Theological Education

ISSUE FOCUS
"Bifocaling" Faculty and Formation

The Association of Theological Schools is a membership organization of schools in the United States and Canada that conduct postbaccalaureate professional and academic degree programs to educate persons for the practice of ministry and advanced study of the theological disciplines. The Association's mission is to promote the improvement and enhancement of theological schools to the benefit of communities of faith and the broader public. The Commission on Accrediting of ATS accredits schools that are members of ATS and approves the degree programs they offer.

This journal is indexed in the ATLA Religion Database® and is available in electronic form in ATLASerials® (ATLAS®), both produced by the American Theological Library Association, 300 S. Wacker Dr., Suite 2100, Chicago, IL 60606; atla@atla.com; http://www.atla.com.

Theological Education

Continuing the Conversation

Theological Education invites responses, of up to 1,500 words, to articles published in the journal in order to foster conversation among its readers. Reader responses may be emailed to editors@ats.edu. Responses are published at the discretion of the editors and may be edited for length.

Editors' Introduction

Stephen R. Graham and Linda D. Trostle

One of the significant changes in the ecology of theological education over the past three or four decades has been the decline of institutions and structures that both formally and informally influenced and prepared students for vocations of ministry. An important facet of that preparation was the spiritual formation that happened, for example, through Sunday Schools, congregational youth ministries, Christian camps, sodalities, and a whole array of other associations and institutions. As a result, theological schools have had to broaden their scope of work and become more intentional about the spiritual formation of students. Roman Catholic schools have emphasized spiritual formation for decades, and it is an integral part of the Program for Priestly Formation. In addition, within the past thirty years or so, a growing number of Protestant schools have included programs of spiritual formation in their curricular and extracurricular programs.

In recent years, pressures from the public, governmental agencies, and accreditors have pushed schools to assess their work of educating and forming students. The confluence of these two streams of change has led to the dilemma of how to assess spiritual formation. It is one thing to evaluate academic performance and intellectual development, but how is *spiritual* development to be measured? This issue of *Theological Education* gives examples of programs in spiritual formation that have developed in evangelical Protestant, mainline Protestant, and Roman Catholic schools, and in the latter case, offers a way to assess spiritual growth.

In addition, three authors examine topics related to faculty work within the changing environment of theological education. Two of the articles explore issues related to the increasing racial/ethnic diversity of faculty and students, and the third looks to the future of theological education through the lens of participation in the Lexington Seminar, a Lilly Endowment funded project that enabled more than forty theological schools to wrestle with issues of theological teaching and learning.[1]

Leading off is the writing team of Mary and Steve Lowe of Erskine Theological Seminary, who in their article "Reciprocal Theology: A Comprehensive Model of Spiritual Formation in Theological Education" assert that spiritual formation takes place within a much broader context than has been considered in the past. Integrating theological concepts of spiritual formation with social science insights from human ecology theory and social network theory, the authors explore the varied sources of spiritual fellowship beyond the campus community: "Seminary students of all age cohorts no longer live in fixed and geographically bounded faith communities . . . they live and serve in fluid multisite social networks that are highly idiosyncratic and can be spiritually beneficial."

---

1.   See, Malcolm L. Warford, ed., *Practical Wisdom on Theological Teaching and Learning* (New York: Peter Lang, 2005); and Malcolm L. Warford, ed., *Revitalizing Practice: Collaborative Models for Theological Faculties* (New York: Peter Lang, 2008).

Kathleen Hope Brown of Virginia Theological Seminary distinguishes between the *formation* and the *education* of students in her article, "Formation and Education of Ministers." Using insights from the Christian spiritual tradition and work by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, she suggests that the task of educators is to facilitate for their students the integration of their theological, spiritual, personal, and professional growth: "We need not only to feed their minds but to foster a movement of their hearts as well. We are about something that must be holistic and transformative."

Edward Hogan of Kenrick-Glennon Seminary along with Karen Kangas Dwyer of the University of Nebraska-Omaha serve on the program review committee for the Institute for Priestly Formation. Their article, "Assessing a Program of Spiritual Formation Using Pre and Post Self-Report Measures" describes the process and instrument used to assess whether the ten-week program for the spiritual formation of diocesan seminarians was meeting its stated objectives. "The results," they say, "suggest that it is possible to develop a curriculum—even one focused on 'ineffable qualities'—whose success (or failure) can be measured in some way."

Turning now to faculty issues, Carmen Nanko-Fernandez of Catholic Theological Union examines the growing field of practical theology from a Latino/a perspective in her article "Held Hostage by Method? Interrupting Pedagogical Assumptions—Latinamente." The article challenges the growing body of scholarship to attend to its methodological and pedagogical preferences and exclusions. She cautions that "practical theology in its attempts to be transnational and intercultural is in effect neither and risks becoming another face of imperial theologizing that colonizes and homogenizes though under an even bigger umbrella."

Another perspective of diversity and multicultural education comes from a study conducted by Deborah Gin of Azusa Pacific School of Theology, "Does Our Understanding Lack Complexity? Faculty Perceptions on Multicultural Education." Soliciting responses from 300 seminary faculty, Gin finds that black, Latino/a, and multiple-race faculty far more frequently engage in multicultural education of their students than do Asian and white faculty. Given that projections place the US church in a nonwhite-majority context in the near future, "theological educators," she advocates, "must . . . engage in the preparation of their seminarians to minister in such a context."

Rounding out this issue of *Theological Education* is a report stemming from the Lexington Seminar. In her article "Loving the Questions: Finding Food for the Future of Theological Education in the Lexington Seminar," Mary Hess of Luther Seminary delves into data from the seminar to address challenges within teaching and learning, including questions of shifting authority, struggles over what constitutes authenticity, and the need to reshape faculty and student practices around agency. The goal, she says, is to help theological schools to "continue to grow and learn" and to encourage faculties and their institutions to "turn again to the necessary work of living into these challenges."

We hope this issue of *Theological Education* offers some helpful insights for leaders in theological education as they address various facets of spiritual formation and also how pedagogical issues and practices among faculty play an integral part of the education and formation of theological school students.

Reciprocal Ecology: A Comprehensive Model of Spiritual Formation in Theological Education

Mary E. Lowe and Stephen D. Lowe
Erskine Theological Seminary

ABSTRACT: *Integrating theological concepts of spiritual formation with social science insights from human ecology theory and social network theory, the authors set forth a reciprocal ecology of spiritual formation model for theological education in the twenty-first century. Countless holistic (academic, social, spiritual, emotional) transactions occur within the social ecology of the seminary community (and beyond) to instigate mutual spiritual formation toward Christian maturity. An ecological and social network perspective of student spiritual formation situates seminary formation efforts within a larger context of influence than previously considered.*

Introduction

Gordon Smith observed in 1996 that in theological education, "We urgently need a model for an understanding of the place and role of spiritual development within the academy."[1] Although true then, we still are in need of a model of Christian formation that embraces the twenty-first century reality of theological education. At a time when many seminaries follow a distributive education approach involving multiple campuses, extension sites, and online education, it is time to embrace a conception of spiritual formation that encompasses our present situation.

Today's seminary students lead widely distributed existences across a variety of social contexts. They are sometimes working professionally, serving as full- or part-time ministers or staff members, and fulfill roles as parents, caretakers, and citizens while enrolled in seminary. Our students today, as Heidi Campbell asserts, "live between multiple social spheres and groups," where they have "created webs of connection between different social contexts to create a personalized network of relations."[2] Jan Fernback echoes this view by noting that a greater portion of our culture lives life "in multiple, overlapping spheres of social interaction."[3] Seminary students of all age cohorts no longer live in fixed and geographically bounded faith communities as their only source of spiritual fellowship and nourishment. Instead, they live and serve in fluid multisite social networks (immediate family, extended family, local church, denomination, seminary, voluntary associations, online communities, accountability groups, and so forth) that are highly idiosyncratic and can be spiritually beneficial.

The diffused nature of seminary student existence that Campbell describes mirrors the diffused structure of an increasing number of seminaries. While some seminaries still have a campus-based residential community of learners

who live, eat, study, and worship together, many have moved away from this model. Today most seminary campuses host commuters long enough for them to go to classes, attend a chapel service, stay overnight, and eat a meal or two while they are on campus. The numbers that ATS report are consistent with this trend. In an email message to the authors on May 15, 2013, Tom Tanner indicated,

> We [ATS] currently have ninety-four schools with approved extension sites that together total 258 different locations. While I don't have hard data on the increase in extension education sites, I'm confident it has grown fairly rapidly in recent years. This year, for example, our most prevalent petitions are for new extension sites.[4]

We are finding that learners require greater flexibility in their academic programs in order to accommodate ministry, family needs, or jobs.

Not long ago Erskine Seminary had an Army chaplain "commute" to one of our extension sites by hitching a ride on a military transport plane from his base in Germany to attend class once a month in South Carolina. Given the reality that most theological schools have students who take classes and participate in seminary life on an ad hoc basis, we need a model of spiritual formation that exhibits *goodness of fit* with our existing situations as students, faculty, staff, administrators, and institutions. We propose in what follows an ecosystems model of understanding and cultivating spiritual formation that considers the shifting cultural and spiritual complexity of twenty-first century seminary students and the emerging realities of many seminary campuses.

The reciprocal ecology model

Jacqueline Mattis et al. have stated unequivocally, "It is critical that scholars take an ecological approach to studies of spiritual maturity . . . ."[5] An ecological approach to the study of spiritual formation means that we zoom out and study the subject less from an individualistic orientation and more from a corporate perspective. An ecological approach uses the metaperspective and tools of the study of natural biotic ecologies applied to the study of human ecologies. Human ecology appreciates the similarities between the reciprocal interconnections of living things in natural ecosystems and the reciprocal interconnections of humans with one another in social ecosystems. Human development models such as what Urie Bronfenbrenner proposed utilize the insights of human ecology to explain how we grow and develop through reciprocal interactions in embedded social networks.[6]

An ecological approach also appreciates the biblical metaphors, analogies, and images that suggest one consider the interconnections of living things in creation as well as the interconnections in the body of Christ. Howard Snyder sets out a robust description of the church as the body of Christ in ecological categories that calls attention to interconnections among members. He argues that the church "may be viewed ecologically as a dynamic interplay of several

parts."[7] He uses the language of ecology to help us appreciate the "complexity" and "interconnectedness" of how Paul understood the church as the body of Christ. He proposes that an ecological model of the church helps us see that "every system operates within a larger system" and that "we are part of a highly complex creation marked by interrelationships and interdependence."[8] His argument is that the natural created order best understood from the perspective of ecosystem forms the concrete reality of Paul's metaphor.

Although Snyder does not address the application of his ecological perspective of the church to spiritual formation, we find his approach to be a fruitful starting point to think theologically and sociologically about the ecological nature of spiritual formation. Combined with insights from human ecology models of human development and the more recent research on social networks, we propose a working model of faith formation that appreciates its ecological dynamic.[9] We see a need for a wider lens through which to view spiritual formation in theological education and believe that the lens of social networks and social ecologies offers a helpful vantage point for doing so.

A holistic model of spiritual formation incorporates and integrates several collateral lines of evidence. First, we know that natural growth in God's creation occurs as the result of various types of reciprocal interactions between and among living things in a defined ecosystem. Second, we know that human growth and development is the result of reciprocal interactions between and among growing humans in a defined social network. Third, we are learning from Scripture that Christians grow through reciprocal interactions that occur in sociospiritual ecologies such as family, church, and school. A theological school is a defined sociospiritual ecosystem composed of Christian students, faculty, and staff connected to one another spiritually and socially. These sociospiritual connections provide opportunities for reciprocal interactions across a multitude of contexts. Our reciprocal ecology model explains how such connections and transactions work to foster mutual spiritual formation that leads to whole person transformation. An examination of the collateral lines of evidence that constitute the model will follow.

Thinking connectionally: The power of social networks

Many denominations, like the United Methodist Church, organize around a connectional system that creates a sense of solidarity and a bond of unity among diverse denominational entities. What Wesley and others knew intuitively and from personal experience about the power of such connections, we are now learning about scientifically. Campbell proposes the use of a social network approach for analyzing religious organizations, institutions, and communities. She argues that the "social network metaphor provides a more accurate description of contemporary patterns of relationships." We agree with her approach and the assumption that social networks provide "an important new narrative and research tool" that serves as "a valuable lens for describing the function of community."[10]

While reductionism with its accompanying fragmentation and specialization was the hallmark of scientific inquiry in the twentieth century, holism

is the operating principle of science in the twenty-first century.[11] A holistic understanding of reality recognizes the interconnectivity of everything.[12] When applied to the interconnections between human beings, a holistic orientation recognizes the power of social networks. While many often think *social media* when they see or hear the term *social network*, the two are not the same. Social media such as Facebook, Instagram, YouTube, and Twitter are visible manifestations of some parts of a person's social network. A social network "is a collection of people" with "a specific set of connections" that create a "particular pattern" of ties that "explain why the whole is greater than the sum of its parts."[13] Social networks are self-organizing dynamic connections among people that we can study like life webs in a natural habitat.

Intricate algebraic and technological algorithms produce visual maps of social relationships that scientists use to study the spread of obesity, alcoholism, happiness, depression, and smoking in social networks.[14]

The spread of obesity, depression, and happiness in social networks suggests that they are "a kind of human superorganism." As such, they "grow and evolve," displaying the same capability of spreading social contagion as diseases spread through human contact.[15] Today YouTube videos go viral because one person links to a site and shares the video with friends, and soon millions have viewed the video. Borrowing a concept from the field of epidemiology, social network scientists refer to social contagion as the spread of an idea, emotion, behavior, or product through a social network. Support for assuming similarity in diffusion between the spread of disease and social contagion "is backed by the empirical fact that many innovations diffuse in a pattern that is similar to the spread of infectious diseases."[16]

Nicholas Christakis and James Fowler discovered in their analysis of the Framingham Heart Study "that social contacts one thousand miles from each other can influence each other's weight."[17] The power to influence others with whom we have social connections is even more evident in that "influence does not require face-to-face interaction" but simply requires the flow of information about the behaviors, attitudes, and emotions of others through various kinds of social contact.[18]

In a similar way, social network ties among Christians function to produce mutual growth through the power of the Holy Spirit. These connections create an opportunity for sustained interaction between Christians, and it is to a consideration of those interactions that we now turn.

Thinking ecologically: The power of social interactions

The connections we create in our social networks provide opportunities for bidirectional influence. The study of human ecology opens our eyes to the nature of the relationships among persons connected socially and spiritually.

American naturalist John Muir said, "When we try to pick out anything by itself we find that it is bound fast . . . to everything in the universe."19 Due to the influence of the scientific study of natural ecosystems, we are beginning to appreciate even more of Muir's native observation. The modern study of ecology and even the term itself traces its origin to Arthur Tansley's 1935

publication that appeared in the scientific magazine *Ecology*. Since that time, the study of natural ecologies has demonstrated that individual living things are part of a larger whole in which "the whole and the parts therefore reciprocally influence and determine each other, and appear more or less to merge their individual characters."[20]

Those familiar with New Testament Greek already know that *oikos* provides the etymological origin of our English word *ecology*. In naturalistic studies, the term refers to the house within which humans live as a defined ecosystem comprising air, water, soil, flora, and fauna, all of which are interconnected and mutually influencing.

Eventually social scientists found the naturalistic concept of ecosystem to be a fruitful framework within which to study human ecologies.[21] Bronfenbrenner's pioneering work in the ecology of human development set in motion a multitude of studies that resurrected the nature/nurture debate.[22] Recognizing the parallels between natural growth in natural ecosystems and human growth in human ecosystems, Bronfenbrenner proposed a series of developmental propositions buttressed by his own research and that of others. Essentially, he argued that human development begins with innate capacities that require reciprocal interaction with other developing persons in a variety of social settings that "instigate" mutual development.[23] Reciprocity involving social interactions and transactions of various types between and among developing persons proved a central tenet of his model.[24] He further proposed that these intentional interactions between persons produced developmental change in all the parties involved in the reciprocal engagements over time.[25] This recent refinement of his model emphasizes the processes or "the mechanisms that produce and sustain stability or change over time." He most famously illustrated this aspect of his model by his analogy of a game of ping pong in which both players increasingly challenge one another's skills toward greater facility."[26]

Thinking theologically: The power of connections and interactions in the body of Christ

As we mentioned earlier, Snyder has alerted us to think ecologically about the church as the body of Christ. Although others have observed the symbiotic relationship of individual members of the body to one another and to Christ as Head, no one has used the language and concept of ecology to describe these relationships. His observations have prompted us to be more alert to Paul's use of language, and this has drawn our attention to two unique features of the Pauline correspondence. Paul employs a host of *syn*-compounds that appear to be unique to his writings, and he is the dominant user of *allēlōn* terminology in the New Testament. We find in his use of these terms a reflection of his ecological conception of the church and a mechanism for its growth as a living organism. The *syn*-compounds reflect how Paul understands our sociospiritual connections *to* one another and the *allēlōn* imperatives reflect how he understands our need for reciprocal interactions *with* one another.[27]

Pauline syn-compounds

The essential thrust of Paul's use of the *syn*-compounds is to emphasize our connection to Christ and to one another. Because of the connection Christians have to Christ, they share a connection to one another that creates a sociospiritual bond and solidarity (*koinonia*). Four of the *syn*-compounds have a direct application to our understanding of the intimate connection Christians have with one another (*symbibazo*, 1 Cor. 2:16; Eph. 4:16; *symphytos*, Rom. 6:5; *synarmologeo*, Eph. 2:21; 4:12; and *syndesmos*, Eph. 4:3; Col. 2:19, 3, 14). Each of them expresses in its own way how Christians are "knit together," how we "fit together," how we are "bonded together" like ligaments in the human body, and how we "grow together" feeding off of and nourishing one another in the sociospiritual ecology of the body of Christ. Ephesians 2:2 offers another example of the *syn*-compound linked with one of Paul's favorite words for spiritual formation—edification (*synōikodomeō*). We build up, edify, and experience spiritual formation through our connections to one another energized by the Holy Spirit. As Brendan McGrath notes, Paul uses these *syn*-compounds "to express as forcibly as possible the intimacy of the connection" of the Christian with Christ and with one another.[28]

Pauline allēlōn commands

While the *syn*-compounds stress our connections to one another in the body of Christ, the *allēlōn* commands stress the nature of our interactions through those connections.[29] Numerous treatments exist that consider the application of the *allēlōn* imperatives to interpersonal relationships among Christians, but none considers their significance for the mutual spiritual formation of Christians in community except that of Bruce William Fong. His analysis of *allēlōn* usage in the traditionally attested Pauline epistles demonstrates that "each Christian is responsible to encourage the spiritual growth of fellow believers."[30] He notes that the thrust of the reciprocal pronoun "demonstrates mutual interaction among believers" and that this mutual interaction is "corporately beneficial for the entire body of Christ."[31]

The majority of the occurrences of the *allēlōn* imperative appear in the latter half of Paul's epistles where he applies his theological indicative to how Christians are to interact with one another.[32] The "love one another" (John 13:34) command that Jesus issued to his disciples manifested itself in a variety of ways among the New Testament church and governed the interactions in Paul's communities to such an extent that Gordon Fee could say regarding the churches that Paul founded, "everything is done *allēlōn*."[33] The starting point of the command to love one another is the Pauline admonition to "welcome one another, just as Christ has welcomed you" (Rom. 15:7). Before there can be one another reciprocal interactions among Christians, there must be an initial embrace of the other embodied in the outstretched arms of Christ on the cross and the open arms of the father to the prodigal son. However, even the initial embrace that Miroslav Volf describes, "is unthinkable without reciprocity" because "in an embrace a host is a guest and a guest is a host . . . without such reciprocity, there is no embrace."[34]

For Paul, the general command of Jesus to "love one another" manifests its ultimate purpose in the general imperative to "build up one another" (Rom. 14:19; 1 Thess. 5:11). This phrase has particular significance for Paul's concept of spiritual formation that he understands as reciprocal interactions between Christians that produce mutual edification.[35] We see Paul's concept of reciprocal interaction leading to mutual formation at work in Romans 1:11–12:

> For I long to see you so that I may impart some spiritual gift to you, that you may be established; that is, that I may be encouraged together with you, while among you, each of us by [one another's] (*allēlōn*) faith, both yours and mine (NASB).

The use of *allēlōn* signals what Marty Reid calls "Paul's rhetoric of mutuality" in his epistle to the Romans, "which encompasses the various facets of the letter's purpose."[36] Following upon his rhetorical analysis of Paul's letter, Reid demonstrates that the use of *allēlōn* in 1:12 and the embellishing phrase which follows ("both yours and mine") introduces Paul's attitude of reciprocity and mutuality between himself as Apostle and the church in Rome. The word "both" (*te*) is an embellishment on an embellishment because he did not need it to communicate his meaning. Paul could have written to the church in Rome from a position of superiority, but instead he opts for a reciprocal equality in which "both" (*te*) "together" (*synparakaleo*) and "by [one another's] faith" (*allēlōn*) they all benefit spiritually. Paul's rhetorical flourish accentuates his firm conviction that even when an apostle is involved, the principle of reciprocal interaction leading to mutual edification remains valid. Douglas Moo captures this interpretation of Paul's rhetoric cogently when he writes, "[Paul] anticipates a time of mutual edification with them, as the faith God has given each individual stimulates and encourages spiritual growth in the others."[37]

Ephesians 4:1–34 offers another illustration of Paul's use of *allēlōn* imperatives that encourage reciprocal interactions between believers instigating mutual spiritual formation. Three times in the passage, the *allēlōn* language appears (4:2, 25, 32) to reinforce the mutual interaction between Jews and Gentiles in the church. The admonition to reciprocal behaviors instigating mutual formation continues in chapter five as both groups are to "submit to one another in the fear of Christ" (5:21). The *allēlōn* imperatives function as a means for both groups to "serve one another" and live out in a sociospiritual ecology the theological reality enumerated in chapters 1–3. The net result of this reciprocal interaction is that "all attain to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a mature man, to the measure of the stature which belongs to the fullness of Christ" (4:13).

James Howard's discussion of community-based transformation in Pauline theology appreciates the dynamic and reciprocal interaction we have described. Additionally, contrary to traditional notions of spiritual formation "that the growth of the believer is largely an individual effort," he argues that "God's normal method of moving his people to righteous living is through the catalytic effect of believers relating to one another in authentic ways." He concludes his analysis by suggesting,

> In a very real way, believers need one another. No longer is it simply desirable to have mutually edifying relationships—it is essential. No longer is it optional to belong to a Christian community—it is essential. And finally, no longer is it a dream to have lasting and significant impact in the lives of others and the world—it is essential. This is the way God designed it and Paul envisioned it."[38]

Thinking technologically: Connecting and interacting online

Our model of spiritual formation that zooms out to take an ecological perspective on the process applies regardless of the delivery method of theological instruction. The processes that instigate Christian formation through sociospiritual networks and ecological interactions can work just as effectively on campus as online.

An often-voiced concern about theological distance education is the absence of physical community that some believe inhibits the creation of meaningful relationships, which in turn create spiritually formative opportunities. While there is value in the relationships and networks formed in a residentially based campus, it does not preclude the significance of those connections that are made online. The community of faith in which we seek to cultivate spiritual formation or skilled ministerial practice is changing with the growing familiarity of social and digital networking. This change in how we seek to cultivate spiritual formation and teach habits of theological reflection manifests itself most clearly in the online presence that characterizes more and more of our institutions.

Most of us are aware of the increasing number of students studying online and connecting digitally. According to Elaine Allen and Jeff Seaman of the Babson Survey Research Group, "The number of . . . students taking at least one online course grew as much this year [2013] as it did last year. The number of students taking at least one online course increased by over 570,000 to a new total of 6.7 million."[39] This represents a total of 32 percent of the total higher education population (compared to 10 percent in 2003). While these figures are largely representative of higher education, one can surmise that the trends for theological education are similar. ATS does not track the number of online students but rather those schools that offer comprehensive distance education programs. According to Tanner, that number stands at 40 percent of the ATS Commission on Accrediting member institutions. Tanner also believes that those numbers have grown rapidly in the last few years, and it is our assumption that with the recent changes made to the Standards of Accreditation by ATS, member schools will continue seeking ways to provide education that is both theologically sound and academically rigorous with regard to online and distance initiatives.

Students today are building community and developing social networks that are vastly different from what we as educators may be prepared to face. They acquire information differently than we may prefer, but the fact is that they are engaged in social interactions that can contribute to whole person development. According to Maeve Duggan and Joanna Brenner, "Internet

users under 50 are particularly likely to use a social networking site of any kind, and those 18–29 are the most likely of any demographic cohort to do so (83%)."[40] Twitter is increasing in popularity as a social networking site and stands at approximately 15 percent of the under-50 cohort. Sharing pictures is another way in which young adults are connecting with others through sites like Instagram. According to Duggan and Brenner, "Facebook remains the most-used social networking platform, as two-thirds of online adults say that they are Facebook users."[41]

What this information seems to suggest is that technology has become part of how we develop and build our ecosystem of networks, small or large. As theological educators, we can hardly afford to ignore the "fields that are ripe unto harvest" if we are going to truly connect with the next generation and avoid losing out with the current or previous cohort of students who have been part of our network of academic and theological influence.

There is a growing seamlessness between our individual and corporate selves, and this plays out in how we communicate and form community, especially through social media sites like Facebook. Brenner notes that

> social networking sites are increasingly used to keep up with close social ties. The average user of a social networking site has more close ties and is half as likely to be socially isolated as the average American. . . . Internet users get more support from their social ties while Facebook users get the most support."[42]

Jesse Rice cites research indicating that "in the first quarter of 2009, five million people joined Facebook every week. In addition, Facebook's membership doubled from one hundred million to two hundred million people from August 2008 to March 2009."[43] Rice surmises that the driving force behind this population explosion is the need for connection or what he terms "home."[44] In this sense, the search for home is essentially a need for community and connection to others.

