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ABSTRACT

ASSESSING READINESS FOR MINISTRY OF GRADUATING STUDENTS AT DALLAS THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY FROM SELECTED PROFILES OF MINISTRY PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS CRITERIA SCORES

Terry L. Hebert

Readers: George Hillman and Barry Jones

The thesis of this dissertation is that graduates of Dallas Theological Seminary (DTS) may not be prepared for ministry because the contemporary theological education offered by DTS fails to prepare students in some areas of personal characteristics. Contemporary theological education in Evangelical schools and seminaries like DTS forms students intellectually according to a Christian worldview rather than forming students spiritually according to the image of Christ. Modern theological educators teach about the Christian life and ministry rather than training ministry candidates to perform and experience the Christian life and ministry.

This project assessed the readiness for ministry of DTS graduating students by using an instrument from the Association of Theological Schools (ATS) called Profiles of Ministry (PoM). DTS graduating students completed the PoM Casebook, and their internship field observers completed an online survey regarding them and their ministry performance. ATS calculated a personal profile report and an aggregate, organizational report. Examining ten of the report’s Personal Characteristics criteria—Fidelity to Tasks and Persons, Personal Responsibility, Acknowledgment of Limitations, Involvement in Caring, Perceptive Counseling, Mutual Family Commitment, Ministry Precedence over Family, Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety, Belief in a Provident God, and Christian Spirituality—this project sought to determine the readiness for ministry of DTS graduating students.

The organizational profile revealed that DTS graduating students demonstrate five positive traits. First, students want to be involved in ministry. Second, students exhibit an entrepreneurial spirit toward ministry. Third, students value humility. Fourth, students are perceived as pious. Fifth, students have high regard for the family. The organizational profile also reveals, however, four deficits in a student’s readiness for ministry. First, although students are reputed to be entrepreneurial, they tend to hold personal convictions loosely, creating boundary issues. Second, although students express a high desire to help others, they underestimate the importance of empathizing with those who are suffering. Third, although students have high regard for the family and for ministry, they reveal a tension to keep family and ministry in balance. Fourth, although students are perceived as pious leaders of their communities, students tend to waver regarding their trust in God.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

For more than fifty years, theological education and ministry preparation have been under indictment. Educators have criticized contemporary methods and philosophies due to a lack of personal and spiritual formation in the curriculum and due to the curriculum’s focus mostly on intellectual and skill criteria. Using an assessment program developed by the Association of Theological Schools (ATS) called Profiles of Ministry (PoM), this project will attempt to measure graduating students at Dallas Theological Seminary (DTS) along ten criteria of personal and spiritual formation. The project will answer the question: “Are DTS graduates ready for ministry?” Before answering this question, chapter 1 of this project will examine the critiques of contemporary theological education and explore the response to these critiques offered by ATS through their PoM Program. This first chapter will also explain the rationale for this research and preview the remaining chapters of the project.

Critique of Contemporary Theological Education

What makes a theological education theological? Since a proper assessment of education starts with the purpose for that education within the culture it serves, then an

assessment of theological education begins with an examination of theology because theology is the purpose of theological education. An assessment of theological education begins with an examination of the church because the church is the culture theological education serves. An assessment of ministerial preparation also begins with an examination of theology because theology is the minister’s purpose. An assessment of ministerial preparation begins with an assessment of the church because the church is the minister’s normative culture or context of service.

By extension, assessing the outcomes of a particular institution’s theological education reveals that school’s purposes, its definition of theology, and the culture it serves. Theological education with no theological purpose lacks direction; it no longer strives toward theology in the church. The church and her ministers become passive to the pressures of the secular culture, to societal stresses and ills, to a plurality of beliefs and values. The church and her ministers have no clear vision of their purpose, no clear direction. They wander from one tradition to another, from one habitual rite to another; they serve with no sense of destiny. They react rather than respond to changing conditions around them. They allow the situation to control the agenda rather than God’s good, perfect, and acceptable will (Rom 12:2). Within the modern institution of theological education, without a theological objective and apart from the church, faculty will teach and students will learn in an atmosphere of chaos and conflict. Turf wars will


3 Ibid., 47.

4 All Scripture references are according to the New American Standard Bible.
erupt over unity and integration. Rivalries will rule over love and humility. Competition will flourish over collaboration, cooperation, and synergy.⁵

According to modern critics, contemporary theological education has lost its biblical and historic purpose and its context of service. It has abandoned its focus on the personal formation of the ministry candidate. The modern curriculum predominately targets the minister’s head and minimally the minister’s heart. The theological academy has shifted the context of service away from the church and toward itself and toward the secular society with the culture’s secular and humanistic interests. Nonetheless, certain modern theological scholarship intuitively perceives the current state as an aberration, a departure from the biblical and ageless norm. Critics of contemporary theological education have heralded a call to recapture the ancient purpose of theology in ministry preparation and to return theological education to the ancient culture of the church.

**Theology Removed from Theological Education**

In 1957, renowned Yale Divinity School ethics professor H. Richard Niebuhr concluded his review of modern theological education by noting:

> The greatest defect in theological education today is that it is too much an affair of piecemeal transmission of knowledge and skills and that, in consequence, it offers too little challenge to the student to develop his own resources and to become an independent, lifelong inquirer, growing constantly while he is engaged in the work of the ministry.⁶

How did contemporary theological education come to produce this defect?

---


In 1983, theology professor at The Divinity School at Vanderbilt University Edward Farley responded to Niebuhr, initiating a global discussion of theological education. This dialog has become the gold standard for a genre of literature that criticizes contemporary theological education. Farley identifies the resources Niebuhr says that students need to develop. Farley blames the loss of *theologia* or sapiential knowledge (understanding of self and God) for Niebuhr’s “defect.” Farley’s call for change in the academy centers on the fragmentation of knowledge, the advance of the encyclopedic silos of education that focus on specialists, and the loss of wisdom (*sapience*) and the loss of the unity of truth. Farley contends, “[A] salvifically oriented knowledge of divine being was part of the Christian community and tradition long before it was named theology.” Moreover, he argues, “Theology has long since disappeared as the unity, subject matter, and end of clergy education and this disappearance is responsible more than anything else for the problematic character of that education as a course of study.” He criticizes modern theological education for what it presupposes: “Spirituality pertains to a realm other than the subject matter and end of studies.” Farley explains:

---

7 See Ellen T. Charry, *By the Renewing of Your Minds: The Pastoral Function of Christian Doctrine* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997). Charry argues for the sapiential goal of reading Scripture from the evidence of ancient sources, e.g. Augustine, *et al.* She calls for a return to wisdom as the higher vocation. See the Conclusion in chapter 5 for an example of Augustine’s focus on wisdom.


9 Ibid., x.

10 Ibid., 161.
Formation and spirituality seem to be so viewed as to have little to do with faith’s sapiential knowledge (theologia). This may be why it has been so easy to talk about and urge a formation which lacks spirituality’s very essence, namely, discipline. This lack of a cognitive element and the discipline necessary to it may be the reason formation in the present-day sense exports intellect from piety.  

What then is theological education without theology? How does the ministry candidate prepare without the purpose of ministry situated in the center of preparation?  

Farley observes from what he calls “classical Christian orthodoxy” that “theology was that personal-existential knowledge which was obtained in stages of spiritual or mystical discipline or through the means of grace.” Farley defines theological understanding as “faith’s actual knowledge of God and the things of God.” This knowledge, he contends, is missing from the theological encyclopedia. Institutions no longer claim this understanding as their goal for the ministerial candidate. The purpose of theological education is to understand God more truly. The nature of a theological school follows from this purpose. This nature contradicts the modern wholesale and exclusive adoption of the research university model for theological education. Farley calls for a return to a God-centered purpose for ministerial training in and for the church.

11 Ibid.

12 Ibid.


14 Kelsey, To Understand God Truly, 15.
Farley unveils and names the culprit responsible for removing theology from contemporary theological education:

Theological education today occurs in the wake of the Enlightenment, the rise of the modern university, and the ideal of the autonomous scholarship. It thus takes for granted the use of historical methods in theology and the emancipation of various enterprises of interpretation and the inquiry which properly pertain to the education of the minister. This modern version of the problem is what called forth on the continent the literature of “theological encyclopedia.”

To complicate matters further, Farley finds four elements or predispositions of resistance to reforming contemporary theological education stemming from the Enlightenment’s influence on theological education. First, he predicts that some conservative schools will resist because they will refuse to submit their canons of authority to historical methods. In this case, their canons of authority such as their modern scientific methodology or their specialized hermeneutic would transcend history or tradition.

Second, some institutions will resist because they will seek ways to train students for ministerial activities that define the profession. They will commit themselves to the specialist agenda and offer training that reflects the needs of the society rather than the higher calling of theology and church.

Third, he suggests that some will resist because they like the status quo they offer students. The system, one might say, massages their egos:

---

15 Farley, Thesologia, 14-7.

16 Ibid., 18-20.

17 Ibid.
Such things as divinity or theology will tend to be invisible to scholarly specialists, who find it very difficult to transcend the specialized discipline to the question of the larger pattern of study. . . . What is hell for the student (the pedagogical experience of an atomism of courses) is heaven for the scholarly specialist (the freedom and autonomy of specialized research and teaching). 18

Fourth, some institutions will deny that Farley’s description of the problem even exists, and they will tackle trivial, technological, or cosmetic symptoms. They will excite students about the ministry profession through pedagogical entertainment. 19

Correctives Attempted

To overcome subject fragmentation in theological higher education and to counter accusations and complaints from graduates caused by theology’s removal from contemporary theological education, Farley identifies correctives employed by some institutions:

Schools have manufactured various devices to bring the dead courses of the “academic” to life: field-based education, case study activities, interdisciplinary courses, increased offerings in culture-oriented and culture-valued skills (therapeutic, literary, and political). Various cycles of curriculum change, conferences on theological education, and special research projects [e.g. Readiness for Ministry] all bespeak this theory-practice ethos. 20

These, he laments, are not the problem. They are the symptoms of the problem that remains hidden to many. The problem, Farley shouts, is the “unity and structure of theological study.” “Faith,” he complains, “is not now the binding reality, the primary

18 Ibid. Are students thus taught to covet this freedom and autonomy?

19 Ibid.

20 Ibid., 5.
agenda-setting power at work in contemporary churches and theological schools.”
Theological education lacks a “convictional vision of the work of the ministry.”\

Following Farley’s attack on theological education, a new genre of literature
has emerged over the last twenty-five years. This Farley-inspired genre, however, attacks
the symptoms rather than the cause Farley has raised. Ironically, this genre and its
educational experts have confused the symptoms for the disease. Their solutions for the
problems of fragmentation attempt to integrate faith and reason; they harmonize nature
and grace; they blend the Christian life with the secular. Their prescriptions fail to
remedy the disease Farley has diagnosed. For example, some equate the gift of faith with
reason or thinking. Is this presupposition correct? If a Christian thinks correctly, some
assume, will not students correctly and automatically integrate learning across all spec-
trums of knowledge sources? This assumption fails to account for humanity’s sin nature
and the effects of sin on the rational mind.22

Consequences of Theology’s Removal

Farley summarizes the obvious results of theology’s absence from theological
education, “The typical product of three years of seminary study is not a theologically

21 Ibid., 12-3.

22 Ibid. See Kenneth O. Gangel, ed., Toward a Harmony of Faith and Learning: Essays on
Bible College Curriculum (Farmington Hills, MI: Tyndale, 1983); Kenneth O. Gangel, “Biblical
Gangel and Howard Hendricks (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1988); A. Duane Litfin, Conceiving the
Christian College (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004), 80. Litfin says, “Our goal is to think and act
Evangelical and Catholic Dialogue (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos, 2008), 19, 94-5. In another irony, Howard
and Turner suggest that a new intellectual tradition might solve the fragmentation.
Accordingly, he notes that clergy education suffers from the following symptoms: First, the “reward system for promotion and success” discourages theological skills. “Education in the theological school is not so much a matter of ‘the study of theology’ as [it is] a plurality of specific disciplines, each with its own method,” he says. A casual glimpse at any institution’s catalog reveals the various departments and their respective specialists of languages, counseling, education, history, theology, philosophy, homiletics, Bible, pastoral care, and more. Each school and department within each school assigns particular emphasis to its cocktail of theological education.

