Evans, just to name a few.⁶¹

Elder Boyd K. Packer later remarked that these summer sessions were instituted when it “was time once again to check the moorings.”⁶² He related an experience during his tenure as Supervisor of Seminaries for the Church, which he presented as emblematic of the attitude that needed to be checked. Elder Packer related observing a teacher who

... thought it was necessary to play the role of debunker. He vigorously criticized the Church and some of the traditions that have been established. He listed a number of things that he alleged, from his careful, scientific inquiry, just weren’t so. His words impugned the character of some of the early leaders of the Church, and perhaps some of the present ones. He was presenting this material, he said, to

make [his students] think! “We’ve got to wake up and be more critical and selective.”

The spirit of his presentation did little to engender faith.⁶³

Elder Packer further commented that this was not an attitude isolated to this one teacher, but had begun to spread throughout the system. The attitude that necessitated “The Charted Course” was beginning to return. Elder Packer remembered:

... There had grown up among many teachers the feeling that the teaching of basic gospel principles might somehow be left perhaps to the Sunday School. These few teachers felt there were more interesting things to do in their classes. They could explore some of the side roads, those that had not received attention ... from the Brethren.⁶⁴

Once again, with these summer trainings initiated in 1954, the Brethren were invited by William Berrett to help S&I get back on course. The pattern of seeking prophetic direction, guidance, and course correction continued.

Although the forum which Berrett commenced and maintained ceased in 1970, instruction from the Brethren to S&I did not. In 1975, the Evening with a General Authority program began. Originally held in September, the meeting date was changed to the beginning of the year in 1988. In 1977, the first annual CES Religious Educators Symposium was held in August at Brigham Young University. Teachers and administrators from throughout the Church Educational System attended. This symposium would later be called the “CES Religious Educators’ Conference.”⁶⁵ Each of these was a forum in which one of the Brethren addressed educators within the Church Educational System. In 2003, the CES Religious Educators’ Conference was discontinued and was replaced with the annual worldwide CES Satellite Training Broadcast (the title was later changed to “Satellite Training Broadcast: Seminaries and Institutes of Religion”), which was transmitted for the first time in August.⁶⁶ These satellite broadcasts, as well as the “Evening with a General Authority,” remain a practice in S&I today.

Under Berrett's leadership, teachers were encouraged to "Follow the Brethren."⁶⁷ These men are regarded by the LDS people as prophets, seers and revelators. Following their counsel and direction is equivalent to following the Lord Himself. LDS scripture states that whether direction come from the Lord's own voice, "or by the voice of [his] servants, it is the same" (DC 1:38). From a review of the history of Seminary and Institutes of Religion, a pertinent and prominent pattern emerges. From its earliest days onward, this organization looked to prophets and apostles for guidance.

Seminaries and Institutes Spread Throughout the World

Berrett not only helped to get S&I back on course, he helped to expand it as well. During the 17 years Berrett was Administrator, S&I spread to South and Central America, Great Britain, Europe, New Zealand and Australia.⁶⁸

In 1970, a new commissioner of Church Education was appointed. The new commissioner was Neal A. Maxwell.⁶⁹ Commissioner Maxwell came to this post with a vision to make religious education a benefit to a now worldwide church. Griffiths noted:

Commissioner Maxwell wanted to make religious education a priority. He later related, "We felt that seminaries and institutes could follow the Church wherever it went." Only a few months after Commissioner Maxwell and his staff were assigned, the Church Board of Education made the announcement that seminaries and institutes would follow the membership of the Church throughout the world.⁷⁰

The policies established during Commissioner Maxwell's tenure, which laid the foundation for global growth, remain in place today and continue to govern the global system.⁷¹

In 2012, S&I celebrated its 100th anniversary. After a century in existence, the organization reported a cadre of more than 45,000 teachers, leaders, and missionaries teaching and serving over 740,000 students in 150 countries or other locations.⁷² A review of the history of S&I has provided an understanding critical to this study regarding the formation of S&I, its

establishment of an identity within The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and the spread of S&I worldwide. Most pertinent to this study, it has exposed a pattern of prophetic influence. This influence and guidance has become more and more specific, prevalent, and precise since the turn of the century.

Seminaries and Institutes in the Twenty-First Century

The first twelve years of the new century brought with them significant adjustments to the expectation of what should occur within an S&I classroom. At its core, S&I has had the same goal for one hundred years: to teach the LDS faith by the power of the Holy Ghost, and help students to learn and apply the gospel of Jesus Christ. However, shortly after the turn of the twenty-first century, a refining of *how* this is to be accomplished was seen as necessary by senior leaders of the Church. S&I's response to instruction and training provided by the Church's senior leaders resulted in the "Current Teaching Emphasis" in 2003 (this was later renamed the "Teaching and Learning Emphasis," and is now referred to as "The Fundamentals of Gospel Teaching and Learning"), a new "Objective Statement" in 2009, and a new *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook in 2012. The material in *Gospel Teaching and Learning* presents adjustments that served to focus, sharpen, and clarify of what teaching and learning in S&I fundamentally entails. This handbook has been distributed to the worldwide cadre of more than 45,000 teachers.⁷³ It has been translated into 38 languages.⁷⁴

These tactical adjustments to teaching and learning in S&I have come at a time of change in other areas of teaching and learning within The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. LDS scholar Matthew O. Richardson noted that the formation of the Current Teaching Emphasis and the publication of the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook were significant elements of a "perfect storm" of events (including the new Sunday School curriculum and the change in the

age requirement for potential missionaries) that “converged precisely at the right moment to create unusual and unprecedented possibilities for effective learning, teaching, and living the gospel of Jesus Christ.”⁷⁵ These changes in S&I are also the outcome of a perfect storm of circumstances. The two most prominent forces in this storm will now be considered; teaching for conversion, and the *Preach My Gospel* curriculum.

Teaching for Conversion

In 2001, Stanley Peterson, who served as the Administrator of S&I at the time, reported having conversations with some of the members of the Church Board of Education⁷⁶ who expressed their concern that S&I needed “to do a better job of instilling in the hearts and souls of our young people the importance of keeping the commandments of God and helping them to be more faithful.” They mentioned to Peterson that “Many young people who attend seminary and institute carry their scriptures; they memorize the verses, but they don’t internalize the doctrine into their spirits. They don’t internalize the gospel into their lives. We are losing too many of them.”⁷⁷ Other Church leaders, including LDS Apostle Richard G. Scott and the Church’s President, Gordon B. Hinckley, had also expressed concern that the gospel was not going down into the hearts of the students in a way commensurate with the increased spiritual threats inherent in rapidly changing world moral climate.⁷⁸

In August 2001, a call was issued to S&I by Elder Henry B. Eyring of the Church’s Quorum of Twelve Apostles. Since this address is emblematic of the concern of senior Church leaders, it will be considered here. Elder Eyring felt that LDS youth needed to gain more spiritual strength as an outcome of their time in S&I classrooms. His call was not for a philosophical shift, but for a clearer focus and a more concentrated effort to bless and strengthen the young Latter-day Saints who participated in S&I. Elder Eyring provided the reasoning for this need in a 2001

CES conference on the Book of Mormon. At this time Elder Eyring also served as the Church's Commissioner of Education. He said:

The spiritual strength sufficient for our youth to stand firm just a few years ago will soon not be enough... we must raise our sights.
 ... Students need more during the time they are our students. That is when they make the daily choices that will bless or mar their lives. That is when the pressures of temptation and spiritual confusion are increasing.
 The pure gospel of Jesus Christ must go down into the hearts of students by the power of the Holy Ghost. It will not be enough for them to have had a spiritual witness of the truth and to want good things later. It will not be enough for them to hope for some future cleansing and strengthening. Our aim must be for them to become truly converted to the restored gospel of Jesus Christ while they are with us.⁷⁹

Due to the perceived increase in threats to the moral and spiritual strength of young people, senior Church leaders needed S&I to do more. One answer to this call for greater effort came in the form of the Current Teaching Emphasis.⁸⁰ This emphasis served as a response to another need of senior Church leaders as well.

Preach My Gospel Curriculum

In the October of 2002 General Conference of the Church, Elder M. Russell Ballard of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles expressed the need throughout the world for the “greatest generation of missionaries.” He told the members of the Church that it was time to “raise the bar” in regards to missionary work.⁸¹ This raising of the bar referred to increased worthiness and preparedness standards for potential missionaries. The Church needed young people to be better prepared and have more gospel knowledge before ever entering the mission field. This challenge was issued during the development phase of the new *Preach My Gospel* manual for missionaries worldwide. This manual was printed and distributed in 2004, but had been in the works since 1999.⁸² *Preach my Gospel* was intended to help each missionary teach from his or her own knowledge and experience, rather than reciting memorized lessons.

In 2002, the Missionary Executive Committee of the Church asked what the seminaries could do to better prepare missionaries. Randall Hall, an S&I Administrator at the time, noted that the request included a desire for students to gain some experience in “[teaching] by the Spirit and from the heart as the new Preach My Gospel manual and its approach to teaching the gospel was rolled out.”⁸³ Around this same time, the new S&I Administrator, Paul Johnson, was invited to visit President Boyd K. Packer’s home. President Packer read to Johnson a draft of the letter that the First Presidency was going to send out on “Raising the Bar” for missionaries. Paul Johnson related the following: “He read it through with me and said, ‘Now what does that mean for seminary and institute?’ I said, ‘Well, it probably means that we need to step up to the plate.’ He said, ‘That’s right. You’ve got to prepare them better. You’ve got to make sure they’re ready to go on their mission.’”⁸⁴

The Current Teaching Emphasis

In 2003, S&I presented The Current Teaching Emphasis⁸⁵ to the global S&I faculty in an August Training Broadcast.⁸⁶ Randall Hall, who led the introduction, noted that the emphasis constituted a “distillation of thoughts, feelings, and ideas flowing from . . . various events and circumstances,” including direction from the senior leaders of the Church regarding the need for S&I to play a more capable role in preparing the Church’s young people to serve missions.⁸⁷ Hall, a senior S&I administrator who played a principal role in the formation of the Current Teaching Emphasis, explained that it was a response to “the continuing invitation from senior Church leaders to do more to get the gospel from the head to the heart of the students . . .”⁸⁸ He also recalled that when it was presented to the Church Board of Education, which is chaired by the First Presidency (the highest governing body) of the Church, they “responded by giving their endorsement and the new [emphasis] was characterized as ‘very timely.’”⁸⁹

What made the Current Teaching Emphasis so timely? It marked the presentation of a unified and concise description of the basic building blocks of teaching and learning which should be present in every S&I classroom throughout the world. The Emphasis was more focused than any earlier commission in describing conditions and factors that would lead to personal conversion and missionary preparation. This emphasis was designed to help facilitate a teacher in his or her quest to help the “gospel of Jesus Christ ... go down into the hearts of students by the power of the Holy Ghost.”⁹⁰ It focused on “teaching the scriptures by the Spirit and helping students identify, understand, and apply doctrines and principles of the gospel. Students were encouraged to explain, share, and testify of these principles in order to deepen their understanding and conversion and better prepare them to teach the gospel to others.”⁹¹ This emphasis was an attempt to answer the call of senior Church leaders to teach for conversion, and to prepare future missionaries. The Church Board of Education gave their endorsement of this “timely” measure.⁹²

The emphasis constituted an update in the desired aims of an S&I classroom experience; an update to the “why” behind them would soon follow. In 2009, a new mission statement was introduced to clarify the vision behind the emphasis.⁹³ This mission statement is now known as “The Objective of Seminaries and Institutes of Religion.” It is commonly referred to as “The Objective.”⁹⁴

The Objective of Seminaries and Institutes

The new objective statement was the subject of a “Global Faculty Meeting” released to S&I personnel worldwide in April of 2009.⁹⁵ In this meeting, Chad Webb, the Administrator of S&I, and Grant Anderson, an Assistant Administrator, introduced the worldwide faculty of teachers and administrators to the new mission statement. The new objective statement was the

outcome of fifty-nine drafts before being accepted by both the Executive Board of Education and the Church Board of Education.⁹⁶ The Objective includes a definitive statement of vision regarding what S&I teachers do, as well as how and why. It is followed by three paragraphs, each of which is derived from the earlier three-part commission: “1. **Live** the gospel. 2. **Teach** effectively. 3. **Administer** appropriately.”⁹⁷ The Objective replaced and updated the previous objective and commission.⁹⁸ The old and new objectives are presented below:

Objective from the <i>Teaching the Gospel</i> handbook (1994)	The 2009 Objective statement which appears in <i>The Gospel Teaching and Learning</i> handbook.
<p>THE OBJECTIVE</p> <p>The objective of religious education in the Church Educational System is to assist the individual, the family, and priesthood leaders in accomplishing the mission of the Church by—</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teaching students the gospel of Jesus Christ as found in the standard works and the words of the prophets. 2. Teaching students by precept and example so they will be encouraged, assisted, and protected as they strive to live the gospel of Jesus Christ. 3. Providing a spiritual and social climate where students can associate together. 4. Preparing young people for effective Church service.⁹⁹ 	<p>The Objective of <i>Seminaries and Institutes of Religion</i></p> <p>Our purpose is to help youth and young adults understand and rely on the teachings and Atonement of Jesus Christ, qualify for the blessings of the temple, and prepare themselves, their families, and others for eternal life with their Father in Heaven.¹⁰⁰</p>

Fundamentally the purpose expressed in the new and old objectives is the same. S&I has always been concerned with helping young people learn and live the gospel of Jesus Christ. The new objective statement, however, represents a more compact and comprehensive description of

S&I's "aim."¹⁰¹ The new objective begins with a clear focus on a student gaining a personal conviction of and relationship with Jesus Christ, His teachings, and His Atonement. It also includes a more explicit perspective of eternity, and a more focused emphasis on future missionary service and family relationships. Grant Anderson remarked that the new objective was a response to Elder Eyring and other Church leaders for S&I to improve their aim at getting the gospel into students' hearts and teaching for long-term conversion.¹⁰²

In a 2011 address to S&I, President Dieter F. Uchtdorf, of the Church's First Presidency, offered a powerful endorsement of the objective. Quoting the exact language of the objective, he taught that "religious education is all about helping our young people *understand and rely on the teachings and Atonement of Jesus Christ*."¹⁰³ Although this is not a new direction for S&I, the new objective statement echoed the clarity of direction, sharpening in definition, and adjustment in aim represented by the Emphasis.