While the purpose of this article is not to promote Facebook as a primary source of connecting, there is a need to point to the way in which Internet-based social media has become an integral part of how organizations, churches, seminaries, and most institutions view their presence online. What sites like Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and other similar social media have done is to highlight the ability to develop a type of community that is meaningful to some. Marilyn Naidoo points out that "the explosive growth of social media such as Facebook and Twitter is an example of the need for people to develop social community." She goes on to note that students who would characterize themselves as "Internet-savvy" place a premium on relationships and look for ways to integrate community in digitally mediated technologies.[45]

Online experiences show us that we can give and receive care for one another, value those relationships, and share with one another those dimensions that go into creating connections and community. If formation is the outward expression of the development of the whole person, including the

spiritual dimension, it makes sense that the formation of online communities, often instigated by social networking sites, is not only possible but holds potential for exciting developments.

Students who study online reflect in a similar vein those contexts that shape and form growth and development. The notions that online students are isolated in the basement simply do not reflect the realities of social networks. Our students connect to one another through the local and global church, family members near and wide, and peers who may be serving in other locations. Social media sites like Facebook can enhance rather than detract from formative opportunities when one views growth and formation from an ecosystems point of view. Furthermore, students who read course texts are interacting with the words, thoughts, and expressions of those authors. When they interact with others online, they are engaging with that person's own network who inform and influence. Hebrews 12 reminds us that we are "surrounded by a great cloud of witnesses" with whom we do not inhabit the same physical space, but who can be part of our own spiritual development as we recall those who are part of the eternal hall of faith.

Our model of faith formation from an ecological perspective has application to online environments as it does to on-campus ones. The connections and interactions we have described as so necessary for the instigation and continuation of spiritual formation are possible in online settings without physical presence. There is no need to have one model of spiritual formation for the campus community and another one for the online community. The ecological model set forth here encompasses both settings, as long as the sociospiritual connections remain intact and reciprocal interactions are encouraged. The outcome of spiritual formation may be achieved regardless of the method of delivery.

Christian ecologies and social networks

If the patterns of spiritual development mirror the patterns of human development, then we must give a more prominent place to reciprocal interactions and transactions between and among developing Christians, including the ecology of a Christian institution. Several studies assessing the variety of positive influences on student spiritual formation in Christian institutions seem to suggest that we need an ecological framework to appreciate the significance of the findings. Although the authors of the studies referenced below have not directly posited spiritual formation within an ecological or social network paradigm, all of their results support such a perspective.

In a study assessing spiritual development in business students at Abilene Christian University, Monty Lynn, Tim Coburn, Vincent Swinney, and Michael Winegeart asked students to report on the strongest positive influences on their spiritual development. From strongest to weakest influences, students identified friends, faculty and staff, church, Bible courses, and chapel.[46]

John Bellamy, Sharon Mou, and Keith Castle queried participants to identify the greatest sources of influence on their faith formation. Participants reported on the positive influence of parents (55%), other family members (31%), various local church workers (60%), other religious workers (28%), and

friends (17%).[47] In a study of students at Concordia Seminary, John Palka discovered that the majority of students (56%) reported that the most significant influences on their spiritual development came from outside the seminary experience.[48] Stella Ma investigated the impact of the Christian college educational environment on student spirituality. Her results indicate that an ecological perspective, which she described as "the college environment as a whole," best explains how the Christian campus environment influences student spiritual development.[49]

These studies reflect an ecological understanding of how one's faith develops through interactions, involvement, and participation with others in a variety of social contexts. Participants report a variety of experiences and relationships that produce a beneficial effect on their perceived spiritual formation. We are suggesting then, based upon Bronfenbrenner's ecology of human development model, social network theory, and theological concepts of the church ecosystem, that the key ingredient for spiritual formation requires various forms of reciprocal interaction and engagement with other Christians in multiple social relationships.[50] Going further, we suggest that these reciprocal interactions lead to mutual transformation. As Stanley Grenz indicates, "mutual edification" takes place through many activities and with many people with whom we "are bound together by common values and a common mission."[51]

Conclusion

Adopting an ecological model of student spiritual formation in seminary education does not require an institution to jettison its existing conceptions of spiritual formation informed by tradition and theology. The ecosystem model set out here offers a way for institutions to understand more precisely *how* students experience Spirit-empowered transformation in the sociospiritual ecology of the seminary experience and beyond. The critical ingredient for developmental benefit in the seminary ecology is the existence of a variety of interactive, transactive, and reciprocal exchanges among persons, Scripture, learning resources, intentional experiences, classroom encounters, theological and biblical concepts, and the entire ecological panoply that constitutes the sociospiritual ecology of the seminary experience. Our intent is to create vibrant reciprocal sociospiritual ecologies that possess the potential of creating mutual Christian development in accordance with the way in which we develop as humans in social networks. We thus view the seminary community as a special form of a social network in which transactional relationships and various kinds of social exchanges conspire to instigate whole person transformation.

As our connections to one another become increasingly global, distributed, and characterized by a hybridization of embodied and electronic communities, we need a model of spiritual formation that encompasses this complex and interdependent reality. An ecological model that honors biblical and theological insights integrated with an expanding appreciation of the power of

social networks will enable theological educators to continue their efforts to form students spiritually into the twenty-first century.

Mary E. Lowe is associate dean of Erskine Virtual Campus at Erskine Theological Seminary in Due West, South Carolina, and executive director of ACCESS, a Christian distance education organization. Stephen D. Lowe is professor of Christian education at Erskine Theological Seminary having most recently served as interim vice president.

ENDNOTES

1. Gordon T. Smith, "Spiritual Formation in the Academy: A Unifying Model," *Theological Education* 33, no. 1 (1996): 83.

2. Heidi A. Campbell, "Understanding the Relationship between Religion Online and Offline in a Networked Society," *Journal of the American Academy* 80, no. 1 (2012): 69.

3. Jan Fernback, "Beyond the Diluted Community Concept: A Symbolic Interactionist Perspective on Online Social Relations," *New Media and Society* 9, no. 1 (February 2007): 49.

4. Tom Tanner, email message to authors, May 15, 2013.

5. Jacqueline S. Mattis, Muninder K. Ahluwalia, Sheri-Ann E. Cowie, and Aria M. Kirkland-Harris, "Ethnicity, Culture, and Spiritual Development" in *The Handbook of Spiritual Development in Childhood and Adolescence*, eds. E. C. Roehlkepartain, P. E. King, L. Wagener, P. L. Benson (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2006), 293.

6. Urie Bronfenbrenner, *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979), 57, 65.

7. Howard A. Snyder, *Liberating the Church* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1983), 74.

8. Howard A. Snyder and Daniel V. Runyan, *Decoding the Church: Mapping the DNA of Christ's Body* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2002), 83.

9. Howard A. Snyder and Joel Scandrett, *Salvation Means Creation Healed: The Ecology of Sin and Grace: Overcoming the Divorce Between Earth and Heaven* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2011).

10. Campbell, "Understanding the Relationship," 70.

11. David Bohm, *Wholeness and the Implicate Order* (London: Routledge Classics, 2005).

12. Albert-László Barabasi, *Linked: How Everything is Connected to Everything Else and What It Means for Business, Science, and Everyday Life* (London: A Plume Book, 2003).

13. Nicholas A. Christakis and James H. Fowler, *Connected: The Surprising Power of Our Social Networks and How They Shape Our Lives* (New York: Little, Brown and Company, 2009), 9.

14. Ibid.; Nicholas A. Christakis and James H. Fowler, "The Spread of Obesity in a Large Social Network over 32 Years," *The New England Journal of Medicine* 357 (July 26, 2007): 370–9; J. Niels Rosenqust, Joanne Murabito, James H. Fowler, and Nicholas A. Christakis, "The Spread of Alcohol Consumption Behavior in a Large Social Network," *Annals of Internal Medicine* 152, no. 7 (2010): 426–33; J. Niels Rosenquist, James H. Fowler, and Nicholas A. Christakis, "Social Network Determinants of Depression," *Molecular Psychiatry* 16 (March 2011): 273–81; Nicholas A. Christakis and James H. Fowler, "The Collective Dynamics of Smoking in a Large Social Network," *The New England Journal*

of Medicine 358 (May 22, 2008): 2249–58; James H. Fowler and Nicholas A. Christakis, "Dynamic Spread of Happiness in a Large Social Network: Longitudinal Analysis over 20 Years in the Framingham Heart Study," *British Medical Journal* 337 (2008): 1–9.

15. Christakis and Fowler, *Connected*, xii.

16. Wouter de Nooy, Andrej Mrvar, and Vladimir Batagelj, *Exploratory Social Network Analysis with Pajek* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 164.

17. Christakis and Fowler, *Connected*, 114.

18. Stanley Wasserman and Joseph Galaskiewicz, *Advances in Social Network Analysis: Research in the Social Behavioral Sciences* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1994).

19. Stephen R. Fox, *John Muir and His Legacy: The American Conservation Movement* (Boston: Little Brown & Co., 1981), 291.

20. Jan Christiaan Smuts, *Holism and Evolution* (Gouldsboro, ME: The Gestalt Journal Press, 1986), 86.

21. Roderick D. McKenzie, *On Human Ecology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968); Richard A. Watson and Patty Jo Watson, *Man and Nature: An Anthropological Essay in Human Ecology* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1969).

22. Bronfenbrenner, *Ecology of Human Development* (see n. 6).

23. Bronfenbrenner, *Ecology of Human Development* (see n. 6); Urie Bronfenbrenner, ed., *aking Human Beings Human: Bioecological Perspectives on Human Development* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2005).

24. Bronfenbrenner, *Ecology of Human Development*, 57–64.

25. Ibid., 65–77.

26. Phyllis Moen, Glen E. Elder, Jr., and Kurt Lüscher, eds., *Examining Lives in Context: Perspectives on the Ecology of Human Development* (Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2001).

27. John D. Harvey, "The 'With Christ' Motif in Paul's Thought," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 35, no. 3 (September 1992): 331.

28. Brendan McGrath, "'*Syn*' Words in St. Paul," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 14, no. 3 (July 1952): 219.

29. Wayne Jacobsen and Clay Jacobsen, *Authentic Relationships: Discover the Lost Art of "One Anothering"* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2003); Wayne Hoag, *The One Another Project* (Maitland, FL: Xulon Press, 2012); Sue Harville, *Reciprocal Living: A Biblical Answer to the Fellowship Crisis* (Coral Gables, FL: West Indies Mission, 1976); Randy Moody, *Living in the Real Church: A Fresh Look at How Christians Treat One Another* (Joplin, MO: College Press Publishing Company, 1998); Richard C. Meyer, *One Anothering: Creating Significant Spiritual Community* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing, 2004); Gene A. Getz, *Building Up One Another* (Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1984); Simon Schrock, *One Anothering* (Green Forest, AR: New Leaf Press, 2000); Gerhard Lohfink, *Jesus and Community* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).

30. Bruce William Fong, "Our Mutual Responsibilities Toward One Another as Seen in the Context of Allēlōn" (Master of Theology thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1978), 52.

31. Ibid., 5, 70.

32. Stephen D. Lowe, "Rethinking the Female Status/Function Question: The Jew/Gentile Relationship as Paradigm," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 34, no. 1 (March 1991): 59–75.

33.   Gordon D. Fee, *Paul, the Spirit, and the People of God* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2003), 66.

34.   Miroslav Volf, *Exclusion and Embrace: A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1996), 143.

35.   Fong, "Our Mutual Responsibilities"; James M. Howard, *Paul, the Community, and Progressive Sanctification: An Exploration into Community-Based Transformation within Pauline Theology* (New York: Peter Lang, 2007).

36.   Marty L. Reid, "A Consideration of the Function of Rom 1:8–15 in Light of Greco-Roman Rhetoric," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 38, no. 2 (June 1995): 181.

37.   Douglas J. Moo, *The NIV Application Commentary: Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2000), 45.

38.   Howard, *Paul, the Community, and Progressive Sanctification*, 187 (see n. 34).

39.   I. Elaine Allen and Jeff Seaman, "Changing Course: Ten Years of Tracking Online Education in the United States," Babson Survey Research Group, last modified January 2013, http://www.onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/changingcourse.pdf, 4.

40.   Maeve Duggan and Joanna Brenner, "The Demographics of Social Media Users—2012," Pew Research Center, last modified February 14, 2013, http://www.pewinternet .org/Reports/2013/Social-media-users.aspx, page 2 of PDF report.

41.   Ibid., page 8 of PDF report.

42.   Joanna Brenner, "Pew Internet: Social Networking," Pew Research Center, http:// pewinternet.org/Commentary/2012/March/Pew-Internet-Social-Networking-full-detail.aspx.

43.   Jesse Rice, *The Church of Facebook: How the Hyperconnected Are Redefining Community* (Colorado Springs, CO: David C. Cook, 2009), 50.

44.   Ibid, 51.

45.   Marilyn Naidoo, "Ministerial Formation of Theological Students through Distance Education," *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 68, no. 2, Art. #1225, http://dx.doi .org/10.4102/hts.v68i2.1225.

46.   Monty L. Lynn, Tim C. Coburn, J. Vincent Swinney, and Michael Winegeart, "Assessing Spiritual Development in Business Students: Lessons Learned and a Suggested Process" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Christian Business Faculty Association, Bourbonnais, IL, October 18–20, 2001).

47.   John Bellamy, Sharon Mou, and Keith Castle, "Social Influences upon Faith Development," National Church Life Survey Occasional Paper 5 (October 2004).

48.   John Palka, "Defining a Theological Education Community," *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning* 5, no. 3 (2004): 471–89.

49.   Stella Y. Ma, "The Christian College Experience and the Development of Spirituality Among Students, *Christian Higher Education* 2 (2003): 330.

50.   Bronfenbrenner, *Ecology of Human Development* (see n. 6).

51.   Stanley J. Grenz, *Created for Community: Connecting Christian Belief with Christian Living* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2001), 222.

Formation and the Education of Ministers

Kathleen Hope Brown
Virginia Theological Seminary

ABSTRACT: Ministry—putting faith into action by service to the people of God—involves the whole person. Using insights from our Christian spiritual tradition and work by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, this essay suggests that our task as educators is to facilitate for our students the integration of their theological, spiritual, personal, and professional growth. We are about something that must be holistic and transformative, so as to prepare our students to live out their vocations with the highest degree of integrity.

> . . . eat what is before you; eat this scroll, then go, speak to the house of Israel . . . feed your belly and fill your stomach with this scroll I am giving you . . . take into your heart all my words that I speak to you; hear them well. Now go to your countrymen in exile and speak to them (Ezekiel 3:1–4 NAB).

> Take and eat; this is my body (Matthew 26:26).

> What we have seen and heard
> we proclaim to you,
> so that you too may have fellowship with us (1 John 1:3).

Educators who prepare their students for the work of ministry—congregational leadership, educational leadership, chaplaincy, spiritual direction, pastoral counseling—understand that this work will demand far more of the ministers than simply what they *know*. Effective ministry demands all of who a person is, and preparation for ministry must address the whole person. The word *formation* is used to distinguish such preparation from *education*. However, formation is a concept that doesn't lend itself to simple definitions, so one of the challenges in approaching ministerial formation is coming to some understanding of what it is.

The preparation of people for ministry certainly requires theological training. But the task of theology—both the teaching and the doing—belongs not just to the world of knowledge and intellect but to the world of Spirit and grace, and also to the incarnate world of human experience. It is not only the knowledge that matters but also the disposition of the one who learns. To be an effective minister, and even to be a good theologian, one must take the knowledge of theology to heart, absorb it, and let it run through the soul and transform.

In the Scripture passage above from the Book of Ezekiel, the prophet is being told that his preparation was to take into himself the word of God, digest it, and allow it to become part of him. Only then was he to go forth and

speak God's Word to those in exile. At his last meal with his disciples, Jesus used food—bread and wine—as sacrament of himself, and the Church has done so ever since. Food is a powerful symbol and metaphor for what nourishes and sustains our lives. When we eat something, we take it into ourselves, and it becomes part of us. Over time, what we eat becomes part of our body, our brain, our nervous system. It becomes a source of our energy. In the First Letter of John, the writer is saying that since the message of the gospel has been seen, heard, and felt by the disciples of Jesus, they not only want to share its joy with others but also feel compelled to do so. In other words, authentic ministry happens from the inside out.

In preparing people to preach, teach, and care for God's people—to be the prophets in our own day—our role as educators is to form ministers who have allowed the Word of God to seep into their hearts and take root there. Much of that can be fostered by the way we teach, the way in which we approach the study of theology, and the way in which we attend to the student as a whole person.

Using insights from our Christian spiritual tradition and work by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, this essay will suggest that our task as educators is to facilitate for our students the integration of their theological, spiritual, personal, and professional growth. We need not only to feed their minds but to foster a movement of their hearts as well. We are about something that must be holistic and transformative. We are preparing people to live out their vocations with the highest degree of integrity.

What is formation?

My own tradition is Roman Catholic. Working and teaching at Washington Theological Union for several years left me with a profound respect for the rich spiritual traditions of the Christian faith. Christian religious communities have for centuries recognized the need for intentional and careful formation, informed by those spiritual traditions, and their insights serve us well in understanding the process of formation. Candidates to be members of vowed religious orders are formed to live in community, to internalize the spiritual traditions of that community, and to carry out the community's mission. Those preparing for religious life have been required to study theology: Scripture, history, tradition, concepts and language about God, grace, and salvation. But theological education has not, in itself, been seen as sufficient preparation for ministry. Time is also devoted to personal and communal prayer, spiritual direction, supervised ministry experience, and theological reflection on that experience.

Faith involves the whole person—mind, body, spirit, relationships, emotions. Ministry—putting faith into action by service to the people of God—involves the whole person. Ministers are called to meet the very real needs of people. Ministers must be comfortable with who they are and hone their interpersonal skills, because ministry is inherently relational. Love, trust, and communication are essential. Ministry will challenge emotions, self-understanding, psycho-sexual maturity, any walls of defense that have been

built around the self, and any psychological baggage that resides within the self. All of these need to be addressed in a formation program. Supervised field experience with ongoing feedback and evaluation; opportunities for theological reflection on ministry; and discussion of psychological issues of boundaries, stress, and self-care are all elements of a comprehensive formation program. And because the God whom a minister teaches, preaches, and proclaims must be the God whom that individual experiences in his or her own life, the spiritual life of the minister also must be carefully nurtured in a formation program, including spiritual direction. He or she will need tools for the ongoing care of his or her relationship with God; it is in the context of that relationship that the call to ministry was heard, and it is in the context of that relationship that ministry will be sustained.

Faith and ministry are ultimately matters of the heart. Ministry is not effective if done in a detached way or only at head level. If ministers are to move people's hearts—and they must—their own hearts need first to have been moved. Formation programs must prepare ministers whose head and heart connect, who are in touch with their own hearts, and who are able to sense the heartbeat of another.

> Our words must be set aflame, not by shouts and unrestrained gestures, but by inward affection. They must issue from our heart rather than from our mouth . . . heart speaks to heart, and the tongue speaks only to [people's] ears.[1]
>
> Preach always; when necessary, use words.[2]

Formation is not a goal or end point so much as a process of integration—the integration of the intellectual, spiritual, ministerial, and professional life of the minister. If one who preaches or teaches has not had his or her own heart moved and transformed by the Word, that individual's own words will be hollow. He or she will not be able to move others in any deep way. Theology integrated with one's relationship with God, ministerial work, and growth as a person can shape a minister's way of being and make it capable of radiating God's peace and love.

Why is formation important?

As educators engaged in the formation of people who can contribute to the world with integrity and wholeness, those engaged in ministerial education are not alone. The need for an integrative approach to preparation is not limited to the field of ministry. A study commissioned by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching points out that all professionals—lawyers, doctors, clergy—are held in esteem in part because they operate with a social contract with the public they serve:

> Integrity is never a given, but always a quest that must be renewed and reshaped over time. It demands considerable

individual self-awareness and self-command. Yet, it also depends for its realization upon the availability of actual social possibilities, since some situations clearly make it more likely that an individual can achieve integrity than others . . . In fact, the qualities of integrity and the demands of professional life are in this way remarkably congruent. Integrity of vocation demands the balanced combination of individual autonomy with integration into shared purposes.[3]

After scandals in the financial world over the past several years, there is an increased desire in the business community to recapture business ethics and to form business professionals with a vision of the greater good, the social contract which they need always to bear in mind. Similarly, church-sponsored organizations in education and healthcare are concerned about the challenges of professionalism they now face—the need for business acumen along with an understanding of gospel-based mission and values. The need for skilled people of vision and integrity, people with a deep understanding of what it means to serve the common good, exists in all professions.

Narrowing of professional claims toward the purely cognitive or technical . . . has contributed to the weakening of professionalism.[4]

Professionals' greatest asset is this professional culture itself. It is this shared . . . culture that enables [professionals] to customize their work to suit the needs of a variety of . . . situations. It also enables them to contribute to the maintenance of public goods in society. Not least, [it] has done a great deal to sustain morale and *esprit de corp*.[5]

Besides having a job, earning a living, and striving to distinguish themselves in their domain of activity, professionals are expected to carry out their work as part of a larger collective project.

As an ideal of living, professionalism connects livelihood with vocation in institutionally stable ways. In holding up this notion of calling, professionalism immediately takes us beyond the simplistic idea that a market framework can solve the most important issues of social and political life. Among these issues is the question of what constitutes good work, for the society and for the individual.[6]

No one is more in need of an understanding not just of *what* they do but of *why* they do it than people in ministry. Their very identity is wrapped into what they do. Recognizing this is what it means to treat ministry as a vocation. As we prepare people for ministry, we are about something that must be holistic, integrative, and transformative. Our students hopefully will find in ministerial work a meaning and purpose for their lives. Their vocation is their

fundamental way of being in the world, a way of being that is in relationship to God and God's people. Their work is not for its own sake but for the life of the world. Their vocation is a fundamental disposition of the heart, an orientation of life. We who prepare people to live out a vocation to ministry are not alone in our desire to form people of integrity. But should we not be in the forefront?

What are some important elements of formation?

Formation is somewhat like prayer in that it is not something that we can *give to* our students or *do for* them. But it is something we can *lead them to* by providing a framework and tools. Effective formation programs can vary in their specific content and approach, but below I suggest that six elements are key: relational skills, humility, boundaries and self-care, call and vocation, prayer, and theological reflection.

Attention to relational skills

A vocation to serve the people of God requires carefully cultivated relational skills. It requires being capable of encounter with another, which does not happen in the abstract but with focused presence, engaging the senses and emotions. Encounter means experiencing deeply, with the heart and imagination, and allowing oneself to be moved, even transformed, by the experience.

Ministry provides sacred places of encounter, privileged opportunities to walk with others in their journeys of faith. Grounded in theology and theological anthropology, a minister helps to illumine the presence of grace and the work of the Spirit in another's life. The skills of active and reflective listening are essential. To be heard is one of the deepest longings of the human heart, and ministers must be people who *hear* with depth and sensitivity, *respond* with compassion, and *reverence* the presence of God in the other. A formation program can provide opportunities for case studies, role-plays, and the honest feedback of mentors and peers in an atmosphere of trust that students can learn to replicate in their ministerial work.

Reflection on humility as a key virtue of ministry

Ministry is not about the privileged role of an individual minister but about serving the good of the whole. Reflection on the cultivation of qualities such as humility and *kenosis*—self-emptying in love—can deepen perspective on the sacrificial aspects of ministry and lessen the tendency for a person to use a position of ministry to meet his or her own needs.

Humility for a minister means a willingness to acknowledge that I can't do everything, and I will sometimes fail. But I am called, even in failure, to be faithful, to learn from failure, to be open to criticism while staying true to who I am, and to be patient with others and myself. Humility also means acknowledging that I can't do it alone, that I need the gifts of others. Supportive relationships are very important. I need friends, companions on the journey. I need mentors and guides, people to show me the way. When I minister, I am vulnerable when I expose the deepest parts of myself. Sometimes I will meet with rejection and hostility, but I am called, even in the face of that,

to be faithful. Most importantly, spiritual humility means acknowledging that I depend on God and surrender to God's mercy and love. *Kenosis* means that I am not willful, but willing, open to discerning God's call. The "freedom from" that results from self-emptying is also a "freedom for."

Servant leadership has become a popular concept, and the humility of ministry is certainly related to service. But humility and *kenosis* go deeper than the actions of service to their source and purpose. That depth of reflection is what can cultivate a sense of mission. If ministers could have a collective mantra to help them keep perspective, it should be, "This is not about me." Ministry is God's work, not one's own, and a habit of turning to prayer and the advice of others as a check on ego helps in laying aside one's own agenda.

Awareness of boundaries and skills for self-care

Boundaries and self-care protect both the minister and those being ministered to. They also help to prevent burnout. Ministers need to find the right balance between involvement and detachment, be aware of what they can and cannot do, and respect power differentials that can create situations of blurring, compromise, or even abuse. Boundaries provide parameters that help a minister to focus on the important demands of his or her profession. Legal and situational boundaries are important, and so are emotional boundaries. Formation programs can benefit from interdisciplinary input, particularly from mental health professionals.

Many people drawn to ministry are so eager to serve that it is difficult for them to say "no." Ministers need boundaries and self-care so as to be able to say no when that is appropriate. Ministry can also be stressful. Some people have a higher tolerance for stress than others, and some actually thrive under peak pressure. But whether people thrive in situations of challenge, they need ways to let go of the stress or they lose their balance. It is also essential that ministers have intimacy in their lives, confidants who are not among the people they minister to. Staying physically healthy is also vital if their work is to reflect energy and joy. Again, interdisciplinary input in a formation program can be very helpful.

Reflection on call and vocation

Discerning a vocation is a process of discovering, of listening for God. Not just seeking the answer to a question, it is a fundamental disposition of the heart, an openness to hearing God's voice in the many ways in which it is heard over the course of a human life, and a willingness to follow. Discernment is an ongoing and lifelong journey, because God is always calling, always speaking—in the movements of a heart, in the words of Scripture, in the wisdom of those in authority, in the voices of friends and strangers.

Frederick Buechner writes that our vocation is found "where your deep gladness and the world's deep hunger meet."[7] As part of a formation program, it can be helpful to pose questions for journaling and reflection: What is it that gives you joy? If you had a day, a week, a year to do something and there were no financial or other constraints, what would you choose to do? What is it that gives you energy? Reflecting on such questions can put students in

touch with their call, their vocation. Various dimensions of this discovery are always going on in an individual life. Some part of each person is always mysteriously being called by God. It is not something that is resolved once and for all, in some great and final synthesis. The uniting of an individual heart with God's is a continuous process of transformation. Feelings of call and response at any given moment are only waves on the surface, only glimmers of the deep undercurrents within, a deep yet to be discovered and lived.