Second, Farley notes another symptom. Students and graduates complain that the theological school fails to prepare them for the ecclesial life, which as Neibuhr argues is the culture of theology. According to Farley, for future clergy, “the academic and practical were never really linked.” Farley offers this indictment, “The required and semi-required curriculum just now returning to the schools is invariably the result of political negotiations between the area fiefdoms, not of any unitary vision of the whole.” Thus, theological education has abandoned theology, the study of the Divine and of self, so that, without theology’s unifying role, the curriculum is divided against itself and so that, without theology’s context, the academy is divided against and isolated from the church.

---

24 Ibid.
25 Ibid.
26 Ibid., 5.
Southern Baptist minister John Killinger—perhaps unwittingly—agrees with Niehbuhr and Farley: institutions have forgotten the culture of theological education, the church. Killinger bitterly maintains that professors teach either because they could not land a pastoral position or because they despised the life of the minister in the church. His seminary professors, he complains, were ill prepared to train him for ministry in the church. He suggests that exposure to the caustic Christian culture of the church might drive away some clergy candidates. Rather than risk dissuading students from the ministry, some professors, he proposes, collude to keep their students in the dark. Cynically, he concludes, “[I]t’s almost as if there’s a conspiracy not to tell future ministers what they are getting into because, if it were told, then the church wouldn’t be the glorious entity it is and we would all be aware of its failings and injustices.”

Killinger makes some daring and unpopular accusations regarding the absent curriculum of theological education. All of them concern the context of ministry and the minister’s preparation to work and live within that culture called the local church. None of Killinger’s ecclesial realities missed during his clergy preparation, however, pertains directly to Farley’s *theologia*, but all of his claims underscore the lack of sensitivity to the context of contemporary theological education that is the church. Indeed, Killinger’s failure to identify the absence of Farley’s *theologia* illustrates plainly the magnitude of the problem with theological education. Killinger does not know all he missed.

__________________________


28 Ibid.
Without theology’s unifying role, the overly complicated and overly specialized curriculum of contemporary theological education has invaded the church and replaced its simple paradigm of discipleship for changing and transforming people into the image of Christ. Churches have lost the clear and simple process of helping people advance in spiritual growth.\(^2^9\) Even in cases where a congregation might unite around the process of making disciples, which is noble and illustrates the need to some extent, the missing ingredient to discipleship may be Farley’s *theologia*. Identifying a process of discipleship without the goal of discipleship fails to identify the goal of the process. Changing or transforming people into the image of Christ remains solely the discretion of each community and the pastor implementing their unifying plan. Uniting around a process falls short of the unity of the faith described in the Scriptures (Eph 4:1-13).

In addition to the invasion of the institution’s fragmented curriculum, contemporary seminaries further distance themselves and their students from the church culture by offering non-relational courses. They focus on concepts in an impersonal and sterile setting. They view learning as an individualistic cognitive mastery. They stimulate competition rather than cooperation.\(^3^0\) One might reasonably ask how this philosophy of education contributes toward the goal of becoming like Christ.

Adding to the overwhelming nature of the problem, pre-seminary education and spiritual requirements for entering the modern theological institution are missing.


\(^3^0\) Larry Richards, *A Theology of Christian Education* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1975), 159.
Farley describes the breadth of qualifications for current students entering theological education today:

1. Students matriculate from a variety of backgrounds.
2. Students have a BA or BS degree in common.
3. Their educational and spiritual diversities make it impossible for the institution to expect an expertise beyond the introductory level in areas such as history, philosophy, language, logic, sociology, and psychology.
4. The institution discovers that students enter seminary at various stages of spiritual maturation.

Farley concludes from this list of qualifications that students are academically and spiritually marginal for ministry preparation when they enter the modern seminary cauldron.\(^{31}\)

Coupled with the entering student’s varied and minimal background and the institution’s variety of theological disciplines, the institution produces a shallow and fragmented educational program. The institution relegates students to a series of survey and introductory courses, leaving students to their own devices for building depth and synthesizing unity from the theological encyclopedia. Perhaps a few students build such depth and unity on their own. Whether this depth is right or wrong, the institution remains unaware. Theologia was not the target of education, neither was it assessed.\(^{32}\)

Other students linger in their superficial and disjointed theological thinking. From this, modern ecclesial constituents—theological students, faculty, graduates, clergy, and laity—equate theology with academics and scholarship. They identify little or no


\(^{32}\) Ibid., 14-5.
connection between theology and the successful practice of the ministry in the church. Given these conditions in the institutions, Farley concludes that a theologically educated minister is impossible. Farley clearly notes again that these remain only symptoms: “Altogether these complaints add up to an experience of theological education as an atomism of subjects without clear rationale, end, or unity.” Without theology at the core of theological education, ministry preparation and its beneficiaries suffer.

Victims of Theology’s Removal

These tentacles of fragmentation reach out beyond the curriculum, theory and praxis, or the means of seeking God. Students ultimately become victims of their own education. The academy that proposes to train candidates for ministry actually threatens the spiritual life and faith of its students upon which ministry in the church is built. Some, however, see this development as a positive.

Virginia Samuel Cetuk, Associate Dean of The Theological School Seminary at Drew University, reinforces Farley’s fragmentation theory. She rhetorically wonders if modern theological education and its students do not more accurately reflect the contrast between the Tower of Babel in Genesis 10 and the coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost in Acts 2. The people at the Tower were arrogant, while the disciples at Pentecost were humble and were open to God. The people at the Tower were self-sufficient and did not need God, while the disciples at Pentecost were waiting patiently and expectantly for the promised coming of the Holy Spirit. The people at the Tower suffered confusion and dispersal from their arrogance, while the disciples enjoyed clarity and unity from their

\[33\text{ Ibid., 17.}\]
humble and patient waiting. The people of the Tower focused on the Tower as a means of seeking God, while the disciples focused on prayer as their means of seeking God. To the people of the Tower, the Tower was a way to God, while to the disciples the way to God was the Holy Spirit, God Himself.\textsuperscript{34}

In keeping with the modern enterprise of theological education and with its fragmentation and lost objectives, students, Cetuk rightly observes, complain that the seminary experience threatens their faith and growth. By that, she says, students mean that seminary threatens their status quo. Students willingly submit to the artificial crisis that seminary creates for them. She observes sadly that students expect little or no challenge from the experience and no personal change or growth during the three or more years they are in the seminary’s crucible.\textsuperscript{35} They are surprised to learn that seminary tacitly demands one’s death to self, that students must relinquish former ways of being, thinking, and relating, and that they must reorient themselves to how they understand themselves, the world, and God. In other words, Cetuk believes, the experience of seminary alone could form the student to some degree if students would submit to its shaping power.\textsuperscript{36}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{34} Virginia Samuel Cetuk, \textit{What to Expect in Seminary: Theological Education as Spiritual Formation} (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1998), 89-92.
\item\textsuperscript{35} A report given at a recent DTS faculty workshop revealed that ThM students average 5.8 years to complete this degree.
\item\textsuperscript{36} For another similar perspective that gives a positive orientation and justification to theological education’s crucible or cauldron affect on students, see Andrew Cameron, ed., \textit{The Trials of Theology: Becoming a "Proven Worker" in a Dangerous Business} (Fearn, Scotland: Christian Focus, 2010).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Cetuk advocates that students submit to the process. How, one might ask, does the student submit without instruction? One might question the student’s innate ability, preparation, and willingness to submit. Are students prepared to engage the artificial crisis seminary introduces and to let it form them? As Farley has noted, students bring a broad range of spiritual maturity to seminary and ministerial preparation. The critical deconstruction of the Christian faith, the subordination of faith to method, the increasing number of less believing or even unbelieving faculty, and the elevation of a sin-tainted rationalism over faith gives rise to increasing skepticism among students. Higher education is Cartesian. Higher education trains students to question the very faith upon which these future ministers will build their Christian ministry. The modern academy subverts the ancient creed that says one believes in order to understand into a creed that says one understands in order to believe. Lost in the academy’s attempt to interpret and judge the Bible and the Christian faith is the Bible’s authority to interpret and judge the student and faculty of the academy. Students cannot submit because students do not know what they do not know. They do not know that their very education threatens their faith. They assume their education will bolster and enrich their faith.

Similarly and often missed by advocates of the crucible view of theological education, the dichotomy of meaning and mystery represents another victim of fragment-


tation and further demonstrates the Cartesian influence on education over that of revelation’s influence. The lust for certainty overshadows the unknowable, the unseen, and the ineffable. Cataphatic conclusions leave no room for apophatic assertions. Where then do students go to build upon their faith as the academy tears it down? What then should students do to build upon their faith as the academy deconstructs their Christian beliefs? The academy raises more questions than it answers. How does one expect an integration of faith and learning when modern education rejects the very faith upon which students will build their ministry, theology, church, and discipleship?

Not only has theological education, according to Farley and others, abandoned theology and the church, its purpose and culture and not only has theological education become fragmented and subversive to the student’s faith, but the absence of theology has victimized the clergy as well. Theological education has left a wounded clergy in its wake. Prompted in the early twentieth century by upheavals in cultural expectations of the church, theological education revised its mission. Defining pastoral ministry

---


41 Ibid., 87-93.


43 See Henri Nouwen, *The Wounded Healer: Ministry in Contemporary Society* (New York: Image, 1972). Including this his most famous work, Nouwen has created a helpful genre dealing with the pastor’s personal examination for ministry readiness. Through his books, one can find a distant mentor and spiritual guide into the modern world of ministry.

44 Chapter 2 will present the evolution of theological education to the present.
involved various models with differing and changing goals for clergy’s role. Relevance
and effectiveness weighed heavily on the minds of clergy. Skepticism and exasperation
crept into the minds of clergy; isolation and intimidation formed the foundation of the
clergy’s psyche. Questions arose. Is ministry a profession akin to the medical or legal
professions? What skills or education might increase competence and self-esteem?
Should ministers specialize or remain generalists? What is the goal of ministry? Is it
individual pastoral care? Is it societal change? Is it helping to increase one’s spirituality?
Is it all of the above?45 Theological education became preparation for social work and
administration. Who can train for all of these areas?46

Scope of Criticism

The narration of the career of Farley’s missing *theologia* in theological
education, at least after the Reformation, has rested almost exclusively with Protestants.
Yet the theological encyclopedic movement has been as much a Roman Catholic as a
Protestant work, and so one might conclude that Rome is equally a victim of the western
philosophical invasion of the church. Roman Catholic theological education, however,
has reaped the harvest sown by the older patterns set by Aristotelian philosophy and
Thomistic scholasticism. Employing the same post-enlightenment European type of theo-
logical faculty as a group of specialists, Roman Catholic seminaries have experienced an

45 David S. Schuller, Merton P. Strommen, and Milo Brekke, eds., *Ministry in America: A
Report and Analysis, Based on an in-Depth Survey of 47 Denominations in the United States and Canada,
with Interpretation by 18 Experts* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1980), 3-8; David S. Schuller, Milo
Brekke, Merton P. Strommen, and Daniel O. Aleshire, *Readiness for Ministry: Assessment* (Vandalia, OH:
Association of Theological Schools, 1976), 1.

identical dispersion of *theologia* into independent sciences. Today it shares with the Protestant faculties most of the problems articulated in this essay.  