Adjusting the Aim

The language of the 2003 Current Teaching Emphasis illustrates well the increase in clarity and direction in the definition of the role of both student and teacher. For example, when the Current Teaching Emphasis document was released in 2003, the descriptions of the function of the teacher are telling. The phrases used to describe the role of the teacher include the following: "We are to encourage students to... We are to help students... We are to give [students] opportunities..."¹⁰⁴ The Emphasis noticeably avoids a description of the teacher's role from the perspective of teacher instruction, teacher skill, or teacher knowledge. Instead, greater emphasis is placed on the teacher as a facilitator on a journey with the student. The teacher is not to be seen as a tour guide, sharing with the students all that he or she has learned about the passing scenery; rather the instructor and the student are both engaged as teachers and learners

who get off the tour bus and explore together the vast landscape. This paradigm is encapsulated in the oft repeated and perhaps central statement from the Emphasis: “We are to help students ...”¹⁰⁵

The clarification of aim represented by the emphasis and the objective also motivated the creation of a new four-year seminary curriculum, the first year of which was distributed in 2012.¹⁰⁶ For the purposes of illustrating the shift in tactics, consider the comparison in the table below. Excerpts from the lesson plan for Helaman chapter 10 in the *Book of Mormon* have been extracted from the old and new curriculum manuals, and have been placed side by side.

The purpose of this comparison is not to compare “good” and “bad” questions. Each question listed above has merit. However, these questions serve a different pedagogical purpose. The questions from the 2000 lesson plan can be characterized as information retrieval questions, with some invitation for analysis. A student looks in the chapter of scripture being taught in order to retrieve the one answer which fits the question posed. The analysis questions prompt discussion of the scriptures and the principles identified from a bit of a distance. They are asked from the perspective of “Why do some people...?” These questions are impersonal. While they serve to help students to identify principles, they do not facilitate a personal connection with them.

The questions from the 2012 curriculum also include questions for identification and analysis, for such have purpose and place in classroom instruction. However, note how many questions draw a student in personally. Language such as “When has helped you?” Or, “What does ... mean to you?” And, “When have you ...?” By drawing out student feelings and experiences, the scriptures become more personal. A connection based on what a student knows, has experienced, and feels is created and built upon. This increases the potential that what is

being taught will go into the heart of the student, thus reflecting the desires of and training from senior Church leaders.

<i>2000 Book of Mormon Teacher Resource Manual</i>	<i>2012 Book of Mormon Seminary Teacher Manual</i>
<p>Questions that teachers might pose::</p> <p>Why do some people feel restricted by the commandments?</p> <p>In what ways does keeping the commandments make us free?</p> <p>Why do people find commandments irritating?</p> <p>How would viewing the commandments as a blessing make a difference in how we obey them?</p> <p>What does unweariness mean?</p> <p>In what ways had Nephi sought God’s will?</p> <p>What does it mean to be blessed forever?</p> <p>In what ways did the Lord make Nephi mighty?</p> <p>Besides Nephi’s unweariness, what other reason did the Lord give for entrusting Nephi with great power?¹⁰⁷</p>	<p>Questions that teachers might pose::</p> <p>What occurred as Nephi was pondering?</p> <p>What is the relationship between pondering and receiving revelation?</p> <p>When has pondering helped you receive personal revelation?</p> <p>How might following Nephi’s example of not fearing the people help us prepare for responsibility in the Lord’s kingdom?</p> <p>What does the phrase “thou . . . hast not sought thine own life” mean to you?</p> <p>What have you done in your life lately to show the Lord that His will is more important than your own?</p> <p>What is one area of your life in which you could better seek the Lord’s will?</p> <p>In what ways have you been blessed by the knowledge that families can be united eternally?</p> <p>How can you seek the blessings of the sealing power in the future?¹⁰⁸</p>

The difference illustrated above is perhaps best summarized by Elder Henry B. Eyring, who instructed S&I teachers as follows:

But some questions invite inspiration. Great teachers ask those . . . Here is a question that might not invite inspiration: “How is a true prophet recognized?”

That question invites an answer which is a list, drawn from memory of the scriptures and the words of living prophets. Many students could participate in answering. Most could give at least a passable suggestion. And minds would be stimulated.

But we could also ask the question this way, with just a small difference: “When have you felt that you were in the presence of a prophet?” That will invite individuals to search their memories for feelings. After asking, we might wisely wait for a moment before calling on someone to respond. Even those who do not speak will be thinking of spiritual experiences. That will invite the Holy Ghost.¹⁰⁹

The *Gospel Teaching and Learning Handbook*

In consequence of “The Current Teaching Emphasis” and “The Objective of Seminaries and Institutes of Religion,” which have been heretofore described, the teaching handbook which had been provided for S&I teachers and administrators was now outdated. This handbook was first printed in 1994 and went by the title *Teaching the Gospel: A Handbook for CES Teachers and Leaders*.¹¹⁰ *Teaching the Gospel* contained no explanation of the Emphasis or the new Objective statement, and was therefore no longer sufficient to train new or existing teachers. Since each teacher was asked to apply the principles of the Objective as their foundation, and teach in a way that incorporated the Emphasis - both of which presented a shift in the definition of the role of teacher and student in S&I - a handbook built around these guideposts was necessary.

In May of 2012,¹¹¹ S&I published and distributed *Gospel Teaching and Learning: A Handbook for Teachers and Leaders in Seminaries and Institutes of Religion* as a capstone to a decade of adjustments to the definition of teaching and learning in S&I.¹¹² It is designed entirely around the Objective and the Emphasis (which is referred to as the “Fundamentals of Gospel Teaching and Learning” in the new handbook). These new expectations reflect the direction of senior Church leaders, who had been teaching S&I to facilitate productive and meaningful student engagement in order to bring about greater personal conviction of what is being learned

in the hearts of students.¹¹³ Perhaps S&I's strategy was the same, but the tactics had changed. The *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook describes how a teacher might apply these new tactics, which are embodied within the principles of the Emphasis and the Objective.

When introducing this new handbook to teachers worldwide, Chad Webb, the Administrator of S&I, explained that it would “unify us as to what we believe is effective teaching. It will give clarity and definition to a standard of effective teaching for all of Seminaries and Institutes of Religion ...” He went on to explain that the handbook “will help to increase the impact that we have on our students while they are with us in our classrooms. That will help them to deepen conversion and protect them from the influences of the world, and to prepare them for the things that lay ahead in their future.”¹¹⁴

In a 2013 address to S&I personnel worldwide, Elder Russell M. Nelson, an LDS Apostle, gave the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook the following endorsement: “If teachers will incorporate these fundamentals effectively If you do all you can – teach in the way that is outlined in your handbook – you will be doing what you need to do to assist with [the] prophetic priority.”¹¹⁵

The *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook has been distributed to the worldwide cadre of more than 45,000 teachers.¹¹⁶ It has been translated into 38 languages.¹¹⁷ The content of the new handbook is the foundation of pre-service and in-service training for all full-time personnel, as well as for the volunteer teachers who make up 90% of the teaching corps.¹¹⁸ These volunteers receive regular training from full-time paid S&I personnel who are taught how to use the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook in these trainings. Full-time personnel have weekly in-service meetings which are based on the principles therein. Chad Webb stated that the new handbook gives S&I a “common standard and common language to refer to.”¹¹⁹ *Gospel Teaching*

and Learning, therefore, potentially impacts S&I administrators, teachers, and students worldwide.¹²⁰

A Unique Decade of Change

The specific training and instruction provided to S&I by Church leadership, as well as the response by S&I, is worth closer analysis. The scope of changes that have been instituted within a short span of ten years to the teaching tactics of S&I is unique within the history of the organization. For its first 75 years in existence, S&I had no formal or institutionalized mission statement issued and distributed from the administration with the endorsement of the Church Board of Education. The closest thing to it came in the form of a landmark address entitled “The Charted Course of the Church in Education.” Given to S&I in 1938 by J. Reuben Clark of the Church’s First Presidency, this address defined what a teacher in S&I should teach, as well as the reason that S&I exists. Given on assignment from the President of the Church, Clark clearly and unmistakably charted the course for S&I. However, after influencing some structural and curricular changes immediately following its delivery, the talk “seems to have been lost,” with “few, if any, references” to it between 1940 and 1970.¹²¹ It would later be re-enthroned as a foundational S&I training document and fundamental address which influenced all future objectives and statements of purpose.

Beginning in 1961, efforts had been made to unify S&I further through the curriculum. William Berrett noted that the administration worked to employ a “more controlled and centrally directed approach” to their produced curriculum;¹²² an approach which progressed and improved over the following decades.¹²³ However, a common curriculum, which explained the “what” of teaching in S&I, did not provide a clear, authorized, and unified description of the “why” behind S&I’s efforts. It wasn’t until the Church Board of Education approved an objective statement in

November of 1987 (cited on page 7) that a formal, system wide objective was presented to unify in purpose and practice the entire body of S&I teachers and administrators throughout the world.¹²⁴ A commission was added to this objective in 1988, and both were printed in the 1994 S&I handbook, *Teaching the Gospel*.¹²⁵ This is not to say that there had never been objectives formulated and issued to S&I before 1987. This year simply marked the first to be formally approved and endorsed by the Church Board of Education and distributed to all S&I personnel from the administration as the definitive description of S&I's purpose.

The earliest known mention of objectives in S&I's history appeared in 1927. Formulated by Adam S. Bennion with S&I teachers during their summer workshop, these objectives included a thirteen item list of "Knowledge Objectives," a fifteen item list of "Attitudes and Ideals," and a thirteen item list of desired "Habits."¹²⁶ John Fowles, an S&I historian, noted that many of the early objectives were not seen by teachers as official directives coming from the top down. He also noted that with so many different ideals listed "teachers would not have the ability to remember them..."¹²⁷

Between 1938 and 1970 the LDS Department of Education prepared an annual booklet known as the *Announcement of Program*. This booklet announced the activities and schedules for the college level Institute programs, as well as the history and purpose of CES for those attending Institute. There is little variation in these statements of purpose, which began with a list of six objectives, and over the course of these several printings resulted in eleven different objectives, which were focused solely on the purpose of the Institute programs.¹²⁸ Some of these objectives included: "...To help students achieve a real and meaningful testimony that God lives, that Jesus is the Christ, and that Joseph Smith is a prophet of God... To help students apply the

principles and spirit of the gospel in every walk of life To arouse in students the spirit of missionary work.”¹²⁹

Although these booklets were prepared and approved by members of the administration of S&I for the purpose of informing Institute students about the various Institute programs, they were never distributed from the administration to the teaching corps as the definitive objective for all of S&I.¹³⁰

In 1959, LDS scholar John Fugal analyzed the development of objectives in S&I and noted that most purpose statements were not presented as clear-cut objectives for the whole system. He also noted that they were not clearly presented as being from the administration. He argued that “the line of ‘descent’ from one level to another does not ... exist. The objectives so far published are sometimes for one area of emphasis, and sometimes for another.”¹³¹ There was no clear, formalized, or institutionally endorsed set of objectives for the system as a whole. Marshall Burton followed up on Fugal’s study eleven years later, and in 1970 noted that there was still “no officially accepted set of objectives” for seminary and institute teachers.¹³²

Since 1970, other objectives have been put forth to S&I, but none in a clearly definitive way packaged and presented as coming from the administration and the Board. In a 1970 address to S&I, Harold B. Lee gave CES teachers the five following broad objectives:

1. To teach the gospel in a way that will free students from darkness.
2. To educate the youth for eternity.
3. To teach the truth in such a way that students will not be deceived by false teachings.
4. To prepare the youth to live well-rounded and balanced lives.
5. To help the youth gain a testimony of the living God and His divine work.¹³³

In a 1981 address to CES, LDS Apostle Bruce R. McConkie described a teacher's divine commission, which also consisted of the following five items: To teach the principles of the gospel, to teach these principles as they are found in the scriptures, to teach by the power of the Holy Ghost, to teach according to the needs and circumstances of the students, and to testify of the truthfulness of what is taught.¹³⁴ CES leaders such as Joe J. Christensen, Commissioner Neal A. Maxwell, and Commissioner Henry B. Eyring had formulated objectives for the program, but Fowles noted that "these seemed to be an attempt to place some parameters on the program rather than the real mission statement."¹³⁵

Other than J. Reuben Clark's landmark address mentioned previously, no record remains between 1912 and 1987 of a unified system-wide objective or mission statement which was approved and endorsed by the Church Board of Education and distributed to all S&I personnel as the definitive description of the function of S&I. The objective and commission of 1987-1988, which would later be distributed to all S&I personnel by means of the 1994 Teaching the Gospel handbook,¹³⁶ marked the advent of a formalized and institutionalized mission statement which was approved and endorsed by the Church Board of Education.