Attention to prayer

Giving oneself over to a vocation in ministry is giving oneself over to life of ongoing conversion. It is a willingness to be continually transformed and reshaped by the work of the Spirit. It is a giving over to God not bits and pieces of one's life, but one's whole mind and heart. The initial "yes" is inevitably followed by many other yeses. It is prayer that sustains. Neglecting one's prayer life can happen easily when life gets busy. A formation program, by including careful attention to prayer, can witness to its importance in the life of a minister. St. Bonaventure spoke of a "ladder" for the student of theology: on one side of the ladder are the scientific elements of study—speculation, reading, knowledge—and on the other are spiritual elements—love, wonder, grace. The two sides are held together by prayer. Bonaventure reminds those who study theology not to neglect, but in fact to consciously favor, the spiritual.

> Since, therefore, in this regard
> Nature can do nothing
> And effort can do but little,
> Little importance should be given to inquiry,
> But much to unction;
> Little importance should be given to the tongue,
> But much to inner joy;
> Little importance should be given to words and to writing,
> But all to the gift of God,
> That is, the Holy Spirit;[8]

Prayer is where the connections between the minister's journey of faith and his or her human journey are made. Prayer is that place in which the minister approaches God in humility and in which the call to ministry is heard. Prayer is that space in which a minister becomes authentic.

Theological reflection

The skills of theological reflection are essential for anyone in ministry. Intentional theological reflection on the lived experience of ministry is extremely formative. In the classroom and in course assignments, faculty can ask students to make connections between the theology they learn and the rest of their life and work, with questions such as the following: How could what you are learning be conveyed in an accessible way to the people in your congregation? How could this be explained to the young people in your school or parish? Is the material in this course changing your image of God or affecting your prayer life? Effective ministry requires making those connections a way of life.

Learning an intentional process of theological reflection is important, especially for people who are inclined to keeping their reflection at head level. Telling stories from the experience of ministry; focusing on particular events, feelings, or circumstances; and asking the questions, What passage of Scripture does this remind you of? Among the theologians you have studied, whose work might shed some light on this? can help to create a habit of ongoing theological reflection, especially when followed by the questions, Does the theology you are studying offer you a new way to think about this? Does your theological reflection suggest a possible course of action?

Summary

Formation is a lifelong process. It cannot be accomplished in the few years our students spend with us. The best we can do is provide them with tools for their own ongoing formation. Then, when they find their lives out of balance, when ministry makes heavy demands, when they feel themselves questioning their effectiveness or even their vocation, they will have inner resources for meeting the challenge. Knowledge is a path into the mystery of God; along that path, knowledge must be transformed into wisdom and love.

> Knowledge . . . is required for the production of love, for we can never love what we do not know . . . Yet it happens often, that knowledge having produced holy love, love does not stay within the limits of the knowledge which is in the understanding, but goes forward and passes very far beyond it; so that in this life we are able to have more love than knowledge of God.[9]

Formation for ministry involves both the discipline of the mind and the deepening of the spirit. The most effective and transformative knowledge and skill are knowledge and skill deepened by love.

> . . . the organized profession insists that the school lay the groundwork for the aspirants' professional identity—that way of thinking and sense of self that shapes the student . . . often marking the person for life.[10]

If our students have not reflected deeply on their own life journeys, calls, and vocations, they will not understand the importance of another's story as the presence and action of God in human experience. If they have not accepted their own brokenness and deep need for God, they will not be able to accept the weaknesses and failures of others and reassure them of God's mercy. If they have not experienced and reflected on the power of human love in their own lives, their preaching about God's love will be hollow.

Only if they understand their own need for love and companionship can they help others to understand what it means to be part of the body of Christ. Only if they have reflected deeply on the grief and sorrow in their own lives

and found God there can they lead others to an understanding of the paschal mystery and theological hope. Only if they have experienced wonder at the beauty of creation and are attuned to the voice of the Spirit in the subtle movements of their own hearts can they lead others to an experience of the living God.

Kathleen Hope Brown is associate director of the Doctor of Ministry program at Virginia Theological Seminary in Alexandria, Virginia. Prior to that, she was dean of students and director of formation for ministry at Washington Theological Union in Washington, DC.

ENDNOTES

1. St. Francis DeSales, *On the Preacher and Preaching*, translated by John K. Ryan (New York: Henry Regnery Co., 1964), 64.

2. Attributed to St. Francis of Assisi, perhaps paraphrasing his Rule of 1221, Chapter XII.

3. William M. Sullivan, *Work and Integrity: The Crisis and Promise of Professionalism in America*, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (San Francisco: Josey-Bass, 2005), 2.

4. Ibid., 12.

5. Ibid., 11.

6. Ibid., 18.

7. Frederick Buechner, *Wishful Thinking: A Seeker's ABC* (New York: Harper-Collins, 1993), 119.

8. Bonaventure, *The Soul's Journey Into God*, Classics of Western Spirituality (Manawah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1988), 113.

9. St. Francis DeSales, *Treatise on the Love of God*, trans. H. B. Mackey (Rockford, IL: Tan Books, 1997), book VI, chap. IV, p. 241.

10. Sullivan, *Work and Integrity*, 26.

Assessing a Program of Spiritual Formation Using Pre and Post Self-Report Measures

Karen Kangas Dwyer
University of Nebraska–Omaha

Edward M. Hogan
Kenrick-Glennon Seminary

ABSTRACT: Since 1995, the Institute for Priestly Formation has conducted a ten-week summer program of spiritual formation for diocesan seminarians in the Roman Catholic Church. The authors, as members of the institute's Program Review Committee, designed an instrument to assess whether the summer program was meeting its stated objectives and whether a program of spiritual formation can produce measurable changes. Now with five years of consistent data, the authors report the rationale, methodology, and findings of the investigation.

Introduction: How many oats have you tried to feed him?

In David Downing's book *Looking for the King*, American Tom McCord is having lunch with C. S. Lewis while discussing Arthurian legends. Lewis asks the American about his studies at UCLA.

> "[W]hat subjects did you choose for your examinations?" asked Lewis.
>
> "Well," explained Tom, "we don't do things the same way over in the States as you do here. Instead of tutoring and comprehensive exams, we sign up for several classes every semester. Each time you earn a passing grade in a course, you are awarded credits. Then once you've accumulated enough credits, you earn a bachelor's degree."
>
> "Oh yes, that's right", said Lewis, ". . . I don't think it's a system that would suit me. It sounds like someone judging a horse not by its speed or strength, but by how many oats you've tried to feed it."
>
> Tom grinned at the analogy. "Yes, that's about how it feels from the horse's point of view, too."[1]

Judging a horse not by its speed or strength, but by how many oats you have tried to feed it—that is exactly what an assessment program tries to avoid! We believe that it is important to avoid the "how many oats have you tried to feed them" mentality not only when it comes to the intellectual component of theological formation but when it comes to the spiritual component as well.

The program to be assessed

The Institute for Priestly Formation (IPF) was founded to assist in the spiritual formation of diocesan seminarians and priests for the Roman Catholic Church. Responding to key documents of the Church,[2] IPF created a ten-week summer program for diocesan seminarians that fosters spiritual formation as the integrating and governing principle of all seminary formation. This program has been in existence since 1995.

As members of the Program Review Committee for the institute, we wanted to know—and to be able to report back to the program directors—whether the ten-week summer program for seminarians was meeting its objectives. Of course, many people wonder whether spiritual formation can be measured at all. Our conviction is summed up nicely by Barbara Walvoord: "We can't fully assess such ineffable qualities, but we can get indications. . . . To get indications about how well our students are achieving ineffable goals, we must rely on student work or student actions that may offer only a small window into the ineffable quality."[3]

So, along with other members of IPF's Program Review Committee, we spent some time designing a "small window" to assess whether the ten-week summer program was meeting its stated objectives and to find out whether the program of spiritual formation was producing measurable changes. What we designed was a pretest and posttest self-report measure. The pretest measure initially consisted of twenty questions (later expanded to twenty-seven), each reflecting a general program objective or a specific course objective, to be answered on a five-point scale (later expanded to a seven-point scale). The posttest measure consisted of the same questions and scale, plus an additional set of questions asking seminarians to rate their growth in each respective area from the beginning of the program to the end.

In what follows, we report on the methodology and results of the 2012 survey, along with comparative data for five years. We believe this report offers encouragement to theological schools seeking to instill what Walvoord calls "ineffable qualities" and wondering whether it is fair or even possible to assess their programs on those points. Our conviction is that it is better *to start* the process of assessment, and to get *some* indicators of the program's success with those qualities, than simply to hope for the best. We believe our experience shows that, with a little creativity, it is possible to begin that process even with qualities as ineffable as "growth in spiritual formation."

Methodology

Participants

Participants for the 2012 study were 170 seminarians enrolled in the 2012 IPF Summer Seminarian program. Of the 170 seminarians enrolled in the program, 164 logged into the survey software,[4] and 159 completed the pretest. Of the 126 seminarians who logged into the survey software to answer the posttest questions, 119 completed the posttest, resulting in 109 who could be matched for pretest/posttest change-score analysis.

For the 159 seminarians who completed the pretest, ages ranged from 21 to 50+ with 73 percent reporting they were 30 years old or younger.

The ethnicity of the seminarians varied (115 white, 15 Hispanic, 6 African American, 15 Asian, 1 American Indian/Alaskan Native, 1 Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, 2 Other, and 9 missing. Their native language ranged from English to Vietnamese (136 English, 6 Spanish, 4 Vietnamese, and 7 other).

The seminarians were also at different points in their studies, ranging from college senior to major seminary-theology four (2 senior, 3 pretheology one, 11 pretheology two, 70 major seminary-theology one, 48 major seminary-theology two, 18 major seminary-theology three, 7 major seminary-theology four, and 5 not reporting).[5]

TABLE 1 Ages of seminarians

Age Range	Number of Students
21–25	67
26–30	49
31–35	21
36–40	9
41–45	7
46–50	1
50+	5
Unknown	5
Total	**164**

Instrumentation

For 2012, the pretest measure consisted of twenty-seven questions. Each question reflected a general objective for spiritual formation and/or a more specific course objective from one of the four courses of the program. Participants could select answers from a seven-point scale (7 = Always, 6 = Usually, 5 = Often, 4 = Occasionally, 3 = Often Not, 2 = Rarely, 1 = Never). In addition, four demographic questions were included: age, program of study, ethnicity, and language.

The 2012 posttest measure consisted of twenty-seven questions, plus one overall question (the same questions used in this program assessment since 2008): "I would rate my spiritual growth over the course of this program as . . . ." In addition, twenty-seven questions asked participants to rate their growth, from the beginning of the program until the end, in the area presented in that question. The growth question followed each question in the preprogram survey. For example, question 1a was "I am able to distinguish between my thoughts, feelings, and desires" (7 = Always, 6 = Usually, 5 = Often, 4 = Occasionally, 3 = Often Not, 2 = Rarely, 1 = Never) and Question 1b that followed was "From the beginning of the program until now, I would rate my growth in this area as" (7 = Very Great, 6 = Great, 5 = Moderate, 4 = Some, 3 = Little, 2 = Very Little, and 1 = None).

Finally, there were five open-ended questions about the summer program:

1. What was most helpful for your spiritual growth in this ten-week program?
2. Was there anything that was not helpful to your spiritual growth or that was detrimental to it in this program?
3. How was your apostolic service helpful to your spiritual growth?
4. If you could change anything in this program, what would it be and how could it be changed?
5. Please add any additional comments.

Procedure

The executive director of IPF emailed a letter with a link to the online survey to the registered seminarians before the program started, asking them to complete the pretest survey before the first class of the summer program, assuring them that that their "comments will assist in determining the overall effectiveness of the summer program," and "will be analyzed off campus by those who do not teach in the program," and promising students that their identities "will be not be revealed to anyone." Participants were asked to record their initials and email addresses to indicate that they completed the survey and for matching posttests with pretests for assessment and statistical analysis purposes only.

Results

See Appendix for preprogram and postprogram mean scores and change scores for all questions from 2008 to 2012. Similar to previous findings for 2009 to 2011, questions 6 and 7 showed the greatest change from the pre to postprogram survey.

6   I have an interior understanding of how to see the Trinity's love for me in prayer (M change = +1.42).
7   I experience how Trinitarian prayer leads to my personal growth in holiness (M change = +1.38).

In addition to questions 6 and 7, four other questions showed significant change scores of over one point:

13   When I relate my sexual feelings and desires to God in prayer, I am able to receive the love of the Trinity (M change = +1.27).
12   When I acknowledge sexual feelings and desires, I am able to relate them to God in prayer (M change = +1.23).
18   I am experiencing and understanding what it means to exercise the gift of spiritual discernment (M change = +1.09).
19   I am experiencing and understanding how to integrate the gift of spiritual discernment with my pastoral service (M change = +1.09).

The seminarians also reported high postsurvey scores of between "Always" and "Usually" (i.e., M > 6.0) on seven questions:

1   I am able to distinguish between my thoughts, feelings, and desires (M = 6.06).
8   I am experiencing and understanding how to integrate prayer with my daily life (M change = 6.03).
11   I am able to acknowledge sexual feelings and desires (M = 6.19).
14   I am experiencing and understanding how a healthy integration of celibate chastity occurs in everyday faith (M = 6.00).

15 I understand the difference between reading Scripture and praying with Scripture (M = 6.32).

24 I understand the unique identity and spirituality of the diocesan priesthood (M = 6.00).

25 When I hear stories about the daily life of a diocesan priest, my heart is enlivened (M = 6.18).

The mean score on the overall growth question 28 also showed a high rating. Seminarians rated their growth over the course of the summer program between "Great" and "Very Great" on this question:

28 I would rate my spiritual growth over the course of the summer program . . . (M = 6.21).

In addition, the mean scores on all "rate your growth" questions for each area on the postprogram survey showed that the seminarians rated their growth between "Moderate" and "Very Great" (i.e., M > 5.0) on all questions.

Analysis and discussion

This assessment of the IPF's summer program of spiritual formation—which we have replicated every summer since 2006—has produced interesting and consistent results. Seminarians have consistently reported perceived growth in the spiritual life, both as measured by statistically significant differences in their pretest and posttest scores (using repeated measures t-tests), and as measured by their rate your growth scores. And, intriguingly, factor analysis of the rate your growth questions has shown the presence of five distinct factors, all of which load on a single scale—what we might call a "spirituality" scale.[6]

Looking back, we know that one of the reasons we could develop this assessment was that each course in the ten-week summer program underwent an intensive curriculum review process. The result was the development, for each class, of a syllabus that not only takes spiritual formation as the integrating and governing principle of all aspects of formation but that also has clear goals and objectives regarding student outcomes—not simply regarding how many "formation oats" they will have been fed. The results of this study suggest that it is possible to develop a curriculum—even one focused on "ineffable qualities"—whose success (or failure) can be measured in some way. This study should challenge those who think that formation for ineffable qualities can't be assessed in any way.

Looking ahead, we know that one of the challenges of this assessment is to begin to shift from indirect measures (students' perceptions of their growth) to direct measures (performance). In other words, lest we claim too much for this investigation, we must readily admit that the nature of the results—even if they involve precise statistics—was limited by the fact that we used self-reporting measures. But, lest we claim too little, it should be pointed out that the survey's questions were designed with an eye toward turning them into direct measures, and that process has begun.[7]

Finally, looking around, we know that we cannot recommend a candidate for ministry who does not have sufficient theological knowledge. We have developed all kinds of ways of evaluating a candidate in that dimension of formation and of assessing whether our programs promote it. We also know that we cannot recommend a candidate for ministry who does not have sufficient psychological stability and affective maturity. We have developed all kinds of ways of evaluating a candidate in that dimension of formation and of assessing whether our programs promote it. We contend that we also cannot recommend a candidate for ministry who does not have sufficient spiritual maturity to promote the encounter between God and humanity. And we cannot "not assess that" on the grounds that we do not quite know *how* to do so. We need to start figuring out how to do so. People in the pews will assess it and will vote with their hearts and their feet. We need to go there first—or, at least, to start taking some baby steps toward it.

Karen Kangas Dwyer is assistant director of the School of Communication at the University of Nebraska-Omaha in Omaha, Nebraska. Edward M. Hogan is associate professor of systematic theology for Kenrick-Glennon Seminary in St. Louis, Missouri.

Appendix

Questions, Reported Means, and Change Scores

*Comparisons **2012** (**bold**) with 2011, 2010, 2009, 2008*

Program Survey Questions and Response Choices*	Pre-M*	Post-M *	Change Score*	Growth M**
1. I am able to distinguish between my thoughts, feelings, and desires.	**5.30**	**6.06**	**.76**	**5.73**
	5.34	6.17	.86	5.99
	5.37	6.24	.87	5.95
	5.06	6.00	.94	5.78
	5.12	6.03	.91	5.84
2. I am able to pray with my heart's desires.	**4.99**	**5.80**	**.85**	**5.74**
	5.01	5.84	.83	5.96
	4.95	5.92	.97	5.81
	4.65	5.66	1.01	5.77
	4.51	5.79	.99	5.82
3. Praying with my heart's desires leads me into experiencing the loving presence of Jesus.	**5.06**	**5.70**	**.68**	**5.71**
	5.05	5.78	.72	5.86
	5.04	5.81	.86	5.82
	4.59	5.73	1.17	6.69
	4.93	5.76	.80	5.68
4. Praying with my heart's desires draws me toward experiencing the loving presence of the Blessed Virgin Mary.	**4.37**	**5.33**	**.95**	**5.50**
	4.64	5.34	.70	5.56
	4.54	5.25	.71	5.38
	3.97	5.07	1.10	5.34
	4.09	5.13	1.04	5.28
5. I practice the silence and solitude necessary for contemplative prayer.	**4.78**	**5.92**	**1.14**	**5.70**
	4.94	5.86	.92	5.91
	4.87	5.78	.91	5.54
	4.49	5.93	1.26	5.29
	4.65	5.74	1.28	5.47
6. I have an interior understanding of how to see the Trinity's love for me in prayer.	**4.28**	**5.71**	**1.42**	**5.73**
	4.14	5.59	1.50	5.80
	4.42	5.85	1.43	5.85
	3.78	5.62	1.83	5.82
	3.87	5.72	1.85	5.80
7. I experience how Trinitarian prayer leads to my personal growth in holiness.	**4.35**	**5.74**	**1.38**	**5.63**
	4.11	5.52	1.41	5.68
	4.35	5.76	1.41	5.77
	3.85	5.55	1.70	5.63
	4.05	5.56	1.51	5.66
8. I am experiencing and understanding how to integrate prayer with my daily life.	**5.10**	**6.03**	**.93**	**5.91**
	5.29	6.03	.74	5.88
	5.32	6.04	.72	5.91
	4.48	5.04	1.06	5.72
	4.96	5.85	1.08	5.93
9. I am experiencing and understanding how to consistently integrate prayer with my studies.	**4.18**	**5.51**	**.70**	**5.39**
	4.64	5.46	.82	5.52
	4.95	5.57	.62	5.53
	4.41	5.13	.72	5.13
	4.47	5.37	.90	5.37

Program Survey Questions and Response Choices*	Pre-M*	Post-M*	Change Score*	Growth M**
10. I am able to integrate the dynamics of personal prayer with liturgical celebrations.	**5.29** 5.18 5.27 4.87 4.93	**5.75** 5.74 5.75 5.60 5.68	**.46** .56 .48 .73 .75	**5.47** 5.36 5.51 5.59 5.44
11. I am able to acknowledge sexual feelings and desires.	**5.76** 5.80 5.80 5.47 5.64	**6.19** 6.12 6.24 6.02 6.18	**.44** .32 .44 .55 .54	**5.47** 5.25 5.97 5.76 5.74
12. When I acknowledge sexual feelings and desires, I am able to relate them to God in prayer.	**4.67** 4.66 4.94 4.51 4.46	**5.90** 5.90 5.72 5.87 5.92	**1.23** 1.25 .78 1.35 1.46	**5.78** 5.76 5.94 5.76 5.90
13. When I relate my sexual feelings and desires to God in prayer, I am able to receive the love of the Trinity.	**4.22** 4.30 4.51 4.10 4.02	**5.49** 5.53 5.56 5.56 5.56	**1.27** 1.23 1.05 1.45 1.54	**5.49** 5.58 5.70 5.88 5.61
14. I am experiencing and understanding how a healthy integration of celibate chastity occurs in everyday faith.	**5.06** 4.96 5.24 4.72 4.77	**6.00** 5.80 6.05 5.81 5.91	**.93** .84 .81 1.10 1.14	**5.70** 5.77 5.97 5.59 5.92
15. I understand the difference between reading Scripture and praying with Scripture.	**5.66** 5.59 5.77 5.36 5.48	**6.32** 6.34 6.34 6.23 6.29	**.69** .76 .57 .87 .82	**5.59** 5.60 5.37 5.24 5.48
16. When I pray with the Scriptures, I notice that I am drawn to a particular word or phrase.	**5.38** 5.22 5.37 5.21 5.29	**5.89** 5.86 5.77 5.75 5.75	**.50** .64 .40 .55 .45	**5.34** 5.65 5.66 5.07 5.27
17. When I pray with the Scriptures and notice that I am drawn to a particular word or phrase, I also notice my interior response to that word or phrase.	**5.18** 5.00 4.95 4.77 4.88	**5.74** 5.70 5.70 5.47 5.58	**.65** .70 .75 .70 .70	**5.51** 5.59 5.73 5.24 5.47
18. I am experiencing and understanding what it means to exercise the gift of spiritual discernment.	**4.72** 4.80 4.89 4.24 4.23	**5.82** 5.57 5.89 5.51 5.64	**1.09** .77 1.00 1.27 1.41	**6.13** 5.62 6.28 5.76 5.92
19. I am experiencing and understanding how to integrate the gift of spiritual discernment with my pastoral service.	**4.49** 4.54 4.85 4.21 4.19	**5.51** 5.46 5.53 5.35 5.43	**1.00** .91 .68 1.14 1.24	**5.61** 5.44 5.72 5.28 5.48
20. My experience in apostolic service contributes to my spiritual growth.	**5.77** 5.67 — 5.16 5.35	**5.92** 5.83 5.81 5.86 5.93	**.13*** .10 — .70 .59	**5.54** 5.55 5.52 5.43 5.45

Program Survey Questions and Response Choices*	Pre-M*	Post-M *	Change Score*	Growth M**
21. I am aware of the presence of Christ in my apostolic service.	**5.67** 5.45 5.67 5.24 5.25	**5.72** 5.72 5.75 5.66 5.87	**.06***** .26 .08 .42 .60	**5.52** 5.52 5.44 5.31 5.34
22. Reflecting on the presence of Christ in my apostolic service enriches my prayer life.	**5.44** 5.40 5.32 5.13 5.29	**5.66** 5.80 5.74 5.56 5.72	**.13***** .40 .42 .43 .43	**5.42** 5.44 5.44 5.15 5.29
23. My prayer fosters a faith that promotes justice and mercy in our world.	**5.50** 5.34 5.41 5.00 5.26	**5.81** 5.73 5.56 5.59 5.75	**.26***** .40 .15 .59 .49	**5.33** 5.21 5.11 4.85 5.10
24. I understand the unique identity and spirituality of the diocesan priesthood.	**5.21** 5.09 5.25 4.61 4.49	**6.00** 6.10 5.97 5.75 5.92	**.78** 1.01 .65 1.14 1.43	**6.10** 6.11 6.10 5.70 5.99
25. When I hear stories about the daily life of a diocesan priest, my heart is enlivened.	**5.49** 5.42 5.62 5.11 5.05	**6.18** 6.05 6.13 5.96 5.96	**.67** .63 .51 .85 .91	**5.77** 5.64 5.73 5.46 5.36
26. I am experiencing how prayer enhances a genuine fraternity with my fellow seminarians.	**5.26** 5.54 5.66 4.84 5.10	**5.77** 5.94 5.73 5.29 5.69	**.50** .40 .07 .45 .60	**5.77** 5.60 5.63 5.30 5.39
27. I am experiencing how prayer enhances friendships.	**5.47** 5.73 5.72 5.04 5.27	**5.77** 6.00 5.85 5.71 5.82	**.29** .27 .13 .67 .55	**5.36** 5.47 5.60 5.30 5.42
28. I would rate my spiritual growth over the course of the summer program . . .				**6.21** 6.17 6.28 6.16 6.17
29. I take the time to reflect on my apostolic service between meetings.				**5.24** 5.26
30. I am able to receive the Lord's grace in my weakness in apostolic service.				**5.63** 5.69
31. My apostolic service directs me to an even deeper connection with the pastoral charity of Jesus.				**5.78** 5.89

*Response Choices: 7 = Always, 6 = Usually, 5 = Often, 4 = Occasionally, 3 = Often Not, 2 = Rarely, 1 = Never

**Rate My Growth Choices: 7 = Very Great, 6 = Great, 5 = Moderate, 4 = Some, 3 = Little, 2 = Very Little, 1 = None

***For 2012, all change scores were statistically significant (p <.05) except for these questions.

ENDNOTES

1.   David C. Downing, *Looking for the King* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2010), 30–1.

2.   For example, the call of *Pastores Dabo Vobis* for a more intense period of spiritual formation for priesthood candidates, and the Program of Priestly Formation's observation that "Since spiritual formation is the core that unifies the life of a priest, it stands at the heart of seminary life and is the center around which all other aspects of formation are integrated" (PPF, #115).

3.   Barbara Walvoord, *Assessment Clear and Simple: A Practical Guide for Institutions, Departments, and General Education*, 2nd ed. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010), 6–7.

4.   Survey Monkey survey software.

5.   The Roman Catholic Church requires seminarians to complete two years of studies in philosophy and then four years in theology. Those who attend a college seminary complete their two years of philosophy in college. Those who have not had two years of philosophy in college must complete a two-year "pretheology" program (i.e., pretheology one and two). Once seminarians have completed their philosophical studies, they enter "major seminary" for four years of theological studies (e.g., major seminary-theology one, etc.).