Eighteenth century Russian migration into Alaska and in the late twentieth century the collapse of communism and the rise of militant Islam have contributed a sizeable Orthodox population in the west. Corroborating Farley’s complaint, Russian Orthodox Bishop Hilarion Alfeyev weighed in on the plight of contemporary theological education during a 2008 lecture at the University of Toronto’s Wycliffe College. Alfeyev questioned the modern understanding of theology as “bookish knowledge,” and he rejects the view that a theological faculty is one among many other faculties of a secular university. Alfeyev summarized the problem this way:

One of the tragic consequences of the divorce between Christian theory and praxis, between faith and knowledge, is that nowadays knowledge about theological subjects does not necessarily presuppose faith. You can be a theologian and not belong to any church community; in principle, you do not need to believe in God to receive a theology degree. Theology is reduced to one of the subjects of human knowledge alongside with chemistry, mathematics, or biology.  

When one adds Bishop Alfeyev’s remarks to the Roman Catholic and Protestant experience of theology’s absence from contemporary theological education, then the criticisms against theological education amount to an ecumenical problem, a problem of the modern academy that penetrates the major traditions of Christianity.

---


48 Hilarion Alfeyev, “Theological Education in the 21st Century” (lecture, Wycliffe College, University of Toronto, Toronto, October 22, 2008).
Assessing Contemporary Theological Education

With the emphasis of theological education on cognitive skills, interpretation, research, social work, and communication, the assessment of a candidate’s readiness for ministry has defaulted to competencies, skills, and cognitive testing. How does one assess the candidate’s preparation for ministry according to the personal characteristics found in Farley’s *theologia*? How does one measure the issues of the heart, of relationships, of sapiential knowledge, and of faith? How does one assess the candidate’s level of caring for and responsibility toward others? How does one assess the candidate’s attitudes toward the tensions created by family and ministry? How does one assess the candidate’s personal faith, commitment to piety, trust in God, and devotion? Although conspicuous by their absence from the curricula of modern theological education, these areas, nonetheless, form the foundation of ministry.

Profiles of Ministry

Sensitive to this growing contemporary critique of theological education, the Association of Theological Schools (ATS) sponsored the Readiness for Ministry Project (RfM) in order to determine the criteria for ministry preparation and to develop instruments that would help seminaries assess their graduating students and novice ministers.\(^4^9\) Today, based on the RfM research, ATS provides a program of assessments called Profiles of Ministry (PoM) for helping seminaries evaluate not only the skills and competencies required for the beginning cleric, but also the issues of the heart, of ministerial relationships, and of personal faith most desired in their graduating students by the con-

\(^4^9\) Chapter 3 will describe the RfM research and the resulting assessment instruments.
stituents they hope to serve. Several of the PoM criteria attempt to assess the would-be minister’s preparation according to Farley’s *theologia*. They take into account the graduating student’s readiness for ministry in areas typically absent from the curriculum. These scales were chosen specifically for this project in order to learn how contemporary theological education might or might not affect students in these traditionally unmeasured areas of personal characteristics.

In 2005, DTS incorporated PoM into its assessment protocols. Students finishing their internship requirement complete two parts of PoM’s Stage II program for graduating students: PoM Casebook and PoM Field Observation Survey.\(^{50}\) The Casebook describes twenty-three ministry situations. For each situation, the Casebook presents several—ten to thirty—possible ways one might respond to the situation. On a five-point Likert scale of Very Unlikely to Very Likely, students evaluate the likelihood that each response would be their response for the presenting situation. In addition to the Casebook, students distribute the Field Observation Survey to five people who have observed them in their ministry context during their internship.\(^{51}\) The Field Observation Survey makes 116 assertions regarding the student’s ministry readiness from the observer’s experience of the student in a ministry context. On a five-point Likert scale of Unlikely to Very Likely, these observers evaluate the likelihood that the student matches

\(^{50}\) PoM Stage I helps entering seminarians identify educational goals and objectives for their seminary experience. This project will focus on PoM Stage II and on graduating students and their readiness for ministry.

\(^{51}\) Beginning in 2009, ATS published the Field Observation Survey online making it more convenient for seminaries, students, and field observers. Distributing and retrieving materials had become increasingly more challenging, especially for DTS interns serving outside the Dallas area. DTS is working with ATS to offer the Casebook online as well. This convenience will help increase response rates and help reduce time and energy applied toward policing students.
the assertion of ministry readiness. Together these instruments form a report used by DTS internship coordinators to counsel graduating students regarding gaps in their ministry preparation, especially in those areas untouched by the DTS curriculum.

Using an aggregate PoM report of all graduating DTS students from the fall of 2009 and focusing on ten PoM criteria that evaluate the personal characteristics of the student’s heart, ministerial relationships, and personal faith, this project will assess the readiness for ministry of graduating students at DTS. After studying at DTS, students should be ready for ministry according to the following ten PoM criteria of personal characteristics:

1. Fidelity to Tasks and Persons
2. Personal Responsibility
3. Acknowledgment of Limitations
4. Involvement in Caring
5. Perceptive Counseling
6. Mutual Family Commitment
7. Ministry Precedence over Family
8. Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety
9. Belief in a Provident God
10. Christian Spirituality

See appendix F for the PoM scales for each instrument.

See Research Subjects in chapter 3 for the scope of “graduating students at DTS.”

See chapters 3 and 4 for more detail regarding these ten criteria. See appendix B for a list of all criteria measured by the PoM program.
Using these ten select PoM criteria of personal characteristics, this project will assess readiness for ministry according to the following ten hypotheses:

1. After studying at DTS, students will score in the Somewhat Likely range for Fidelity to Tasks and Persons.\(^{55}\)

2. After studying at DTS, students will score in the Likely range for Personal Responsibility.

3. After studying at DTS, students will score in the Likely range for Acknowledgment of Limitations.

4. After studying at DTS, students will score in the Likely range for Involvement in Caring.

5. After studying at DTS, students will score in the Likely range for Perceptive Counseling.

6. After studying at DTS, students will score in the Likely range for Mutual Family Commitment.

7. After studying at DTS, students will score in the Possibly range for Ministry Precedence over Family.\(^{56}\)

8. After studying at DTS, students will score in the Somewhat Likely range for Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety.

9. After studying at DTS, students will score in the Likely range for Belief in a Provident God.

10. After studying at DTS, students will score in the Somewhat Likely range for Christian Spirituality.

\(^{55}\) See appendix F for a discussion of the different scoring scales for the Field Observation Survey (Somewhat Likely) and the Casebook (Likely).

\(^{56}\) Mutual Family Commitment and Ministry Precedence over Family together form the Family Perspectives cluster. Their respective scores are held in tension demonstrating the student’s balance between family and ministry commitments. DTS expects students to score one grid lower or left for Ministry Precedence over Family than for Mutual Family Commitment. See chapter 5 for interpretation of these criteria.
According to these personal characteristic scores, therefore, are DTS graduating students ready for ministry?

**Rationale**

The beneficiaries of this research may include DTS, the Spiritual Formation and Leadership (SFL) Department, and DTS students. DTS may find this research helpful when evaluating curriculum effectiveness and for addressing curriculum design issues. A student’s readiness-for-ministry should drive the seminary’s curriculum design initiatives.

Moreover, this research may inform and encourage the Seminary regarding its decision to employ PoM as one of its assessment instruments. DTS may realize that the choice of PoM was a strategically helpful one. DTS may use the data and analysis to inform future planning and direction for the Seminary. DTS may demonstrate the value of this data to other Seminary constituents and decision-makers. Likewise, other institutions may find this research compelling and encouraging enough to engage PoM for their student assessments.

The SFL Department of DTS may benefit most from this research. Internship coordinators in the SFL Department may gain a better understanding of these scores. Internship coordinators at DTS conduct exit interviews with graduating DTS students. These exit interviews include a discussion of the student’s PoM scores. Specifically, the Personal Characteristics clusters may interest the SFL Department because DTS has few—if any—means for measuring these types of personal student issues. These clusters enhance the depth of the exit interviews. They reveal potential areas of future ministry difficulty or failure. They provide a starting place for discussing sensitive areas of ministry and the future minister’s heart. Furthermore, this research may help the SFL Department assess its effectiveness as a department of DTS toward reaching the
seminary’s core competencies and toward the seminary’s mission of equipping godly servant leaders.

Students, likewise, may benefit from the clearer counsel that DTS internship coordinators may provide because of this research.57 Because the hearts of students are not the target of theological education, understanding these personal characteristics will give the student a place to apply their theological education to themselves first, before they attempt to apply it to others.

**Preview of the Remaining Chapters**

How did modern theological education get into its current challenges? Through a biblical and historical survey, chapter 2 will review the research and literature regarding readiness for ministry and ministry preparation in theological education.

Chapter 3 will describe the procedures and research methods for this study. In addition, the chapter will describe the research subjects and the survey instruments of PoM. Lastly, the chapter will describe PoM in the context of the SFL Department at DTS.

Chapter 4 will report the results of the study. After studying at DTS, are students prepared for ministry as reported in the ten selected criteria of PoM?

Not only will chapter 5 explain any differences and offer reasons for any discrepancies between the actual and the expected scores of these criteria, but it will also interpret the scores of the PoM criteria. The interpretations will come from the hundreds of personal student exit interviews conducted by the SFL Department at DTS since 2005.

57 Lastly, this project may inform my work at DTS in the SFL Department. As an internship coordinator, I assist with assessing the readiness for ministry of DTS students and with evaluating their growth toward spiritual maturity.
Chapter 5 will also identify limitations to the study and discuss implications for both DTS and its students, for theological education, and for future research.

**Conclusion**

Contemporary theological education has neglected theology and the culture of theology, which is the church. It has become fragmented and an agent of fragmentation. The academy threatens the faith of students. The next generation of ministers may be at risk during ministry preparation. Separate enterprises within the institution have emerged to point the way back to more ancient goals. Helping students grapple with the intellectual fire hose that modern theological education represents includes directing them gently toward personal ownership of their spiritual formation and toward the purpose of their education, which is theology in the church. The SFL Department at DTS maintains this as one of its overall goals. The internship and the exit interview during which students reflect on their PoM scores from the Personal Characteristics section strives to help students wrestle with the magnitude of their need for Farley’s *theologia*. The SFL Department expects students to realize their need to be a servant of God before doing the ministry of God. The SFL Department expects students to follow the tenets of the Christian faith before they presume to teach the faith to others.

How did contemporary theological education and ministry preparation find its way into these dilemmas? Chapter 2 will present a biblical and historical survey that first establishes the biblical and apostolic paradigm of theological education and ministry preparation and that second demonstrates the mutation of theological education over the last thousand years away from that biblical and apostolic paradigm.
CHAPTER 2

PREVIOUS RESEARCH AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This research project will report on ten criteria of ministry readiness as defined by ATS in Stage II of their PoM Program, an assessment instrument for graduating seminarians. The previous chapter revealed that seminaries have aimed at numerous educational targets, resulting in a vast genre of literature aimed at criticizing contemporary theological education and ministry preparation. Some educators in the theological academy understand that personal formation or theologia is missing from the curriculum and that the church is no longer the context or culture of theological education. This vast genre demonstrates the level of disagreement regarding how to recapture theologia and how to return theological education to the ecclesial context. To recapture theologia and to return to the church suggests that the modern period is an aberration from a previous era of theological education. The instituted alterations are not reforms; they are not improvements or correctives to ministry preparation; they are not a return to the ancient model. They are mutations away from the ancient, biblical model. How did modern ministry preparation arrive at this unstable and confusing period? Starting with a biblical survey, this chapter will present a historical perspective on the purpose and context of theological education and ministry preparation.
Biblical Examples of Theological Education

To outline the biblical evidence for ministry formation, one starts in the Old Testament where theological training—and even vocational training amongst the Levites—begins with parents. That trend continues in the New Testament with young Timothy’s theological education coming from his mother and grandmother (2 Tim 3:14-5). The novice priests lived in the temple learning from elderly priests. Prophets took the mantle from the previous prophet whom they attended as servants. Wisdom and character were strong emphases.¹ Protégés served their mentors; younger men learned from older men. Education was largely nonformal, in-service, and collaborative.²

The New Testament continues the spirit of the Old Testament, except that the caliber of the teacher changes. Jesus recruits twelve disciples who follow Him in a nonformal way for three years. He gives them assignments; they listen as He teaches in the synagogues. Through their collaboration in His service, they inherit His ministry when He departs, just as the Old Testament prophets inherited the ministry of their prophet mentors. The Apostle Paul continues this model of collaborative, nonformal, in-service training with Timothy and others.³


² Larry Richards, *A Theology of Christian Education* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1975), 66. Richards distinguishes between “isolated” and “operating” beliefs. Formal education produces what Richards calls “isolated” beliefs and is inadequate for producing what he calls “operating” beliefs. He also prefers nonformal learning to formal because formal focuses on the head rather than the whole person. See Banks, *Reenvisioning Theological Education*, 92-3.