Between 2003 and 2012, three major directives have been issued to S&I from the administration; each of which were approved and endorsed by the Church Board of Education.¹³⁷ Therefore, in the context of formalized descriptions of the what, why, and how of teaching in S&I, the changes from 2003-2012 comprise a significant contribution that is both significant and unique in regards to clarity and concentration in the one hundred year history of this global organization.

Why have so many significant changes been made within the last decade? What have been the driving forces and the contributing factors that led to these changes? Why has such

focused and specific direction been so concentrated in recent years by the men who are revered in LDS theology as prophets, seers, and revelators? Such questions take on deep significance in a faith-based culture; their answers would have a potentially profound impact on the performance of S&I personnel worldwide.

Research Regarding Prophetic Influence on the Educational Philosophy of Seminaries and Institutes

In a PhD dissertation that is foundational to the present study, John Fowles reviewed every address given by the Brethren to seminary and institute personnel from 1890 to 1990. Completed in 1990, Fowles' dissertation is titled "A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints from 1890-1990: A Response to Secular Education." Fowles explained that his purpose was to analyze "LDS leaders' speeches, classes taught, and directives they delivered regarding the mission of religious instruction through various conferences, meetings, and other gatherings of LDS religion instructors."¹³⁸ His study aimed to determine which addresses had the greatest impact on the policy, curriculum, and formalized mission statements of Seminaries and Institutes of Religion.¹³⁹

Fowles' study rendered the following conclusions:

1. Most addresses from the Brethren from 1890-1938 were a response to secular education. There were few addresses during this period of time from Church leaders; however, "the discourse by J. Reuben Clark entitled 'The Charted Course of the Church in Education' had the most profound effect upon LDS educators."¹⁴⁰
2. The summer school sessions from 1954-1970 mainly "focused on clarification of LDS doctrine."¹⁴¹
3. The summer of 1970 marks a shift in the messages received from the Brethren. During the 1970s and 80s almost "every sermon, address speech or talk delivered by LDS General Authorities mentioned the value and importance of the

scriptures.”¹⁴² This emphasis led to major developments in both curriculum and teaching practices with the institution of Sequential Scripture Teaching.¹⁴³

4. The addresses from the Brethren during the 1980s continued along the path of the prior decade. These “directives defined a purpose for the C.E.S.”¹⁴⁴ These directives led to the formation of a 1987 mission statement and commission.¹⁴⁵

When Fowles published his study in 1990, he asserted that, as far as any scholarly work is concerned, “little attention or serious inquiry has been attempted thus far concerning the mission or philosophy of C.E.S. as a whole, or of its Seminaries and Institutes department.”¹⁴⁶ Aside from Fowles study, the same holds true today. Fowles went on to astutely claim that “LDS religious educational philosophy or objectives are ... derived primarily from Church leaders’ directives or teachings.”¹⁴⁷ Fowles study performs three crucial functions for the purposes of the present study:

1. It lays the foundation, as well as the research-based evidence, for the need to explore the words of prophets, seers, and revelators directed to S&I in order to understand its educational philosophy.
2. It presents a thorough academic discussion regarding how prophetic guidance directed S&I’s efforts from 1890-1990.
3. It concludes its research in 1990. No research comparable to Fowles’ has been performed regarding the educational philosophy of S&I since then, thus providing a gap in the research which the current study will address.

A review of the literature regarding the words of the Brethren to S&I reveals powerful examples of how one address can have a far-reaching impact on the policies, practices, and philosophy of S&I. One example, reviewed previously, was President Clark’s address in 1938. After reviewing a century of formal addresses given to S&I by the Brethren, Fowles asserted that “J. Reuben Clark’s address, ‘The Charted Course of the Church in Education,’ remains the single most important document regarding the mission of the Church Educational System.”¹⁴⁸ James Clark, another LDS historian and scholar asserted that “No document, perhaps in recent L.D.S.

Church history, and in particular in the history of ‘Mormon’ education and educational philosophy, has had wider distribution or wider discussion than this message.”¹⁴⁹ This address “stands today as the centerpiece of religious instruction in the Church.”¹⁵⁰ It continues to influence and inform the objectives and direction of S&I in the twenty-first century.

A second illustration of how one address can have a far-reaching impact on the policies, and practices of S&I, is an address delivered by Boyd K. Packer in 1977 entitled “Teach the Scriptures.”¹⁵¹ In this talk Elder Packer shared an insight gained during a moment of personal pondering over the scriptures. He recalled an experience he had while reading the description of the last days recorded by the apostle Paul in 2 Timothy chapter 3 which reads:

This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come.
For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud,
blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy,
Without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce,
despisers of those that are good,
Traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God... (2
Timothy 3:1-4)

After pondering on these spiritually treacherous conditions, and noting their similarity to current world affairs, Elder Packer reported feeling “a mood of very deep gloom and foreboding, a very ominous feeling of frustration, almost futility.”¹⁵²

He then recalled glancing down the page and reading Paul’s words regarding “the immunization against all of it.”¹⁵³ Elder Packer related reading the following:

But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of,
knowing of whom thou has learned them;
And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make
thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.
All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for
reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:
That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works. (2
Timothy 3:13–17)

After citing this passage of scripture, Elder Packer gave this clarion call:

And there you have it—your commission, your charter, your objective in religious education. You are to teach the scriptures. That is the word that stood out on the page—*scriptures*. If your students are acquainted with the revelations, there is no question—personal or social or political or occupational—that need go unanswered. Therein is contained the fulness of the everlasting gospel. Therein we find principles of truth that will resolve every confusion and every problem and every dilemma that will face the human family or any individual in it.¹⁵⁴

This talk led to major changes in how teachers taught the scriptures. Regarding Elder Packer’s address, “Gerald Lund, zone administrator and past director of curriculum mentioned that this was definitely a ‘watershed’ address which influenced curriculum and teaching decisions.”¹⁵⁵ One major change that followed, influenced by Elder Packer’s charge, was the development of Sequential Scripture Teaching.¹⁵⁶

A review of the literature regarding the influence of prophets upon the educational philosophy of S&I over the past 100 years reveals the following insights relevant to the current study:

1. From its earliest days, S&I has looked to prophets and apostles for guidance, direction, and even correction. Direction given from these leaders is viewed as divine doctrine that should be followed in faith and obedience. A forum was established early on for formal addresses from the Brethren to the teaching cadre. This tradition continues today.
2. Directives received from the Brethren became the driving force behind changes in policy, practice, curriculum, and philosophy in S&I.
3. Any serious investigation designed to analyze the link between the words of the Brethren to the educational philosophy of S&I ended in 1990. Therefore, there is a gap in the research from 1990 to the present day.

The pattern illustrated by the history of the influence of LDS prophets on S&I uncovers questions which this study aims to answer. In 1938, President Clark had specific message with a specific desired outcome. A pruning needed to be made and the identity of a religious educator needed to be forged. S&I responded to his call. In 1954, a return to the course charted was necessary. Prophets came to train and correct, and S&I heeded the call. In 1977 there was a call

made to teach the scriptures. Changes followed that conformed to this request. In the past decade, three significant and far-reaching adjustments have been made to the definition of teaching and learning in S&I in the form of the Current Teaching Emphasis, the Objective, and the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook. Each of these changes has come in response to direction from LDS prophets and apostles. This begs the following questions: What has motivated this recent increase in clarification and direction? What moral, spiritual, and social factors are influencing the messages of the LDS prophets to S&I? What can be learned from S&I's response? Investigating these questions is one purpose of the current study. They have not yet been addressed in any published research.

Contemporary Commentary Regarding Prophetic Influence on the Educational Philosophy of Seminaries and Institutes

To say that there has been no commentary regarding the recent adjustments to S&I's definition of teaching and learning would be false. Though the published research has not been extensive or comparable to the scope of a doctoral-level analysis, there have been some articles which are relevant to the current study.

The Religious Educator, first published by the Religious Studies Center at Brigham Young University in the year 2000, is a forum for published research regarding the Church Educational System.¹⁵⁷ A review of *The Religious Educator* since 2003, when the Current Teaching Emphasis was established, produced some relevant and interesting articles in regards to the present study. The main interest of this study in these articles is to discover the depth of analysis scholars have applied to the Teaching Emphasis, the Objective, and the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook. Also of interest, is the extent to which these analyses consider

direction given to S&I from LDS prophets and apostles. The following review of these articles will be conducted from this viewpoint.

Analyses of the Current Teaching Emphasis. There is a common pattern among the published articles which analyze the Current Teaching Emphasis. Each author takes a concept from the Emphasis, reviews the foundation of that concept within the context of the words of the Brethren to S&I, gives suggestions and illustrations of how a teacher might apply this concept in the classroom, and uses their article as a forum to magnify the concept's merits.

In an article published in 2005, Alan Maynes examines how a teacher might create "questions that invite revelation."¹⁵⁸ Within the article, Maynes uses a brief analysis of four talks from the Brethren to S&I to establish the importance of his topic and give credence to its worth. The talks cited are from Elder Scott and Elder Eyring ranging from 1993 to 2003. Other sources are cited, but those mentioned here are relevant to the current study.

In 2007 and 2008, two articles appeared in *The Religious Educator* regarding student participation. The earliest of the two, entitled "The Power of Student Discovery and Sharing," is a helpful and thorough discussion of what a teacher can do to increase meaningful participation.¹⁵⁹ The author includes prophetic direction received from five talks from the Brethren to S&I between 2003 and 2005. The citations come from Elders Bednar, Scott, Hales, and Eyring. The latter of the two articles, entitled "The Case for Student Participation," does just as its title suggests.¹⁶⁰ It examines the benefits of student participation, as well as some concerns teachers may have in regards to this method. He cites, to make his case for student participation, three talks from the Brethren to S&I from 2005 to 2007. He cites Elders Holland, Bednar, and Scott.

A 2009 article in *The Religious Educator* again looked at student participation, labeling it “active learning.”¹⁶¹ In this article, Anthony Sweat established the need for active learning by citing five addresses from the Brethren to S&I between 2001 and 2007. These addresses were given by Elders Eyring, Scott, Bednar, and Holland. After establishing the prophetic charge to apply active learning in the classroom, Sweat shares illustrations from the Savior’s ministry among the Nephites that provide both instructive illustrations, and compelling evidence regarding active learning.

In the past ten years, more articles than the four reviewed above have been printed in *The Religious Educator* regarding seminaries and institutes. However, those cited represent the articles that examine the Current Teaching Emphasis in the light of prophetic direction. There was not any published research in regards to the Objective and the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook at the time of this study. The sum total of different addresses from the Brethren to S&I mentioned in the above articles is eleven. The current study analyzed thirty-five addresses spanning nearly twenty years. Twelve additional talks between 1938 and 1993, which are considered foundational to the work of S&I, will also be analyzed.

The addresses analyzed in *The Religious Educator* focused mainly on one element of the teaching and learning fundamentals of S&I: student participation. The current study aims to look at each element of the Objective and the Emphasis as they have been encapsulated in the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook.

Interviews with Administrators. Chad Webb, the Administrator of S&I, was interviewed by Kenneth L. Alford. Roger G. Christensen, secretary to the Church Board of Education, was interviewed by Casey Griffiths. These interviews are relevant to the current study since they provide first-hand information on the role of the Church Board of Education.

The Church Board of Education is the governing body over Seminaries and Institutes of Religion.¹⁶² As of September 11, 2013, the members of the Board were as follows: President Thomas S. Monson, President Henry B. Eyring, President Dieter F. Uchtdorf, Elder Russell M. Nelson, Elder Dallin H. Oaks, Elder Richard G. Scott, Elder Donald L. Hallstrom, Sister Linda K. Burton, and Sister Bonnie O. Oscarson.¹⁶³ Chad Webb, the Administrator of S&I, stated that “The Church Board of Education is not a token board. They truly oversee the major decisions within our programs, and we do the best we can to carry out their direction and counsel.”¹⁶⁴

Roger G. Christensen added:

I think the real message is that the First Presidency and the Twelve recognize the challenges that young people are facing in the world today. From the perspective of the board, as we talk about different things, they seriously consider what’s going on in the world and they want to know that we are building faith.¹⁶⁵

In this same interview, Christensen remembers a comment made by Elder David A. Bednar when he attended meetings while serving as the president of BYU-Idaho prior to his call as apostle. President Bednar observed that “We have the most unique Board of Trustees of any institution in the world because we have prophets, seers, and revelators. So our responsibility is to let prophets be prophets.”¹⁶⁶

Such insights are valuable as they reveal the level of direction and involvement of LDS prophets, seers, and revelators through the functionality of the Church Board of Education. These Brethren define the direction of S&I.