6.   The rate your growth scale was found to be highly reliable (28 items; a = .95).

7.   In addition to Edward Hogan's paper, "How Many Oats Have You Tried to Feed Him?" (delivered at a gathering of psychologists and seminary formation personnel and outlining some possibilities forthcoming from IPF Press in a collection of essays from that gathering), a national consultation of seminary rectors, psychologists, spiritual directors, and theologians has been coordinated by the Institute for Priestly Formation which is, among other things, addressing this question.

Held Hostage by Method? Interrupting Pedagogical Assumptions—Latinamente

Carmen Nanko-Fernández
Catholic Theological Union

ABSTRACT: *This article critically examines the growing field of practical theology(s) from a Latin@´ perspective. It challenges this growing and influential body of scholarship to attend to its methodological and pedagogical preferences and exclusions. Five coordinates are raised for further consideration if theological education is to strive to be transnational and intercultural.*

Did you ever wonder where theological educators come from? What networks of multiple-belongings intersect to form and inform those who articulate, in the vernacular of their place, the mystery of God and all it implies for our relationships with the divine and the whole of creation? Do you wish there were an efficient survey tool to assess your location on the theological spectrum? Thanks to quizfarm.com, entrepreneur svensvensven has developed the "Which Theologian Are You?" quiz, which complements his line of free products including "What's your eschatology?" and "Are you a heretic?"[1]

Imagine my surprise to discover that apparently I, a Latin@´ theologian,[2] am channeling Jürgen Moltmann; though it took a tiebreaker question to establish that I am slightly more Moltmann than I am Friedrich Schleiermacher. What struck me was that the list of possible theologians included not one woman, barely a Catholic, and with the possible exception of the North African Augustine, not one theologian from a racially or ethnically underrepresented or "minoritized" community. So who is mapping the coordinates of contemporary theologizing, and why does it seem that only some of us bear an obligation to socially locate—especially to locate as Other? What are the jarring implications of taking seriously transnational and intercultural compositions of our churches, classrooms, and scholarly academies? Or is the "new normal" disturbingly pointing to the establishment of new norms emanating from positions of dominance that are seeking to control the inevitable and uncontrollable?[3]

The process of mapping is complex. There are no neutral cartographers, let alone mappings without agendas, presuppositions, distinctive idioms, and even coded information. Mapping articulates relationality in terms of proximity and distance. Postcolonial critiques explicitly make the connection between mapping and imperial machinations. David Howard suggests, "Maps have often symbolically reconstructed and reoriented social and physical landscapes into more metropolitan-friendly places of settlement and sovereignty."[4] Maps may attempt to codify the known and speculate about the unknown.

What is represented? In what manner? and What is omitted? are questions too significant to ignore. Equally demanding of critical attention are questions about who and/or what is "Othered," and how that alterity is represented.

Mapping territory sets parameters of inclusion and exclusion that, as daily lived experiences often demonstrate, are viewed as malleable and fluid by those whose lives are determined by the seeming arbitrariness of certain borders. While mapping is a tool of empire, it can also be employed as a tool of resistance, an act of reasserting the validity and existence of the ignored as well as reclaiming what has been taken.

My particular mapping of the terrain designated as practical theology initially seeks to establish the existence of alternate terrains that either self-identify as teologías prácticas and/or intersect with the concerns, sources, and interpretations that currently define the expanding borders of the field. My attempt at a disruptive cartography is not intended to propose that theologies arising from those who identify in the complicated global matrices of latini-dad e hispanidad are in effect practical theologians or that these theologies are subdisciplines of practical theology. Rather it is to caution that practical theology in its attempts to be transnational and intercultural is in effect neither, but risks becoming another face of imperial theologizing that colonizes and homogenizes, though under an even bigger umbrella.

Mapping practical theology(s)

In the most recent Blackwell compendium on practical theology,[5] editor Bonnie Miller-McLemore seeks to define practical theology. She affirms its multivalent nature and seeks a descriptive rather than prescriptive definition. She identifies practical theology in terms of "four distinct enterprises with different audiences and objectives,"[6] namely as

- a *discipline* among scholars;
- an *activity of faith* among believers;
- a *method* for studying theology in practice;[7] and
- a *curricular* area of subdisciplines in the seminary.[8]

For McLemore, each dimension points as well to "different spatial locations, from *daily life* to *library* and *fieldwork* to *classroom, congregation*, and *community*, and, finally, to *academic guild* and *global context*."[9] McLemore perceives practical theology as distinctive from and broader than pastoral theology, so much so that pastoral is considered subsumed under practical as a subdiscipline (though for some, this classification remains an open question).[10]

The trajectory of antecedents for practical theology often traces back to Friedrich Schleiermacher and his division of theological disciplines. Commentator Terrence Tice suggests that Schleiermacher's schema sought to protect the varying disciplines against an imposed isolation that prevented students and practitioners from appreciating theological studies as organically integrated.[11] While contemporary trajectories reflect an affinity for correlational methods as drawn from interpretations of Paul Tillich and David Tracy, the scholarship of feminists, womanists, and African Americans in particular continue to challenge and stretch the field. The *Blackwell Companion* seeks to identify new strands of influence by attending to certain themes like racism, ablism, and

colonialism and by including perspectives that reflect global diversity more intentionally. However, these efforts fall short. Practical theologian Tom Beaudoin observes that, while these themes are important to the field, surprisingly authors reflecting on these specific concerns overwhelmingly noted how little had been attempted or accomplished. In his review Beaudoin comments,

> Dale Andrews states that "direct attention to race is still in its early stages." Jeanne Hoeft relates that "practical theologians have just begun to consider . . . heteronormativity," and practical theology has "almost no queer-identified texts. . . ." Melinda McGarrah Sharp says that practical theology "has not grappled adequately with postcolonial theory." John Swinton shows how the ground in theologies of disability has been plowed elsewhere in systematics and ethics. Kathleen Greider argues that religious plurality has "languish[ed] in the background" of Christian practical theology.[12]

English, German, and Dutch remain the primary research languages of the field.[13] This reflects the contexts from which the overwhelming majority of the volume's authors and adherents in the field arise, namely Germany, Netherlands, England, and English-speaking North America. Miller-McLemore acknowledges that a growing edge in practical theology "in North America and Europe is greater understanding of what is happening among our French and Spanish neighbors."[14] It is unclear if this reference is to France and Spain and/or French-speaking and Spanish-speaking populations. Miller-McLemore continues, "Only one chapter on French Canada points to the potential conversation here."[15] This seems to indicate diasporic lands and populations associated with former colonial ventures and past and present migration patterns. If so, the United States as the third largest Spanish-speaking country in the world needs to be included as well.

The absence of scholars from the Spanish-speaking world as authors and/or resources in this volume and other similar anthologies is surprising considering the influence of Latin American liberation theologies on practical theologies and the significance of Spanish theologian and liturgist Casiano Floristán in the area of teología práctica.[16] Floristán taught on the faculty of the Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca from 1960 and died in 2006. He was actively engaged with European, Latin American liberationist, and US Hispanic theologians, as is evident by his scholarship, his travels, his friendships in Europe and América, and his mentoring of Latin@'s including Gary Riebe-Estrella, Ana María Pineda, and María Pilar Aquino. His prolific publishing in the field includes the classic *Teología Práctica: Teoría y Praxis de la Acción Pastoral*,[17] in its fifth edition as of 2009. For Floristán, teología práctica necessarily entailed reflection on ecclesial praxis that could not be separated from its task as liberative praxis.[18]

The absence of Latin Americans and Latin@'s is a lacuna evident in earlier volumes on practical theology as well.[19] This neglect is striking when points of intersection between practical theology and Latin@' theologies are taken

into account. Besides an acknowledged relationship with Latin American lib-eration theologies, these bodies of work take seriously daily lived experience as ground, source, and locus of theologizing. This inclination invites inten-tionally interdisciplinary approaches, and its liberative dimensions suggest a necessarily public presence. Miller-McLemore writes of how practical the-ology found "new interest in lived religion, ordinary theology, and popular culture, with the allure of ethnography."[20]

These are not new areas for Latin@' theologies; in fact, they date back as early as 1978 with the completion of Virgilio Elizondo's dissertation *Méttisage, violence culturelle annoce, de l'Evangile*.[21] Orlando Espín's foundational text *The Faith of the People: Theological Reflections on Popular Catholicism* (1997) grows out of his doctoral work at the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in systematic theology and practical theology (1984). Mujerista theolo-gian Ada María Isasi-Díaz's use of ethnography as integral to her theological method begins in 1988 in her collaborative venture with Yolanda Tarango, *Hispanic Women: Prophetic Voice in the Church*, and is further developed in her now classic *En la Lucha/In the Struggle: A Hispanic Women's Liberation Theol-ogy* (1993, anniversary edition 2003). These are but a few representatives of a significantly larger and growing body of scholarship that holds at the heart of its commitments an integral relationship between theology and pastoral praxis expressed as teología y pastoral en conjunto. This expression conveys an embedded, critical, and inseparable relationship. Jean-Pierre Ruiz explains,

> Theological analysis cannot be divorced either from the grassroots realities of religious experience or from consci-entious involvement in pastoral practice. This necessary reciprocal connection keeps the US Hispanic/Latino theology from becoming a self-enclosed, self-preoccupied endeavor by binding both its questions and its reflections to the lived reality and the living faith of the churches and communities within which and for the sake of which it takes place.[22]

Miller-McLemore acknowledges that "methodologically, practical theology begins with the concrete and local."[23] This has been and remains a hallmark of Latin@' theologies across Christian perspectives. For example, Luis Pedraja writes,

> Hispanic theologies describe the theological content of the experiences, culture, hopes, and faith of Hispanics. They examine the theological implications inherent in the culture and practices of the different Hispanic populations in the United States. In addition, Hispanic theologies are not merely descriptive. They also prescribe a theological direction for action. They embody the eschatological hope of the Hispanic community and critique present structures in light of this hope.[24]

The question I asked in a 2006 presentation with the practical theology session of the AAR remains: Why does practical theology continue to overlook Latin@´ theologies, especially since the majority of the scholarly production appears in English as its first language?

Disrupting pedagogical assumptions Latinamente

This brief examination, through a Latin@´ lens, of a growing and influential body of scholarship, with its pedagogical and methodological preferences, suggests certain coordinates deserve our coordinated attention.

Method

I have become increasingly convinced that a fundamental obstacle to the development of truly transnational and intercultural pedagogies is an obsession with method in the so-called dominant stream of theological education and scholarship. In pedagogical contexts, especially where the traditionally underrepresented find themselves in the truly global classroom, too often methods are imposed in ways that preempt questions, content, and context, forcing sources and engagement into preconceived categories and patterns with contrived correlations. In training for ministries in particular, methods that favor mutual critical correlation place culture, tradition, and experience into conversation in uncritically appropriated but handy frameworks.[25] These can and do result in cookie-cutter theological reflections, with flat understandings of culture, and/or context that continue to insist that the exotic Other has the obligation to locate more intentionally. Such impositions deny local and indigenous epistemologies, sources, and constructive frameworks. They teach means of controlling conversations. However because they include explorations of culture in their framework, such methods are perceived as inclusive and therefore exportable as value free and transculturally and globally useful. There is a driving obsession to relate theory and praxis, and it comes from a disjointed place that needs to put in relation that which for some of us never experienced a divorce.

The presuppositions and worldview that ground such methods reflect ways of knowing that makes sense by compartmentalizing and categorizing threads and then placing them in relationship through a structured conversation. The assumption is that this way of making sense is accessible and comprehensible to all—in other words, it is universal. The observation of José Irizarry in his presidential address to the Religious Education Association is applicable here:

> A Western, middle-class, White version of faith cannot be the sole effective perspective by which a plurality of religious selves in a globalized world are educated. That perspective is important and perhaps necessary, but it is only one perspective in search of deepening by perspectives that are engrained in other racial, ethnic, and class faith experiences.[26]

Sources

Too often there exists an implicit canon of sources—those deemed credible for research papers, thesis projects, and dissertations and those who, if allowed, merit credibility via the normative authority of designated interpreters. In other words, sources from the Other as deemed worthy by interpreters from the dominant stream who "discover" or "introduce" or establish "them" as the authentic representative perspectives of the designated Other. On the other hand, the cavalier use of Scripture and Tradition (with a capital S and T) as privileged sources too often fail to take into account centuries of reception, translation, interpretation, and even subversion by transnational and local communities. Scripture and Tradition are treated as though they were static content passed on in manners that do not take into account that in the living, in the local, in the particular, transformations and critiques should be mutual.

Accountability

While there is openness to popular, communal, experiential, and ritual sources in practical theologies, the issue of accountability continues to be framed in the language and expectations of the US academy with its concerns for the protection of human subjects. This concern is an attempt to prevent the exploitation of people, especially the vulnerable, and while the language of the standards continues to evolve, it is reflective of the concerns of the biological sciences and couched in complicated legalese. However, at least it demonstrates a commitment to accountability that is not always evident in theological research that draws from the experiences of Others and represents those experiences. The words of indigenous scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith in her book *Decolonizing Research Methodologies: Research and Indigenous People* should disrupt naïve scholarly fantasies about being accountable to the "people," especially in outsider/insider configurations, and should serve as warning to those of us who are colonized scholar insider/insiders unaware of the imposed baggage we bear. She chides researchers, "This collected memory of imperialism has been perpetuated through the ways in which knowledge about indigenous peoples was collected, classified, and then represented in various ways back to the West, and then, through the eyes of the West, back to those who have been colonized."[27]

Starting points

In his classic text *A History of the Church in Latin America: Colonialism to Liberation*, Enrique Dussel suggests that

> the *point* of departure for European theology—even the most progressive theology—is the university or the pastoral praxis of the churches. The *point* of departure of the theology of liberation is the 'militancy' of the theologians who are as parts of the Christian *movements* involved (even unto death) in the real, political, economic, cultural process of Latin America (emphasis in original).[28]

I would propose that the point of departure for Latin@' theologies is embedded in the complexities of la vida cotidiana, daily lived experiences, which more often than not call forth responses of militancy from theologians en conjunto. These complications demand a variety of lenses that must take into account intricate historical constructions that cannot easily shake off legacies of racism, sexism, heterosexism, classism, and colonialism embedded in contemporary contexts; theological formulations; and power and privilege differentials in church, academy, and society. This militancy, a posture I refer to as hostilidad pastoral/pastoral hostility, is a source of profound discomfort; therefore, representations of Latinos by those who are not Latin@´s are preferred in the mainstream, or should I say plainstream! A preference for such external management of cultural representations impacts the classroom too, objectifying the represented as well as those students in our classrooms who come from the thematized "those people."

Representation and objectification

At an international conference billed as ecumenical, a respected feminist practical theologian in a panel plenary presentation observed that in the United States one needed to see discrimination beyond a black-white binary. She went on to explain that Asians and Hispanics also experience it and, to underscore her point, proceeded to name aloud two derogatory terms for Asians and/or Asian Americans and two offensive pejoratives regarding Latin@'s—"spics" and "wetbacks." This scholar, a self-described white Southerner, would never dream of uttering aloud the n-word, yet her need to "educate" in an international context allowed her to announce these terms to the assembly while neglecting to cite the original Latina source and context of her new-found knowledge.[29]

In a blog commentary on the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) document "Our First and Most Cherished Liberty," a Catholic moral theologian noted, as a positive feature of the statement, that not only did the bishops cite a number of examples beyond the HHS mandate; the second one listed concerned immigration. The author wrote, "The second issue mentioned is laws that endanger those who provide services to "illegal" immigrants. By citing such an example, the bishops take a step toward shaping the issue in a truly Catholic, rather than partisan, way."[30] In response to an email that reminded the author that bishops did not use the term *illegal* as a modifier of *immigrant*, the blog was edited the next day as follows: "The second issue mentioned is laws that endanger those who provide services to "~~illegal~~" undocumented immigrants."[31] What remains curious is that the word was never deleted, even though it misrepresents what the bishops actually say; and to their credit, on the issue of immigration, they have been very careful about their use of language. The response "~~illegals~~ undocumented" sends mixed messages and is predicated on the author's admitted intention to use "illegals" as a colloquialism, thus setting the word off in "scare quotes."[32] In a paradoxical manner, the visible cross-out makes the "colloquial" insult even more visible, and scare quotes just manage to scare those who may already harbor doubts about the credibility of bishops.

Both of these examples of (mis)representation share implicit assumptions: there is no one in each theologian/professor's respective audiences who could be offended by these words;[33] the utterance of these terms could not possibly participate in the very violence each would see their scholarship/teaching as countering; these terms are not quite hate speech. How often do our well-intentioned colleagues still not get it, even though scholars from underrepresented communities have inhabited the same "professional spaces" for decades, not to mention countless classrooms as their students? How often do "they" talk about "us" as if "we" were not there, and in the process forget to cite us and our work on the very issues that remain central to our commitments?[34] How often are "we" complicit and/or powerless in our own "Othering"? How often do we model the very Othering we ourselves have experienced, perpetuating cycles of violence? The pedagogical violence experienced by our students from underrepresented racial, ethnic, and cultural constituencies is often enough the reality experienced by their professors from those very same constituencies.

Interrupting and disrupting

These concerns are not new. In 1994, biblical scholar, theologian, and culture critic Fernando Segovia covered some of the same ground in what was a disruptive call to interrupt presumptions of normativity and objectivity in theological education and scholarship. In his presidential address to the Academy of Catholic Hispanic Theologians of the United States (ACHTUS), Segovia acknowledged how the experience of theological education and scholarship would be both alien and alienating to those of us who hail from underrepresented racial/ethnic constituencies. Nearly twenty years later, his question continues to haunt and challenge:

> How can one deal with a practice and discourse which are not one's own, which do not regard one's discourse and practice as being on par with those of the reigning paradigm, which possess inherent ways of preventing any possibility of a critical mass from taking shape, and which simply refuse to see themselves as particularized and contextualized as any other?[35]

With brutal realism he sought to equip underrepresented faculty, scholars, and students for the inevitability of an ongoing and constant struggle in the academy and, I would add, in too many of our churches. Twenty years later, if the academy is to survive and if our churches are to thrive, the obligation to strategize on these matters shifts from the scholars to the institutions. Our disruptive and interruptive presence is here to stay and has been for quite a while. Respond with merely cosmetic solutions and ignore its complexity at your own risk.

Carmen Nanko-Fernandez is associate professor of Hispanic theology and ministry for Catholic Theological Union in Chicago, Illinois.

ENDNOTES

1.   svensvensven, "Which theologian are you?" http://quizfarm.com/quizzes/new/svensvensven/which-theologian-are-you/.

2.   This essay employs Spanglish as both an intentional writing strategy and as a metaphor for the hybridity constituted by the Hispanic presence in the United States. Spanglish is one of many terms used to describe the fusion of Spanish and English in daily communication. It is manifest here through the following conventions. First, words and expressions in Spanish are not italicized nor translated unless they appear as such in direct quotations; at times sentences include both languages. Second, I created @´, the "at" symbol (el arroba) with an accent mark. I borrow the use of @ from others because it conveniently combines the "o" and "a" into one character that is gender inclusive. I add the acute accent (@´) as a reminder of the fluidity of language, culture, and identity. I develop these themes in my book *Theologizing en Espanglish: Context, Community, and Ministry* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2010). In this essay América/America refers to the hemisphere, not to the United States.

3.   Prior to this revised version, this paper was presented in June 2012: "The Future of Transnational and Intercultural Pedagogies: Embracing the New Normal," Intercultural/Transnational Pedagogies Interest Group, Catholic Theological Society of America (CTSA) annual convention, St. Louis, Missouri. See summary in Jean-Pierre Ruiz, "Intercultural/Transnational Pedagogies—Interest Group," CTSA *Proceedings* 67 (2012), http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ctsa/article/view/2220/2037.

4.   David Howard, "Cartographies and Visualization," in *A Concise Companion to Postcolonial Literature,* eds. Shirley Chew and David Richards (Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2010), 141.

5.   Bonnie J. Miller-McLemore, "The Contributions of Practical Theology," in *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Practical Theology,* ed. Bonnie J. Miller-McLemore (Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2012), Kindle edition.

6.   Ibid., 5, location 923.

7.   This enterprise of practical theology as a method remains confusing, and the term is used in varying ways by different authors. The section of the book devoted to method presents numerous methods that also reflect specific subdisciplines identified in the proceeding section. See Part II, "Method: Studying Theology in Practice in Library and Field," (chap. 8–24), 89–265.

8.   Miller-McLemore, *The Wiley Blackwell Companion*, Kindle edition, 5, location 918.

9.   Ibid., location 932.

10. Ibid., 6–7, location 949–50.

11. Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Brief Outline of Theology as a Field of Study*, Revised Translation of the 1811 and 1830 Editions with Essays and Notes by Terrence N. Tice (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011), 138.

12. Tom Beaudoin, "Remarks on *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Practical Theology*, edited by Bonnie Miller-McLemore (Wiley-Blackwell, 2012)," Rock and Theology Blog, November 22, 2011, http://www.rockandtheology.com/?p=4577#more-4577. Originally delivered as part of a panel on the book at the practical theology session of the AAR in San Francisco, California, November 2011.

13. See for example the languages of submission for the *International Journal Practical Theology* are German and English, http://www.degruyter.com/view/supplement/s16129768_Submission_guidelines_en.pdf.

14. Miller-McLemore, *The Wiley Blackwell Companion*, Kindle edition, 9–10, location 1066–7. I am assuming that an editorial error occurred here and the author meant French-speaking and Spanish-speaking neighbors. If not, and this referencing was intentional, it further demonstrates the struggle practical theologians have in understanding the critiques of postcolonial theories and theologies. It also betrays a homogenization of the Spanish-speaking world by scholars who fail to comprehend multiple distinctions and colonial and diasporic legacies that shape populations across Latin America, the United States, and Canada.

15. Miller-McLemore, *The Wiley Blackwell Companion*, Kindle edition, 10, location 1067.

16. Of the fifty-six authors in the volume, there is one Latina, one Latino, and one Latin American author, a Brazilian. A few non-Latin@´ authors cite Latin@'s: e.g., Pamela Cooper-White briefly mentions mujerista theologian Ada María Isasi-Díaz in "Suffering," *En la Lucha/In the Struggle: A Hispanic Women′s Theology of Liberation* (Fortress, 2004), 23–31; and Joyce Ann Mercer briefly cites Carmen Nanko-Fernández in "Economics, Class, and Classism," *Theologizing en Espanglish: Context, Community and Ministry* (Orbis, 2010), 432–42.

17. Casiano Floristán, *Teología Práctica: Teoría y Praxis de la Acción Pastoral* (Salamanca, España: Ediciones Sígueme, 2002).

18. Casiano Floristán, "Naturaleza de la Teología Práctica," *Journal of Hispanic/Latino Theology* 6, no. 2 (1998): 16. He writes teología práctica "es el fuerzo reflexivo o teórico que hace la Iglesia a través de sus comunidades, con la ayuda imprescindible de los teólogos, para entender y promover la vida comunitaria cristiana en un mundo más justo y solidario." (See his obituary at http://www.elpais.com/articulo/agenda/Casiano/ Floristan/honesto/realidad/sincero/Dios/elpepigen/20060104elpepiage_10/Tes.)

19. See for example *The Blackwell Reader in Pastoral and Practical Theology*, eds. James Woodward and Stephen Pattison (Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2000). I have posited several reasons for this in chapter 2, "Decolonizing Practical and Pastoral Theologies," in *Theologizing en Espanglish*, 21–37. An earlier version of this chapter was presented as a paper in the practical theology section of the AAR in 2006.

   Among the Latin@'s who identify as practical theologians and/or who work in the field, see Elizabeth Conde-Frazier's "Participatory Action Research," *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Practical Theology* (West Sussex, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2012), 234–43; Allan Figuroa Deck, "A Latino Practical Theology: Mapping the Road Ahead," *Theological Studies* 65 (2004); Nancy Pineda-Madrid, *Suffering and Salvation in Cuidad Juarez* (Minneapolis, Fortress, 2011); and Ospino Hosffman, ed., *Hispanic Ministry in the 21st Century: Present and Future* (Miami: Convivium Press, 2010).

20. Miller-McLemore, *The Wiley Blackwell Companion*, Kindle edition, 2, location 865.

21. Elizondo earned his doctorate from the University of Paris. An abridged, English version of his dissertation is published as *Galilean Journey: The Mexican-American Promise* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1968).

22. Jean-Pierre Ruiz, "U.S. Hispanic/Latino Theology: The 'Boom' and Beyond," cited in Nanko-Fernández, *Theologizing en Espanglish*, 22.

23. Miller-McLemore, *The Wiley Blackwell Companion*, Kindle edition, 6, location 966.

24. Luis G. Pedraja, "Guideposts Along the Journey: Mapping North American Hispanic Theology," in *Protestantes/Protestants: Hispanic Christianity within Mainline Traditions,* ed. David Maldonado, Jr. (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1999), 124.

25. See for example James D. Whitehead and Evelyn Eaton Whitehead, *Method in Ministry: Theological Reflection and Christian Ministry* (Kansas City: Sheed & Ward, 1995).

26. José R. Irizarry, "REA Presidential Address: Spaces of Inter-Cultural Provocation for Religious Formation," *Religious Education* 103, no. 4 (July–September 2008): 405.

27. Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Research Methodologies: Research and Indigenous People* (Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago Press, 1999), 1–2.

28. Enrique D. Dussel, *A History of the Church in Latin America: Colonialism to Liberation*, trans. and rev. Alan Neely (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1981), 331.

29. When challenged, the scholar responded that she was merely repeating what a Latina had written from a source another Latina had recommended. See Linda Martín Alcoff, "Latinos Beyond the Binary," section I, Anti-Latino racism, second paragraph, http://www.alcoff.com/content/beyondbinary.html.

30. David Cloutier, "Faithful Citizenship Friday: What's a 'Fortnight'?" *Catholic Moral Theology* (April 13, 2012), http://catholicmoraltheology.com/faithful-citizenship-friday-whats-a-fortnight/.