³ Banks, *Reenvisioning Theological Education*, 94-126. Banks calls this approach “collegial” and “missional.”
Discipleship summarizes the biblical approach to theological education and ministry preparation. This discipleship approach can be summarized in four ways. First, the teacher is a model to the student. Second, the disciple, learner, or would-be minister becomes like the teacher, even imitating him. Third, modeling produces identification or identity with the teacher or master. Fourth, the relationship between teacher and disciple is based on transactions or activities. Most importantly, from this list, becoming like the Master or becoming like Christ is the goal of education and ministry preparation (1 John 3:2; 4:16-17; 1 Cor 15:49; Matt 10:25).

Education according to the Bible is incarnational. The disciple imitates the incarnate Christ and His apostles. Since Christ the incarnate God is Truth, then, truth is to be incarnated or fleshed out. As the Apostle Paul says in his letter to the churches at Corinth and Ephesus, all are imitators of Christ and God (1 Cor 11:1; Eph 5:1). The whole community is to be transformed in this way. The minister submits himself for transformation into the image and likeness of Christ, and he learns how to transform


6 Ibid., 34-5.

7 Ibid., 44.
others because his ministry goal and commission is to transform his community into the image and likeness of Christ.

In short, learning changes the learner.8 The Lord Jesus confirmed the nature of learning this way when He said, “Everyone who is fully trained will be like his teacher” (Luke 6:40b).9 Before teachers become teachers, they are students or apprentices of their teachers. Before they are masters, they are followers. As learners, teachers change; then they help their learners change by reproducing their experiences of change in the learner.10 Specifically, learners change how they think, they change their habits, and they change who or what they follow.11

By contrast, the modern seminary approach to theological education is conceptual rather than incarnational, impersonal rather than relational, cognitive rather than sapiential, individualistic and private rather than collegial and social, competitive rather than cooperative and collaborative, and it transacts in a sterile classroom rather than in-service to the church and community.12

8 Howard Hendricks, Teaching to Change Lives: Seven Proven Ways to Make Your Teaching Come Alive (Portland, OR: Multnomah, 1987), 123.
9 Ibid., 18.
10 Ibid., 16.
11 Ibid., 33–43.
12 Richards, Theology of Christian Education, 159.
**Historical Views of Theological Education**

This section will review theological education and pastoral preparation from the early church, through the middle ages and the Reformation, into the early modern period and colonial America. During the first thousand years of the church, the biblical model remained the church’s practice for preparing ministers. Changes to the biblical model, however, are introduced in the Middle Ages, and alterations to the biblical prescription continue to the modern era.

**Early Pastoral Formation**

The biblical model continues during the first millennium of the church. Early Christian disciples not only inherited their model of discipleship from the Old Testament, Jesus, and the Apostles, they also borrowed and Christianized Hellenism’s influence on the Roman world. Plato advocated a four-fold curriculum that formed the student called *paideia*. First, master and disciple attend to and make themselves available to common virtues; they allow *arête* (excellence) to shape and mold the disciple through knowledge of the Good. Second, master and disciple study the nature of the Good, which is the highest principle, which is the knowledge of God. Third, through their knowledge of God and knowledge of their own humanity, the disciple learns virtue. Fourth, the disciple

---

13 Banks, *Reenvisioning Theological Education*, 17-33. See Edward Farley, *Theologia: The Fragmentation and Unity of Theological Education* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 152-6. Farley opposes the modern view that education merely exposes the student to the known universe or just communicates the known universe to the student. Such a means of educating fails to form the student. Farley resurrects the ancient Greek notion of *paideia*. He prefers that education enculturate the student in Christian virtue. If the goal is virtue, then how does one educate toward that goal? The educational target informs the pedagogy.
converts; the disciple follows the master; the disciple turns to the light of the Good.\textsuperscript{14} Christian education from the beginning of the second century understood its goal as the forming of a person’s life on this model of education called \textit{paideia} or the “classical” model.\textsuperscript{15}

Through his \textit{Second Oration} entitled \textit{In Defense of His Flight to Pontus}, fourth century bishop and renowned church father Gregory of Nazianzus influenced another fourth century bishop John Chrysostom and sixth century Roman pope Gregory the Great to author classic works on ministry preparation. John Chrysostom composed his \textit{Treatise Concerning the Christian Priesthood}, and Pope Gregory the Great wrote the \textit{Book of Pastoral Rule}. Pope Gregory’s \textit{Pastoral Rule} became the main treatise on preparing for Christian ministry for the next thousand years.\textsuperscript{16}

Four keys for pastoral preparation emerged from these texts. First, the candidate prepares for his personal, spiritual, and moral formation. The beginning of ministry is the pastor’s heart and the pastor’s heart shapes his ministry. Before he can attempt to clean others, he must be clean. Before he can dispense wisdom, he must be wise. Before he can draw others near to God, he must be near. Before he can call others to holiness, he must be holy. Second, the church must call the candidate to the unique responsibilities and relationships of Physician of Souls and Shepherd of Christ’s Flock.


\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 75.

\textsuperscript{16} Brian A. Williams, \textit{The Potter’s Rib: Mentoring for Pastoral Formation} (Vancouver: Regent College, 2005), 27. According to his note on page 302, the \textit{Book of Pastoral Rule} was the primary text at least in the West if not the East.
Rather than a candidate’s personal call to ministry, the church identified her ministers. Third, the candidate must demonstrate himself a theologian through reflection, deliberation, and obedience. Fourth, the candidate must know and understand the practical pastoral skills. By following the action of a veteran pastor—his model—the novice contemplated their joint identities and activities. Together they prayed, worshiped, and sought God’s will. They feared presumption, inadequacy due to sin (rather than due to a lack of skills), the responsibility for the care of souls, and the temptations to pride, power, and worldliness.

For example, Gregory of Nazianzus and Augustine were skilled and trained in rhetoric, philosophy, and the liberal arts, yet the role of pastor intimidated them. Each ran from the call of the church, and yet a greater fear of disobedience to the church drove them back. Others equally were resistant to the church’s call to ministry: Ambrose, Gregory the Great, Cyprian, Evagrius of Pontus, John Chrysostom, and Basil to name a few. Biblical examples of reluctant servants were Moses, Jonah, and Isaiah. Even the Lord’s brother James in his general epistle warns about becoming a teacher: “Let not many of you become teachers, my brethren, knowing that as such we will incur a stricter judgment” (Jas 3:1). In every case, the external call of the church proved stronger than their reluctance to serve. By contrast, moderns exit ministry after they enthusiastically answer a personal, internal call because of burnout, boredom, moral failure, or faithlessness.

17 Ibid., 27-38.
18 Ibid., 9-10.
19 Ibid., 14-7.
During this first millennium, theology served the pre-critical, pre-modern, ancient church as a practical discipline. Theological education was unified in purpose, which was the glory of God in the worshiping community. Theological education and its purpose, which is theology, were from the beginning in the church. Ministerial preparation, in keeping with its biblical and apostolic roots, first formed the ministry candidate, and then prepared the candidate to form others into the image and likeness of the one Master, the Lord Jesus Christ.

**Medieval Scholasticism and the University**

The Great Schism of 1054 split the church between the Patriarchate of Rome and the four eastern Patriarchates of Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem. Soon after this scandal, Medieval Scholasticism and the university were founded under Rome. The scholastic teachers or schoolmen became among the most intellectually influential in modern western theology and practice. Roman Catholicism and Protestantism alike owe their legacy to the theological and philosophical heritage left by Medieval Scholasticism. Beginning their studies in the monastic and cathedral training centers of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, they invented the university system by the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, thereby moving theological education away from its biblical and apostolic roots and away from the church. For example, the University of Paris and the University of Oxford dominated the theological landscape, while lesser

---

schools like the University of Salerno and the University of Bologna specialized in medicine and law.

For the first time, a full-time, professional body of instructors with consensus regarding purposes, pedagogy, and standards incorporated to pass along to their students an agreed curriculum of knowledge. The university system consisted of four faculties: an undergraduate faculty of arts and three upper-level faculties of theology, law, and medicine. The curriculum employed an established text. In the faculty of theology, Peter Lombard’s *Sentences* and later Thomas Aquinas’ *Summa Theologicae* were the center of study. These texts presented topics and theological propositions from the Old and New Testaments, from the various church councils, and from the church fathers.21

The medieval university depended on two pedagogies: (1) the lecture, which primarily focused on a commentary of the Scriptures or Lombard’s *Sentences* (until Aquinas) and (2) disputations or debates on theological questions.22 Lecture took two forms for students. First, the student listened to lectures from his instructors. Then, over time and by way of recognition, instructors would invite senior students to present lectures to their juniors. The more valued pedagogy was debate or disputation. Students later in their education would defend a particular thesis. Other students would attack this thesis or defend an opposing view. Each debate submitted to formal rules of logic and argument. Following the debate, the teacher would summarize and resolve the dispute.


He might side with one view or the other and demonstrate each view’s relative strengths and weaknesses.²³

These innovative schools focused on theology, philosophy, law, and medicine. These were the hallmarks of scholasticism. Three popular modern myths concerning this period suggest: (1) the schoolmen practiced unquestioning faith, (2) the society was uncommonly stable affording scholars the leisure for intellectual pursuits, and (3) this period represents merely a transition between the Roman Empire and modernity. The period was hardly peaceful, given the Crusades and the expansion of Islam. The scholastic rigor encouraged students to question their faith rather than believe without the support of reasoned argument. Indeed, the schoolmen considered themselves modern, and they formulated their own enlightenment.²⁴

Unlike the previous millennium where philosophy served theology, Scholasticism freed philosophy and made it equal to revelation. Although most regard him more as philosopher than theologian, Thomas Aquinas, the great doctor of the Scholastic period, considered a philosopher a non-Christian lover of wisdom.²⁵ His definition and attitude toward education ushers in a separation of philosophy from theology. Philosophy will rise from handmaiden to theology to interpreter of theology.

²³ Kenny, Brief History of Western Philosophy, 133.

²⁴ Eugene Rathbone Fairweather, A Scholastic Miscellany: Anselm to Ockham (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1981), 17-21. See Arthur Frank Holmes, Building the Christian Academy (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001), 58. Coming out of the Scholastic period, nominalism, which emphasized the dichotomy between reason and revelation, informs the entire western philosophical project moving forward. How nominalism influences theological education is beyond this project’s scope, but it is a question worthy of future consideration.

²⁵ Bauerschmidt, Holy Teaching, 21.
Over the next few centuries, Scholasticism will assert that one must know Aristotle and his logic before one can study theology. Aquinas, who re-introduced Aristotle to the Latin West, maintained full confidence in humanity’s reason, in spite of the Fall. He placed high regard on humanity’s reasoning faculty, separating it from faith and revelation as a means for understanding God, self, and creation.