An interview conducted by Barbara Morgan with Gary K. Moore, appeared in a 2010 volume of *The Religious Educator*.¹⁶⁷ Brother Moore was appointed Executive Assistant to the Administrator of S&I in 2002, a title later changed to Associate Administrator. In 2007, he was appointed CES Administrator of Religious Education and Elementary and Secondary Education, where he served until he retired in 2008.¹⁶⁸ In this interview, Moore gives some rich detail and

first-hand account into the creation of the Current Teaching Emphasis. After discussing the factors that led to its formation, Brother Moore remarked that “if we in S&I will keep our eye on what the Brethren are doing, and how they are doing it, and what they are trying to have happen, we will be far more successful as a system and as individuals.”¹⁶⁹

The interviews in *The Religious Educator* help establish that S&I receives specific direction and involvement from LDS prophets through formal board meetings. These Brethren are concerned with, and actively engaged in work of S&I.

Each of the articles analyzed from *The Religious Educator* examine an element teaching and learning in S&I. Each article drew a comparison between the identified element and direction received by S&I from LDS prophets and apostles. However, no research has been conducted similar to what the present study proposes. The purpose of this study is to discover the history, the factors, and the driving forces that led to the formation of *Gospel Teaching and Learning: A Handbook for Teachers and Leaders in Seminaries and Institutes of Religion*. This must of necessity include a comparable study of the creation of the then named Current Teaching Emphasis, and the Objective Statement. In addition, this study aims to investigate the depth and breadth of the link which the emphasis, the objective, and the new handbook have to the formal direction given directly to S&I through addresses from LDS prophets and apostles from 1994-2011. No research of this sort has been conducted since 1990.

Notes

¹ *Preach My Gospel* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 2004).

² *Teaching the Gospel in the Savior's Way: A Guide to 'Come, Follow Me: Learning Resources for Youth'* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 2012).

³ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Gospel Teaching and Learning: A Handbook for Teachers and Leaders in Seminaries and Institutes of Religion* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 2012).

⁴ M. Lynn Bennion, *Mormonism and Education*, (Salt Lake City: The Department of Education of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1939), 40.

⁵ Cited by A. LeGrand Richards, *Called to Teach: the Legacy of Karl G. Maeser* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2014). Originally taken from Brigham Young, address in Salt Lake City, August 31, 1862, *Journal of Discourses*, 9:369.

⁶ Richards, *Called to Teach*.

⁷ William E. Berrett, *A Miracle in Weekday Religious Education* (Salt Lake City: Salt Lake Printing Center, 1988), 27.

⁸ Berrett, *Miracle*, 18.

⁹ Alma P. Burton, *Karl G. Maeser: Mormon Educator* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1953), 25-26.

¹⁰ Berrett, *Miracle*, 18.

¹¹ Richards, *Called to Teach*.

¹² Casey Paul Griffiths, "A Century of Seminary,"

<https://si.lds.org/search?q=a+century+of+seminary&lang=eng#!ts=1380300938596>, 2.

¹³ Berrett, *Miracle*, 19.

¹⁴ Griffiths, "A Century of Seminary," 2.

¹⁵ Bennion, *Mormonism and Education*, 204.

¹⁶ Richards, *Called to Teach*.

¹⁷ Griffiths, "A Century of Seminary," 2.

¹⁸ T. Edgar Lyon, "Evangelical Protestant Missionary Activities in Mormon Dominated Areas, 1865-1900," (PhD diss., University of Utah, 1962), 67-71.

¹⁹ For a thorough analysis of this paradigm shift, see Scott C. Esplin, & E. Vance Randall, (2014) "Living in two worlds: The development and transition of Mormon education in American society," *History of Education*, 43 (1), 3-30.

²⁰ Bennion, *Mormonism and Education*, 203.

²¹ Bennion, *Mormonism and Education*, 204.

²² Berrett, *Miracle*, 28.

²³ Griffiths, "A Century of Seminary," 1-2.

²⁴ Berrett, *Miracle*, 49.

²⁵ Casey Paul Griffiths, "The First Seminary Teacher," in *Religious Educator* 9, no. 3 (2008), 124.

²⁶ See Casey Paul Griffiths, "Joseph F. Merrill: Latter-day Saint Commissioner of Education, 1928-1933," (Masters Thesis, BYU, 2007), 11. The cost in 1926 was reported as being \$818,426.01 for maintain the Church schools, as opposed to \$197,502.59 to run the Seminary program.

²⁷ For a thorough history of the transitions that LDS education went through from 1847-1912, see Casey Griffiths, Scott C. Esplin, & E. Vance Randall, "'The glory of God is intelligence': Exploring the historical foundations of Latter-day Saint religious education, Religious Education" (In press), copy in author's possession.

²⁸ Berrett, *Miracle*, 37-49.

²⁹ Berrett, *Miracle*, 47.

³⁰ Berrett, *Miracle*, 48-49.

³¹ Berrett, *Miracle*, 6-7.

³² Henry B. Eyring, "To Know and Love God," *Address to CES Religious Educators*, February 26, 2010, p. 5.

³³ Berrett, *Miracle*, 224.

-
- ³⁴ Griffiths, "A Century of Seminary," 2.
- ³⁵ Griffiths, "A Century of Seminary," 4-5.
- ³⁶ Berrett, *Miracle*, xv.
- ³⁷ Griffiths, "A Century of Seminary," 5.
- ³⁸ Berrett, *Miracle*, 39.
- ³⁹ Casey Paul Griffiths, "The Chicago Experiment: Finding the Voice and Chartering the Course of Religious Education in the Church" in *BYU Studies* 49, no. 4 (2010), 93.
- ⁴⁰ Griffiths, "The Chicago Experiment," 93.
- ⁴¹ Berrett, *Miracle*, 183.
- ⁴² William E. Berrett, oral history, interviewed by Thomas E. Cheney, January 27, 1982, BYU Special Collections.
- ⁴³ William E. Berrett, "My Story," 37, unpublished manuscript, BYU Special Collections.
- ⁴⁴ John Lessing Fowles, "A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints from 1890-1990: A Response to Secular Education," (PhD diss., University of Missouri-Columbia, 1990), 149.
- ⁴⁵ Fowles, "A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program," 174.
- ⁴⁶ Boyd K. Packer, *That All May Edified* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1982), 43.
- ⁴⁷ Griffiths, "The Chicago Experiment," 91.
- ⁴⁸ Griffiths, "The Chicago Experiment," 104.
- ⁴⁹ Griffiths, "The Chicago Experiment," 107.
- ⁵⁰ Scott C. Esplin, "Charting the Course: President Clark's Charge to Religious Educators," in *The Religious Educator* 7, no. 1 (2008), 105.
- ⁵¹ J. Reuben Clark, "The Charted Course of the Church in Education," *Address to Seminary and Institute of Religion Leaders*, August 8, 1938, 2-5.
- ⁵² For further insight into who responded, and what happened to them, see Esplin, "Charting the Course," 106-107.
- ⁵³ Clark, "The Charted Course," 5.
- ⁵⁴ Griffiths, "The Chicago Experiment," 108.
- ⁵⁵ For a full discussion of these changes, and the impact of this address, see Esplin, "Charting the Course."
- ⁵⁶ For examples of this, see Boyd K. Packer, *That All May Edified*, 44, "Teach the Scriptures," *Address to CES Religious Educators, October 14, 1977*, and "The Great Plan of Happiness," *CES Symposium on the Doctrine and Covenants, August 10, 1993*.
- ⁵⁷ Clark, "The Charted Course of the Church in Education," 6-7.
- ⁵⁸ Berrett, *Miracle*, xv.
- ⁵⁹ Berrett, "My Story," 78.
- ⁶⁰ Fowles, "A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program," 174.
- ⁶¹ Fowles, "A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program," 150-183
- ⁶² Packer, *That All May Edified*, 45
- ⁶³ Boyd K. Packer, *Teach Ye Diligently*, (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1975), 208-209.
- ⁶⁴ Packer, *That All May Edified*, 45

-
- ⁶⁵ Robert A. Ewer, “Seminaries and Institutes of Religion timeline: A century of seminary,” <https://si.lds.org/training/talks/history/seminaries-and-institutes-of-religion-timeline-a-century-of-seminary?lang=eng>, 3.
- ⁶⁶ Ewer, “Seminaries and Institutes of Religion timeline,” 5.
- ⁶⁷ Packer, *That All May Be Edified*, 45.
- ⁶⁸ Berrett, *Miracle*, 147-174.
- ⁶⁹ Berrett, *Miracle*, xv.
- ⁷⁰ Griffiths, “A Century of Seminary,” 18.
- ⁷¹ Casey Paul Griffiths, “The Globalization of Latter-day Saint Education,” (PhD diss., BYU, 2012), 273.
- ⁷² Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Seminaries and Institutes of Religion Annual Report for 2013*, 1-5.
- ⁷³ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Annual Report for 2013*, 1-5.
- ⁷⁴ Paul Murphy, Curriculum Department for S&I, to Adam N. Smith, email, September 13, 2013.
- ⁷⁵ Matthew O. Richardson, “Come Follow Me,” in *Religious Educator* 14, no. 3 (2013), 24.
- ⁷⁶ This Board is the highest governing body over the Church Educational System. It is chaired by the President of the Church, his two counselors, and three of the twelve Apostles. These men are revered in the LDS faith as prophets, seers, and revelators. Three other members sit on the Board of Education. These participants are selected from other General Officers of the Church, including the Presidents of the Church’s organizations for women.
- ⁷⁷ Stanley A. Peterson. “Carrying the Scriptures unto the Hearts, Not Just into the Hands, of Students,” CES Conference on the Book of Mormon, 14 August 2001,
- ⁷⁸ See Elder Richard G. Scott’s account of speaking with President Hinckley about these concerns in “To Understand and Live Truth,” *Address to CES Religious Educators*, February 4, 2005.
- ⁷⁹ Henry B. Eyring, “We Must Raise Our Sights,” *CES Conference on the Book of Mormon*, August 14, 2001, 1- 2.
- ⁸⁰ Grant Anderson, Assistant Administrator to Adam Smith, email, November 13, 2013.
- ⁸¹ M. Russell Ballard, “The Greatest Generation of Missionaries,” *Ensign*, November 2002, 46.
- ⁸² Benjamin Hyrum White, “The History of Preach My Gospel,” in *Religious Educator* 14, no. 1 (2013): 129-158.
- ⁸³ Randall Hall, Personal writings, copy in author’s possession.
- ⁸⁴ Casey Paul Griffiths, Interview with Paul V. Johnson, January 19, 2010, copy in author’s possession.
- ⁸⁵ The Current Teaching Emphasis was renamed the “Teaching and Learning Emphasis” in 2009, and is now referred to as “The Fundamentals of Gospel Teaching and Learning.”
- ⁸⁶ Ewer, “Seminaries and Institutes of Religion timeline: A century of seminary,” 5.
- ⁸⁷ Randall L. Hall, “The Current Teaching Emphasis: An Update,” *CES Satellite Broadcast*, August 2003, 8.
- ⁸⁸ Hall, Personal writings.
- ⁸⁹ Hall, Personal writings.
- ⁹⁰ Eyring, “We Must Raise Our Sights,” 1-2.
- ⁹¹ Ewer, “Seminaries and Institutes of Religion timeline: A century of seminary,” 5.
- ⁹² Hall, Personal writings.
- ⁹³ Grant Anderson, Assistant Administrator to Adam Smith, email, November 13, 2103.