31. Ibid. The ~~illegal~~ is the modification made on April 14, to the post of April 13, 2012. In our email exchange I wrote on April 13: "Please note the USCCB does not refer to alternately documented peoples as "illegal." They are very careful about the use of their language on this sensitive topic. Their term of preference is "undocumented immigrants." This is the term they employ in their recent religious liberty document. The word illegal is used in that statement to reference actions—never people."

   David Cloutier responded promptly by email on April 14: "Thank you. I appreciate the carefulness needed for language, and I hope that it is clear from the blog post that the use of the term "illegal" was colloquial, which is exactly why the term is used in scare quotes. I'm happy to note this in the post . . ."

32. See email exchange in previous note.

33. See for example Carolyn Salazar, "Almost Half of Latino Voters Find 'Illegal Immigrant' Offensive, Says Poll," http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/news/2012/03/08/almost-half-latinos-feel-term-illegal-immigrant-is-offensive/#ixzz1oYwkieEG for discussion of the use of *illegal*. See as well as the website of the campaign to "Drop the I-Word," http://colorlines.com/droptheiword/.

34. I address this omission in "Alternately Documented Theologies: Mapping Border, Exile, and Diaspora," chapter 2 in *Religion and Politics in America's Borderlands*, ed. Sarah Azaransky (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2013).

35. Fernando F. Segovia, "Theological Education and Scholarship as Struggle: The Life of Racial/Ethnic Minorities in the Profession," *Journal of Hispanic/Latino Theology* 2, no. 2 (1994): 15.

Does Our Understanding Lack Complexity? Faculty Perceptions on Multicultural Education

Deborah Gin
Azusa Pacific School of Theology

ABSTRACT: *In this study, 300 full-time faculty in US seminaries affiliated with The Association of Theological Schools were surveyed. Findings showed that multicultural education in the seminary context is not one-dimensional but consists of three types: power and positionality, cultural competence, and classroom techniques. Underrepresented racial/ethnic, and to a lesser extent Asian, faculty tend to engage power and positionality and classroom techniques more frequently than do white faculty. As a national study with input from multiple faculty voices, this study provides a needed breadth of perspective within theological education.*

Introduction

Studying faculty perspectives in the classroom, particularly with respect to self-reports of their engagement with multicultural education, holds great significance when we consider how diverse our society is becoming. Various studies in higher education cite multiple benefits of diversity to students and society,[1] including for example, enhanced student engagement, increased ability to hold complex concepts in tension, greater awareness and sensitivity in student-student and student-faculty interactions, progress in cultivating a more inclusive citizenry, and many others. The literature in higher education additionally indicates that faculty of color and white women faculty tend to engage active learning strategies, their students, multicultural pedagogies, the community, and other areas more than do white men faculty.[2] Yet, national percentages of faculty of color in higher education continue to reveal low representation (i.e., 15.2% of the total full-time instructional faculty in 1999 and 22.2% in 2009).[3]

And for institutions within The Association of Theological Schools (ATS), white men faculty still comprise 62.6 percent, and white men and women faculty together represent 80.7 percent, of all faculty in ATS member schools. Because faculty in higher education are still overwhelmingly white, it gives us reason to wonder whether faculty as a whole are engaging in multicultural pedagogy and whether students are, then, having an opportunity to engage in such learning.

Changing demographics in seminaries

Janice Edwards-Armstrong, director of leadership education of ATS, describes an ongoing project titled "Preparing for 2040: Enhancing Capacity to Educate and Minister in a Multiracial/Multicultural World."[4]

Teams from various institutions gather to plan for institutional transformation on many levels (e.g., curriculum changes, infrastructure, understanding of race/ethnicity, and others). In the mid-2000s, ATS also organized a series of consultations with invited faculty from various racial/ethnic groups to learn how seminary education could be made more relevant for their communities. From personal observation as a participant, I noted several important recommendations resulting from the Asian/Asian North American faculty meetings, such as the reduction of the number of required courses in order to make room for students taking more elective courses (e.g., exploration of racial/ethnic identities; ministry in Asian/Asian North American contexts; or other courses that highlight diversity, inclusivity, or multicultural pedagogy) or elevating those courses from elective to required status.

However, it is unclear how fully these recommendations have affected theological education; a mechanism does not currently exist to assess whether faculty are engaging in multicultural education in their classrooms, to verify which faculty are doing the engaging, or to detect the varieties of multicultural pedagogies being engaged. This lack may have far-reaching implications, especially when we consider the numerical growth among seminarians of color. ATS records on race and ethnicity between 1999 and 2010 indicate increases in students of color for nearly every group except white men. For example, between these years, growth ranged between 10.2 percent (1,254 to 1,382) among international female students and 57.1 percent (1,592 to 2,501) among Hispanic male students.[5]

Need for seminary faculty engagement with multicultural education

Churches and US Christianity are also seeing growth in diverse representation. Soong-Chan Rah projects that "by 2050, African, Asian, and Latin American Christians will constitute 71 percent of the world's Christian population."[6] In preparation for these changes, it behooves the community of North American theological education to consider, broadly, the current status of seminary faculty engagement with multicultural education and, more specifically, any patterns of engagement with multicultural education. Thomas F. Nelson Laird's framework carries some promise for identifying with greater variability the ways in which faculty engage this work. He refers to a course as having greater or less "diversity inclusivity" based on nine elements of a course: purpose/goals, content, foundations/perspectives, learners, instructor(s), pedagogy, classroom environment, assessment/evaluation, and adjustment. Laird argues that when faculty design courses, they engage multicultural education to a greater or lesser extent in *each* of these areas.[7]

In a larger study, I explored seminary faculty engagement with multicultural education, specifically the *predictors* of multicultural education

engagement.[8] This article reports the findings from one aspect of that study—namely, the *types* of multicultural education seminary faculty engage. Here, I consider two questions: (1) In which aspects of multicultural education are seminary faculty most likely to engage? and (2) Does their engagement in these aspects fall into patterns?

Review of the literature

Multicultural education

In a review of the works of multicultural religious educators, nearly all make reference to three scholars in the field, James A. Banks, Christine E. Sleeter, and Carl A. Grant. Their works are extensive and well-known; thus, in this article, I will only summarize key points.

James Banks. Banks contributes several metaconcepts to this body of literature, addressing a range of aspects of multicultural education.[9] Of particular import to this study is Banks' explanation of five dimensions of multicultural education: content integration, knowledge construction, prejudice reduction, an empowering school culture, and an equity pedagogy.[10]

Content integration is typically what is referenced when faculty imagine how they might incorporate more diversity into their classrooms. According to Banks, it involves the inclusion of examples from multiple, different groups to demonstrate theoretical concepts. *Knowledge construction* deals with epistemological concerns, how knowledge is made as well as the assumptions underlying the knowledge. Here, Banks advocates making explicit the positionality and social location of both the authors being studied and the learner-educators. The dimension of *prejudice reduction* includes ways educators help learners become aware of their socialization, particularly in terms of the presence and influence of members of dominant groups, and how interactions with different others can reduce prejudice but only in situations of equal status. An *empowering school culture* refers to institutional commitment, particularly as it refers to the institution's policies, culture, and practices. An *equity pedagogy* addresses expectations, teaching styles, and the transmission of various types of cultural capital.[11]

Christine Sleeter and Carl Grant. Also regarded as key contributors to the field, Sleeter and Grant identify five sets of models that maintain the "multicultural education" designation.[12] While they find value in each of the models, their critiques weigh more heavily on the first two. Thus, in the following, I truncate the description of the first two and highlight aspects in the last three that pertain to the present study.

The first set of models, Teaching the Exceptional and the Culturally Different, focuses on difference, with assimilation as the ultimate goal. Within the Human Relations approach, educators emphasize experiential learning and direct contact with communities that are not familiar to the student, helping the student to develop understanding, minimize stereotyping, and cultivate an attitude of hospitality. Criticism for these two approaches includes keeping difference learning on the periphery or tending to trivialize or exoticize difference, often failing to recognize that oppression also stems from systemic and institutional inequities.[13]

Sleeter and Grant's third approach is Single-Group Studies. Concentrating on a selected group, educators increase students' awareness and appreciation for that group's contributions to history, culture, and identity development. Students from the group being studied often become reeducated about their own community, and students from the dominant group face their own group's realities of oppression and discrimination. Critics identify the possibility of further marginalization resulting from keeping single-group study courses at the elective (rather than core or required) level.[14] Indeed, this problem surfaced during the ATS consultation for Asian/Asian North American faculty as an obstacle to diversifying theological education.

The fourth option, Multicultural Education, includes operating under the assumption that multiple perspectives, diversity of content, analysis of all perspectives, and engaging all learners and learning styles adds to the learning experience. The approach is integrated into every curricular aspect, and the ultimate goal is "social change . . . in the very fabric of . . . society."[15] Criticisms of this approach include the frequent reductionist tendencies of multicultural educators to miss the complexities of overlapping identities, the requirement of this approach for multiple skills and knowledge by educators, and the continued lack of addressing systemic inequities inherent in educational systems and curricula.[16]

In the Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist approach, learning extends to engaging in social analysis and exploring experiences of dominance and oppression, ultimately culminating in social change. Pedagogues design their courses around social issues and intentionally address topics of the discipline through the lens of social critique. This approach is considered too radical by some, and critics raise concerns about the ability of educators to guide learners through authentic reconstruction, the skills required by educators to model structural analysis well, considering the tendency of most to analyze events and issues through the lens of the individual, and the viability of teaching an approach that requires radical commitment.[17]

Sleeter and Grant align most with the fifth model, advocating for education that cultivates in students the skills necessary to bring about social justice.[18] As critical pedagogues, they call for a revision of the dominant curriculum, such that all students are learning about and basing their learning on the experiences and assumptions of multiple communities, not just those of communities in power, and that the hegemonic assumptions, policies, and practices of dominant systems are dismantled.

Multicultural theological education

Multicultural education in the seminary context has roots that extend back to the beginnings of theological training.[19] In this section, I explore the literature on multicultural theological education, focusing particularly on authors' perceived motivations for such education and their stated purposes and goals.

Motivations for multicultural theological education. Most who advocate for individual and community engagement with multicultural education derive motivation from theological conviction.[20] Whether it is about humanity knowing God more wholly by understanding the particularities inherent

in self and in others[21] or about "growth in Christlikeness,"[22] the motivations come from a deep desire to know and be known by God and God's people.

Others name more tangible motivations. Robert J. Priest and Alvaro L. Nieves await the church's active participation in the healing of a racialized world, for which the church is also culpable.[23] Barbara Wilkerson specifies impulses driving seminary adoption of multicultural education: helping the US church realize it is not immune to the "exclusively Anglocentric" nature of instruction[24] permeating the public educational realm; compelling church ministries, particularly those focused on mission, to go beyond the superficial; and developing skills to address intergenerational and cross-cultural difficulties.[25]

Purposes/goals of multicultural theological education. Scholars articulate a variety of purposes and outcomes of multicultural theological education, ranging from awareness and appreciation of unlike others to antiracist activism. For example, Wilkerson concludes that the theories of Paulo Freire and of Sleeter and Grant align well with the theological thrust toward the goal of reconciliation.[26] Laura B. Lewis, Ronald H. Cram, and James Michael Lee also consider the work of Sleeter and Grant and strongly advocate for the analysis of power asymmetries and other inequitable dynamics embedded in an institution's culture and curricula.[27] It is interesting to note the slight nuances of interpretation between these two articles on the same theoretical framework (i.e., that of Sleeter and Grant): Wilkerson sees the models as providing opportunity for reciprocity, where Lewis and colleagues expand the conversation to critiques of power.

Another body of literature reaches further into a critical pedagogy, examining issues of privilege and race-based inequitable structures. David V. Esterline argues that the essential aim of multicultural theological education is changed lives, where everyone experiences an "antiracist" curriculum.[28] Indeed, by "multicultural," Esterline believes theological education must include the objective of transforming systems of racism or structures that advantage certain groups based on race.[29] Lawrence H. Mamiya offers a similar challenge from black church communities, that American society (and theological education) adopt a "strong antiracial discrimination stance."[30] Likewise, while not addressing seminary education per se, Rah questions the future relevancy of an evangelicalism that is nonconversant with the thriving vibrancy of ethnic minority and immigrant communities.[31]

Others call for the transformation of individual and social identity,[32] helping Christian communities understand that "*all* human experience is a social product and process,"[33] a redistribution of power so that all experience it equally in community and harmony,[34] listening to the heretofore silenced voices of oppressed communities,[35] a consciousness raising of our own social locations and positions of power,[36] and the opportunity for all to identify as part of the family of God[37] as primary goals of multicultural seminary education.

Data and analysis[38]

Sample

The population studied in this project is full-time US faculty in graduate-level theological education. Though perceptions of faculty in Canadian and Puerto Rican seminaries need to be explored, these contexts differ from that of the non-Puerto Rican United States. This study, thus, includes faculty in non-Puerto Rican United States (henceforth, US) seminaries only.

To investigate the targeted population, I analyzed a random sample[39] of 300 respondents (corresponding to a 23.0% response rate), roughly two-thirds female and one-third male, acquired through the ATS database. The racial composition of the sample was slightly more than one-half white, one-fifth black, one-tenth Asian, one-tenth Latino/Hispanic, slightly less than 5 percent of multiple races, and less than 1 percent each Native American and Pacific Islander. Respondents mainly represented the higher ranks (associate or full professor), more than two-thirds held tenure or extended contracts, and they were evenly distributed among evangelical and mainline Protestant schools, with more than one-tenth from Roman Catholic seminaries. The three most frequently reported discipline categories were theology (26.8%), Bible (19.2%), and ministry (15.8%).

Analysis

Question A: Aspects of multicultural education that faculty engage. This section highlights findings on responses to the single item, "I include multicultural education in my courses" (OverallMC), and to the seventeen other dependent items related to engagement with other aspects of multicultural education. (See Appendix for descriptives on all dependent items.)

Engagement of multicultural education overall. Overall, the sample reported engaging in multicultural education (OverallMC$_{mean}$ = 2.86, between "Occasionally" and "Frequently" but closer to the latter on a four-point scale ranging from "Never" to "Always"); however, overall engagement with multicultural education was indicated among the lowest response means for dependent items. Cross-tabulations by gender and race and by frequency response show that more black/African/African American (henceforth, black) faculty reported always (44.3%) engaging in multicultural education than did Latino/Hispanic (henceforth, Latino/a) faculty (40.6%), faculty of multiple races (36.4%), Asian/Asian American (henceforth, Asian) faculty (25.7%), and white faculty (17.9%).

Response *patterns* by race on this single dependent item also reveal differences. For Asian faculty and for white faculty, the responses follow a normal, bell-shaped distribution. However, for black faculty, Latino/a faculty, and faculty of multiple races (i.e., underrepresented racial/ethnic faculty, henceforth URE), the distributions show a skewed distribution, cresting in the direction of "Frequently" and "Always." See Table 1 for frequency cross-tabulations on the single-item dependent measure.

Comparison of means between underrepresented racial/ethnic faculty and nonunderrepresented (non-URE) faculty reveals that, while for non-URE faculty, the overall engagement item was one of the two items with the lowest mean (2.66 between Occasionally and Frequently), for URE faculty, it was not

TABLE 1. Dependent Variable, OverallMC—Frequency Cross-tabulations by Race and Gender

Race*	Gender	DV: I include multicultural education in my courses (OverallMC)				
		Never	Occasion-ally	Frequently	Always	Total
Asian/ Asian Am	Male	1	3	3	2	9
	Female	2	9	8	7	26
	Total Count	3	12	11	9	35
	Total % of Race	8.6%	34.3%	31.4%	25.7%	100.0%
Black, African/ African Am	Male	0	2	7	11	20
	Female	0	9	16	16	41
	Total Count	0	11	23	27	61
	Total % of Race	0%	18.0%	37.7%	44.3%	100.0%
Latino/ Hispanic	Male	0	1	2	2	5
	Female	2	3	11	11	27
	Total Count	2	4	13	13	32
	Total % of Race	6.2%	12.5%	40.6%	40.6%	100.0%
Multiple Races	Male	0	0	1	2	3
	Female	0	3	3	2	8
	Total Count	0	3	4	4	11
	Total % of Race	5%	27.3%	36.4%	36.4%	100.0%
White	Male	1	13	21	15	50
	Female	10	46	33	12	101
	Total Count	11	59	54	27	151
	Total % of Race	7.3%	39.1%	35.8%	17.9%	100.0%
Total	**Male**	**2**	**20**	**34**	**32**	**88**
	% of Gender	**2.3%**	**22.7%**	**38.6%**	**36.4%**	**100.0%**
	Female	**14**	**71**	**71**	**49**	**205**
	% of Gender	**6.8%**	**34.6%**	**34.6%**	**23.9%**	**100.0%**
	Total Count	**16**	**91**	**105**	**81**	**293**
	Total %	**5.5%**	**31.1%**	**35.8%**	**27.6%**	**100.0%**

* Counts in the Native American/First Nations and Pacific Islander racial categories were very few (three total) and were omitted to maintain confidentiality.

(3.21, Frequently). Independent sample t-test confirms that the difference in means for this single dependent item is significant [t (293) = -5.360, p < .001] and represented a moderate-sized effect (Cohen's D = .65).

These findings together suggest that underrepresented racial/ethnic faculty are more apt to engage multicultural education than those in the non-underrepresented racial/ethnic faculty group. Indeed, this item was one of the ten that showed a statistically significant difference ($p < .001$ level) in mean response between the two groups.[40]

Engagement in other aspects of multicultural education. Comparisons of mean responses provide perspective on other aspects of multicultural education engagement. For the entire sample, the item with the highest mean was "Creating a safe climate in my classroom is very important for me" (Safe Climate, 3.77 on a 4-point scale). The two items with the next highest means were "Developing in students the skills necessary to work effectively with people from various cultural backgrounds is a very important purpose of education"[41] (Student Cultural Competence, 3.58) and "I regularly reflect on my decisions about which skills, values, or knowledge students should learn in the classroom" (Reflect Epistemology, 3.38). In addition to Safe Climate and Student Cultural Competence, URE faculty also showed strongest agreement with engaging in Critique Dominant Canon, Teacher Social Location, and Diverse Teaching Methods. (See Appendix for full text of items.)

The item with the lowest mean for the sample was "I include lecture, class discussions, or writing assignments that integrate topics of my discipline with topics related to diversity (justice, equity, power asymmetry, access, . . . genderism/racism/ageism/classism . . ." (Diversity Content, 2.84). The three items with the next lowest means were "I reflect on how my students' various sociocultural identities (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, ability, culture, religion/denomination, etc.) affect their learning" (Reflect Social ID Affect Learn, 2.87), "I adjust aspects of the course (e.g., pace, content, assignments) based on student learning needs"[42] (Adjust Course, 2.87), and "I employ pedagogical strategies to create equal-status conditions[43] (e.g., minimizing feelings of superiority/inferiority among students . . .) for deep interaction" (Equal Status Conditions, 2.90).

It is important to note that for all dependent items, the URE faculty group did not have any means resulting below 3.10 (Agree). For the non-URE faculty group, eight of eighteen dependent items returned means that fell below 3.00. While this may indicate the presence of a social desirability effect, it may also suggest a greater engagement with multicultural education by underrepresented racial/ethnic seminary faculty.

Question B: Patterns of multicultural education engagement. To determine whether faculty engagement with multicultural education falls into identifiable patterns, I performed factor analysis of responses to the seventeen nonoverall dependent items.[44] As is standard in such analysis, I considered the factor loadings to identify *patterns* of responses by this sample, then to determine individual items that group together to form a "composite" variable. Table 2 presents factor loadings in the pattern matrix. Through examination of the high factor loadings, I named the first three factors Multicultural Education-Power and Positionality, Multicultural Education-Cultural Competence, and Multicultural Education-Classroom Techniques; saved them as variables using regression method; and used them in subsequent analyses in the larger study.[45]

Power and Positionality. Six items loaded high for the construct Power and Positionality. These were "I regularly reflect on my social location and/or positionality" (Teacher Social Location, .903); "I regularly have students explore their social location and/or positionality" (Student Social Location, .719); "I regularly reflect on my potential biases about course-related issues" (Reflect on Biases, .654); "I encourage students to question the dominant curricular canon's assumptions, paradigms, and characteristics that perpetuate dominance" (Critique Dominant Canon, .638); "I include lecture, class discussions, or writing assignments . . . with topics related to diversity . . ." (Diversity Content, .578); and "I include lecture, class discussions, or writing assignments that incorporate diverse perspectives . . ."[46] (Diverse Perspectives, .525).

Cultural Competence. Three items comprised Cultural Competence. The items with the highest loadings were "Developing in students the skills necessary to work with . . . various cultural backgrounds is . . . very important . . ."[47] (Student Cultural Competence, .833); "My goal for student learning is . . . knowledge, attitudes, skills necessary for participation in action for justice and equality" (Student Learning Goal, .641); and "Creating a safe climate in my classroom is very important for me" (Safe Climate, .628).

Classroom Techniques. Five of the seventeen dependent items loaded high for the composite factor Classroom Techniques. These were "I adjust aspects of the course . . . based on student learning needs"[48] (Adjust Course, .672); "I employ pedagogical strategies to create equal-status conditions . . ."[49] (Equal Status Conditions, .664); "I evaluate student learning using multiple techniques"[50] (Evaluate Multiple Techniques, .657); "My teaching methods are intentionally diverse to encourage the active participation of all students" (Diverse Teaching Methods, .604); and "I reflect on how my students' various sociocultural identities . . . affect their learning" (Reflect Social ID Affect Learning, .517).

Conclusions

Key findings and interpretations

In this section, I first address the kinds of multicultural education/diversity inclusivity in which seminary faculty engage. Then, to respond to the question about whether engagement in multicultural education falls into identifiable patterns, I discuss the factors that emerged.

Which faculty engage which pedagogical aspects? Overall, seminary faculty do engage in multicultural education; however, black and Latino/a faculty, as well as faculty of multiple races, far more frequently engage in multicultural education than do Asian and white faculty.

The types of multicultural education that seminary faculty are most likely to engage, however, vary according to group (i.e., URE and non-URE faculty). The three areas of multicultural pedagogy that non-URE faculty are most likely to engage include providing a safe climate for students, building student competence to work effectively with people from other cultures, and reflecting on decisions about what students should learn. Similar to non-URE faculty, URE faculty are most likely to engage in providing a safe climate for

TABLE 2. Dependent Factors Pattern Matrix

		Factor			
		1	2	3	4
Factor: Power and Positionality	TEACHER SOCIAL LOCATION I regularly reflect on my social location and/or positionality.	**.903**	.007	-.121	.067
	STUDENT SOCIAL LOCATION I regularly have students explore their social location and/or positionality.	**.719**	.060	.039	-.043
	REFLECT ON BIASES I regularly reflect on my potential biases about course-related issues.	**.654**	-.019	.084	.244
	CRITIQUE DOMINANT CANON I encourage students to question the dominant curricular canon's assumptions, paradigms, and characteristics that perpetuate dominance.	**.638**	.109	.068	-.135
	DIVERSITY CONTENT I include lecture, class discussions, or writing assignments that integrate topics of my discipline with topics related to diversity (justice, equity, power asymmetry, access . . . genderism/racism/ageism/classism, etc.).	**.578**	.072	.215	-.328
	DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES I include lecture, class discussions, or writing assignments that incorporate diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.).[1]	**.525**	.108	.157	-.174
	REFLECT EPISTEMOLOGY I regularly reflect on my decisions about which skills, values, or knowledge students should learn in the classroom.	.333	.060	.134	.239
Factor: Cultural Competence	STUDENT CULTURAL COMPETENCE Developing in students the skills necessary to work effectively with people from various cultural backgrounds is a very important purpose of education.[2]	.048	**.833**	-.038	.016
	STUDENT LEARNING GOAL My goal for student learning is that they gain the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary for participation in action for justice and equality.	.169	**.641**	.022	-.124
	SAFE CLIMATE Creating a safe climate in my classroom is very important for me.	-.091	**.628**	.007	.043

Factor: Classroom Techniques

Item				
I adjust aspects of the course (e.g., pace, content, assignments) based on student learning needs.[2] ADJUST COURSE	.012	-.064	**.672**	-.167
I employ pedagogical strategies to create equal-status conditions (e.g., minimizing feelings of superiority/inferiority among students, equitable opportunity to contribute to course discussions/content) for deep interaction.[3] EQUAL STATUS CONDITIONS	.029	.079	**.664**	-.173
I evaluate student learning using multiple techniques.[3] EVALUATE MULTIPLE TECHNIQUES	-.071	.064	**.657**	.179
My teaching methods are intentionally diverse to encourage the active participation of all students. DIVERSE TEACHING METHODS	.029	.124	**.604**	.128
I reflect on how my students' various sociocultural identities (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, ability, culture, religion/denomination, etc.) affect their learning. SOCIAL ID AFFECT LEARNING	.304	.040	**.517**	-.161
I regularly learn about who my students are in order to improve classroom instruction. LEARN ABOUT STUDENTS	.197	.020	.412	.243
I am conscious of my differential expectations of individual students in my class (i.e., based on their gender, race, ethnicity, ability status, socioeconomic status, etc.). DIFFERENTIAL EXPECTATIONS	.205	.014	.318	.160

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.

[1] Paul D. Umbach, "The Contribution of Faculty of Color to Undergraduate Education," *Research in Higher Education* 47, no. 3 (May 2006): 341.

[2] Thomas F. Nelson Laird, "Measuring the Diversity Inclusivity of College Courses," *Research in Higher Education* 52, no. 6 (Sep. 2011): 574; Thomas F. Nelson Laird and Mark E. Engberg, "Establishing Differences between Diversity Requirements and Other Courses with Varying Degrees of Diversity Inclusivity," (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, 2011), 122.

[3] Sylvia Hurtado, "Linking Diversity and Educational Purpose: How Diversity Affects the Classroom Environment and Student Development," in *Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action*, eds. Gary Orfield and Michal Kurlaender (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review, 2001), 189.

students and building student competence to work effectively with people from other cultures; however, they are also more likely to incorporate a diversity of teaching methods to encourage active participation by all students, instructor self-reflection on social location and positionality, and encouragement of students to critique the dominant curricular canon's assumptions and paradigms that perpetuate dominance.