Aquinas identified two kinds of knowledge or scientia. The higher scientia was holy teaching (sacra doctrina); the light of God established holy teaching. The higher scientia was first God’s revelation through the prophets, the apostles, and Jesus Christ. Before embarking on the higher study of revelation, one acquired the seven liberal arts—the trivium, which was comprised of grammar, rhetoric, and logic, and the quadrivium, also known as “natural scientia,” which covered arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music. Second to holy teaching and God’s revelation passed down through teaching was natural scientia. To those who had completed the trivium and quadrivium and who had advanced to the graduate university, Aquinas wrote his great work Summa Theologica, which replaced Peter Lombard’s Sentences as the standard text for preparing preachers. For Aquinas, faith liberates reason. Faith rescues reason from error. Faith improves reason. Scholasticism’s reformation of theological education has

26 Holmes, Building the Christian Academy, 62.

27 Francis A. Schaeffer, Escape from Reason (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1968), 11.

28 Bauerschmidt, Holy Teaching, 13-36. Aquinas was a member of the Dominican Order, which was also known as the Order of Preachers. Lombard’s Sentences was the standard text for preparing the members of this Order. One should resist the modern temptation that would reduce the full meaning and activities of the clergy or the ministry to preaching.

29 Holmes, Building the Christian Academy, 101.
shifted from preparing the minister’s heart to filling the minister’s mind and to teaching the minister how to think and how to defend his thesis.

Reformation

Following the reforms of Scholasticism that invented the university system, one of the unheralded alterations of the Reformation was the university’s theological curriculum. Headed by academician and theology professor Martin Luther, the Reformers did away with the trivium and quadrivium, concluding that history, grammar, and ancient languages were all one needed for propagating Christianity. Luther attacked late medieval scholastic theology. He demanded that the university free theology from the bonds of the philosopher Aristotle. By rewriting the theological curriculum, Reformers met the needs of their protest against Rome and the needs of their sixteenth and seventeenth century Protestant movement.\(^{30}\) However, where Scripture was silent, the reforming of the theological curriculum had no basis of authority.

Divisions, which were brought on by the various and contradictory interpretations of the Bible, tore at early Protestantism. Questions arose regarding the political establishment. Out of these chaotic, divisive, independent, and uncertain belief systems—and long before the Enlightenment’s quest for certainty—education thirsted for objectivity, for assurances, and for authoritative bases of truth. The influence of a growing nominalism on the Reformers would snowball into the Enlightenment and Modernity, leaving its relativism in its wake. One normally equates the Enlightenment

with skepticism and the search for certainty, but the Reformers were committed to that quest long before Descartes.\footnote{Holmes, \textit{Building the Christian Academy}, 75. See Thomas A. Howard, ed., \textit{The Future of Christian Learning: An Evangelical and Catholic Dialogue} (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos, 2008), 8. One might illustrate the Reformers legacy of skepticism and their quest for certainty from Howard’s introduction to a dialogue between an Evangelical and a Roman Catholic on educational matters. Phobias regarding the papacy, tradition, and ecumenism continue among Protestants.}

To combat the inherent skepticism of the Reformation, later Protestants, like Heinrich Bullinger, David Chytraeus, and Andreas Hyperius, added canons that shaped the student’s spirituality onto Luther and Melanthon’s curricular changes of theological study. Reminiscent of the first millennium, Bullinger claimed that correct understanding requires faith, worship, piety, and reverence and that one must dedicate all results to the glory of God. In a similar existential way, Chytraeus maintained that one’s relationship with God determined correct theological knowledge, which one should never separate from piety. Hyperius insisted that his students pray over their theological studies. He nevertheless identified more with the medieval view that theology was a form of \textit{sapientia} or wisdom and \textit{scientia}.\footnote{Muller, "Era of Protestant Orthodoxy", 106-11. See also Farley, \textit{Theologia}, 62-80. In a note, Muller praises Farley’s observation that “the unity of pre-Enlightenment theological study arose out of this stress on theology as \textit{praxis} . . . .”}

\textit{Berlin School}

In 1810, the renowned father of Christian liberalism Frederich Schleiermacher launched yet another alteration of the theological curriculum. Under his direction, the University of Berlin introduced the research university—also known as the Berlin School. It operated according to three innovative principles of “scientific research” or
First, teacher and student research together, exemplifying the unity of research and teaching. Second, students transform their character by developing their rational capacities and by becoming expert researchers. Third, the institution must protect academic freedom.\textsuperscript{33}

This last tenet was the most important and most damaging. According to \textit{Wissenshaft}, academic freedom meant more than simply the freedom to learn or teach, and it meant more than simply the instructor’s protection by tenure. Following the lead of Aquinas, academic freedom liberated reason from all foundations of authority. Through academic freedom, reason became the highest authority. Reason’s role was to question any other claim of authority. The proponents of academic freedom advanced this tenet ostensibly for the well-being of the state.\textsuperscript{34}

From these three principles of \textit{Wissenshaft}, five consequences formed in the research university. First, inquiries lead to the mastery of truth. Second, inquiry was critical inquiry. Third, no other alleged authorities were recognized. Fourth, research meant that students and instructors joined to “re-search” the truth; they conducted a second, independent, repeatable search for truth. Fifth, research was method-driven.\textsuperscript{35} On this last consequence, one’s method becomes one’s authority. By the last third of the nineteenth century, American higher education had adopted this model.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{33} Kelsey, \textit{To Understand God Truly}, 78-81.
\textsuperscript{34} Ibid., 81.
\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., 84-5.
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid., 83.
A gap, however, grew between the humanities and the sciences. How does the university apply this model of scientific research or *Wissenschaft* to the humanities, especially theology with its claim of divine revelation? Academic freedom and its principles rejected any discipline that claimed an authority that was beyond the scrutiny of scientific study. The sciences were especially suspicious of the theological disciplines and their appeals to revelation. Such sources of authority had no place within the university. How then does one participate in theological studies?

In response, the Berlin School adapted the study of ancient texts to accommodate the research model. By “re-searching” or searching again to discover the truth about ancient texts, the teacher-student researcher sought to uncover their ancestry, their primal meanings, their usages, their history of exegesis, and their social or psychological implications. First, these methods were applied to Scripture and then to church history. They fragmented theological education into exegesis, history, and dogmatic theology. Christian truth was no longer universal and transcendent; it was specifically historical and cultural. Christian truth was no longer divine and human; it was merely human. The Berlin School set a new goal for theological studies and the preparation for ministry: educate professional religious leaders to turn theory into practice. This paved the way for practical theology as a new discipline.

Out of practical theology emerged the foundation for the professional school that operated according to four fundamentals. First, professional interests ruled

---

37 Ibid., 83-8.

theological education. Second, effective leadership and research ability supplanted conversion and the Bible as prime requisites. Third, training focused on the subject rather than the formation of the student. Fourth, the public nature of the profession—one’s contribution to the public well-being—justified the clergy’s existence. Ministers now engaged in social and political issues as theorists and practitioners. They developed theories from the source texts and applied them to the common problems of the day.39

Colonial America

In early American Christian history, formal theological education was unavailable. Due to this lack, clerical training in early American Christianity followed the pattern of the apprenticeship model. Most of scholasticism’s influence was on hold. The apprenticeship model came originally from the university system, where an apprentice interned with an established minister. University training for ministry was thus two-steps: formal education plus apprenticeship.40 Without the formal step of the university model, early American theological education was reduced to apprenticeship in all phases of education. The candidate’s mentor taught him theology in his personal study; the candidate learned how to preach the Word from the church pulpit. The mentor recommended pastoral advice and modeled godly living.41

39 Kelsey, To Understand God Truly, 90-5.


41 Ibid., 138.
These students were products of their time, and they preferred a more scholastic, university pattern of education. They expected their mentor to direct their readings, to instruct them and answer their questions in the didactic style of the university system. Their pastoral instructors offered little from the church fathers. They had little training in scriptural exegesis or linguistics, and they provided only a slight understanding of doctrine. Their most firm and constant conviction and presumption was that the Reformation corrected the corruptions of the faith that came from the middle ages. In 1808, the founding of Andover Seminary marked the end of the apprenticeship-only era in early American theological education and the beginning of the modern seminary. Toward the latter third of the nineteenth century, American universities adopted the Berlin School model. Predictably, this model and the professional school model invaded the American seminary.

The Professional School or Ministry Formation

The Berlin School’s Wissenshaft gave birth to another reform in theological education: the professional school or vocational model. Because ministry preparation also involved the craft of ministry, theological education was, in this way, more than scientific research. Because theological education demanded authorities that would not submit to human skepticism, questioning, and critique, it was, in another way, less than scientific research. By definition and presupposition, Wissenshaft rejected theology’s transcendent
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42 Ibid., 139.

43 Ibid., 144-5.

44 Kelsey, To Understand God Truly, 83.
resources and its authorities. One could not approach theology by way of the empirical sciences. The professional school rose out of the Berlin School due to the recognized need to combine this nineteenth century obsession for adapting applied scientific research methods to theology with the development of future ministry practitioners.

The professional model of the Berlin School was a hybrid approach that blended the research university and the world of craft, skill, and vocation. It integrated the cognitive and applied theoretical sciences with ministry skills through pedagogies of coaching and mentoring. Vocational preparation included theological knowledge as scientific research, professional skills, personal and social skills for managing people and communities, and Christian commitment and service. Consequently, from the birth of the professional school, professional interests informed clergy training. Conversion and knowing the Scriptures became irrelevant since the prime faculty was now research. Clergy training focused on the subject rather than the formation of the person or heart of the clerical candidate. Clergy training aimed for the public good so that clergy could engage in social and political issues.\textsuperscript{45} The ministry became a professional service where clergy went about a practice, a skill, an art, and a craft in the service of others, much like law and medicine. The professional school was rooted in the common practice of the day, apprenticeship.\textsuperscript{46}


Today, the graduate school of theological education and ministry preparation, or even the undergraduate school of theological education, is a professional school where students serving in three apprenticeships form clergy for ministry. First, students serve a cognitive apprenticeship under the research scholar. Second, they serve a practical apprenticeship under the supervision of the skilled cleric. Third, they serve a normative apprenticeship within the context of clergy service, the church.47

Cognitive and practical apprenticeships are standardized. They resemble both the scholastic and the research universities, but normative apprenticeships are more challenging. These apprenticeships require experimentation, and they must occur in the context of the profession’s service, the church. Here in the normative apprenticeship, the candidate for the clergy learns the values, the outlook, and the imagination of being a professional minister. The apprentice begins to take on the identity of the clergy and discovers the specific problem-solving paradigms that the graduate school could never teach in its sterile research environment. The normative apprenticeship—through the likes of field education and internships, or as some might call it, on-the-job training—emphasizes learning through doing and moves the candidate for ministry toward competence in the crafts, the skills, and the art of the profession.48 A normative apprenticeship working within the confines of the normal situation of the minister’s vocation, the local church, gives context to the cognitive and practical apprenticeships. In the normative apprenticeship, candidates develop relationship skills. They learn to listen for the religious content of their respective congregations. Here ministers learn to apply

47 Ibid., 5.

48 Ibid., 6.
their cognitive and practical training to life in that vibrant and dynamic organism, the church.\textsuperscript{49}

\textbf{Contemporary Theological Education}

Contemporary theological education maintains its legacy from Medieval Scholasticism and the university system, from the Reformers and their reduced curriculum, and from the Berlin School’s emphasis on scientific research and professionalism. The outcomes of these movements away from the biblical and historic models of theological education have blossomed into a different flower than perhaps educators expected. The minister today looks nothing like the pastor of the ancient church of the first millennium. Experts are proposing more “reforms” to theological education. This section will survey some of their proposals. Some, as Farley predicted, are band-aids to the symptoms rather than attacks on the cause; some are true reforms calling for a return to Farley’s \textit{theologia}, to biblical and ancient models, and to methods of \textit{paideia} and personal formation.

\textit{Niebuhr’s Intellectual Center of the Church}

With the Berlin School, theological education and ministry preparation devolved into centers where pastors trained as social workers. The function of the modern church was to meet humanity’s needs relative to society and nature rather than to God’s service.\textsuperscript{50} Clergy looked more like political leaders than they looked like the church’s

\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., 7.

\textsuperscript{50} H. Richard Niebuhr, \textit{The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry: Reflections on the Aims of Theological Education} (New York: Harper, 1956), 76.
sacramental officers. Ministers served as pastoral directors or business executives of their respective parishes. They administrated the secularized affairs of the church rather than administering the holy sacraments and ordinances of the church.