-
- ⁹⁴ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Gospel Teaching and Learning*, 10.
- ⁹⁵ Ewer, “Seminaries and Institutes of Religion timeline: A century of seminary,” 5.
- ⁹⁶ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion. “2009 April Global Faculty Meeting-The Objective of Seminaries and Institutes of Religion,” <https://si.lds.org/training/talks/gfm/2009-april-global-faculty-meeting--the-objective-of-seminaries-and-institutes-of-religion?lang=eng>.
- ⁹⁷ The Church Educational System, *Teaching the Gospel Handbook*, 3-4.
- ⁹⁸ The Church Educational System, *Teaching the Gospel: A Handbook for CES Teachers and Leaders*, 3-9.
- ⁹⁹ The Church Educational System, *Teaching the Gospel Handbook*, 3-4.
- ¹⁰⁰ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Gospel Teaching and Learning*, x.
- ¹⁰¹ Eyring, “We Must Raise Our Sights,” 2.
- ¹⁰² Grant Anderson, Assistant Administrator to Adam Smith, email, November 13, 2103.
- ¹⁰³ Dieter F. Uchtdorf, “A Teacher of God’s Children,” *Address to Religious Educators*, January 28, 2011, 7 (emphasis added).
- ¹⁰⁴ Hall, “The Current Teaching Emphasis: An Update,” 8.
- ¹⁰⁵ Hall, “The Current Teaching Emphasis: An Update,” 8.
- ¹⁰⁶ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Book of Mormon Seminary Teacher Manual* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 2012).
- ¹⁰⁷ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Book of Mormon Teacher Resource Manual*, 202-203.
- ¹⁰⁸ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Book of Mormon Seminary Teacher Manual*, 385-386.
- ¹⁰⁹ Henry B. Eyring, “The Lord Will Multiply the Harvest,” *Address to CES Religious Educators*, February 6, 1998, 6.
- ¹¹⁰ The Church Educational System, *Teaching the Gospel Handbook*.
- ¹¹¹ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, “The New Gospel Teaching and Learning Handbook,” Official Memo, May 28, 2012. https://si.lds.org/news/announcements/new_gospel_teaching_and_learning_handbook_01-memo3528?lang=eng
- ¹¹² Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Gospel Teaching and Learning*.
- ¹¹³ For illustrative examples of this see David A. Bednar, “Seek Learning by Faith,” *Address to CES Religious Educators*, February 3, 2006, and Richard G. Scott, “To Understand and Live Truth,” *Address to CES Religious Educators*, February 4, 2005.
- ¹¹⁴ Chad Webb, “Welcome To The New S&I Handbook. A Video From Brother Chad H. Webb,” <https://si.lds.org/help/educator-website/welcome-to-the-new-s-i-handbook--a-video-from-chad-webb?lang=eng>
- ¹¹⁵ Russell M. Nelson, “Teaching Youth in the Day of the Wave,” *Seminaries & Institutes of Religion Broadcast*, August 6, 2013, 3.
- ¹¹⁶ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Seminaries and Institutes of Religion Annual Report for 2013*, 1-5.
- ¹¹⁷ Paul Murphy, Curriculum Department for S&I, to Adam N. Smith, email, September 13, 2013.
- ¹¹⁸ Chad Webb, “Welcome To The New S&I Handbook.”
- ¹¹⁹ Chad Webb, “Welcome To The New S&I Handbook.”
- ¹²⁰ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Seminaries and Institutes of Religion Annual Report for 2013*.
- ¹²¹ Esplin, “Charting the Course,” 111.

¹²² Berrett, *Miracle*, 90.

¹²³ See discussion of curriculum formation in John Lessing Fowles, "A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints from 1890-1990: A Response to Secular Education," (PhD diss., University of Missouri-Columbia, 1990), 285-299.

¹²⁴ Fowles, "A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program," 301.

¹²⁵ The Church Educational System, *Teaching the Gospel Handbook*, 4.

¹²⁶ Kenneth G. Bell, "Adam Samuel Bennion: Superintendent of LDS Education, 1919 to 1928," (Master's Thesis, BYU, 1969), 70-74.

¹²⁷ Fowles, "A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program," 220-226.

¹²⁸ Fowles, "A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program," 220-225.

¹²⁹ Fowles, "A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program," 225.

¹³⁰ Fowles, "A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program," 226-227.

¹³¹ John Paul Fugal, "An Analysis of the Development and Use of Objectives for the Seminary Teachers in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints," (Master's Thesis, BYU, 1959), 75.

¹³² Marshall Burton, "A Recommended Organizational Structure Defining Major Staff and Line Positions for the Department of Seminaries and Institutes of Religion of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints" (Ed.D Dissertation, BYU, 1970), 67.

¹³³ Harold B. Lee, "Objectives of Church Education," June 17, 1970, William Barrett Papers, Box 5, Fd. 6, BYU Special Collections.

¹³⁴ Bruce R. McConkie, "The Foolishness of Teaching," *Address to CES Religious Educators*, September 18, 1981.

¹³⁵ Fowles, "A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program," 301.

¹³⁶ The Church Educational System, *Teaching the Gospel: A Handbook for CES Teachers and Leaders* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1994), 3-9.

¹³⁷ Hall, Personal writings.

¹³⁸ Fowles, "A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program," iii.

¹³⁹ Fowles, "A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program," 27-29.

¹⁴⁰ Fowles, "A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program," 145.

¹⁴¹ Fowles, "A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program," 209, 219.

¹⁴² Fowles, "A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program," 281.

¹⁴³ Fowles, "A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program," 253, 285-299. For more information regarding the formation of Sequential Scripture Teaching, see Kelly P. Anderson, Sean R. Dixon, Tracy R. Kirkham, and Gregory B. Wightman,

“Foundations of Sequential Scripture Teaching in the Church Educational System,” unpublished manuscript, University of Phoenix(1997), 16-17 (Copy in author’s possession).

¹⁴⁴ Fowles, “A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program,” 284.

¹⁴⁵ Fowles, “A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program,” 300-303, 359.

¹⁴⁶ Fowles, “A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program,” 4.

¹⁴⁷ Fowles, “A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program,” 5.

¹⁴⁸ Fowles, “A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program,” 146.

¹⁴⁹ James R. Clark, ed., in *Messages of the First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1975) 6:44, cited in Scott C. Esplin, “Charting the Course: President Clark’s Charge to Religious Educators,” in *The Religious Educator* 7, no. 1 (2008), 103.

¹⁵⁰ Esplin, “Charting the Course,” 115.

¹⁵¹ Boyd K. Packer, “Teach the Scriptures,” *Address to CES Religious Educators*, October 14, 1977.

¹⁵² Packer, “Teach the Scriptures,” 3.

¹⁵³ Packer, “Teach the Scriptures,” 3.

¹⁵⁴ Packer, “Teach the Scriptures,” 3, 4.

¹⁵⁵ Fowles, “A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program,” 253.

¹⁵⁶ See Kelly P. Anderson, Sean R. Dixon, Tracy R. Kirkham, and Gregory B. Wightman, “Foundations of Sequential Scripture Teaching in the Church Educational System,” unpublished manuscript, University of Phoenix (1997), 16-17 (In author’s possession).

¹⁵⁷ Church Educational System, “New Publication,” Official Memo, October 13, 2000. (In author’s possession).

¹⁵⁸ Alan R. Maynes, "Creating Questions That Invite Revelation," in *Religious Educator* 6, no. 3 (2005): 31-42.

¹⁵⁹ John Hilton III, “The Power of Student Discovery and Sharing,” in *Religious Educator* 8, no. 3 (2007): 89–99.

¹⁶⁰ Rob Eaton, “The Case for Student Participation,” in *Religious Educator* 9, no. 2 (2008): 31-44.

¹⁶¹ Anthony R. Sweat, “Active Learning and the Savior’s Nephite Ministry,” in *Religious Educator* 10, no. 3 (2009): 75–86.

¹⁶² Casey Paul Griffiths, “The Church Education System: A conversation with Roger G. Christensen,” in *Religious Educator* 13, no. 2 (2012): 18.Griffiths, "The Church Educational System: A Conversation with Roger G. Christensen," 17-31.

¹⁶³ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, “Church Board of Education and Other Officers,” Official Memo, September 11, 2013. (In author’s possession).

¹⁶⁴ Chad H. Webb and Kenneth L. Alford, “Serving Students: A Conversation with Chad H. Webb,” in *Religious Educator* 10, no. 3 (2009), 239.

¹⁶⁵ Griffiths, "The Church Educational System: A Conversation with Roger G. Christensen," 17-31.

¹⁶⁶ Cited in Griffiths, "The Church Educational System: A Conversation with Roger G. Christensen," 27.

¹⁶⁷ Barbara Morgan, Garry Moore, LaNell Moore, "Seminaries and Institutes of Religion," in *Religious Educator* 11, no. 3 (2010): 181-213.

¹⁶⁸ Ewer, "Seminaries and Institutes of Religion timeline: A century of seminary," 5.

¹⁶⁹ Barbara Morgan, "Seminaries and Institutes of Religion," 220.

Appendix B

Methodology Section

Statement of Problem

There is no formal history written of the formation of the Current Teaching Emphasis, the Objective, and the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook. These adjustments profoundly affect the teaching and learning of 45,000 teachers, and 740,000 S&I students worldwide. It represents a significant shift in what is required of teachers and students in the S&I classroom. The audience for such a history is both a large, and a global audience.

In order to understand the history of the Current Teaching Emphasis, the Objective, and the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook important, one must also understand the source behind the principles they teach. Chad Webb touched briefly on this source in a worldwide internet introduction of the new handbook. He stated:

Over the last 20 years, we have had a handbook that served us very well. And through that time we have continued to learn and to grow as an organization. We have the wonderful blessing of being led by inspired leaders who have taken many opportunities to instruct us about effective teaching. One of the reasons for this new handbook is to have a collection where we have compiled much of what we've learned throughout the years in Seminaries and Institutes of Religion about effective teaching and about effective learning. I am grateful for the opportunity to have the words of living prophets and the things that they are teaching us about teaching gathered together and placed in this wonderful new handbook.¹

In this citation, Webb asserts that the new *Gospel Teaching and Learning Handbook* represents the direction and training S&I has received over the past 20 years from men they revere as prophet9s and apostles. The Latter-day Saint people regard following the prophets to be a paramount priority. It is therefore imperative to show that the new handbook is S&I's encapsulation of the most recent direction given to them by senior Church leaders. Such would

be a powerful source of vision and understanding to any teacher or administrator in S&I around the globe.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study is to document the history and the contributing factors that led to the formation of the Current Teaching Emphasis, the Objective, and the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook, in the context of the addresses given by senior Church leaders to S&I. These addresses will be analyzed in order to: clearly identify the principles that have driven the changes in S&I's teaching tactics, provide key insights into the clarification and adjustments in the description of teaching and learning in S&I, investigate how these principles differ from previous approaches, describe the significance of this shift, and consider the contemporary issues that influenced the increased clarity and direction from senior Church leaders to S&I.

An understanding of these elements is crucial to the performance of S&I teachers and students worldwide. R. Gill, a scholar of organizational change, noted that a “shared vision is key to successful change” in any organization. He went on to assert that the “foundation” of effective organizational change “is defining and communicating an effective vision of the future ... Vision needs to be meaningful, ethical, and inspiring.”² The prophetic vision behind the Current Teaching Emphasis, the Objective, and the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook will not benefit S&I unless this vision is shared and applied by individual teachers. Understanding both the history behind, and the prophetic source of this vision would increase the likelihood of achieving a “shared vision.”³ Careful documentation of the history, intention and development of these new approaches will provide a rich resource not only to future historians, but also to teachers who desire to implement these innovations as intentionally as possible.

Research Questions

The following questions will be addressed in this study:

1. What is the history, and what are the contributing factors that led to the formation of the Teaching Emphasis, the Objective, and the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook?
2. What was the process by which these changes were developed and how are they different from previous approaches to Seminary and Institute instruction?

Methodology

In order to capture the history of the Current Teaching Emphasis, the Objective, and *The Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook, interviews were conducted with high-level administrators, as well as personnel most closely tied to their formation. Due to the unavailability of Church Board of Education meeting minutes, great emphasis was given to these interviews. Managers and directors of the training and curriculum departments within S&I were most helpful and willing in identifying those who would be key interviewees for this study.

Interviews were conducted with Troy Virgin (Area Director and former Pre-Service Trainer), Mark Eastmond (Curriculum Services), Doug Hart (Director of Training Division), Grant Anderson (Assistant Administrator), Randall Hall (former Associate Administrator), and Chad Webb (Administrator of S&I). Prior interviews conducted by other researchers with Gary Moore (former Administrator of S&I), and Paul V. Johnson (Commissioner of Church Education) were also be analyzed for pertinent content. Due to their participation from an administrative standpoint in the creation, distribution, and training regarding the Current Teaching Emphasis, the Objective, and the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook, these participants are capable of not only telling the history, but also filling in many of the gaps left by the unavailability of the meeting minutes.

Each interviewee was asked questions regarding the contributing factors behind the creation of the above named innovations, as well as what adjustments, shifts, or changes they are designed to bring about. They were also asked to explain how the recent innovations differ from previous approaches and how they perceive the significance of this shift. An audio recording and transcription was made of each interview. The transcriptions were then analyzed for pertinent historical data and critical findings relevant to the formation and desired outcomes of the Current Teaching Emphasis, the Objective, and the *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook.

S&I granted access to organizational memos from 1994-2011, as well as any other materials necessary for this study that are held at the S&I Library on the 8th floor of the Church Office Building in Salt Lake City, Utah. A liaison between the Church History Library and the S&I Curriculum department offered his services to secure access to any materials in that library that would be of assistance. The author has been an employee of the organization during the time of the changes being analyzed and therefore has experiences and relationships that enabled the thorough completion of this study from an inside perspective; including, but not limited to, the addresses of senior Church leaders to S&I.

This study also conducted an analysis of the direction given by senior Church leaders to S&I through two formal media: “An Evening with a General Authority,” and summer addresses given prior to the start of the traditional U.S. school year. The forum for these addresses was referred to as the “BYU Symposium” from 1994-2003, and the “CES Satellite Broadcast” or the “Satellite Training Broadcast: Seminaries and Institutes of Religion,” from 2003-Present.⁴ This study analyzed these addresses to investigate the depth and breadth of the link between the Current Teaching Emphasis, the Objective, and the *Gospel and Teaching* handbook, and the focused training, direction, and instruction given directly to S&I from LDS prophets and apostles

through these formal training sessions. An address must fulfill the following criteria to be considered for this study:

1. The source is an LDS Church President or Apostle.
2. The address was given directly to S&I in an above-mentioned forum between 1994 and 2011.