Dimensions of multicultural education. Multicultural education engagement does fall into identifiable patterns. While two types of multicultural education were anticipated *a priori*, three distinct dimensions in fact emerged. Results from analyses performed to identify these dimensions were further corroborated by specific alignment of certain *predictors* of each dimension of multicultural education.[51]

The Power and Positionality dimension of multicultural education is reminiscent of Banks' Knowledge Construction,[52] which deals with epistemological concerns (including the asymmetrical power structures that reinforce decisions about what counts as knowledge).

The Cultural Competence dimension focuses on building student knowledge and skills necessary for interacting cross-culturally and providing safe spaces for that exploration. In theological contexts, this dimension of multicultural education is commonly found as a model of teaching and learning for mission and evangelism.[53]

A third, unexpected dimension emerged: Classroom Techniques. While this type of multicultural education enjoyed some convergence with Power and Positionality, its characteristics lie uniquely in concrete pedagogical methods and strategies that promote diversity inclusivity.

Data indicate that seminary faculty engage more in aspects of two dimensions of multicultural education: Power and Positionality and Cultural Competence. Seminary faculty engage less readily in aspects of Classroom Techniques. And, though aspects of Cultural Competence are engaged by all faculty, URE faculty are more apt to engage pedagogical aspects of Power and Positionality.

What meaning can we make?

Racial group. Literature overwhelmingly indicates that faculty of color and white women faculty engage active learning strategies, their students, multicultural pedagogies, the community, and other areas more than do white men faculty.[54] Descriptive analysis in this study confirmed that URE faculty and non-URE faculty differed significantly in their responses to survey items. Examples of ways in which faculty engagement differed include the fact that URE faculty were most likely to engage in instructor self-reflection on social location and positionality and in encouragement of students to critique the assumptions of curricular canons and paradigms that perpetuate dominance; whereas, non-URE faculty were most likely to engage in building student competence to work effectively with people from other cultures and in reflecting on decisions about what students should learn.

Complexity of multicultural education. That seminary faculty incline more toward Power and Positionality and Cultural Competence than they do

Classroom Techniques was an interesting finding. Much of theological or seminary activity resides in the realms of the conceptual or immaterial, thus perhaps making the first two dimensions of multicultural education more attractive or palatable to this population. Items that comprise the dimension Classroom Techniques relate to specific classroom techniques that promote diversity inclusivity, such as using a variety of assessment methods in order to provide students with multiple ways of demonstrating their learning,[55]controlling the participation of students from dominant groups[56] so that all students have equal opportunity to contribute,[57] and adjusting course agendas, content, or delivery based on feedback from a diversity of learning styles.[58] While these are considered pedagogical best practices in any class, such best practices may be unfamiliar to seminary faculty, many of whom did not take courses in teaching/learning while in graduate school nor were socialized to consider themselves as multicultural educators.

Regarding the nontechnical dimensions, it is important to recognize that multicultural education is not monolithic. Multicultural education in seminary settings can incline toward a pedagogy that respects the different Other, with an awareness of how we "assume that our way is the only way that is appropriate . . ."[59] This Cultural Competence dimension can emphasize mutual celebration and learning from and of the "stranger."[60] It can also *lack* a sense of mutuality, the notion that the racial/ethnic student will also inform the instructor. For example, in a discussion on cooperative learning, Deborah L. Bainer and Jeffrey W. Peck describe a technique in which they hint at their pedagogical philosophy not in their direct explanation but in the act of putting quotation marks around a key word, (e.g., "Each member of a small group 'teaches' the rest of his or her group . . . ," apparently to indicate that students are not actually engaging in teaching their classmates.[61] While reconciliation is typically the end goal, most cultural analysis in this dimension occurs at the level of the individual or group.[62] Seminary pedagogues applying this dimension of multicultural education emphasize experiential learning and interaction with unfamiliar others, helping students develop sensitivity and understanding and nurture hospitality (similar to Sleeter and Grant's Human Relations approach).[63]

Multicultural education in seminary settings, however, can also focus more on social analysis of systems and unjust structures. Such pedagogies identify and name hegemonic practices and policies that perpetuate dominance, privileging one group or system over others.[64] Various authors highlight this dimension of Power and Positionality in their writing and classroom approach.[65] Pedagogies within this dimension range from a recognition and welcoming of the diversity of students' social locations as points of expertise (e.g., Charles R. Foster's description of exploring strategies for students to situate their own experiences and histories in the course content),[66] to incorporating content on diversity topics that relate to the course's discipline, to challenging racist structures in society and within the church head on, with an awareness of asymmetrical power in knowledge construction.[67] This dimension of multicultural education is more in agreement with Sleeter and Grant's Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist approach, in which instructors

design courses around sociohistorical issues and explore experiences of dominance and oppression, ultimately leading to social action and transformation.

Final remarks

This report has contributed a missing piece to the literature. Germinal works exist within the literature that explores theological education;[68] however, these works either build on historical synthesis or analyze select institutions (i.e., eighteen out of more than 260 ATS institutions, in the case of Foster and colleagues[69]). While their conclusions are profound and revelatory, those pieces can be seen as constrained by the contexts about which they write. This national study, however, presents a more inclusive understanding of the perspectives of faculty who engage in theological education and thus complements the depth of those important works by providing a slice of the breadth that they miss.

Given that projections place the US church in a nonwhite-majority context in the near future, exploration of multicultural theological education becomes paramount. Not only will future seminarians be increasingly racially diverse, but seminary graduates will be ministering in a racially diverse church context as well. Theological educators must, therefore, engage in the preparation of their seminarians to minister in such a context. The Association of Theological Schools has already begun its campaign to address this challenge with the "Preparing for 2040" project. This study also addresses the challenge by considering 300 seminary faculty voices, half of whom are faculty of color. What better way to gain understanding about preparation for a multicultural world than by hearing from a multiracial multitude?

Deborah Gin is associate professor in ministry at Azusa Pacific School of Theology in Azuza, California, and senior faculty fellow in the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment.

Appendix
Dependent Items—Descriptives

Item	N Mean S.D.	Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Agree 3	Strongly Agree* 4
Creating a safe climate in my classroom is very important for me. SAFE CLIMATE	299 3.77 .523	4 1.3%	2 0.7%	54 18.1%	239 79.9%
My goal for student learning is that they gain the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary for participation in action for justice and equality. STUDENT LEARNING GOAL	300 3.23 .768	7 2.3%	41 13.7%	129 43.0%	123 41.0%
Developing in students the skills necessary to work effectively with people from various cultural backgrounds is a very important purpose of education.[1] STUDENT CULTURAL COMPETENCE	300 3.58 .636	5 1.7%	9 3.0%	92 30.7%	194 64.7%
I regularly reflect on my decisions about which skills, values, or knowledge students should learn in the classroom. REFLECT EPISTEMOLOGY	300 3.38 .592	0 0%	17 5.7%	151 50.3%	132 44.0%
I encourage students to question the dominant curricular canon's assumptions, paradigms, and characteristics that perpetuate dominance. CRITIQUE DOMINANT CANON	300 3.15 .778	4 1.3%	59 19.7%	124 41.3%	113 37.7%
I regularly have students explore their social location and/or positionality. STUDENT SOCIAL LOCATION	300 3.10 .778	5 1.7%	62 20.7%	131 43.7%	102 34.0%
I regularly reflect on my potential biases about course-related issues. REFLECT ON BIASES	300 3.19 .616	2 0.7%	28 9.3%	182 60.7%	88 29.3%
I regularly reflect on my social location and/or positionality. TEACHER SOCIAL LOCATION	298 3.22 .714	3 1.0%	41 13.8%	141 47.3%	113 37.9%
I regularly learn about who my students are in order to improve classroom instruction. LEARN ABOUT STUDENTS	299 3.34 .594	2 0.7%	13 4.3%	165 55.2%	119 39.8%
I am conscious of my differential expectations of individual students in my class (i.e., based on their gender, race, ethnicity, ability status, socioeconomic status, etc.). DIFFERENTIAL EXPECTATIONS	296 3.11 .675	6 2.0%	35 11.8%	176 59.5%	79 26.7%

Item	N Mean S.D.	Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Agree 3	Strongly Agree* 4
My teaching methods are intentionally diverse to encourage the active participation of all students.	297 3.28 .643	1 0.3%	28 9.4%	154 51.9%	114 38.4%
DIVERSE TEACHING METHODS					
I evaluate student learning using multiple techniques.[2]	297 3.26 .649	1 0.3%	31 10.4%	156 52.5%	109 36.7%
EVALUATE MULTIPLE TECHNIQUES					
I include lecture, class discussions, or writing assignments that incorporate diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.).[3]	300 3.07 .798	(Never) 12 4.0%	(Occasionally) 49 16.3%	(Frequently) 144 48.0%	(Always) 95 31.7%
DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES					
I include lecture, class discussions, or writing assignments that integrate topics of my discipline with topics related to diversity (justice, equity, power asymmetry, access, stereotype/essentializing, genderism/racism/ageism/classism).	299 2.84 .868	(Never) 18 6.0%	(Occasionally) 86 28.8%	(Frequently) 121 40.5%	(Always) 74 24.7%
DIVERSITY CONTENT					
I reflect on how my students' various sociocultural identities (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, ability, culture, religion/denomination, etc.) affect their learning.	300 2.87 .769	(Never) 7 2.3%	(Occasionally) 90 30.0%	(Frequently) 139 46.3%	(Always) 64 21.3%
REFLECT SOCIAL ID AFFECT LEARNING					
I adjust aspects of the course (e.g., pace, content, assignments) based on student learning needs.[1]	299 2.87 .748	(Never) 4 1.3%	(Occasionally) 94 31.4%	(Frequently) 139 46.5%	(Always) 62 20.7%
ADJUST COURSE					
I employ pedagogical strategies to create equal-status conditions (e.g., minimizing feelings of superiority/inferiority among students, equitable opportunity to contribute to course discussions/content) for deep interaction.[2]	297 2.90 .822	(Never) 19 6.4%	(Occasionally) 59 19.9%	(Frequently) 151 50.8%	(Always) 68 22.9%
EQUAL STATUS CONDITIONS					
I include multicultural education in my courses.	298 2.86 .892	(Never) 17 5.7%	(Occasionally) 91 30.5%	(Frequently) 107 35.9%	(Always) 83 27.9%
OVERALLMC					

*Response options in this item category followed these column headers unless otherwise noted in parentheses.

[1] Thomas F. Nelson Laird, "Measuring the Diversity Inclusivity of College Courses," *Research in Higher Education* 52, no. 6 (Sep. 2011): 574; Thomas F. Nelson Laird and Mark E. Engberg, "Establishing Differences between Diversity Requirements and Other Courses with Varying Degrees of Diversity Inclusivity," (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, 2011), 122.

[2] Sylvia Hurtado, "Linking Diversity and Educational Purpose: How Diversity Affects the Classroom Environment and Student Development," in *Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action*, eds. Gary Orfield and Michal Kurlaender (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review, 2001), 189.

[3] Paul D. Umbach, "The Contribution of Faculty of Color to Undergraduate Education," *Research in Higher Education* 47, no. 3 (May 2006): 341.

ENDNOTES

1.   For example, Patricia Gurin, "Selections from *The Compelling Need for Diversity in Higher Education*: Expert Reports in Defense of the University of Michigan," *Equity & Excellence in Education* 32, no. 2 (1999); Patricia Gurin et al., "Diversity and Higher Education: Theory and Impact on Educational Outcomes," *Harvard Educational Review* 72, no. 3 (Fall 2002); Sylvia Hurtado et al., "Enacting Diverse Learning Environments: Improving the Climate for Racial/Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education," *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report* 26 (1999); Patricia Marin, "The Educational Possibility of Multi-Racial/Multi-Ethnic College Classrooms," in *Does Diversity Make a Difference? Three Research Studies on Diversity in College Classrooms*, eds. Geoffrey Maruyama et al. (Washington, DC: American Council on Education; American Association of University Professors, 2000). For full text, see http://www.acenet.edu or http://www.aaup.org; Geoffrey Maruyama and Jose F. Moreno, "University Faculty Views About the Value of Diversity on Campus and in the Classroom" (Washington, DC: American Council on Education; American Association of University Professors, 2000); Jeffrey F. Milem, "Increasing Diversity Benefits: How Campus Climate and Teaching Methods Affect Student Outcomes," in *Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action*, eds. Gary Orfield and Michal Kurlaender (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review, 2001); Daryl G. Smith, *Diversity Works: The Emerging Picture of How Students Benefit* (Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 1997); Daryl G. Smith and Natalie B. Schonfeld, "The Benefits of Diversity: What the Research Tells Us," *About Campus* 5, no. 5 (Nov.–Dec. 2000).

2.   Anthony Lising Antonio, Helen S. Astin, and Christine M. Cress, "Community Service in Higher Education: A Look at the Nation's Faculty," *The Review of Higher Education* 23, no. 4 (Summer 2000); Marcia J. Belcheir, "What Predicts Perceived Gains in Learning and in Satisfaction" (Boise, ID: Boise State University, 2001); Mari Luna De La Rosa, "Making a Difference: Diverse College Faculty and Factors Influencing Student Engagement" (dissertation, Claremont Graduate University, 2005); Shouping Hu and George D. Kuh, "Being (Dis)Engaged in Educationally Purposeful Activities: The Influences of Student and Institutional Characteristics," *Research in Higher Education* 43, no. 5 (October 2002); Sylvia Hurtado, "Linking Diversity and Educational Purpose: How Diversity Affects the Classroom Environment and Student Development," in *Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action*, eds. Gary Orfield and Michal Kurlaender (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review, 2001); Maruyama and Moreno, "University Faculty Views"; Milem, "Increasing Diversity Benefits"; Thomas F. Nelson Laird, "Measuring the Diversity Inclusivity of College Courses," *Research in Higher Education* (2011); Thomas F. Nelson Laird and Mark E. Engberg, "Establishing Differences between Diversity Requirements and Other Courses with Varying Degrees of Diversity Inclusivity," (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, 2011); KerryAnn O'Meara, "Motivation for Faculty Community Engagement: Learning from Exemplars," *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 12, no. 1 (2008); Julie J. Park and Nida Denson, "Attitudes and Advocacy: Understanding Faculty Views on Racial/Ethnic Diversity," *The Journal of Higher Education* 80, no. 4 (July/August 2009); Paul D. Umbach, "The Contribution of Faculty of Color to Undergraduate Education," *Research in Higher Education* 47, no. 3 (May 2006); Amy Wade and Ada Demb, "A Conceptual Model to Explore Faculty Community Engagement," *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* (Spring 2009).

3.   Digest of Education Statistics, 2011.

4.   Personal communication, May 11, 2010.

5.   ATS, 2010–2011 Annual Data Tables, "Head Count Enrollment by Race or Ethnic Group, Degree, and Gender, 2010."

6.   Soong-Chan Rah, *The Next Evangelicalism: Releasing the Church from Western Cultural Captivity* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Books, 2009), 13.

7.   Thomas F. Nelson Laird, "Measuring the Diversity Inclusivity of College Courses," *Research in Higher Education* 52, no. 6 (Sep. 2011).

8.   Contact the author for findings related to the larger study.

9.   James A. Banks, "Multicultural Education: Historical Development, Dimensions, and Practice," in *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education*, eds. James A. Banks and Cherry A. McGee Banks (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004); "Multicultural Education: Dimensions and Paradigms," in *The Routledge International Companion to Multicultural Education*, ed. James A. Banks (New York: Routledge, 2009).

10.   Banks, "Multicultural Education: Historical Development, Dimensions, and Practice."

11.   Ibid.

12.   Christine E. Sleeter and Carl A. Grant, *Making Choices for Multicultural Education: Five Approaches to Race, Class, and Gender*, 4th ed. (New York: J. Wiley & Sons, 2003).

13.   Ibid.

14.   Ibid.

15.   Sleeter and Grant, *Making Choices for Multicultural Education*, 158 (see n. 12).

16.   Sleeter and Grant, *Making Choices for Multicultural Education* (see n. 12).

17.   Ibid.

18.   Ibid.

19.   Contact the author for historical survey of seminary education through the lens of multicultural pedagogy or diversity inclusivity.

20.   For example, Laura B. Lewis, Ronald H. Cram, and James Michael Lee, "Curriculum and Multicultural Religious Education," in *Multicultural Religious Education*, ed. Barbara Wilkerson (Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1997); David I. Smith, *Learning from the Stranger: Christian Faith and Cultural Diversity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2009); Barbara Wilkerson, ed., *Multicultural Religious Education* (Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1997).

21.   Carol A. Jenkins and Dale Kratt, "Sociological Foundations of Multicultural Religious Education," in *Multicultural Religious Education*, ed. Barbara Wilkerson (Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1997).

22.   Elizabeth Conde-Frazier, S. Steve Kang, and Gary A. Parrett, *A Many-Colored Kingdom: Multicultural Dynamics for Spiritual Formation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2004), 7.

23.   Robert J. Priest and Alvaro L. Nieves, eds., *This Side of Heaven: Race, Ethnicity, and Christian Faith* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).

24.   Wilkerson, *Multicultural Religious Education*, 32, (see n. 20).

25.   Wilkerson, *Multicultural Religious Education* (see n. 20).

26.   Ibid.

27.   Lewis, Cram, and Lee, "Curriculum and Multicultural Religious Education" (see n. 20).

28.   David V. Esterline, personal communication, March 28, 2011.

29.   David V. Esterline, "Multicultural Theological Education and Leadership for a Church without Walls," in *Shaping Beloved Community: Multicultural Theological*

Education., eds. David V. Esterline and Ogbu U. Kalu (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006).

30. Lawrence H. Mamiya, "A Black Church Challenge to and Perspective on Christianity and Civil Society," in *Christianity and Civil Society*, ed. Rodney L. Petersen (Newton, MA: The Boston Theological Institute, 1995), 45.

31. Rah, *The Next Evangelicalism* (see n. 6).

32. Virgilio Elizondo, "Benevolent Tolerance or Humble Reverence? A Vision for Multicultural Religious Education," in *Multicultural Religious Education*, ed. Barbara Wilkerson (Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1997).

33. Lewis, Cram, and Lee, "Curriculum and Multicultural Religious Education," 329, emphasis in original, (see n. 20).

34. Elizabeth Conde-Frazier, "From Hospitality to Shalom," in *A Many-Colored Kingdom: Multicultural Dynamics for Spiritual Formation*, eds. Elizabeth Conde-Frazier, S. Steve Kang, and Gary A. Parrett (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2004).

35. Pui-lan Kwok, "The Global Challenge," in *Christianity & Civil Society*, ed. Rodney L. Petersen (Newton, MA: The Boston Theological Institute, 1995).

36. Mark Hearn, "Positionality, Intersectionality, and Power: Socially Locating the Higher Education Teacher in Multicultural Education," *Multicultural Education Review* 4, no. 2 (2012).

37. Elizondo, "Benevolent Tolerance or Humble Reverence?" (see n. 32); Esterline, "Multicultural Theological Education and Leadership" (see n. 29).

38. This section reports data and analysis in abridged fashion. For full data results and analyses, please contact the author.

39. "Random sample" refers to the method of sampling of white faculty; faculty of color were oversampled in order to ensure representation in the study. All faculty of color from ATS member schools were included in the initial invitation.

40. Contact the author for dependent variable descriptives and comparison data, by race and gender.

41. Laird, "Measuring the Diversity Inclusivity," 574 (see n. 7); Laird and Engberg, "Establishing Differences," 122 (see n. 2).

42. Ibid.

43. Hurtado, "Linking Diversity," 189 (see n. 2).

44. I performed a Principal Axis factor (PAF) analysis, with Varimax rotation, on all seventeen dependent items. The rotation failed to converge after twenty-five iterations. After considering the factors as unique, yet related at a metalevel (i.e., they are different *kinds* of multicultural pedagogy), I performed PAF analysis again on all seventeen dependent items, this time with Oblimin rotation. The analysis yielded much clearer factor loadings on three of four factors. I ran reliability analysis on these three factor-scales and found them to have acceptable relatedness (Power and Positionality, Cronbach's alpha = .880; Cultural Competence, alpha = .756; Classroom Techniques, alpha = .812).

45. For additional, typically reported, factor analysis results, contact the author.

46. Umbach, "The Contribution of Faculty of Color," 341 (see n. 2).

47. Laird, "Measuring the Diversity Inclusivity," 574 (see n. 7); Laird and Engberg, "Establishing Differences," 122 (see n. 2).

48. Ibid.

49.   Hurtado, "Linking Diversity," 189 (see n. 2).

50.   Laird, "Measuring the Diversity Inclusivity," 574 (see n. 7); Laird and Engberg, "Establishing Differences," 122 (see n. 2).

51.   Contact the author for findings from the larger study, on *predictors* of multicultural education.

52.   Banks, "Multicultural Education" (see n. 9).

53.   For example, Judith E. Lingenfelter and Sherwood G. Lingenfelter, *Teaching Cross-Culturally: An Incarnational Model for Learning and Teaching* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2003); Smith, *Learning from the Stranger* (see n. 20); R. Albert Mohler Jr., "Thinking of the Future: Evangelical Theological Education in a New Age," in *Theological Education in the Evangelical Tradition*, eds. D. G. Hart and R. Albert Mohler Jr. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1996).

54.   For example, Antonio, Astin, and Cress, "Community Service in Higher Education" (see n. 2); Belcheir, "What Predicts Perceived Gains in Learning and in Satisfaction" (see n. 2); De La Rosa, "Making a Difference" (see n. 2); Ada Demb and Amy Wade, "Reality Check: Faculty Involvement in Outreach and Engagement," *The Journal of Higher Education* 83, no. 3 (2012); Hu and Kuh, "Being (Dis)Engaged in Educationally Purposeful Activities" (see n. 2); Hurtado, "Linking Diversity and Educational Purpose" (see n. 2); Maruyama and Moreno, "University Faculty Views" (see n. 1); Milem, "Increasing Diversity Benefits" (see n. 1); Laird, "Measuring the Diversity Inclusivity of College Courses" (see n. 2); Laird and Engberg, "Establishing Differences between Diversity Requirements and Other Courses" (see n. 2); O'Meara, "Motivation for Faculty Community Engagement" (see n. 2); Park and Denson, "Attitudes and Advocacy" (see n. 2); Umbach, "The Contribution of Faculty of Color to Undergraduate Education" (see n. 2); Wade and Demb, "A Conceptual Model to Explore Faculty Community Engagement" (see n. 2).

55.   Laird, "Measuring the Diversity Inclusivity," 574 (see n. 7); James A. Banks, *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2007).

56.   Carole L. Lund, "The Nature of White Privilege in the Teaching and Training of Adults," *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, no. 125 (2010): 23.

57.   Hurtado, "Linking Diversity and Educational Purpose," 189 (see n. 2).

58.   Laird, "Measuring the Diversity Inclusivity," 574 (see n. 7).

59.   Lingenfelter and Lingenfelter, *Teaching Cross-Culturally*, 20–1 (see n. 45).

60.   Smith, *Learning from the Stranger* (see n. 20).

61.   Deborah L. Bainer and Jeffrey W. Peck, "Effective Teaching and Multicultural Religious Education," in *Multicultural Religious Education*, ed. Barbara Wilkerson (Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1997), 309.

62.   For example, Jean S. Phinney et al., "Ethnic Identity, Immigration, and Well-Being: An Interactional Perspective," *Journal of Social Issues* 57, no. 3 (Fall 2001).

63.   Sleeter and Grant, *Making Choices for Multicultural Education* (see n. 12).

64.   For example, Esterline, "Multicultural Theological Education and Leadership" (see n. 29).

65.   For example, J. Kameron Carter, *Race: A Theological Account* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008); Laurie M. Cassidy and Alexander Mikulich, eds., *Interrupting White Privilege: Catholic Theologians Break the Silence* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2007); Elizabeth Conde-Frazier, "Prejudice and Conversion" in *A Many Colored Kingdom: Multicultural Dynamics for Spiritual Formation*, eds. Elizabeth Conde-Frazier, S. Steve

Kang, and Gary A. Parrett (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2004); Miguel A. De La Torre, *Reading the Bible from the Margins* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2002); Michael O. Emerson and Christian Smith, *Divided by Faith: Evangelical Religion and the Problem of Race in America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); Edward Gilbreath, *Reconciliation Blues: A Black Evangelical's Inside View of White Christianity* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2010); Hearn, "Positionality, Intersectionality, and Power" (see n. 36); Willie James Jennings, *The Christian Imagination: Theology and the Origins of Race* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010); Kwok, "The Global Challenge" (see n. 35); Priest and Nieves, *This Side of Heaven* (see n. 23); Rah, *The Next Evangelicalism* (see n. 6); Cornel West, *Race Matters* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2001).

66.   Charles R. Foster, "Diversity in Theological Education," *Theological Education* 38, no. 2 (2002): 29.

67.   For example, Esterline, "Multicultural Theological Education" (see n. 29); Mary E. Hess and Stephen D. Brookfield, "'How Can White Teachers Recognize and Challenge Racism?' Acknowledging Collusion and Learning an Aggressive Humility," in *Teaching Reflectively in Theological Contexts: Promises and Contradictions*, eds. Mary E. Hess and Stephen D. Brookfield (Malabar, FL: Krieger, 2008); Elaine A. Robinson, *Race and Theology* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2012).

68.   For example, Virginia Lieson Brereton, *Training God's Army: The American Bible School, 1880–1940* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1990); Charles R. Foster et al., *Educating Clergy: Teaching Practices and Pastoral Imagination* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006).