In the late 1950s, however, Richard Niebuhr surveyed the American theological education landscape and offered the first critique of contemporary theological education: “The critique of [theological] education requires the critique of theology and the critique of theology involves the critique of the church.” His critique of the church led him to compare the church to a filling station. Specialists in ministry emerged. Diversity of views and attempts to meet humanity’s needs fragmented the seminary. Who can train for all the possible ministries? In addition to offering the post-Reformation fare of language, history, theology, philosophy, and Bible, seminaries had innovated courses regarding the social gospel, social ethics, religious education, psychological counseling, and ecumenical studies. Niebuhr pines: Who can train in all of these areas?

Our schools, like our churches and our ministers, have no clear conception of what they are doing but are carrying on traditional actions, making separate responses to various pressures exerted by churches and society, contriving uneasy compromises among many values, engaging in little quarrels symptomatic of undefined issues, trying to improve their work by adjusting minor parts of the academic machine or by changing the specifications of the raw material to be treated.

51 Ibid., 9.
52 Ibid., 81.
53 Ibid., 47.
54 Ibid., 9.
55 Ibid., 95-7.
56 Ibid., 101.
Furthermore, Neibuhr complained that the division between the church and academy had formed a mutual distrust. Anti-intellectualism had formed in the church, and anti-ecclesiasticism had formed in the academy. Niebuhr proposed to bridge the divide by casting the academy as the “intellectual center of the church’s life.” Rather than correct these contrary opinions one toward the other, Niebuhr promoted a synergism where the church motivates the academy, and the academy motivates the church. The academy is not the church, and the church is not the academy. The academy is the intellectual member of the church. It is that place where one loves God with all one’s mind.

To alienate church from academy further, by adopting the cult of the Berlin School, the academy’s role included criticizing the church. The academy had become her conscience. The academy was now her judge, which was a role especially important to the Reformers. The academy had integrated the pure and applied sciences with theology. The academy had created theory and applied theory to practice. Other critics will later insist that the term theology carries the additional meanings of episteme and scientia. These refer to a cognitive enterprise using appropriate methods and resulting in a body of teachings. This secondary meaning now dominates theological education and continues to widen the gulf between academy and church.

57 Messer, Calling Church & Seminary, 26.
58 Niebuhr, Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry, 107-10.
59 Ibid., 110-29.
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Reacting against postmodernism’s challenge to authority and tradition and against its subsequent relativism, Arthur F. Holmes, professor of philosophy at Wheaton College, complains that contemporary theological education has neglected the need for a Christian worldview. Enlightenment individualism emancipated the culture from the restrictions of authorities or traditions. Postmodernism followed and liberated the culture from objective truth. To the postmodernist, knowledge and truth are relative. Holmes objects, “Students talk as if there is no such thing as truth or falsity, no right or wrong; they have no worldview to ground such ideas, and no sense of personal identity. There is no ‘big picture,’ no ‘metanarrative.’”61

According to Holmes, ancient Christian theology taught that God created through wisdom and that what He created was in His mind from before creation. Truth exists apart from creation, and God reveals truth to and in creation. Truth comes from God. The Logos of creation and of redemption His Son Jesus Christ is the Truth. The metanarrative and the big picture are about Jesus Christ.62

Holmes calls for the return of theological education to the Christian metanarrative that breeds epistemological confidence: the existence and unity of truth, which one finds in a person—Jesus Christ—the synergy of reason and revelation, the humility of scholarship, born of one’s realization that creation is finite and that all of

61 Holmes, Building the Christian Academy, 105-6.

62 Ibid.
humanity labors under its sinfulness. Since the Author and End of all things is One, then all truth and all ways to truth are one.

According to Holmes, “to capture for Christ the modern mind, its attitudes and ideas concerning science, the arts and society, is both integral to the biblical mandate and crucial to future history.”

Duane Litfin, president of Wheaton College, picks up his colleague’s call to transform the world for Christ when he defends theology in the university curriculum. Christian scholars in the academy, he asserts, want to “fulfill, at least in part, the so called ‘creation mandate.’” They desire, Litfin says, “to transform the world for Christ.” Their goal is “the Christianization of culture and society and the thinking of the academy.”

Borrowing from Charles Malik, former professor of philosophy at such distinguished schools as Notre Dame University and the Catholic University of America, Litfin asserts, “The University determines the course of events and the destiny of man more than any other institution or agency today.” Consequently,
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since all Christians begin with the person of the Lord Jesus Christ and since the Christian’s goal is to think and behave as “little christs,” then theological education must transform the university’s worldview.\textsuperscript{70} The prime motive for transforming culture must be one’s obedience to Christ. Like Daniel in Babylon, one must live faithfully to the Lord, even though surrounded by people of differing worldviews. One must resist those differences and remain uncompromisingly loyal to God. Likewise, the prime motive for educating the Christian mind must therefore be intrinsic rather extrinsic. One must obey from one’s loyal heart to Christ, from one’s loving obedience to His commands.\textsuperscript{71}

\textit{Suspicions toward Higher Education}

In keeping with Niebuhr’s observation that the church has a bent of suspicion toward the academy, Albert Mohler, president of Southern Baptist Seminary, and Darryl Hart, associate professor of church history at Westminster Theological Seminary, describe the Evangelical suspicion and protest toward higher education with refreshing honesty. Evangelicals are, they contend, “distrustful of formal learning and academic institutions.”\textsuperscript{72} Evangelicals, they add, are “suspicious of formal theological education and an overly scholarly exposition of the gospel.”\textsuperscript{73} Mohler and Hart castigate Evangelicals for their discomfort with theological education. They accuse Evangelicals of

\textsuperscript{70} Litfin, \textit{Conceiving the Christian College}, 79-80.

\textsuperscript{71} Ibid., 57-8.

\textsuperscript{72} Albert Mohler and D.G. Hart, eds., \textit{Theological Education in the Evangelical Tradition} (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1996), 9.

\textsuperscript{73} Ibid.
criticizing and protesting the larger community of Christianity. Instead, Evangelicals prefer to focus on the transforming power of the Good News. Too much head knowledge, they fear, tends to squeeze out heart knowledge.\footnote{Ibid., 7.}

According to Donald Messer, president of Iliff School of Theology, the heart of the conflict is the Evangelical’s “anti-intellectualism and fear of change.”\footnote{Messer, \textit{Calling Church & Seminary}, 10. See Howard, ed., \textit{Future of Christian Learning}, 15-6. In his introduction, Howard cites three culprits contributing toward Evangelicalism’s phobias toward higher education: (1) anti-intellectualism, (2) wariness of tradition, and (3) isolation, specifically an anti-ecumenism.} When Messer considers some of the more recent trends in theological education, he suspects that Evangelical suspicion of higher education may continue.\footnote{Messer, \textit{Calling Church & Seminary}, 65-70. Messer identifies nine trends, many of which may cause anxiety for Evangelicals: (1) feminism, (2) women on faculty, (3) ethnic diversity, (4) older students, (5) global and ecumenical perspectives in the curriculum, (6) regional rather than global, (7) faculty diversity, (8) gay and lesbian students, and (9) the average student has limited religious background.} He maintains that the rise of modern science, Enlightenment individualism, democratic liberalism, the modern research university model, colonization to decolonization, two world wars, affluent consumerism, and multi-cultural pluralism all contribute toward Evangelicalism’s phobias regarding higher education.

Adding to their bias toward anti-intellectualism, Evangelicals harbor distrust toward history and tradition. They isolate themselves from Christian sects and denominations. In keeping with the protest of their Protestant and Puritan roots, they fear any hint of Roman or papal Christianity.\footnote{Ibid., 8-16.} These fears create a defensive posture within

\footnote{74 Ibid., 7.}
\footnote{75 Messer, \textit{Calling Church & Seminary}, 10. See Howard, ed., \textit{Future of Christian Learning}, 15-6. In his introduction, Howard cites three culprits contributing toward Evangelicalism’s phobias toward higher education: (1) anti-intellectualism, (2) wariness of tradition, and (3) isolation, specifically an anti-ecumenism.}
\footnote{76 Messer, \textit{Calling Church & Seminary}, 65-70. Messer identifies nine trends, many of which may cause anxiety for Evangelicals: (1) feminism, (2) women on faculty, (3) ethnic diversity, (4) older students, (5) global and ecumenical perspectives in the curriculum, (6) regional rather than global, (7) faculty diversity, (8) gay and lesbian students, and (9) the average student has limited religious background.}
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\footnote{78 Ibid., 8-16.}
Evangelical theological education rather than meekness. Ministerial training prepares the would-be pastor to defend the Evangelical faith against Christian sects, denominations, and especially against Roman Catholicism, and for a ministry of personal revivalism. Yet in spite of Evangelicalism’s wariness toward higher education, Evangelicals are the largest contributors to and beneficiaries of theological education. How do Evangelicals react against denominational schools that have rejected necessary Evangelical components? Evangelicals start institutions of higher learning. Formal Evangelical training begins for some from their dissatisfaction with the status quo, with their protest. Born of their resistance to Roman liturgy and sacramental worship, Evangelicals tend to distrust anything routine, formal, and repeated. They prefer innovation. Likewise, they resist secularism’s relativism.

Return to Personal Formation

Recognizing the heavy emphasis on cognitive learning, reacting to the professional school paradigm, and answering the Evangelical suspicion toward the academy, some educators are addressing their students’ need for personal and spiritual formation. Similar to ancient paideia, personal formation seeks to help students form

79 Mark A. Noll, “Reconsidering Christendom,” in The Future of Christian Learning: An Evangelical and Catholic Dialogue, ed. Thomas A. Howard (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos, 2008), 23–70. Given the rise of Islam, secularism, and protesting atheism, perhaps all Christians should find common ground to defend the faith against external forces that threaten the church at large.

80 Mohler and Hart, eds., Theological Education in the Evangelical Tradition, 10-2.

81 Ibid., 14-7. The Evangelical paradigm that focuses on that which is opposed raises the question regarding when the first emergent church seminary will surface.
character and identity toward that of the image of Christ. The goal draws attention to
two types of knowledge and mysteries: knowledge of self and knowledge of God.\(^{82}\)

Advocates of personal formation (spiritual formation or character formation)
focus on the evolutionary process of personal development or growth. They often
describe the process with a metaphor, the journey of the heart. For some of these
advocates of formation, formal theological education becomes a crucible for weeding out
those who do not belong in ministry, those who are avoiding the journey of the heart.\(^{83}\)

To evade further suspicion, the academy must reveal its own journey of the
heart. Should not those who are instructing future clergy demonstrate their heart’s travel
itinerary? According to Parker J. Palmer, founder and senior partner of the Center for
Courage and Renewal and former senior associate of the American Association for
Higher Education, “Good teaching comes from the identity and integrity of the teacher.”\(^{84}\)
Teaching is an issue of the teacher’s heart. Teaching is an inner journey. Parker asserts,
“To educate is to guide students on an inner journey . . . .”\(^{85}\) Parker notes that most

---

\(^{82}\) Williams, \textit{Potter’s Rib}, 46. Williams advocates a return to Augustine and Calvin. With respect to Augustine, see his \textit{Soliloquies}, I.7: “[Augustine]. Behold I have prayed to God. R[eason]. What then wouldst thou know? A. All these things which I have prayed for. R. Sum them up in brief. A. God and the soul, that is what I desire to know. R. Nothing more? A. Nothing whatever.” With respect to Calvin see his \textit{Institutes}, I.1: “Our wisdom, in so far as it ought to be deemed true and solid Wisdom, consists almost entirely of two parts: the knowledge of God and of ourselves.”

\(^{83}\) Virginia Samuel Cetuk, \textit{What to Expect in Seminary: Theological Education as Spiritual Formation} (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1998), 189. See also Truman, “Importance of Being Earnest”, 9. The term one often hears today for describing the purpose for various entrance assessments is “rat catcher.”
Once students survive whatever mode of rat catching a seminary might use, then students must maneuver past any one of several processes used by theological education to thin the minister candidate pool.