In limiting the time frame of the study to 1994-2011, certain key addresses from senior Church leaders to S&I would be overlooked. These addresses still have relevance and impact upon S&I and need to be included in this study. Therefore, this study analyzed addresses which are viewed as “foundational.” An address must fit the following criteria in order to be considered foundational:

1. The source is an LDS prophet or apostle.
2. The address was included in *Charge to Religious Educators*, which was a portion of the Seminary pre-service curriculum from 1981-2004.⁵
3. The address is included in *Teaching Seminary: Preservice Readings*, which is a portion of the Seminary pre-service curriculum from 2004-Present.⁶

Key Definitions for this Study

This study is intended for, and written to a Latter-day Saint audience. No significant effort has been made to clarify or explain terms and ideas that are common to Latter-day Saints.

The use of the word “Brethren” in this study refers to those men who are accepted by members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints as prophets, seers, and revelators, and who comprise the First Presidency and the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles.

Delimitations

This study focused on the time period from 1994-2011. This time frame is based on two factors: First, a comprehensive study of the influence of senior Church leaders on the educational philosophy of S&I was published in 1990.⁷ Second, Chad Webb’s statement that the new *Gospel*

Teaching and Learning handbook represents what S&I has learned over the past 20 years from prophets and apostles.⁸ The time period was further defined by the 1994 publication date of the now obsolete *Teaching the Gospel* handbook, and the December 2011 approval date by the Church's correlation department for the new *Gospel Teaching and Learning* handbook.⁹ In other words, the period of time that passed between the printings of these two handbooks represents the time frame of this study.

The Church Board of Education is the governing body over Seminaries and Institutes of Religion.¹⁰ Access to Board Meeting Minutes is denied since they are confidential. They contain private information regarding finances, personnel, and administrative issues that do not relate to the current study.¹¹

Notes

¹ Chad Webb, "Welcome To The New S&I Handbook. A Video From Brother Chad H. Webb," <https://si.lds.org/help/educator-website/welcome-to-the-new-s-i-handbook--a-video-from-chad-webb?lang=eng>

² R. Gill, "Change management or change leadership?" in *Journal of Change Management* 3, no. 4 (2003), 307-318.

³ R. Gill, "Change management or change leadership?," 307-318.

⁴ Robert A. Ewer, "Seminaries and Institutes of Religion timeline: A century of seminary," <https://si.lds.org/training/talks/history/seminaries-and-institutes-of-religion-timeline-a-century-of-seminary?lang=eng3-5>.

⁵ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Charge to Religious Educators* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1994)

⁶ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Teaching Seminary: Preservice Readings* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1994)

⁷ John Lessing Fowles, "A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints from 1890-1990: A Response to Secular Education," (PhD diss., University of Missouri-Columbia, 1990)

⁸ Chad H. Webb, "Welcome To The New S&I Handbook."

⁹ Robert A. Ewer, Manager of Curriculum Services for S&I to Adam N. Smith, email, September 13, 2013.

¹⁰ Casey Paul Griffiths, "The Church Education System: A conversation with Roger G. Christensen," in *Religious Educator* 13, no. 2 (2012): 17-31

¹¹ This issue was also faced by John Lessing Fowles in the research he conducted for "A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program of the Church of Jesus

Christ of Latter-day Saints from 1890-1990: A Response to Secular Education,” (PhD diss., University of Missouri-Columbia, 1990), 33, 304.

Appendix C

A Brief Synopsis of the Influence of Latter-day Prophets upon the Educational Philosophy of Seminaries & Institutes of Religion (1912-2000)

Since the beginnings of the seminary program in 1912, and continuing with the establishment of institute in 1926, prophetic guidance and training have been sought by religious educators in The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. The instruction and direction received by senior Church leaders (the Brethren) have determined the educational philosophy of Seminaries and Institutes of Religion (S&I).

The Influence of Latter-day Prophets

The first formal format for training and instruction directly from the Brethren to S&I was organized by Adam S. Bennion, Church Superintendent of Education from 1920 until 1928.¹ In the summer of 1920, Bennion organized a summer school in order to produce more standardized training and curriculum for the seminary system. In 1921, Bennion invited several General Authorities to provide training for the seminary teachers in attendance.

William E. Berrett, who later would become the administrator for Seminaries and Institutes for seventeen years, remembered attending these summer school sessions.² Berrett first attended one of these sessions in 1927,³ and recalled that “many of the General Authorities’ addresses at the summer school sessions concerned the clarification or interpretation of LDS doctrine, rather than matters involving educational methodology.”⁴ These meetings were held periodically for the next twenty years.⁵

Berrett must have been deeply influenced by the opportunity to be taught by prophets, seers, and revelators during the summer. When he became the administrator of the Seminaries and Institutes in 1953,⁶ he “secured permission from the Church Board of Education to call all Seminary and Institute teachers into a five week’s summer school session at BYU for the first

term of school, 1954.”⁷ These sessions became the first in a series as Berrett created a summer inservice training schedule that would continue every other summer from 1954 to 1970. These trainings were held on the BYU campus at Provo, Utah.⁸ Berrett ensured that the bulk of the instruction received during these summer sessions came from the Brethren.⁹

Following Berrett’s leadership tenure, instruction and training from the Brethren to S&I continued. In 1975, the “Evening with a General Authority” program began. In 1977, the first annual CES Religious Educators Symposium was held in August at Brigham Young University. Teachers and administrators from throughout the Church Educational System attended. This symposium would later be called the “CES Religious Educators’ Conference.”¹⁰ Each of these was a forum in which one of the Brethren addressed educators within the Church Educational System. In 2003, the CES Religious Educators’ Conference was discontinued and replaced with the annual worldwide CES Satellite Training Broadcast (the title was later changed to “Satellite Training Broadcast: Seminaries and Institutes of Religion”), which was transmitted for the first time in August.¹¹ These satellite broadcasts, as well as the “Evening with a General Authority” remain a practice in S&I today. Throughout its century in existence, S&I has established and maintained a pattern of seeking to attain and follow prophetic training and direction.

Regarding prophetic leadership and guidance, the Lord said: “...whether by mine own voice or by the voice of my servants, it is the same” (Doctrine and Covenants 1:38). For teachers and administrators in S&I, this means that the educational philosophy promulgated by prophets and apostles is divine. It is the word and will of God (see Doctrine and Covenants 68:4). Therefore, an S&I teacher’s success depends upon his or her individual understanding and application of the divine directives. Understanding this viewpoint is crucial to understanding S&I. In the brief presentation of this educational philosophy that will follow, foundational talks¹²

from the beginning of S&I have been analyzed, as well as each formal training given by the Brethren to S&I between 1994 and the year 2000. Throughout S&I's history, LDS prophets and apostles have instructed teachers regarding what should be taught and how it should be taught. The Brethren have also provided a functional description of the S&I student and teacher.

What to Teach

From the earliest days of the seminary and institute programs, the Brethren have emphasized that teachers of the gospel should focus on “the fundamentals.”¹³ In 1938, a member of the First Presidency named J. Reuben Clark described those fundamentals in an address given to S&I teachers. He mentioned that foremost among these fundamentals is the belief that the Church “is the organized priesthood of God,” and that Jesus Christ is the literal Redeemer of mankind.¹⁴ He also emphasized that teachers must know and teach that “the Father and the Son actually and in truth and very deed appeared to the Prophet Joseph” and through him restored Christ's true Church, gospel, and priesthood to the earth, along with *The Book of Mormon*, a book of sacred scripture.¹⁵ In 1981, Elder Boyd K. Packer reiterated these fundamentals.¹⁶

The sources that a teacher should use to teach these fundamentals to their students have also been clearly spelled out by the Brethren. Again, beginning with the 1938 address from President Clark, teachers were directed to use as their “sources and authorities the standard works of the Church and the words of those whom God has called to lead His people in these last days.”¹⁷ Teachers are not paid to “intrude into [their] work [their] own peculiar philosophy” or “to change the doctrines of the Church or to modify them.”¹⁸ Teachers in S&I are to teach the doctrine of the LDS Church as it is “declared by and in the standard works of the Church and by those whose authority it is to declare the mind and will of the Lord to the Church.”¹⁹ As Elder

Bruce R. McConkie put it, a teacher is “an agent, a servant, a representative, an ambassador if you will” who has been hired to “preach [*Christ’s*] gospel, not [theirs].”²⁰

The importance of teaching from the scriptures has been an oft repeated theme from the Brethren to S&I. President Ezra Taft Benson in 1976,²¹ Elder Packer in 1977,²² Elder McConkie in 1981,²³ President Howard W. Hunter in 1989,²⁴ and Elder Holland in 2000²⁵ all gave direct instruction that S&I is to teach the scriptures. Perhaps Elder Packer summed up these principles best when, in the year 1977, he said that a teachers “commission ... charter, [and] objective in religious education” is to “teach the scriptures.”²⁶

One purpose for the emphasis on the scriptures is to ensure an emphasis on Jesus Christ. In 1978, Elder Gordon B. Hinckley reminded teachers that in the scriptures that there is a “central figure ... and that figure is the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God. Teach of Him.”²⁷ President Hunter explained that connecting students with the scriptures would “invite ... students directly to Christ, not just to one who teaches his doctrines.”²⁸ In an S&I classroom, Jesus Christ and His gospel should be center-stage. This gospel should be taught from official LDS scripture and the words of LDS prophets.

Another reason for the emphasis on scripture is to keep the doctrine pure. Elder McConkie explained clearly that a teacher is a messenger and not an interpreter of doctrine. He stated that “Doctrinal interpretation is the province of the First Presidency.”²⁹ Elder Packer instructed teachers to avoid an academic approach, stating that “the things of God are understood only by one who possesses the Spirit of God.”³⁰ Elder McConkie added to this that it “is pleasing if we have some intellectual attainments. But basically and fundamentally, as teachers we are dealing with the things of the Spirit.”³¹

A teacher's role therefore, is to be a witness of the truthfulness of LDS doctrine and scripture, and to teach them "out of a deep and earnest conviction so that your students will feel the strength of your testimony."³² Teachers are "not being sent out to teach new doctrine." They are "to teach the old doctrines, not so plainly that [the students] just understand, but you must teach the doctrines of the Church so plainly that no one can misunderstand."³³ President Clark summarized the sentiment of each of these Brethren clearly when he said: "I say once more, you must teach the gospel. You have no other function and no other reason for your presence in a Church school system."³⁴

Perhaps the most important reason that "holy scripture and the words of living prophets occupy a privileged position" is that, for an S&I teacher, "they are the key to teaching by the Spirit ..."³⁵ In 1991, Elder Neal A. Maxwell explained that "Inspired scriptures involve sanctified words" which create a channel of communication between the students of the scriptures and their original Divine source. Elder Maxwell explained that "when speaker and hearer—writers and readers—are spiritually conjoined, it is a special thing, as revelatory reciprocity occurs ..."³⁶

How to Teach

Elder McConkie stated that S&I teachers are "to teach by the power of the Holy Ghost."³⁷ Elder Packer advised S&I personnel to teach their students to "see with the eyes they possessed before they had a mortal body; teach them to hear with ears they possessed before they were born; teach them to push back the curtains of mortality and see into the eternities."³⁸ Elder McConkie explained to S&I teachers that "conversion comes and truth sinks into the hearts of people only when it is taught by the power of the Spirit."³⁹ Elder Maxwell added that teaching by the Spirit "not only informs and increases mutual understanding, it convinces!"⁴⁰

Prophets and apostles have taught that teaching and learning in S&I, and in the Church, simply cannot occur without the Holy Ghost being present in the process. President Hunter taught that S&I “*should not* teach without the Spirit, but also that we really *cannot* teach without it. Learning of spiritual things simply cannot take place without the instructional and confirming presence of the Spirit of the Lord.”⁴¹ The goal of teaching in S&I is personal conversion to the gospel of Jesus Christ in each student, and “conversion comes and the truth sinks into the hearts of people only when it is taught by the power of the Spirit.”⁴²

The Brethren provide an additional reason why teaching by the Spirit is superior to any other method: Through the Spirit a teacher may present to the students the words of the Lord Himself. Elder McConkie explained that if teachers “teach by the power of the Holy Ghost, you say the things that the Lord wants said, or you say the things the Lord would say if he himself were here.”⁴³ This is only possible through the assistance of the Holy Ghost, who “is a revelator,” and helps the teacher to speak “words of revelation.”⁴⁴ Therefore, the S&I teacher’s paramount concern should be “getting in tune with the Spirit and expressing the thoughts, in the best language and way that I can, that are implanted there by the power of the Spirit.”⁴⁵ Elder McConkie asserted that the Lord, who knows what each individual student needs to hear, “has provided a means to give that revelation to every preacher and every teacher.”⁴⁶