69.   Foster et al., *Educating Clergy*.

Loving the Questions: Finding Food for the Future of Theological Education in the Lexington Seminar

Mary Hess
Luther Seminary

ABSTRACT: *Although it ran for more than ten years and involved more than 200 faculty from forty-four ATS member schools, the findings of the Lexington Seminar have not been engaged as robustly as they could be in facing current challenges. This essay collates the experiences of the Lexington Seminar with recent educational literature to suggest a range of options in faculty development for meeting the adaptive challenges facing schools, particularly in terms of shifting dynamics of authority, authenticity, and agency.*

> . . . have patience with everything unresolved in your heart
> and try to love *the questions themselves*
> as if they were locked rooms
> or books written in a very foreign language.
> Don't search for the answers, which could not be given to you now,
> because you would not be able to live them.
> And the point is, to live everything. *Live* the questions now.
> Perhaps then, someday far in the future, you will gradually,
> without even noticing it,
> live your way into the answer.[1]

This is the epigraph that Seabury-Western Theological Seminary used for the report it wrote out of its experience in the Lexington Seminar. It is an apt way to begin this essay, too, for in reflecting upon what theological education looks like today—let alone what it might need to look like in the future—we discover that there are more questions than answers, more change than stasis, and infinite opportunities to *live into* our questions rather than to close them off too quickly. Such a situation calls for what Glenda Eoyang and Royce Holladay describe as "adaptive action."[2]

My own contribution to this challenge rests at the heart of the discussion about teaching and learning, and in this essay I hope to offer a perspective drawn from recent research in theological schools as well as specific dynamics to which we must attend as we move forward. Toward that end, I will be drawing primarily upon the experiential, participatory action research embodied in the work of the Lexington Seminar, a Lilly-funded project that ran from 1998 to 2008. The annals of that project remain immediately accessible on its website, but few scholars have employed those data in their work. The project involved more than forty-four theological seminaries and university divinity schools committed to dealing with issues of teaching and learning

in theological education. Each year, as many as five schools were invited to participate in a weeklong seminar held in June for teams composed of the six members of the faculty and administration of each institution. Following the June seminar, each of the participating schools was invited to submit a grant proposal for an educational project that addressed the issue in theological teaching and learning identified by the whole faculty. At the end of each two-year cycle, a joint consultation for the schools was held to reflect on their projects and a final report was written, which is also available on the project website.

Teaching in theological education

We are only two decades into the renewed discussion about teaching in higher education that began with the initial publication of Ernest Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered.* Discussion of the role of teaching within theological education is even younger, although there is more of a center to the discussion—not yet a consensus, but at least common ground is emerging. Vincent Cushing, for example, in his opening forward to the book published out of the Keystone Conferences, writes,

> Educators are coming to the realization that their work is more about learning than teaching. While teaching is a constituent element in any good education, it is the *process* of teaching that has reformulated the calculus of education. Process involves the awareness of students' cultural backgrounds, the recognition of the experiential as well as the cognitional, and the evaluation of whether real learning actually occurred. All this places the emphasis squarely on learning.[3]

A concern for *process* in teaching, not simply the *content* of what is to be shared, emerges from biblical reflection on the topic as well. Rolf Jacobson notes that

> the people that formed the Bible did not differentiate between different types of knowledge in the same ways that we moderns do. . . .
>   . . . biblical concern for the corporate good must crowd in on us when we are thinking about education. Education must be about the common good.[4]

This concern for the common good is not simply pragmatic, however; it is an essential consequence of the deep recognition of relationality that pervades the biblical witness, the felt sense that our Bible tells us of God's ongoing relationship with God's people. Melchert notes that

> congruence between the *what* and the *how* (content and method) is pedagogically striking in Jesus' teaching and in the Gospel texts. Jesus talked of the kingdom, the compassionate

and just rule of God, what it was like to be a subject, and he enacted that in his interactions with people. The texts not only portray Jesus' sending apprentice-disciples to do as he did but effectively invite later reader-learners to find themselves sent as well.[5]

Similar points are being made by theologians who argue, as does Parker Palmer, that "we know as we are known."[6] Elizabeth Conde-Frasier writes that "knowledge is an activity in which the totality of one's being is engaged, not only the mind. . . . Full comprehension is manifested in action that corresponds to the relationship apprehended."[7] A recent book titled *To Teach, To Delight, and To Move*, centers on "theological education in a post-Christian world," claiming in its very title this integrative and congruent theological claim.[8]

Within the educational disciplines more generally, a host of studies and theories point to the essentially relational character of learning, at the same time urging that teaching and learning not be understood as either relativist or instrumental in character. Jane Vella's very popular text on adult learning is titled *Learning to Listen, Learning to Teach*; while the classic text on curriculum design by Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe, *Understanding by Design*, notes that there are six facets to understanding: not only are explanation, interpretation, and application part of the process, but equally important aspects of understanding are perspective, empathy, and self-knowledge—these latter three particularly implicated in relational forms of knowing.[9] Educators continue to draw on the work of researchers in a variety of disciplines. Within psychology Robert Kegan's work is central, and his constructive developmental theorizing also argues for an intensely relational, contextual aspect to learning.[10] Sociologists working within education have also argued in this vein. University of Chicago professors Anthony Bryk and Barbara Schneider, for example, studied years of educational reform within the K-12 public school system in Chicago and concluded that *relational trust* is the key predictive element for whether reform would be successful and sustainable.[11] Even neuroscientists have begun to use the language of emotions and relationality to describe the complex processes by which synapses fire to create pathways of memory and learning. As James Zull points out,

> Presenting our subject as stories . . . is a way to help the learner become emotionally engaged. But there is more to effective teaching than how we present the *subject.* Specifically, there is how we present *ourselves.* And there may be no more important part of teaching than the emotional reaction of a student to a teacher.[12]

Teaching is fundamentally concerned with the process of learning. Learning is fundamentally a relational, even spiritual practice.[13] There is widespread agreement about these two assertions within the educational literatures. But do theological educators accept these assertions and grasp their implications for teaching in the theological context? There are signs that more and more

of our colleagues are, in fact, moving in that direction. The books produced out of the Lexington Seminars, *Practical Wisdom* and *Revitalizing Practice,* and out of the Keystone Conferences, *Educating Leaders for Ministry*, are eloquent arguments for such an understanding. Three other recent books, *The Scope of Our Art: The Vocation of the Theological Teacher, Educating Clergy,* and the book I noted earlier, *To Teach, To Delight, and To Move*, engage these issues directly.

Yet haunting all of these books are echoes of other definitions of teaching and learning, other, perhaps more technical or instrumental, conceptions of the role of the theological educator. At the same time as our wider cultural spaces are shifting dramatically, responding to huge changes not only in the mixing of cultures as peoples move across vast distances of terrain and religion, but also to huge technological shifts that make it possible to shift time and space in brand new ways, theological institutions are clinging ever more tightly to disciplinary categories and pedagogical methods that were developed centuries before and which grew out of contexts that no longer exist.[14]

Ronald Heifetz has developed a distinctive way of framing this dilemma by distinguishing between a "technical" challenge and an "adaptive" challenge.[15] A technical challenge is one that can be met well by a specific technical skill. When you have a broken wrist, for example, the best course of action might be to find the most technically skilled doctor you can and then to sit as still as possible while you allow that doctor to set your wrist. An adaptive challenge, on the other hand, demands active participation in seeking a solution and generally requires a shift in practice. It is not usually possible to solve an adaptive problem without changing, without evolving in some way. Learning that you have developed a chronic illness demands of the patient not only a technically proficient doctor but also one who is skilled in supporting the active changes in behavior that the patient will need to adopt to cope with the illness.

As Heifetz, Kegan, and others note, we are currently living in times that present a wide assortment of *adaptive* challenges. This is as true within theological education as outside of it, but it is perhaps not as thoroughly understood. As theological educators face such challenges, many teachers (not to mention institutions) have grasped at what might be termed "technical" solutions, rather than seeking to engage the underlying, adaptive challenges.

This is the point in the conversation at which the Lexington Seminar research is so pertinent. I am disappointed that the work of this Lilly-funded project has not been more widely assimilated into theological education. The Lexington Seminar ran from 1998 to 2008 and involved teams of educators and administrators from forty-four ATS Commission-accredited schools. Aimed at engaging the entire culture of a school, rather than individual faculty, the Lexington Seminar asked schools to write stories that evoked rather than detailed specific challenges they were facing. It then used those stories as a focus for shared and concerted work on those challenges. The project's narrative approach created a more open-ended and flexible process, which in turn provided more room for adaptive challenges to be identified and engaged. The rest of this essay will focus on what has been learned about teaching from the forty-four Protestant and Reformed seminaries

and divinity schools, more than 200 committed teachers, and ten years of work to be found in the project files of the Lexington Seminar. Three adaptive challenges emerge in particular: contestation over authority, growing from that contestation a renewed quest for authenticity, and growing out of that quest a compelling need to shift understandings of agency.[16]

Theological knowledges in postmodern contexts, for instance, are not knowledges accepted *a priori* or simply through assertion. They are knowledges that must build their authority and credibility through the development of authentic agency. You can see such challenges in the numerous stories of teachers in the Lexington project schools who can no longer assume that their students begin from the same base of knowledge and with similar expectations as in the past. Rather, teachers must build credibility with students—credibility of the knowledges shared, credibility of their own authority as researchers and teachers, credibility of the impact of their knowledge for the contexts in which the students will be exploring and utilizing it.

The recognition that authority grows out of credibility built from authentic experience arises intimately out of the current dynamics of formation within theological schools. Indeed, authenticity was not, until recently, an issue within higher education more generally, let alone theological education specifically. But as numerous studies point out, formation is increasingly the element of theological education that differentiates it from higher education more generally.[17] While formation is not easily nor universally defined—as the Carnegie Foundation study notes, "almost no one, even in Catholic communities who use this terminology most frequently, is truly satisfied with formation language"[18]—the language of formation is ubiquitous and nearly always carries affective elements to it. Where Wiggins and McTighe speak of the elements of understanding as being "explanation, interpretation, application, perspective, empathy, and self-knowledge,"[19] it is generally the latter three that come into play in the context of formation. All three are woven into what is meant by the phrase "authentic expression" that is used so often in these contexts.

Finally, embedded in many of these school reports, in the experiences of many seminaries in this era of theological education, is deep and abiding tension over the "ends" of their endeavor. For what purposes do such schools teach? David Tiede speaks of this dilemma in terms of the tensions seminaries face in abiding within conflicting images of themselves as abbey, as academy, or as apostolate.[20] If the schools themselves are struggling with these tensions, the challenge becomes even more specific and pointed for individual teachers. The incentives for scholarship built into the *academy* model of a seminary dovetail well with the demands of specific academic guilds but do not rest easily with the challenges of translating scholarship into units of meaning sequenced well for learning. Similarly, the demands of translating critical analysis into a frame of engagement that supports prayer and meditation (that is, the *abbey* element) are not easily met. Finally, the task of preparing students for an *apostolate*, for sending them into contexts in which they are leading communities of faith in mission, often does not align well with the more distanced objectivity of academic scholarship.

The challenges: Authority, authenticity, agency

The middle section of this paper looks at several of the challenges specifically identified by schools in the areas of authority, authenticity, and agency, collating their experiences with the more general conclusions of the educational literatures. Then the final section of this paper considers a range of options of faculty development to meet challenges in each of these areas.

The adaptive challenge of shifting notions of authority

What constitutes authority in a given setting is clearly bound up with philosophical discussions of epistemology. How do we know? How do we know that we know? What constitutes knowing? These are the underlying questions that well up in the midst of more limited debates over who has authority in a given classroom, or what constitutes an "A" paper vs. a "C" one.[21] If our larger cultural contexts were not immersed in such vivid debates, it's unlikely that they would spill over into classroom settings in quite the same way. Yet it is the larger cultural context that presses into theological classrooms and shifts teaching dilemmas from simple, more technical choices of which particular text to use or which kind of lecture to prepare, to a much larger and more adaptive challenge of what it means to *know* religiously and how one might prepare to lead a community of knowing. The schools in the Lexington Seminar voiced this challenge in a number of ways.

Institutional DNA. Over and over again amongst the reports and narratives comes striking language about the shifting nature of theological authority in denominational contexts. Whether it was Calvin Theological Seminary pondering the role and shape of reformed theology in its current incarnation, Colgate Rochester Crozer Divinity School struggling to understand the ways in which its social gospel heritage remains active, or Anabaptist Mennonite Biblical Seminary rethinking what missional leadership is, many of the schools in the Lexington Seminar felt challenged by the necessity of moving beyond simply transferring their traditional heritage to, first, seeking to understand it critically, and then making it "come alive" through justifying it to their students.[22]

No longer is it enough simply to transfer and hone specialized information between members of a community who have been previously socialized into that community's practices. Rather, the teaching/learning task is now one of simultaneously introducing students to the deeper rationales and elements of a theological tradition at the same time as they must also be introduced to effective ways to critique and transform it. Many of the schools in the Lexington Seminar refer to this teaching/learning challenge as introducing students to critical thinking.[23]

Student body composition. Underlying this challenge of needing to rethink, retrieve, and reclaim theological traditions is the shifting nature of student bodies in theological education. Where previously a faculty could assume that students were devoting their full-time attention to learning the content a faculty had determined was necessary, now students span a spectrum from full-time, young, single students who reside in dorms on the

seminary's campus, to students studying full time *and* working part time, to students studying part time *and* working full time *while* parenting, to students studying part time while living and working at a huge geographic remove (this last made possible through digital technologies and distributed learning frameworks). Most if not all of the schools in the project shared their struggles with supporting students from multiple backgrounds, but the narratives of Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, and Lancaster Theological Seminary are particularly pointed on this topic.

Teaching across such diversity (which is further stretched if you take into account the shifting racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity of student bodies) requires more than simply adding a few courses to the required curriculum. Most often it requires radical rethinking of the entire curriculum itself—again, an adaptive challenge that forces faculty to rethink much of what they know about teaching and learning. Developing the relational competence necessary for teaching across such vast diversity is difficult, and many schools reported that the Lexington Seminar was one of the first times they could devote any concentrated attention to the challenge.

Faculty training and background. Changes in epistemology and changes in student bodies—these in turn lead to yet another challenge that schools in the Lexington Seminar identified: lack of specific training and expertise in teaching. Faculty generally prepare for their roles as teachers in seminary settings by studying for and achieving a PhD in a specific field of study. Few doctoral programs—although more than there used to be—provide specific instruction in teaching methods. Thus faculty learn how to teach by observing their own teachers, and their own teachers in doctoral programs are generally focused on undertaking original research and initiating their students into the practices of such research. Faculty understanding of how one acquires and maintains authority in educational settings, for instance, is most directly linked to research methodologies and the criteria for authority that are developed within academic guilds.

Students, on the other hand, are most often preparing for pastoral ministry in congregational or nonprofit settings. While credible research results carry some authority in pastoral settings, it is far more often the case that pastoral leaders need to be effective "shepherds, builders, and gardeners," to use Scott Cormode's terminology.[24] That is, they need to be capable of sensitive human interactions, they need to be adept at structural engagement, and they need to be agile interpreters of current contexts. Few doctoral programs prepare their graduates well for the process of making research accessible, and fewer still prepare their graduates for the hard task of building authority through the nurturing of learning community.

Thus, yet another adaptive challenge arising out of the broader category of authority lies in helping seminary faculty learn to be adept teachers in this changing context.[25]

Broader issues of cultural epistemological shifts. While I've already mentioned some of the epistemological shifts that underlie these challenges, many of the schools in the Lexington Seminar specifically identified one cluster of

such shifts as having to do with the challenges raised by racism in the US context.[26] Given the ubiquity of "white privilege" in the US context, theological school faculties have begun to cultivate deliberately what Brookfield and Hess have termed an "aggressive humility" in their teaching, and that, again, is an element of adaptation pertaining to authority.[27]

Other schools have worked on understanding the specific challenges raised by students coming from largely international contexts. As Virginia Theological Seminary noted, international students bring with them a variety of ways of responding to teachers and often live within a complicated set of differences in relation to what is considered authoritative in their studies.[28]

As faculties struggle to figure out how to teach amidst such conflicting demands, they often reach for technical "fixes"—adding more required courses to the curriculum, adding more noncredit requirements, struggling with one another about grading issues—without digging more deeply into the adaptive challenges, seeking solutions that have sufficient ambiguity and flexibility to truly meet the needs of their students and the communities they will eventually lead.

The adaptive challenge of competing ways of defining authenticity

Authenticity as a category grows out of notions of genuineness, of affective experiences that have resonance, of faithfulness and factuality.[29] In the theological setting, it is a term that has profound epistemological consequences. Is human experience an appropriate criteria of theological knowing, for example? To what extent is authenticity even appropriately used in theological formulations? Yet while theological faculty will most often engage the term philosophically, our students—and often the communities from which they come and to which they will be sent—hear the term in profoundly affective, embodied ways. Ask a professor of worship what constitutes authentic worship and you are likely to receive a response that is based on historical precedent and biblical warrant. Ask a student in our seminaries, or a member of our congregations, what constitutes authentic worship and you are more likely to receive a description of emotional response to specific forms of music or of visual or embodied gesture. The differences are profound and often lead to some of the most difficult conflicts in seminary settings. The schools in the Lexington Seminar often worked with this theme, engaging it in terms of reflection and experiential learning.

Integration and formation issues. One direct element of facing the adaptive challenge of what constitutes authenticity grows out of differing understandings of what constitutes "integration" or "formation" for our students. Several schools in the Lexington Seminar focused their work on this question, Bethel Seminary and United Theological Seminary in particular. One of the more painful conflicts arises here between what a faculty understands as integration, and what students see that term conveying. Some of the conflict is developmental in nature, and both of these schools have developed substantial processes for engaging the developmental growth they seek to support in their students.[30]

Other faculties have found themselves divided on the definitions of these words, and many of the Lexington Seminar projects used project funds to create retreats and other settings in which theological faculties could seek to understand the many ways in which they defined these terms, and then sought to teach toward such practices.[31]

Time stress. Teachers and students alike agree that *time* is a crucial element of authentic practice; time for adequate experience, time for appropriate reflection, time for serious study. Indeed, one overwhelming impression upon reading the Lexington Seminar project files is that schools simply wanted to duplicate the Lexington Seminar process by providing time for their faculty to have generative conversations in more nurturing contexts than is typical for seminary faculties.

Here the challenge for authenticity is perhaps most explicitly about having the time and space necessary to support authentic practice. As noted early in this essay, teaching is no longer understood primarily as a process of delivering content, but learning how to focus on content within relational structures is not something most faculty have much experience with. Creating room for the reflection and learning that leads to appropriate change takes deep trust; developing such trust takes real time, and time is in short supply at most seminaries. As the narratives from Church Divinity School of the Pacific and General Theological Seminary make clear, this is a very pointed challenge.[32]

Media shifts. Finally, while no school's project focused only, or even primarily, on media shifts in the surrounding cultural contexts (cf. Campbell's work on "networked religion"), there were elements of these shifts present across many of the narratives and reports. From the student in Wesley's narrative who was surfing the net while in a lecture, to the student who refused to check her on-campus mailbox at Church Divinity School of the Pacific, to the faculty member at Luther who loosed his blunt comment to the whole faculty email list, rather than to the specific colleague to whom he intended it to go, media shifts in communicative practice are present throughout the teaching/learning landscape. The presenting dilemma may be one of attention—to what does one "pay" one's attention?—but the underlying challenge is rooted in epistemological shifts that form around issues of authenticity.[33]

The adaptive challenge of agency

In many ways, considering questions of authority leads directly to issues of authenticity, and those questions, in turn, lead to issues of agency, of how to *put into practice* what seminaries are about. Indeed, the issue is even more bluntly one of *to what end* are seminaries educating their graduates?

When faculties were drawn primarily from people who grew up within their respective denominations, going to school together, entering the pastorate together, going back to graduate school, returning to the seminary as faculty where they began as students, *agency* was not a very visible concern. There was a clear process by which people moved along a career path, and there was often tight relationality between the seminary and the communities of faith that seminary graduates led. Funding structures reinforced that close relationship, with churches and denominations largely footing the bill of pastor training, and thus receiving back from the seminaries trained pastors who entered as church members sent them.

All of these structures are shifting and changing in ways that are not always evident and toward ends not always clearly defined. In addition, individual faculty face all manner of difficult questions in relation to agency across the seasons of their teaching life. Early in one's career, agency often focuses on developing a focus of study that can be made one's own, while later in the process, the focus might be more on integration across disciplines.[34]

Structural shifts. Many of the school reports in the Lexington Seminar databank speak of the dramatic shifts schools have faced over several decades as the cultural role of "pastor" has shifted, with fewer people wanting to enter that role and fewer churches existing to fund and call pastors. Several of the schools have faced abrupt structural shifts, moving either away from the universities to which they were originally attached (as at Phillips Theological Seminary) or toward university connections (as at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Palmer Theological Seminary, and Bethel Seminary)—a trend that has only intensified in the years since the Seminar concluded. These shifts have dramatically changed the structural contexts in which faculty teach, often shifting incentive systems either *toward* more academic scholarship or *away* from it into church practice. In both cases it is the shift that is difficult, the change which requires new practices of teaching. Where once one's role was to preach effectively and teach students how to do so, now preaching professors may face pressure to publish in scholarly journals, or vice versa. The adaptive challenge here becomes one of understanding how one is to practice one's vocation as teacher in a context in which the very ground has shifted. If previously one's worth and practice as a teacher was substantially reinforced by frequent pulpit supply across the church, and now one's worth and practice rests on guild recognition, how does that complicate or support what you do in the classroom? Or, similarly, if previously one's worth and practice was directly linked to the guild's reception of one's research, but now there are explicit incentives for impacting the church more directly, how do you adapt to such a change?

Graduate vocational outcomes. Underlying and in many ways *underscoring* the structural challenge is the shifting nature of student bodies in theological education. Increasingly, students come from a diversity of backgrounds and previous preparation and are heading toward not simply pulpit ministries but a vast assortment of extended pastoral ministry settings. Here the teaching challenge is not simply discerning how a tradition needs to be represented, but in what ways students are to be prepared *to lead* within that tradition.

Similarly, as more and more students are drawn toward MA programs—many of which are much shorter and do not require the same kinds of candidacy elements demanded of MDiv programs—faculties find themselves having to struggle with ways to adequately differentiate their teaching. A class on the Pauline correspondence, for instance, may contain students with fluency in *koine* Greek and an interest in moving toward doctoral-level work, while at the same time containing students who are passionate about supporting ministries with youth and who have little attention for original languages—and these are just the MA students. Most seminaries do not have

large enough faculties to support courses that are specialized to fit specific master's degree programs but, instead, must field courses that fit the needs of multiple degree programs. Schools as diverse as Gordon Conwell Theological Seminary, Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, General Theological Seminary, Bethel Seminary, and Luther Seminary are all facing this specific challenge.

Media shifts. Here again, media shifts in communicative practice become relevant. A teacher who learned how to teach through lecturing can find it very difficult to learn how to teach in online environments. A teacher who is most comfortable using an overhead projector suddenly feels stifled and overwhelmed by a mandatory shift to a digital projector. A teacher used to providing evaluation feedback upon a hard copy of a student paper now finds herself or himself using electronic commenting tools to offer feedback. A teacher who circulates small group work across multiple groups in one hour of classtime, now feels herself forced to spend hours reading small group responses on a web-based course platform, just to stay in touch. It is easy to become caught up in these difficulties, but the real challenge is *not* primarily the technical one (how to use a specific piece of equipment), but rather the adaptive one of discerning how to be most effective, how to *practice* teaching in these shifting cultural contexts, how best to have *agency* as a teacher in a learning community.

Effective responses

The challenges raised are difficult and perduring, but the Lexington Seminar schools have been enormously creative and innovative in their responses to these challenges, and it is to those responses that I turn now. Perhaps the first and most important conclusion to share is that all three of these adaptive challenges—questions of authority, issues of authenticity, dilemmas of agency—are often interwoven in complex ways. The schools in the Lexington Seminar who have best met such challenges have sought, wherever possible, to do so in ways that meet multiple purposes, that draw on existing institutional pressures, and that provide multiple opportunities for engagement. Hence, over and over throughout the reports, successful schools note that the Lexington Seminar arrived at an important moment—just as they were *also* embarking on a self-study for accreditation, or had decided to revise their curriculum, or were being joined to a larger university.

Three overarching strategies stand out, and we'll consider specific instances within each. In engaging questions of authority, schools have found it most effective to dig into their institutional histories and founding documents to trace solutions to authority challenges that draw on institutional DNA in creative ways, often reframing what had been intractable debates. In responding to challenges of authenticity, schools implemented a series of steps that might overall be termed *reflective practice*. And in confronting challenges of agency, the schools concluded that challenges must be understood as *cultural* in scope, and thus any interventions must also be *cultural* in nature.

Reframing authority through drawing on institutional DNA

When it comes to questions of authority, teachers in the Lexington Seminar schools have found a number of creative ways to respond to the adaptive challenge embedded in authority that draw on the institutional DNA of their schools for effectiveness.[35]

Learning-centered and/or problem-based pedagogies. One method has been to make very explicit changes in overall pedagogical strategies. Palmer Theological Seminary, for instance, has systematically shifted its entire institutional focus toward learning-centered pedagogies.[36] Drawing on the "Baptist DNA" of its mission statement—"the Whole Gospel for the Whole World through Whole Persons"—the seminary has developed a list of learning outcomes it prepares its students to accomplish. This list drives everything in learning at the seminary—from the development of overall curriculum, to specific assignments in individual courses. Such a shift makes transparent the expectations the school has for the learning the students will engage and at the same time both requires and affords the faculty an opportunity to assess to what extent their teaching indeed leads to such outcomes. The need to reframe their curricular work in a way that very explicitly focused on "whole persons" was particularly important for this shift in pedagogy, as faculty began to discover that their previous modes of teaching had very little impact on the specific learning outcomes they sought. Other schools that are beginning to implement learning-outcome-based practices include Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia; Methodist Theological School in Ohio; Luther Seminary's children, youth, and family program; and United Theological Seminary.

Yet another shift in pedagogical strategy comes under the title of "problem-based learning."[37] Few schools have been able to make the kind of whole-scale move that Palmer Theological Seminary has made, but many have chosen to use the Lexington Seminar to bring such ideas to their faculties through a variety of workshops and retreats.