\(^{85}\) Ibid., 6.
teachers of higher education chose their vocation because they care about students and their subject. Many lose heart because of the demands that come from higher education and from graduate school education, such as publishing, research, and committees. Palmer raises these fundamental questions regarding ministry preparation and theological education: How can seminary instructors teach clergy without focusing on the inner journey? How can seminary instructors lead clergy on this inner journey without being on the journey themselves? How can seminary instructors lead clergy if they have lost heart in teaching? DTS professor Howard Hendricks concurs. For Hendricks, changed lives are fundamental to his definition for learning; and change or growth starts with the teacher. “If you stop growing today, you stop teaching tomorrow.”

Arthur Holmes draws from an early period to observe that education—unlike today—was never about knowledge alone. Education drove onward to wisdom, which gave knowledge power. Professor of Systematic Theology at Princeton Theological Seminary Ellen Charry explains this recent movement away from wisdom:

Sapiental truth is unintelligible to the modern secularized construal of truth. Modern epistemology not only fragmented truth itself, privileging correct information over beauty and goodness, it relocated truth in facts and ideas. The

---
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search for truth in the modern scientific sense is a cognitive enterprise that seeks correct information useful to the improvement of human comfort and efficiency rather than an intellectual activity employed for spiritual growth. Knowing truth no longer implied loving it, wanting it, and being transformed by it, because the truth no longer brings the knower to God but to use information to subdue nature. Knowing became limited to being informed about things, not as these are things of God but as they stand (or totter) on their own feet. The classical notion that truth leads us to God simply ceased to be intelligible and came to be viewed with suspicion. . . .

Charry harkens back to the rise of reason in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Wisdom and virtue were lost and ignored. Participating in doctrine fell to systematizing doctrine and the correct assent to dogmas. She notes that for Augustine, science prepared the way for wisdom, but for theology today, science limits knowledge to itself alone.

Earlier goals for education emphasized character formation: it integrated a moral identity. Education’s unifying virtue was the fear of the Lord. Education disciplined the student’s thinking, and it demanded personal moral scrutiny. Holmes asserts that these historical emphases of Christian higher education demand that theological education focus on personal formation. Personal formation requires caring spiritual guidance from one who forms a friendship with the student and shows interest in the student’s growth and development. Interested in more than just the protégé’s intellectual and social relationships and the disciple’s competencies in ministry skills, the spiritual guide or mentor understands the need to help the student recognize strengths and

---
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weaknesses. The mentor, however, must model virtue and the student’s efforts for growth. Holmes suggests that each department should discuss the typical temptations for that profession. If intellectual pride threatens the philosopher or if greed threatens the entrepreneur, then theological education should warn students of threats native to ministry practice, and the spiritually forming curriculum should address these threats through a supportive community of faith.93

Edward Farley’s solution to the fragmentation of theological education proposes that institutions return to theologia.94 Theological understanding should be “the presupposed subject matter and goal of all education in the ecclesial community.”95 He recommends three major elements for a curriculum of ministry preparation characterized by theologia. First, he recommends that theologia or theological understanding must be both habitus of sapiential knowledge and a dialectical activity. Second, he suggests that theologia must be pedagogical, by which he means that education has two distinguishing characteristics: Education as paideia that forms the student and education as the content

93 Ibid., 116-7. Some have proposed a hybrid model that synthesizes the best features from personal formation, ministry formation, and critical or scientific research. See his “Utopia” in Kelsey, To Understand God Truly. For a summary and critique of this model, see Banks, Reenvisioning Theological Education, 46-57. They advocate both a model that forms the student personally in love and for ministry. “Theological education is for the sake of equipping and nurturing the people of God to witness faithfully and cogently in the world to the One who loves us beyond our comprehension. . . . To learn to love God truly and passionately is the goal of theological education.” See Carnegie Samuel Calian, The Ideal Seminary: Pursuing Excellence in Theological Education (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 2002), xi. In so doing, Calian says, they “shift from our present predominately ‘clerical paradigm’ to a ‘people of God paradigm,’” opening the doors to all rather than merely to those called into professional ministry. Ibid., xii. Does this not admit to the need to return responsibility for theological education back to the church?

94 See chapter 1.

95 Farley, Theologia, 176.
and method of study. Lastly, he proposes that *theologia* must be scholarly. It is not in competition with research and the sciences. Farley sums it up this way: “The education whose center is *theologia* is an ecclesial counterpart to *paideia*, focusing as it does, not on *arête*, but on a sapiential knowledge engendered by grace and self-disclosure.”

*Wolterstorff’s Call for Shalom*

Like Farley and advocates of the personal formation school, Nicholas Wolterstorff, reformed Christian and Yale Divinity School Professor, exhorts theological education to move away from its current focus on intellectualism and its liberal arts approach. He recommends that seminaries educate more than the mind. In his series of essays called *Educating for Shalom*, Wolterstorff reframes theological education as “scholarship placed in the service of peace and justice for humankind.” He “rejects the maturation, socialization, and humanization models for education, calling instead to teach for justice and shalom” Using the biblical Hebrew word for peace, Wolterstorff inflates the meaning of the word by envisioning a world of prosperity for all, a world where people happily respect and nourish their relationships with God, others, nature, and themselves. *Shalom* extracts all potential for the created order and acknowledges God’s goodness everywhere. *Shalom* voluntarily polices ethical and moral decisions, giving rise
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to social and political safety. *Shalom* is a command to pray and struggle for peace in the midst of a fallen creation, in the midst of pain and suffering. *Shalom* asks one to respond to hunger, to poverty, to domination and intimidation, to war, to fear and danger, to frustration, and to cries for help.\(^{101}\)

Wolterstorff’s goal for Christian higher education seeks to inspire students for engaging the world. He expects to encourage them to wrestle for peace.\(^{102}\) Because *shalom* begins in the heart of the Christian, his ontological focus on the student demands that Christian education return to its ancient focus of personal transformation. Because Christian higher education is only a part of Christianity, he calls it “an arm of the body of Christ in the world.”\(^{103}\) He adds that Christian higher education equips “members of the people of God for their lives as members of that people—a people that exists not for its own sake but for the sake of all humanity and thereby to the glory of God.”\(^{104}\) By way of implication, education’s goal does more than merely understand the world; it endeavors to change it. Education’s objective does more than impart a Christian worldview to students; it prepares them and moves them toward being and acting in a Christian way toward the world. For Wolterstorff, merely teaching abstract theories will never produce action.\(^{105}\)
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Conclusion

Where has the nearly two millennia journey taken theological education and ministry preparation? From the beginning of church memory until the Great Schism, following the lead of the Old Testament, Jesus, and the Apostles, bishops determined the theology of the church and handed down that theology to their disciples. Before the Great Schism, bishops met in ecumenical council to forge the dogmas of the church. Bishops trained their clergy through discipleship and mentoring. The goal of their training was personal, spiritual, and ministry formation. Following the Great Schism, the West relied on one bishop, the Patriarch of Rome, to form its dogmas. Out of this change in dogmatic authority, Scholasticism developed and grew as a model for preparing clergy. Intellectual formation trumped spiritual and ministry formation. After the Reformation, ordained clergy or the teaching elder determined the theology of the church. Intellectual formation prepared the would-be minister so that he could exegete the text as the authority. Today, all are theologians. For some, that means theological education includes all. By definition, the focus of the modern curriculum is rational and intellectual.

In the beginning, paideia’s source formed the would-be pastor, and thus personal identity informed the pastor engaged in ministry. For the pietist, the pastor studied the contents of the source and applied them to ministry. For the Berlin School and the Professional School of today, rather than any attention to the source, rather than
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107 Stanley J. Grenz and Roger E. Olson, Who Needs Theology: An Invitation to the Study of God (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1996), 12-21. See also Kelsey, To Understand God Truly, 202. Today, Rome decides for Roman Catholics; the seven ecumenical councils and Holy Tradition decides for the Orthodox; local church or denominational governing boards or academic faculties decide for Protestants; ultimately all are doing theology and making judgments about what is Christianity.
personal formation, theological education means cultivating the student’s capacity to theorize (philosophical theology) and apply his theory to social ills. Theology has become a verb.\(^{108}\)

The advent of formal education in colonial America separated the message from the medium. The intellectual development of the student trumped the spiritual formation of the pastoral candidate. Institutions have placed character and spiritual development well below linguistics, homiletics, theology, theory, logic, and philosophy. Apprenticeship, modeling, mentoring, discipleship, and praxis are victims of the academy’s institutionalism and bureaucracy.\(^{109}\)

Assessing the purposes and context of contemporary theological education demonstrates that theology as personal formation or theologia is no longer its purpose, and the church is no longer its culture or context. Before concluding his analysis regarding the state of theological education today, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary professor of history and systematic theology David Wells first assigns three features to theology.

Foundationally, theology must begin with the truth of God’s Word and, therefore, with the God of that Word, the God of unchanging truth. Theology, secondly, has to do with the interior life—with reflection, moral culture, intellectual formulation, and spiritual maturation. Third, it has to do with working out the intersection between that truth and the norms, values, hopes, and failures of . . . culture.\(^{110}\)

\(^{108}\) Kelsey, *To Understand God Truly*, 95.

\(^{109}\) Kling, "New Divinity Schools", 147.

Wells illustrates how theology as *theologia* is no longer the purpose. Seminary professors teach and students learn doctrinal substance. Students affirm and assent to a Christian worldview and set of dogmas. Students, however, fail to see truth’s reality. Students fail to see, for example, their own sin and sin in the world. After theological education, students cannot distinguish the incongruence and incompatibility between love for God and love for the world (Jas 4:4).\(^{111}\)

*Theologia* is not only lost from the curriculum of the academy. Wells accuses the church of abandoning its biblical and historic integrity: “Today this character is eroding in the church and loud calls are now being made for a different kind of ministry for which a different kind of preparation will be necessary.”\(^{112}\) The church is forming alliances with a religious humanism; he calls it “secular Evangelicalism.”\(^{113}\) As ministers come to serve this new breed of church, they bring their inability to distinguish love for God and love for the world. He finds it unsurprising then that “the Evangelical church is now drowning in its own worldliness.”\(^{114}\) Wells suggests that seminaries tend to treat the affects of secularism in one of three ways: (1) they are ignorant regarding secularism’s affect on the Christian faith; (2) they presuppose that secularism is neutral; or (3) they assume students magically possess discernment about the dangers secularism poses.\(^{115}\) Missing is a theology that leads to wisdom, humility, love of God, and love for neighbor.

\(^{111}\) Ibid.

\(^{112}\) Ibid., 297.

\(^{113}\) Ibid., 298.

\(^{114}\) Ibid.

\(^{115}\) Ibid.
Conspicuous by its absence and neglect, the intentional spiritual
development of contemporary seminary students stands as the overwhelming need in
contemporary theological education. The first millennium in faithfulness to biblical and
apostolic tradition focused on the heart of the ministry candidate. The second millennium
in faithlessness to that tradition has focused on the head of the ministry candidate. The
Great Schism divided the church and her means for preparing her shepherds.

The church today languishes for lack of a shepherd whose heart she has
trained to lead her. Such ministers are Christ’s pastors and shepherds of His flock. They
are great because they talk with God. They represent God to the flock and to the world.
Their citizenship is in heaven and their earthly experience is but a sojourn. They offer the
ceremonies of worship to God. They speak for God. They, more than others, leave their
passions and love for this world far behind them. Their love for God transcends their love
for all else in this life. They keep the wolves at bay from the flock, and for the flock, they
model the life of the Great and Good Shepherd Jesus Christ.¹¹⁶

King David was once a shepherd, too. He was known as a man after God’s
own heart (1 Sam 13:14). David lamented during his own repentance, “A broken and
contrite heart, O God, You will not despise” (Ps 51:17b). Since the Great Schism and the
advent of Scholasticism, of the university, and of the Berlin school, ministry as
shepherd the flock of God and the minister as Christ’s under-shepherd has been lost.
The preparation of shepherds and the shepherd’s heart has been lost. Seminaries no
longer prepare ministers to imitate the Good and Great Shepherd Jesus Christ. They no

Monastery, 2000), 23.
longer target *theologia*; the flock of God the church is no longer the context of theological education.