Elder Spencer W. Kimball urged S&I teachers, therefore, to “Seek the Spirit of the Lord.”⁴⁷ Without Divine assistance, a teacher in S&I simply cannot succeed. In order to teach by the Spirit, a teacher must merit this heavenly assistance. President Benson instructed S&I that their “first responsibility as a teacher of the gospel is to prepare yourself spiritually... The most important part of your teaching preparation is that you are guided by the Spirit.”⁴⁸ In order to do this, they must “live in such a way that you have the Spirit of the Lord in your teaching.”⁴⁹

In addition to living a life worthy of the companionship of the Holy Ghost, “the Spirit will be given by the prayer of faith.”⁵⁰ Prayer, however, will not be enough. Elder Maxwell warned S&I that teaching by the Spirit “does not remove responsibility from the teacher for prayerful and pondering preparation,” and that it “is not the equivalent of going on ‘automatic pilot.’ We still need a carefully worked out flight plan.” Praying for the Spirit is most effective “when we ask the Lord to take the lead of an already informed mind.”⁵¹

A final, and deeply significant requirement for a teacher to qualify for the help of the Spirit, is for that teacher to have a sincere concern for the welfare of the student. Elder Maxwell explained that “if we already care deeply about those to be taught, it is so much easier for the Lord to inspire us to give customized counsel and emphasis to those we teach.”⁵²

The principal reason for why a teacher should teach by the Spirit is so that each student might experience learning by the Spirit. This is one of the chief tenets of all teaching and learning in S&I. President Hunter told S&I teachers to “invite your students to feel the Spirit of the Lord, not just give them your personal reflection of that.” By so doing, the Spirit would lead each individual student “toward God the Father and his Only Begotten Son, Jesus Christ, and toward the leadership of the true Church.”⁵³ President Hunter went on to teach that the students need the Spirit to protect and strengthen them as they are “assaulted and barraged by worldliness all around them.”⁵⁴

By feeling the Spirit, the students take part in a learning experience; what President Hunter referred to as a “spiritual experience” where they “will feel the spirit of the truth being taught them and will recognize that inspiration and revelation has come into their hearts.”⁵⁵ Elder Jeffrey R. Holland pled with teachers to give “students a spiritual experience in every way that you can.”⁵⁶ Elder Richard G. Scott instructed teachers to educate students not only on what it

means to be led by the Spirit, but also to help them *experience* being spiritually led. He taught that teachers must “create an appropriate environment for the Holy Ghost to instruct ... We must qualify ourselves to be ready to receive the Lord’s guidance and direction when He determines to provide it.”⁵⁷ By helping to provide such an experience, a teacher will “build faith” in their students and “strengthen testimonies...”⁵⁸

Elder Maxwell offered a concise and comprehensive summary of these principles when he said: “Actually, the Spirit ties students to the Lord directly.”⁵⁹ That is the ultimate “why” behind teaching by the Spirit.

The Student

In regards to this topic, J. Reuben Clark’s teachings in 1938 are foundational. They have been quoted verbatim in addresses to S&I by LDS apostles Marion G. Romney⁶⁰, and Bruce R. McConkie⁶¹. They have been referenced in apostolic addresses to S&I on other occasions as well.⁶²

President Clark asserted to S&I that “your students, are in great majority sound in thought and in spirit.”⁶³ He told the teachers that the youth of the Church are “hungry for things of the Spirit; they are eager to learn the gospel, and they want it straight, undiluted ... They are not now doubters but inquirers, seekers after truth.... They are prepared to understand the truth.”⁶⁴ He claimed that the students are prepared to believe and understand matters of faith and the Spirit. S&I students, according to President Clark, “come to you possessing spiritual knowledge and experience the world does not know.”⁶⁵

In 1975, Spencer W. Kimball, who at the time was president of the Church, emphasized to S&I teachers the spiritual strength and eternal importance of their students. He said that the “adversary is waging a great battle to stop the progress of the kingdom, as you know. But the

Lord is sending forth great and powerful spirits that have been reserved to help move his work forward in these critical times. These spirits need to be trained and prepared for the work they have to do.”⁶⁶

In 1976, President Benson echoed this sentiment when he reminded S&I teachers that they “have been given custody of some of the choicest spirits of all time.” He emphasized that these youth “are not just ordinary spirits, but among them are some of the choicest spirits that have come from heaven.” These spirits have been “reserved to come forth in this time” to help the Lord “bear off the kingdom triumphant.”⁶⁷

With this understanding of who the student is, the burden upon the teacher to teach the gospel by the power of the Spirit is increased. President Clark explained that S&I teachers “do not have to sneak up behind this spiritually experienced youth and whisper religion in his ears; you can come right out, face to face, and talk with him.”⁶⁸ Because of who the LDS youth are, the Brethren assert that an S&I teacher should inspire them to be faithful throughout their entire lives. During his years as an apostle, Elder Spencer W. Kimball emphasized the need to prepare these young people for future Church service and for an LDS temple marriage. He stated that “seminaries and institutes can do much to get young people into the mission field and into temple marriage and, finally, into exaltation. This program is that perfect agency in the Church; all the others, of course, make impressive contributions.”⁶⁹ Elder Kimball felt that S&I plays a primary role, outside of home and family, in preparing the LDS youth for a devoted life of faithful Church and family activity.

With such special youth, and the profound responsibility to help prepare them for a life of faithfulness, an S&I teacher must be filled with love for the student. Elder Hinckley invited S&I teachers to “cultivate in your hearts ... a deep love for those you teach and particularly for those

who appear to be ... difficult to reach.”⁷⁰ Quoting President Heber J. Grant, President Hunter reminded the teaching corps that “There is no labor in which any of us can be engaged that is more acceptable in the sight of our Heavenly Father than laboring for the [youth] in the Church of Jesus Christ. . . .”⁷¹

The Teacher

First and foremost, S&I religious educators have been commissioned to “live as you teach.”⁷² This has been a repeated message from prophets and apostles to S&I.⁷³ President Hunter pointed out that LDS “young people need great living examples, moral and religious heroes, if you will, who set a standard before them and show them the grace and beauty of a worthy life.”⁷⁴ President Benson admonished teachers to be “consistent in your life with the message you declare to your students.”⁷⁵ Teachers are to “inspire by your personality, by your excellent example, by the dignity of your life.... There must be strict adherence to *all* the commandments of the Lord.”⁷⁶ By so doing, teachers will “lead [the students] with the light of your own testimonies.”⁷⁷

President Kimball, during his time as LDS Church President, informed teachers in S&I that he expected them to possess “honor, integrity, cleanliness, positiveness, and faith...” He also expected teachers to be “well-groomed, positive, happy people from homes where ... peace reigned and love was enthroned”⁷⁸ S&I teachers should be exemplary as spouses and parents, living what they teach at home when no outside eye is watching.⁷⁹ President Kimball gave S&I teachers the charge to “constitute one of the best models of proper home living ... so that your students see in you and your family the ideal after which to pattern their lives.”⁸⁰

Teachers not only need to live what they teach, they need to know what they teach. In a 1993 address from Elder Packer, he gave all teachers in S&I a charge to study and know God’s

plan of Salvation for His children and present it as an overview at the beginning of the school year. By so doing, a teacher would present to the students an eternal perspective, and refer to it throughout the year as a reference point and as explanation of the why behind God's commandments. He urged teachers to "convince [students] of the reality of spiritual things,"⁸¹ and to teach them about eternal and absolute spiritual laws.⁸²

Elder Harold B. Lee, who would later become the eleventh president of the Church, informed teachers that they are "expected to be an expert" on "Jesus Christ and him crucified."⁸³ President Hunter told teachers to study the scriptures "with all their might and reap what is so plentifully offered there."⁸⁴ Elder Hinckley invited teachers to "not rest in your development" and to "be constantly drinking of the waters of knowledge and revelation," lamenting that there is "so much to learn and so little time in which to learn it."⁸⁵ President Benson told teachers that if they wanted to strengthen their students, it was "essential" for them to "study the doctrines of the kingdom and learn the gospel." Only then will a teacher "have the power to convince [the] students."⁸⁶ A teacher must remember that the convincing power rests with the Spirit, not a teacher's knowledge. Elder Maxwell reconciled the two when he taught S&I teachers that in order to teach by the Spirit, they must have already "studied out" the gospel to such an extent that the Spirit could "take the lead of an already informed mind."⁸⁷

Having extensive and expert knowledge of the gospel is not sufficient for the S&I teacher. President Clark stated that the "first requisite of a teacher for teaching these principles is a personal testimony of their truth. No amount of learning, no amount of study, and no number of scholastic degrees can take the place of this testimony..."⁸⁸ This call for teachers to have a personal testimony has been echoed by several other apostles in addresses to S&I.⁸⁹ President

Benson taught that a teacher's testimony must be so deep that they have been personally converted and experienced their own "change of heart."⁹⁰

The risk inherent in mastering the teachings of the scriptures and the gospel of Jesus Christ is for the teacher to set himself or herself up as an authorized interpreter of divine doctrine. However, such is the exclusive right of the president of the Church. Therefore, teachers have repeatedly been admonished to be loyal "to those who preside in authority over you," namely, the Brethren.⁹¹ President Benson informed S&I teachers that the Brethren "are entrusting you to represent the Lord and the First Presidency to your students, not the views of the detractors of the Church."⁹² Elder Lee gave the following warning to S&I teachers, "I think nothing could get you into deep water quicker than to answer people when they say, "What does the Church think?" You want to be smart, so you try to answer what the Church's policy is. Well you're not the one to make the policies for the Church. ... If the President of the Church has not declared the position of the Church, then you shouldn't go shopping for the answer."⁹³

An S&I teacher must be cautious and careful to teach the gospel in a way that conforms closely to the scriptures and the teachings of modern prophets. Teachers should not seek to set themselves up as a light. President Benson pled: "May your motives be ... pure. May the welfare of your students be the *primary* motive to your teaching. May you be converted so you can strengthen your students."⁹⁴ A converted teacher seeks to spark or fan the flame of conversion in the student. Elder Henry B. Eyring trained teachers to focus their teachings on those things that would lead a young person to personal conversion to the gospel of Jesus Christ. As teachers prepare their lessons, Elder Eyring advised them to "look ... for converting principles. Most of your students want to do the right thing, but they need the conversion that comes from doing the

right thing in faith. A converting principle is one that leads to obedience to the will of God—always in faith and sometimes to the point of sacrifice.”⁹⁵

An S&I teacher’s primary priority is to teach in a way that would “build faith rather than destroy it.”⁹⁶ Elder L. Tom Perry stated that S&I “is one of the most valuable resources we have for the building of testimonies in the youth of the Church.”⁹⁷ President Benson told teachers that their “purpose is to increase testimony and faith in your students.”⁹⁸ It is not an S&I teacher’s job to teach world views, or the opinions of detractors to the LDS faith. Elder Packer stated clearly that “the Church [is] not neutral . . . We are therefore obliged to give preference to and protect all that is represented in the gospel of Jesus Christ . . .”⁹⁹ President Clark summarized well these principles with the following charge, “In the first place, there is neither reason nor is there excuse for our Church religious teaching and training facilities and institutions unless the youth are to be taught and trained in the principles of the gospel, embracing therein the two great elements that Jesus is the Christ and that Joseph was God’s prophet.”¹⁰⁰

In S&I, teachers are to focus on “a central figure,” and “that figure is the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God.”¹⁰¹ Teachers should concentrate primarily on teaching about Jesus Christ and “bear testimony of Him out of a deep and earnest conviction so that your students will feel the strength of your testimony.”¹⁰²

Conclusion

S&I teachers have been taught by prophets and apostles that they “have a great mission” and “stand upon the highest peak in education . . .”¹⁰³ How can such a claim be made? President Clark explained that there is no teaching that can “compare in priceless value and in far-reaching effect” than that which is taught in S&I.¹⁰⁴ Its curriculum “deals with man as he was in the eternity of yesterday, as he is in the mortality of today, and as he will be in the forever of

tomorrow.”¹⁰⁵ Elder Eyring added the encouraging promise that the Lord will multiply and magnify each teacher’s efforts to the blessing of the students as they strive in faith to “offer to the children of our Heavenly Father the opportunity to choose eternal life.”¹⁰⁶

Notes

¹ William E. Berrett, *A Miracle in Weekday Religious Education* (Salt Lake City: Salt Lake Printing Center, 1988), xv.

² Berrett, *Miracle*, 183.

³ William E. Berrett, oral history, interviewed by Thomas E. Cheney, January 27, 1982, BYU Special Collections.

⁴ John Lessing Fowles, “A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints from 1890-1990: A Response to Secular Education,” (PhD diss., University of Missouri-Columbia, 1990), 149.

⁵ Fowles, “A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program,” 174.

⁶ Berrett, *Miracle*, xv.

⁷ Berrett, “My Story,” 78.

⁸ Fowles, “A Study Concerning the Mission of the Week-day Religious Educational Program,” 174.

⁹ See Boyd K. Packer, *That All May Edified* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1982), 45.

¹⁰ Robert A. Ewer, “Seminaries and Institutes of Religion timeline: A century of seminary,” <https://si.lds.org/training/talks/history/seminaries-and-institutes-of-religion-timeline-a-century-of-seminary?lang=eng>, 3.

¹¹ Ewer, “Seminaries and Institutes of Religion timeline,” 5.