Shifts in feedback and evaluation for students. The Methodist Theological School in Ohio began its Lexington Seminar project by describing faculty concern with their current processes of grading student papers. In the course of several retreats and a large project involving statistical self-study and further research, that faculty began to reflect back on the historical roots of their institution. Their memories of the innovative educational leaders who founded Methesco inspired them to rethink their strategies for evaluating student work. Rather than simply rewriting their grading policy, they sought to invite students to become more active learners. They have created a system in which students receive a paragraph evaluation from every course that they take. These evaluations, in turn, are gathered and read by student advisors and form the basis of a midprogram assessment that comes shortly after students complete their first full year complement of courses. Faculty are frequently invited when considering the broad group of students, to note any who ought to receive developmental support of some kind. While the process may seem cumbersome—and indeed, in one way requires more direct engagement with student evaluation than did their previous system—it is a process the faculty

has received as being worth more than the extra work it creates. As it draws deeply on founding goals for the institution, it has also drawn the faculty members more closely together in renewing their commitment to being an intellectual resource for their whole region. Students, in turn, have clear and precise information on how they are—or are not—progressing through the curriculum, along with specific resources for improving their progress.[38]

Make explicit faculty positions on disputed issues. One of the more difficult elements of disputes over authority has been the shifting interpretations and understandings that arise as schools seek to reform and renew their founding commitments. Many of the Lexington Seminar schools wrote narratives and developed projects that ended up engaging—whether intentionally or not—previously tacit conflicts among faculty over competing interpretations of such commitments. As faculties diversify—denominational faculties, for instance, often now have members from other churches—complications arise over how to teach in settings in which there is not faculty agreement.[39] Luther Seminary's narrative, for instance, used the metaphor of a supertanker to talk about how a change in direction began long ago and only becomes visible now.

Many of the Lexington Seminar schools found themselves using their projects to explore more deeply such conflicts, ultimately leading to faculty learning to "teach the conflict" more effectively than simply delivering their own position in isolation. Such a process required the development of faculty trust.

Implementing reflective practice

One of the more powerful strategies for engaging the adaptive challenge posed by shifting notions of authenticity is that of reflective practice. Indeed, the very concept of adaptive challenge is met in the literature with corresponding work on the development of reflective practice.[40] If there is one overwhelming similarity throughout the Lexington Seminar reports, it is the experience of schools seeking to create more room for generative reflection.

The Lexington Seminar process of engaging groups of faculty members in extended conversation over school narratives and then providing sufficient, even generous space for relaxation and reflection, was nearly universally experienced as generative. School after school wrote projects that sought to replicate, in some way, the process of the Lexington Seminar. Most of the schools developed retreats that were held off site at more comfortable places than were usually accessible for the schools. Some schools translated the retreat format into multiple special dinner engagements, and others used project funds to provide release time for specific faculty to do reseach on behalf of the whole.

Yet reflective practice is not simply, or even solely, about faculty members reflecting on their own vocations within theological education (although that is, in itself, a laudable enterprise).[41] It also has very specific elements within the process of supporting learning. Much has been written about reflective practice in teaching contexts, but here are several elements created by Lexington Seminar schools.

Developing portfolio processes

Several schools have either begun, or further refined, a portfolio process of development and assessment with their students. United Theological Seminary's narrative, for instance, expressed deep frustration with its then current process of an integrative exam. It has since developed a multilevel process that has students keeping an integrative notebook, writing a spiritual chronicle, and participating in lunchtime forums in which faculty members share their own spiritual journeys. These elements are then, in turn, added to the portfolio that students keep over the course of their time in the degree program.[42]

Implementing critical reflection processes. Faculty members at Palmer Theological Seminary have built into all of their courses and highlighted on their syllabi a variety of reflection practices that help students and faculty to stay clearly focused on the learning outcomes the school intends and, in the process, to develop and shape critical reflection capabilities.

Another example growing out of the Lexington Seminar comes from the faculty at Luther Seminary who have instituted the use of the critical incident inquiry form in their classes. This process, developed by Stephen Brookfield, asks students to reflect on their experiences *within* a class session in terms of engagement, distance, affirmation, confusion, and surprise.[43] Their responses are then, in turn, summarized by the professor who reflects on her or his own learning from the process.

Inviting faith journeys into public storying. Many school faculties found themselves first in retreats, and then later in more public contexts, sharing and learning from one another's stories of journeys in faith. United Theological Seminary, for instance, implemented a series of lunch time discussions in which faculty members shared their own stories. As one faculty member put it: "our students always knew we had faith, they just didn't have any idea what that meant!" In several instances at other schools, emeriti faculty were invited back to share their own stories, and these stories, in turn, were placed in the context of the institutional history—directly exposing, and in some cases reclaiming, institutional DNA that had been lost or forgotten.

Recognizing and shaping cultural interventions

The strongest message coming through the Lexington Seminar schools with regard to the adaptive challenge involved with agency and teaching is the recognition that schools are undergoing profound cultural changes, and those changes require explicitly cultural responses.[44] Many of the schools remarked upon the need to shift practices in relation to pedagogy, and those changes needed to be system-wide—explicit interventions in school *culture*. Hence, in many cases, there was need to draw upon institutional DNA and to build change into existing dynamics.

Over and over again schools wrote about the gift of the Lexington Seminar being the gift of time and reflection to layer over and under and around existing pressures and assignments. Many of the schools were in some part of the reaccreditation process—either embarking on a self-study or having just concluded one and thinking about its implications. The project afforded them the time and space necessary to be more present to such processes than they had

been able to be in the past. Other schools were in some place on the spectrum with relation to curriculum revision, and the Lexington Seminar gave them needed motivation as well as concrete conceptual frameworks (often, the writing of the narrative) in which to engage deep questions of mission and goals.

Faculty reflection on teaching and learning. I've already mentioned the extent to which time for faculty reflection proved essential in most of the Lexington Seminar projects. Faculties facing teaching challenges often resort to the "technical fix" of curriculum revision, rather than the deeper work of engaging teaching dilemmas. Prominent in the task of doing that deeper work is the development of sufficient trust on a faculty's part to engage in real reflection on the issue at hand. Faculty retreats—emphasis on the word *retreat* rather than recreating work in another setting—are one key element Lexington Seminar schools found useful. Recognizing that cultural intervention requires active engagement in a specific faculty culture—which can mean, in this era of faculty retirements, *creation* of a faculty culture—leads to recommending that schools find ways to regularly honor faculty reflection on teaching and learning issues. Faculty retreats are one source of such time, but so, too, are faculty reflection groups, peer collaboration projects, and so on.

Restructuring faculty divisions. One of the more dramatic ways in which Lexington Seminar schools have responded to the teaching/learning challenge of reconfiguring issues of agency in a school culture has been by restructuring the ways in which their faculties convene. Marianne Winkelmes once wrote that "seminary classrooms are perhaps the single most important and most feasible place for formation to occur," and several schools have taken that assertion very seriously and sought to embed integrative work directly in the structuring of faculty practice.[45]

Bethel Seminary, for instance, completely reshaped how its faculty regularly convene from what were more typical divisions into three centers of learning: the Center for Biblical and Theological Foundations, the Center for Transformational Leadership, and the Center for Spiritual and Personal Formation. Each center has its own associate dean, who is in turn responsible for leading the various elements of the curriculum and shaping their accountability structures. Clearly Bethel is quite large as an institution, and this structure make sense for them, where it would not for a smaller school. The point, however, is not the specific configuration but rather the effort to reshape, *structurally* and particularly in terms of accountability, the main elements of its curriculum.

Sharing syllabi. Perhaps a more manageable, smaller first step can be seen across many of the schools in their efforts to reflect in shared ways upon their course syllabi. Many of the Lexington Seminar projects included sessions in which faculty members shared syllabi and reflected on the teaching/learning challenges they were facing. One particularly interesting example of a way to systematize such reflection is in place at Palmer Theological Seminary, where every faculty member files his or her course syllabi a couple of weeks in advance of the first course meeting with the library director. This practice arose in part because doing so allowed the library director to ensure that the

library collection had adequate resources for specific course goals, but it has grown into an opportunity for the library director to reflect in formative ways with the faculty (rather than in summative, employment evaluation terms) on the scope and sequence of what is being taught at the seminary. Thus the specific action—reflecting on course syllabi—has become a part of the larger culture and structures of the seminar.

Hiring practices. One additional element of cultural change in seminary faculties was frequently mentioned in follow-up interviews in relation to school reports: changing the composition of the faculty. Several schools spoke of how important hiring people *into* the faculty who had specific commitments to teaching was, and how much they have changed their job descriptions to reflect their hiring goals. Palmer Theological Seminary, for instance, is lately only hiring faculty who are at least bilingual, if not multilingual. Bethel Seminary requires faculty to teach across various platforms—teaching in regular classrooms, in distributed online classrooms, in their various geographically disparate classrooms, and so on. Luther Seminary includes a sentence about "teaching in an innovative learning environment" in all of its position descriptions. Several other schools that are working on issues of diversity in regard to deconstructing racism also noted the importance of changing faculty culture through hiring when such opportunities arise.

Conclusions

Theological schools are facing enormous amounts of adaptive challenge. The boundaries of such challenges are messy, the parameters for change ambiguous, and the marks of success elusive. Nevertheless the Lexington Seminar schools found multiple ways to engage these challenges, and their experiences point toward paths for other schools to try. To recapitulate briefly, those challenges within teaching and learning—at least as identified by the forty-four schools that participated—include questions of shifting authority, struggles over what constitutes authenticity, and the need to reshape faculty and student practices around agency. In engaging these adaptive challenges of authority, authenticity, and agency, the schools drew on three primary strategies. First, they worked wherever possible to draw in fruitful ways on the institutional DNA of their schools. Second, they sought to implement reflective practice in a multitude of ways across their school's teaching and learning contexts.[46] And third, they kept in mind the profoundly cultural nature of the challenges, and thus built into their strategies responses that took seriously the entirety of the learning environment.

Considered in light of the broader literature on teaching and learning, these schools have accomplished remarkable change. Lee Shulman has outlined a series of principles that characterize communities of learners:

> The subject-matter content to be learned is *generative* . . .
> The learner is an *active* agent in the process . . .
> The learner not only behaves and thinks, but can "go meta"—
>   that is, can *reflectively* turn around on his/her own thought
>   and action . . .

> There is *collaboration* among learners . . .
> Teachers and students share a *passion* for the material . . .
> The process or activity, reflection and collaboration are sup-
> ported, legimated, and nurtured within a *community* or
> *culture* . . .[47]

There is a striking degree of similarity between this list and the "authority, authenticity, agency" elements of the work of the Lexington Seminar schools. Many of these schools have been quite successful in forming communities of learning, and the Shulman principles suggest further directions in which they can continue to grow. And that, of course, is the hope and promise of the Lexington Seminar more generally: that theological schools can continue to grow and learn as they face the many challenges of the contexts they inhabit. Unfortunately, the landscape and environment of theological education at the moment does not privilege the formation of communities of learners. In some ways the pressures of our time push in the precise opposite direction—toward fragmentation, "each school on its own," and faculty competition rather than collaboration. It is my profound hope that by lifting up once again the findings of the Lexington Seminar, faculties and their institutions will be encouraged to turn again to the necessary work of living into these challenges and growing to "love the questions."[48]

Mary Hess is associate professor of educational leadership at Luther Seminary. From 2005 to 2008 she participated in the Lexington Seminar Academic Leadership Mentoring Project.

ENDNOTES

1.   Rainer Marie Rilke, *Letters to a Young Poet*, trans. Stephen Mitchell (New York: Random House, 1984), 34–5; emphasis in original.

2.   Glenda Eoyang and Royce Holladay, *Adaptive Action: Leveraging Uncertainty in Your Organization* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2013).

3.   Vincent Cushing, "Foreward," in *Educating Leaders for Ministry: Issues and Responses*, eds. Victor J. Klimoski, Kevin O'Neil, and Katarina M. Schuth (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2005), v.

4.   Rolf Jacobson, "Biblical Perspectives on Education," in *Journal of Lutheran Ethics* 4, no. 7 (July 2004).

5.   Charles F. Melchert, *Wise Teaching: Biblical Wisdom and Educational Ministry* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998), 264.

6.   While Parker Palmer is not professionally recognized as a theologian, his books certainly speak to pragmatic or practical theology. His small book *To Know As We Are Known: A Spirituality of Education* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1983) is a required text in seminaries across the country within religious education.

7.   Elizabeth Conde-Frasier, *A Many-Colored Kingdom: Multicultural Dynamics for Spiritual Formation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2004), 196.

8.   David S. Cunningham, ed., *To Teach, To Delight, and To Move: Theological Education in a Post-Christian World* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2004).

9.   Jane Vella, *Learning to Listen, Learning to Teach* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997). Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe, *Understanding by Design* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall, 2001).

10.   See both Robert Kegan, *The Evolving Self: Problem and Process in Human Development* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982), and Robert Kegan, *In Over Our Heads: The Mental Demands of Modern Life* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995). For an account of this work that is contextualized within pastoral ministry settings, see Anita Farber-Robertson, *Learning While Leading: Increasing Your Effectiveness in Ministry* (Herndon, VA: Alban Institute, 2000).

11.   Anthony S. Bryk and Barbara Schneider, *Trust in Schools: A Core Resource for Improvement* (Washington, DC: US Department of Education, ERIC, 1996).

12.   James E. Zull, *The Art of Changing the Brain: Enriching the Practice of Teaching by Exploring the Biology of Learning* (Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2002), 230.

13.   See, for instance, Vachel M. Miller and Merle M. Ryan, eds., *Transforming Campus Life: Reflections on Spirituality and Religious Pluralism* (New York: Lang, 2001); Margaret A. Jablonski, ed., *The Implications of Student Spirituality for Student Affairs Practices* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2001); Leona M. English and Marie A. Gillen, *Addressing the Spiritual Dimensions of Adult Learning: What Educators Can Do* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000); Elizabeth J. Tisdell, *Exploring Spirituality and Culture in Adult and Higher Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003); Sherry L. Hoppe and Bruce W. Speck, eds., *Spirituality in Higher Education: New Directions for Teaching and Learning* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005).

14.   The literature on these shifts is widespread. Of particular importance is Heidi Campbell's essay, "Understanding the Relationship between Religion Online and Offline in a Networked Society," in *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 80, no. 1 (Fall 2011): 64–93. Her essay provides a substantial review of current literature. Two essential texts in the wider educational fields are Lee Rainie and Barry Wellman, *Networked: The New Social Operating System* (Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2012) and Douglas Thomas and John Seely Brown, *A New Culture of Learning: Cultivating the Imagination for a World of Constant Change* (Amazon: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2011).

15.   Ronald Heifetz, *Leadership Without Easy Answers* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1994).

16.   Foster et al., quote Wenger's work on identifying three modes of belonging that are involved in communities of practice around learning: "active involvement in mutual processes of negotiation of meaning," "producing new 'images' and generating new relations that become 'constitutive of self,'" and "[aligning] one's engagement in an educational activity with the 'energies, actions, and practices' of something larger" (35). These three, while not the same as "authority, authenticity, and agency," nevertheless are analogous to the themes emerging here. Charles R. Foster, Lisa E. Dahill, Lawrence A. Goleman, Barbara Wang Tolentino, *Educating Clergy: Teaching Practices and Pastoral Imagination* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006).

17.   Stephen Brookfield makes this point directly, in "How Can We Teach Authentically? Reflective Practice in the Theological Classroom," in *Teaching Reflectively in Theological Contexts: Promises and Contradictions*, eds. Mary E. Hess and Stephen D. Brookfield, (Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing, 2008).

18.   Foster et. al. *Educating Clergy,* n. 1, 125.

19.   The rubric they use can be found in their primary text, *Understanding by Design* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall, 2001). It is contextualized within

theological education in Mary E. Hess, *Engaging Technology in Theological Education* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2005) 42–3.

20. Lois Malcolm notes Tiede's formulation in her essay "Teaching as Cultivating Wisdom for a Complex World," in *The Scope of Our Art: The Vocation of the Theological Teacher*, eds. L. Gregory Jones and Stephanie Paulsell (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002), 140.

21. For a good introduction to many of these questions in a theological context, see Hanan A. Alexander, *Reclaiming Goodness: Education and the Spiritual Quest* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001). For a more general introduction within higher education, see Kenneth A. Bruffee, *Collaborative Learning: Higher Education, Interdependence, and the Authority of Knowledge* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993). The classic text by Parker Palmer, *To Know As We Are Known* (see n. 5) is often used to prompt exploration of these issues.

22. References to the projects of individual schools are all drawn from the files of the Lexington Seminar, located online at http://www.lexingtonseminar.org/.

23. In addition to the schools already referenced, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, Ashland Theological Seminary, and Phillips Theological Seminary also engaged these questions in their Lexington Seminar narratives.

24. Scott Cormode, "Multi-Layered Leadership: The Christian Leader as Builder, Shepherd, and Gardener," in *Journal of Religious Leadership* 1, no. 2 (Fall 2002): 69–104.

25. One resource several schools referred to in the context of this challenge is Walter Brueggemann, William C. Placher, and Brian K. Blount, *Struggling with Scripture* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002).

26. Seabury-Western Theological Seminary and the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia named this issue explicitly.

27. Mary E. Hess and Stephen D. Brookfield, "How Can White Teachers Recognize and Challenge Racism? Acknowledging Collusion and Learning an Aggressive Humility," in *Teaching Reflectively in Theological Contexts: Promises and Contradictions* (Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing, 2008). For a broader consideration within higher education, see Frank W. Hale Jr., ed., *What Makes Racial Diversity Work in Higher Education* (Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2004). There is also a brief, but useful, rubric on the spectrum of change in relation to racial justice to be found in Mark Chesler, Amanda Lewis, and James Crowfoot, *Challenging Racism in Higher Education* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2005), figure 8.2, 172–3.

28. See Alan Ka Lun Lai, "Educating Chinese Seminarians in North America: A Cross Cultural Understanding of Teaching and Learning," in *Consensus* 25, no. 1 (1999) 69–92.

29. See, for instance, Jerold Apps, *Teaching From the Heart* (Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing, 1996); Patricia Cranton, *Becoming an Authentic Teacher in Higher Education* (Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing, 2001) and Parker J. Palmer, *The Courage to Teach: Exploring the Inner Landscape of a Teacher's Life* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998).

30. For more on such dilemmas in higher education more generally, see Karen Strom Kitchener and Patricia M. King, *Developing Reflective Judgment: Understanding and Promoting Intellectual Growth and Critical Thinking in Adolescents and Adults* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994).

31. Other schools whose work focused on this challenge included Lexington Theological Seminary and Trinity Evangelical Divinity School.

32. See also Marilla Svinicki, "If learning involves risk-taking, teaching involves trust-building," in *Teaching Excellence* 2, no. 3 (1989) for more on the underlying issues.

33. For more on this topic, see Mary E. Hess, Peter Horsfield, and Adan M. Medrano, eds., *Belief in Media: Cultural Perspectives on Media and Christianity* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Co., 2004), and Mary E. Hess, *Engaging Technology in Theological Education* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2005).

34. A particularly interesting reflection on the issue of individual faculty agency over the lifespan can be found in Anna Neumann, Aimee LaPointe Terosky, and Julie Schell, "Agents of Learning: Strategies for Assuming Agency, for Learning in Tenured Faculty Careers," in *The Balancing Act: Gendered Perspectives in Faculty Roles and Work Lives*, eds. Susan J. Bracken, Jeanie K. Allen, and Diane R. Dean (Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2006).

35. One possible way of reframing "institutional DNA" for schools particularly committed to missional approaches is Robert J. Banks' *Reenvisioning Theological Education: Exploring a Missional Alternative to Current Models* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1999).

36. See Maryellen Weimer, *Learner-Centered Teaching: Five Key Changes to Practice* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2002).

37. An excellent, brief introduction to problem-based learning can be found in Lee S. Shulman, "Problem-Based Learning: The Pedagogies of Uncertainty," in *Teaching as Community Property: Essays on Higher Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004). See also Barbara J. Duch, Susan E. Groh, and Deborah E. Allen, "Why Problem-Based Learning? A Case Study of Institutional Change in Undergraduate Education," in *The Power of Problem-Based Learning: A Practical "How To" for Teaching Undergraduate Courses in Any Discipline*, eds. Barbara J. Duch, Susan E. Groh, and Deborah E. Allen (Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2001).

38. There has been an enormous flowering of work on classroom assessment. See, for instance, Thomas A. Angelo, ed., *Classroom Assessment and Research: An Update on Uses, Approaches, and Research Findings,* New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 75 (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998); Susan M. Brookhart, *The Art and Science of Classroom Assessment: The Missing Part of Pedagogy.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 27, no. 1 (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000); Lorin W. Anderson, *Classroom Assessment: Enhancing the Quality of Teacher Decision Making* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates, 2002); Susan M. Butler and Nancy D. McMunn, *A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Assessment* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006).

39. Stephen D. Brookfield's *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995) is an excellent resource in the midst of this kind of faculty discussion, as is his book, cowritten with Stephen Preskill, *Discussion as a Way of Teaching: Tools and Techniques for Democratic Classrooms* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005). See also Nicholas C. Burbules, *Dialogue in Teaching: Theory and Practice* (NYC: Teachers College Press, 1993).

40. Here is another area in which much has been published lately. A good place to begin is Stephen Brookfield's *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher* (see n. 38). See also Karen F. Osterman and Robert B. Kottkamp, *Reflective Practice for Educators: Professional Development to Improve Student Learning* (Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press, 2004); and Parker Palmer, *The Courage To Teach* (see n. 28).

41. There is a growing literature available on the scholarship of teaching and learning that details faculty reflection and its utility and generativity for research. See Thomas Hatch, *Into the Classroom: Developing the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006).

42.   United's process is further explored and engaged in "Student Learning and Formation: An Improvisational Model" by Peter T. Cha, in *Revitalizing Practice: Collaborative Models for Theological Faculties*, ed. Malcom L. Warford (New York: Peter Lang, 2008). There is a growing literature on the use of portfolios in student assessment. Alverno College in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, is the preeminent school in this arena. Good basic information can be found in "Student Portfolios: An Alternative Way of Encouraging and Evaluating Student Learning" by Carmel Parker White in *Alternative Strategies for Evaluating Student Learning*, eds. Michelle V. Achacoso and Marilla D. Svinicki, New Directions for Teaching and Learning series, no. 100 (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005).

43.   This process is introduced in Stephen Brookfield, *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher* (see n. 38). Multiple examples of the use of this process in theological education are scattered through the essays in Mary E. Hess and Stephen D. Brookfield, *Teaching Reflectively in Theological Contexts: Promises and Contradictions* (Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing, 2008).

44.   Indeed, in some ways the Foster et al. *Educating Clergy* is primarily focused on this issue: "we have attempted more generally to account for ways to assess the extent to which the alignment or misalignment of the institutional culture and mission of a school either augments and reinforces or hampers and diminishes the intent in faculty teaching practices for student learning" (37). For a broader consideration of this topic in settings that are still related to ministry, but beyond congregations, see Gary R. Gunderson, *Boundary Leaders: Leadership Skills for People of Faith* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2004). For a more general exploration of the topic in relation to organizational development, see Edgar H. Schein, *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004).

45.   Mary Ann Winkelmes, "Formative Learning in the Classroom," in *Practical Wisdom: On Theological Teaching and Learning*, ed. Malcolm L. Warford (New York: Peter Lang, 2004), 162.

46.   In addition to the books referenced previously, several texts have excellent chapters that make for good faculty reflection prompts. In particular, Sandra Chadwick-Blossey, ed., *To Improve the Academy: Resources for Faculty, Instructional, and Organizational Development* (Boston: Anker Publishing Company, 2006), and Thomas Hatch et al., *Going Public with Our Teaching: An Anthology of Practice* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2005).

47.   Lee S. Shulman, "Communities of Learners and Communities of Teachers, in *The Wisdom of Practice: Essays on Teaching, Learning, and Learning to Teach* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004) 493–4.

48.   Yet another resource for doing so is Sam M. Intrator, ed., *Living the Questions: Essays Inspired by the Work and Life of Parker J. Palmer* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005).

Theological Education Mission Statement

Theological Education, the journal of The Association of Theological Schools and The Commission on Accrediting of ATS, is devoted to the distinctive concerns of graduate theological education in North America. The journal supports the mission of the Association and the Commission by providing those concerned with theological education—including administrators, faculty, and independent researchers—with scholarly discourse and reports on issues and trends, research findings and resources, provocative reflection pieces, and models of critical analysis and effective practices in graduate theological education.

Format of the Journal: Theme Focus and Open Forum

The **theme focus** section of the journal contains articles that have been **solicited** by the editors or the editorial board. These articles address current topics and issues in theological education, identified areas of the Association's work, and/or reports of work undertaken by ATS projects.

Unsolicited submissions are generally considered for publication in the **open forum** section. These articles may focus on any of a variety of subjects related to graduate, professional theological education in North America. The open forum may also include articles drawn from presentations at ATS leadership education events and other Association venues in order to make them more widely available.

Submission Guidelines

Theological Education invites submissions of articles that are consistent with the journal's purposes as enumerated in its mission statement. Unsolicited submissions satisfying initial review by the journal editors will be sent for blind peer review to members of the review board, who make recommendations to the editors regarding their publication. Articles being submitted simultaneously to other publications will not be considered.

1. Recommended length of articles is 3,750 words (approximately 15 double-spaced pages).
2. Follow *Chicago Manual of Style*, 16th ed., using one-inch margins, left justification, and endnotes. Convert footnotes to endnotes.
3. Write in the third-person form when possible.
4. If quoting Scripture, include the Bible translation with each reference.
5. The *American Heritage Dictionary* and the *Canadian Oxford Dictionary* are the references for preferred spellings.
6. Provide a paragraph abstract of approximately 80 words at the beginning of the article.
7. Add a short (2–3 sentence) paragraph at the end of the article identifying the author(s), institution or relationship to the project/topic, position held, and/or other information relevant to the experience of the writer(s).
8. Submissions should be emailed to editors@ats.edu.

Responses to prior articles are encouraged and are published at the discretion of the editors. The suggested length for a reader response is 1,500 words; responses may be edited for length.

Author's Checklist

1. The audience for *Theological Education* includes people from multiple academic disciplines and diverse religious traditions, who share in common their work as theological educators. Have you written with this audience in mind?
2. Is the article timely? Does it contribute significantly to current interdisciplinary discourse about theological education?
3. Does the subject matter represent new ideas or experiences that colleagues at other theological schools can incorporate into their teaching or administration?
4. Will the article spark useful debate on the topic?
5. Is the article well-written with a clear focus and well-developed/supported arguments?
6. Is the research methodology sound and appropriate?
7. If applicable, does the article make accurate use of the data available from ATS and other sources?
8. Does the article conform to the submission guidelines listed above?