¹² An address must fit the following criteria in order to be considered foundational: 1. The source is an LDS prophet or apostle, 2. The address was included in *Charge to Religious Educators*, which was a portion of the Seminary pre-service curriculum from 1981-2004, and 3. The address is included in *Teaching Seminary: Preservice Readings*, which is a portion of the Seminary pre-service curriculum from 2004-Present.

¹³ J. Reuben Clark Jr., “The Charted Course of the Church in Education,” *Address to Seminary and Institute of Religion*, August 8, 1938, 1-2.

¹⁴ Clark, “The Charted Course,” 1-2.

¹⁵ Clark, “The Charted Course,” 2.

¹⁶ Boyd K. Packer, “The Mantle is Far, Far Greater Than the Intellect,” *CES Symposium on the Doctrine and Covenants and Church History*, August 22, 1981, 8.

¹⁷ Clark, “The Charted Course,” 6.

¹⁸ Clark, “The Charted Course,” 6.

¹⁹ Clark, “The Charted Course,” 6.

²⁰ Bruce R. McConkie, “The Foolishness of Teaching,” *Address to CES Religious Educators*, September 18, 1981, 11.

²¹ Ezra Taft Benson, *The Gospel Teacher and His Message*, *Address to CES Religious Educators*, September 17, 1976, 3.

-
- ²² Boyd K. Packer, “Teach the Scriptures,” *Address to CES Religious Educators*, October 14, 1977, 3.
- ²³ McConkie, “The Foolishness of Teaching,” 4-6.
- ²⁴ Howard W. Hunter, “Eternal Investments,” *Address to CES Religious Educators*, February 10, 1989, 2.
- ²⁵ Jeffrey R. Holland, “Therefore, What?” Address to CES Religious Educators, August 8, 2000, 2.
- ²⁶ Packer, “Teach the Scriptures,” 3.
- ²⁷ Gordon B. Hinckley, “Four Imperatives for Religious Educators,” *Address to CES Religious Educators*, September 15, 1978, 3.
- ²⁸ Hunter, “Eternal Investments,” 2.
- ²⁹ Benson, “The Gospel Teacher and His Message,” 6.
- ³⁰ Packer, “The Mantle is Far, Far Greater Than the Intellect,” 8.
- ³¹ McConkie, “The Foolishness of Teaching,” 3.
- ³² Hinckley, “Four Imperatives for Religious Educators,” 3.
- ³³ Harold B. Lee, “Loyalty,” *Address to CES Religious Educators*, July 8, 1966, 4.
- ³⁴ Clark, “The Charted Course,” 6.
- ³⁵ Neal A. Maxwell, “Teaching by the Spirit— ‘The Language of Inspiration,’” *CES Symposium on the Old Testament*, August 15, 1991, 1.
- ³⁶ Maxwell, “Teaching by the Spirit,” 1.
- ³⁷ McConkie, “The Foolishness of Teaching,” 8.
- ³⁸ Boyd K. Packer, “The Great Plan of Happiness,” *CES Symposium on the Doctrine and Covenants and Church History*, August 10, 1993, 6.
- ³⁹ McConkie, “The Foolishness of Teaching,” 9.
- ⁴⁰ Maxwell, “Teaching by the Spirit,” 1.
- ⁴¹ Hunter, “Eternal Investments,” 3.
- ⁴² McConkie, “The Foolishness of Teaching,” 9.
- ⁴³ McConkie, “The Foolishness of Teaching,” 8.
- ⁴⁴ McConkie, “The Foolishness of Teaching,” 8.
- ⁴⁵ McConkie, “The Foolishness of Teaching,” 8.
- ⁴⁶ McConkie, “The Foolishness of Teaching,” 8.
- ⁴⁷ Spencer W. Kimball, “Men of Example,” *Address to CES Religious Educators*, September 12, 1975, 6.
- ⁴⁸ Benson, “The Gospel Teacher and His Message,” 3.
- ⁴⁹ Hunter, “Eternal Investments,” 3.
- ⁵⁰ McConkie, “The Foolishness of Teaching,” 11.
- ⁵¹ Maxwell, “Teaching by the Spirit,” 2.
- ⁵² Maxwell, “Teaching by the Spirit,” 2.
- ⁵³ Hunter, “Eternal Investments,” 2.
- ⁵⁴ Hunter, “Eternal Investments,” 3.
- ⁵⁵ Hunter, “Eternal Investments,” 4.
- ⁵⁶ Jeffrey R. Holland, “Therefore, What?” Address to CES Religious Educators, August 8, 2000, 7.
- ⁵⁷ Richard G. Scott, “Helping Others to be Spiritually Led,” Address to CES Religious Educators, August 11, 1998, 1-2, 11.

-
- ⁵⁸ Hunter, “Eternal Investments,” 4.
- ⁵⁹ Maxwell, “Teaching by the Spirit,” 3.
- ⁶⁰ Marion G. Romney, “The Charted Course Reaffirmed,” *Address to Religious Educators*, September 12, 1980.
- ⁶¹ McConkie, “The Foolishness of Teaching, 4-5.
- ⁶² See Boyd K. Packer, *Teach Ye Diligently* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1975), 361-378, and “The Great Plan of Happiness” for examples of this.
- ⁶³ Clark, “The Charted Course,” 2.
- ⁶⁴ Clark, “The Charted Course,” 2-3.
- ⁶⁵ Clark, “The Charted Course,” 3-4.
- ⁶⁶ Kimball, “Men of Example,” 4.
- ⁶⁷ Benson, “The Gospel Teacher and His Message,” 1.
- ⁶⁸ Clark, “The Charted Course,” 6.
- ⁶⁹ Spencer W. Kimball, “Circles of Exaltation,” *Address to Religious Educators*, June 28, 1968, 4. See also Kimball, “Men of Example,” 5.
- ⁷⁰ Hinckley, “Four Imperatives for Religious Educators,” 4.
- ⁷¹ Hunter, “Eternal Investments,” 1.
- ⁷² Benson, “The Gospel Teacher and His Message,” 6.
- ⁷³ Hunter, “Eternal Investments,” 5.
- ⁷⁴ Hunter, “Eternal Investments,” 5.
- ⁷⁵ Benson, “The Gospel Teacher and His Message,” 6.
- ⁷⁶ Kimball, “Circles of Exaltation,” 5.
- ⁷⁷ Kimball, “Men of Example,” 6.
- ⁷⁸ Kimball, “Men of Example,” 2.
- ⁷⁹ Kimball, “Men of Example,” 2-3.
- ⁸⁰ Kimball, “Men of Example,” 3.
- ⁸¹ Packer, “The Great Plan of Happiness,” 4.
- ⁸² Packer, “The Great Plan of Happiness,” 5.
- ⁸³ Lee, “Loyalty,” 4.
- ⁸⁴ Hunter, “Eternal Investments,” 3.
- ⁸⁵ Hinckley, “Four Imperatives for Religious Educators,” 1-2.
- ⁸⁶ Benson, “The Gospel Teacher and His Message,” 3.
- ⁸⁷ Maxwell, “Teaching by the Spirit,” 2.
- ⁸⁸ Clark, “The Charted Course,” 4-6.
- ⁸⁹ Lee, “Loyalty,” 4, and Benson, “The Gospel Teacher and His Message,” 1.
- ⁹⁰ Benson, “The Gospel Teacher and His Message,” 2.
- ⁹¹ Lee, “Loyalty,” 6.
- ⁹² Benson, “The Gospel Teacher and His Message,” 6.
- ⁹³ Lee, “Loyalty,” 4.
- ⁹⁴ Benson, “The Gospel Teacher and His Message,” 3.
- ⁹⁵ Henry B Eyring, “Converting Principles,” Address to CES Religious Educators, February 2, 1996, p. 1
- ⁹⁶ Packer, “The Mantle is Far, Far Greater Than the Intellect,” 4.
- ⁹⁷ L. Tom Perry, “Bearing Down in Pure Testimony,” Address to CES Religious Educators, February 2, 1996, p. 1

-
- ⁹⁸ Benson, “The Gospel Teacher and His Message,” 5.
- ⁹⁹ Packer, “The Mantle is Far, Far Greater Than the Intellect,” 5.
- ¹⁰⁰ Clark, “The Charted Course,” 4.
- ¹⁰¹ Hinckley, “Four Imperatives for Religious Educators,” 3.
- ¹⁰² Hinckley, “Four Imperatives for Religious Educators,” 3.
- ¹⁰³ Clark, “The Charted Course,” 6.
- ¹⁰⁴ Clark, “The Charted Course,” 6.
- ¹⁰⁵ Clark, “The Charted Course,” 6.
- ¹⁰⁶ Henry B Eyring, “The Lord Will Multiply the Harvest,” Address to CES Religious Educators, February 6, 1998, p. 1

Appendix D

Addresses Analyzed for Research Project

Foundational Addresses Given to S&I from 1912-1993

Date:	Speaker:	Title:
8/8/1938	President J. R. Clark Jr.	The Charted Course of the Church in Education
7/8/1966	Elder Harold B. Lee	Loyalty
6/28/1968	Elder S. W. Kimball	Circles of Exaltation
9/12/1975	Pres. S. W. Kimball	Men of Example
9/17/1976	Pres. E. T. Benson	The Gospel Teacher and His Message
10/14/1977	Elder Boyd K. Packer	Teach the Scriptures
9/15/1978	Elder G. B. Hinckley	Four Imperatives for Religious Educators
8/22/1981	Elder Boyd K. Packer	The Mantle is Far, Far Greater Than the Intellect
9/18/1981	Elder B. R. McConkie	The Foolishness of Teaching
2/10/1989	President H. W. Hunter	Eternal Investments
8/15/1991	Elder Neal A. Maxwell	Teaching by the Spirit—"The Language of Inspiration"
8/10/1993	Elder Boyd K. Packer	The Great Plan of Happiness

In order for an address to fit the definition of “foundational” for this study, it must fit the following criteria:

1. The source is an LDS prophet or apostle.
2. The address was given prior to 1994.
3. The address was included in *Charge to Religious Educators*, which was a portion of the Seminary pre-service curriculum from 1994-2004.¹
4. The address is included in *Teaching Seminary: Preservice Readings*, which is a portion of the Seminary pre-service curriculum from 2004-Present.²

Notes

¹ Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Charge to Religious Educators* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1994)

² Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, *Teaching Seminary: Preservice Readings* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1994)

Addresses by the Brethren to S&I Between the Publication of TTG (1994) and GTL (2012)

Date:	Speaker:	Title:
2/1994 ¹	Elder Scott	<i>Talk Unavailable</i>
8/9/1994 ²	Elder Holland	“A Standard Unto My People”
2/3/1995	Elder Maxwell	“O How Great the Plan of Our God!”
8/15/1995	Elder Eyring	“Covenants and Sacrifice”
2/2/1996	Elder Eyring	“Converting Principles” (<i>Remarks</i>)
2/2/1996	Elder Perry	“Bearing Down in Pure Testimony”
8/13/1996	Elder Ballard	“The Law of Sacrifice”
2/6/1998	Elder Eyring	“The Lord Will Multiply the Harvest”
8/11/1998	Elder Scott	“Helping Others to be Spiritually Led”
2/5/1999	Elder Eyring	“Love and Loyalty” (<i>Remarks</i>)
2/5/1999	Elder Holland	“Our Consuming Mission”
8/10/1999	Elder Eyring	“Teaching the Old Testament”
2/2000	President Faust	“Remembrances” – <i>Not Printed</i>
8/8/2000	Elder Holland	“Therefore, What?”
2/2/2001	Elder Eyring	“Inquire of the Lord” (<i>Remarks</i>)
2/2/2001	Elder Maxwell	“Glorify Christ”
8/14/2001	Elder Eyring	“We Must Raise Our Sights”
2/01/2002	Elder Hales	“Teaching by Faith”
8/13/2002	Elder Maxwell	“Our Creator’s Cosmos”
2/7/2003	Elder Eyring	“The Spirit Must Be Our Constant Companion” (<i>Remarks</i>)
2/7/2003	Pres. Hinckley	“A Challenging time – A Wonderful Time”
8/1/2003	Elders Scott, Eyring	“Elder Richard G. Scott and Elder Henry B. Eyring Discussion”
2/6/2004	Pres. Packer	“The One Pure Defense”
8/4/2004	Elder Eyring	“Raising Expectations”
2/4/2005	Elder Scott	“To Understand and Live Truth”
2/3/2006	Elder Bednar	“Seek Learning by Faith”
2/10/2007	WWLTM	“Teaching and Learning”
2/29/2008	Pres. Packer	“Conversation With Teachers”
2/27/2009	Elder Cook	“Choices and Challenges”
2/26/2010	Pres. Eyring	“To Know and to Love God”
8/3/2010	Elder Ballard	“Panel Discussion”
8/3/2010	Elder Ballard	“We Are on the Lord’s Errand”
1/28/2011	Pres. Uchtdorf	“A Teacher of God’s Children”
8/2/2011	Elder Bednar	“A Discussion With Elder David A. Bednar” (<i>Video Available for S&I Purposes Only</i>)

Notes

¹ The “Evening with a General Authority” occurred on the February dates.

² The August dates reflect either the CES Summer Symposium/Conference, or the CES/SI August Satellite Broadcast.