Given the absence of the minister candidate’s personal and spiritual formation as theological education’s purpose, how do contemporary candidates fare in areas of personal formation? What personal characteristics might the theological academy assess to determine the ministry candidate’s readiness for ministry based on criteria of personal formation? Next, chapter three will describe the Readiness for Ministry Project and the assessment instruments it produced for answering these kinds of questions about graduates of modern seminaries.
CHAPTER 3
PROCEDURE AND RESEARCH METHOD

Introduction

What do churches and parishes expect from a novice minister just graduating from seminary? The PoM Program, a trio of assessment instruments from ATS, aims to answer that question for seminary students, seminary faculty, and the churches these students hope to serve.

In order to gain a clearer understanding of the nature of the PoM program and its assessment value to DTS and its students, this chapter will describe the following:

1. History and development of the PoM instruments through the Readiness for Ministry Project (RfM)

2. Features of the three instruments derived from RfM for the PoM program

3. Specific PoM scales evaluated by this project and their respective research hypothesis

4. Benefits accrued to member schools of ATS after employing PoM

5. PoM at DTS

6. Subjects for this project

Using an aggregate PoM report of all graduating DTS students from the fall of 2009 and focusing on ten PoM criteria that evaluate the personal characteristics of the student’s heart, ministerial relationships, and personal faith, this project will assess the
readiness for ministry of graduating students at DTS. After studying at DTS, students should be ready for ministry according to the following ten PoM criteria of personal characteristics:

1. Fidelity to Tasks and Persons
2. Personal Responsibility
3. Acknowledgment of Limitations
4. Involvement in Caring
5. Perceptive Counseling
6. Mutual Family Commitment
7. Ministry Precedence over Family
8. Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety
9. Belief in a Provident God
10. Christian Spirituality

Contemporary theological education focuses on the student’s head and hand, on cognitive learning and skills training, on the intellectual and on the communication of content. These personal characteristics, however, measure the heart values and dispositions of the student, issues pertaining to Farley’s *theologia*. These criteria attempt to measure the likelihood that students will lead in their service, demonstrate care to people in need, keep personal balance between ministry and family, and trust God during the performance of ministry.

---

1 See Research Subjects in this chapter for the scope of “graduating students at DTS.”
2 For definitions of these criteria, see PoM Scales Considered for This Project later in this chapter.
History of RfM Project

While revising standards for the accreditation of their member theological schools in 1970–72, ATS realized that their members needed ways or tools to assess the quality of their education. Schools needed more than grade point averages for evaluating their students and the institution’s effectiveness. Schools needed a quantifiable way to verify that graduating students were prepared for ministry.

The research began in May 1973. ATS formed the initial RfM research team in partnership with the research agency Search Institute. ATS Associate Director and later ATS President David S. Schuller led Milo L. Brekke and Merton P. Strommen from Search Institute. Current ATS Executive Director Daniel O. Aleshire joined the team in July 1975, and in the fall of 1976, Francis Lonsway, now retired, former Director of the PoM program at ATS, completed Schuller’s research team. RfM took six years spanning 1973 to 1979 to complete its work. A grant from the Lilly Endowment funded the basic research. The Lutheran Brotherhood assisted toward the later publication of results, provided computer time, and additional funding.

---

3 David S. Schuller, Milo Brekke, and Merton P. Strommen, Readiness for Ministry: Criteria (Vandalia, OH: Association of Theological Schools, 1975), iv.


6 Ibid., xvi.

7 Ibid., iv.
The stated purpose for RfM was to “develop ways of assessing readiness for the practice of professional ministry.” RfM realized three corollary outcomes from the research. First, RfM identified criteria for assessing the effectiveness of a new minister. Second, RfM developed a set of instruments for assessing the degree to which the students exhibited those criteria. Third, schools employed these instruments to help students establish educational and vocational goals and to help students create programs of continuing education. Through the instrument’s reporting, faculty from ATS member schools analyzed the data to evaluate educational outcomes of their respective school’s curriculum.

The challenge of defining readiness for ministry proved daunting and elusive. With so many denominations, with the variety of parachurch organizations, and with the advent of ministry specialists, how might one define contemporary ministry? If ministry eludes definition, then how might one assess the qualities, abilities, and knowledge required for beginning ministers leaving the seminary? What do novice ministers fresh out of seminary need as they approach their first church or parish assignment? Without a consensus definition, how might one gauge the effectiveness of ministry going forward?

---

8 Schuller, Brekke, and Strommen, *Criteria*, vi.

Ministry Criteria Defined

The RfM research team’s first step was to create a taxonomy of criteria for future assessment instruments. What do people identify as an act of ministry? What past experiences cause them to acknowledge that ministry had been accomplished either effectively or ineffectively? Since theological education primarily targets people who are called into pastoral service, then who better to assess the quality of that education than the clergy who prepare for ministry. Likewise, since theological education directly affects parishioners, then who better to assess the quality of that education than those who receive the benefit—or the detriment—who better than the laity for whom that education has prepared the student for ministry?

RfM researchers used a procedure called critical incidents to help over twelve hundred survey respondents from every walk of church life remember episodes of ministry they had received from clergy and explain why they believed these episodes were effective or ineffective. Surveyors asked respondents to describe specific incidents or moments when they believed clergy either effectively or ineffectively had ministered to them. From these collected narratives and a review of the literature regarding ministry, researchers composed 850 questionnaire items into a pretest, in which over two thousand people from the forty-seven denominations represented by ATS—half clergy and half professors, pastors, priests, denominational leaders, and senior seminary students. See ibid., xix.

10 Schuller, Brekke, and Strommen, Criteria, vi.

11 Schuller, Strommen, and Brekke, eds., Ministry in America, 14.

12 For the RfM study, “clergy” means seminary professors, pastors, priests, denominational leaders, and senior seminary students. See ibid., xix.

13 Schuller, Brekke, and Strommen, Criteria, iv.
laity—participated. Keeping in mind their ministry context, respondents weighed the relative importance of each item.¹⁴ From those pretest results emerged a refined questionnaire of 444 items of particular ministerial behaviors. Nearly five thousand respondents—444 professors, 441 senior seminary students, 1917 seminary graduates in ministry, 322 denominational officials, and 1871 laity from forty-seven denominations—participated in the second survey. As with the first survey, this subsequent survey asked participants to judge the relative importance of each item.¹⁵

To this second round of data, RfM researchers applied both cluster and factor analysis, which mathematically organized consistent response patterns of the data into useful characteristics or dimensions.¹⁶ From these two independent methods, researchers identified sixty-four core clusters of criteria that described dimensions of ministry.¹⁷ By averaging their scores, researchers ranked each cluster’s relative importance to the participants. The top clusters described the five values people most sought in their minister:

1. Service without Regard for Acclaim: Ministers acknowledge their limitations and do not covet public recognition.

¹⁴ Respondents rated each item’s importance according to the following scale: highly important, essential or mandatory; quite important, a major asset; somewhat important, a minor asset; neither important nor unimportant; somewhat detrimental, a minor hindrance in ministry; quite detrimental, a major hindrance in ministry; and highly detrimental, harmful, could destroy the effectiveness of ministry. See Schuller, Strommen, and Brekke, eds., *Ministry in America*, 22.

¹⁵ Ibid., 14-6.

¹⁶ Ibid., 21-2. For a fuller explanation, see chapter four of Schuller, Brekke, and Strommen, *Criteria*.

¹⁷ See appendix A.
2. Personal Integrity: Ministers honor commitments despite pressures to compromise.

3. Christian Example: Ministers reveal their faith by their generosity, and the community respects their minister as a model citizen.

4. Acknowledging Mistakes and Limitations: Ministers recognize their need for continued growth and learning.

5. Community Builder: Ministers know their parishioners, and they have earned their parishioners' trust.  

On the opposite end of the scale, participants ranked these personal characteristics the three least desirable in their ministers:

1. Undisciplined Living: Ministers demonstrate self-indulgent behavior, even to the point of illicit sexual relationships.

2. Self-Serving: Ministers avoid intimacy and repel people through criticism, demeaning assaults, and insensitivity, even taking on an air of superiority.

3. Professional Immaturity: Ministers reveal their insecurities.

The RfM research, therefore, consists of data collected from the opinions of people in North American ecclesial and academic organizations. The surveys sought to identify a snapshot of how people understood ministry and their expectations of ministers. The project aimed at presenting the realities of ministry according to contemporary churchgoers. One might raise the question that this study, although empirical in methodology, bases its research on opinion rather than transcendent

---


19 Ibid., 16-20.

20 Ibid., 12-4.
revelation, history, theology, or the needs of the church regardless of era and culture. RfM administrative director and former ATS Associate Director Daniel Schuller echoes his team’s sensitivity to this problem, “From the beginning of the project’s design, the research team has been sensitive to this danger of reducing ministry to its human dimension, of highlighting sociological and psychological issues while slighting the more elusive theological dimensions.” Schuller describes the care and extra effort his team used to prevent an unbalanced, humanistic instrument design:

Therefore, while deliberately pressing to describe the work of the ministry as concretely and specifically as possible, we eagerly invited biblical, theological, and historical input to assure the description of contemporary ministries that would stand the test of theological critique. It was for this reason that theological professors (biblical, historical, and so on) were involved in developing the pool of items that were used to form the survey questionnaire. They were also included as one sector of the professional group of ministers surveyed.

Not only did Schuller’s team include subject matter experts for quality control of their research, they also deployed a second questionnaire designed to capture input from a broader range of people than the first questionnaire. They sought to hear from all, thus allaying any fears that the instrument’s research was market-driven.


22 Schuller, Strommen, and Brekke, eds., Ministry in America, 13.

23 Ibid.

24 Ibid.
Ministry Areas Defined

Repeating the analysis against the sixty-four core clusters yielded eleven major ministry themes called factors, which are like families or areas of ministry. In no rank order the eleven factors were:

1. Ministry to the Community and World
2. Spiritual Ministry from Personal Faith-Commitment
3. Disqualifying Personal and Behavioral Characteristics
4. Open, Affirming Style
5. Development of Koinonia and Liturgia
6. Legalistic, Docetic Privatism
7. Priestly-Sacramental Ministry
8. Congregational Leadership
9. Caring for Persons under Stress
10. Theologian in Life and Thought
11. Denominational Awareness and Loyalty

From these areas, researchers aimed to describe ministry as its functions and to identify those personal characteristics that transcend function. The eleven themes defined ministry functions as the minister’s skills and competencies and as issues of the

---

25 For a more detailed account of this step in the process, see chapter four of Schuller, Brekke, and Strommen, *Criteria*.

26 Schuller, Strommen, and Brekke, eds., *Ministry in America*, 24.
minister’s character, faith, and personhood. Again, the average scores from these areas produced a ranking of their relative importance to one another.\textsuperscript{27}

Leading the factors as the most desirable ministerial quality was an approach to ministry called Open, Affirming Style. This family describes the minister’s manner, which transcends the functions of ministry. The minister is one who honors commitments despite pressures to compromise. The minister is one who acknowledges limitations and mistakes and recognizes the need to grow and learn. The minister is one who remains calm and affirming under pressure. The minister is one who demonstrates competence and responsibility by finishing work, relating well to others, and handling differing opinions.\textsuperscript{28} The most important themes follow this same transcendent quality of the minister’s personal characteristics for ministry.

On the opposite pole, that which respondents considered harmful to ministry, clusters congregated into the least desirable factor of ministry called Disqualifying Personal and Behavioral Characteristics. These clusters focus on qualities of the minister’s person as well. Ministers scoring high in this area avoid intimacy and repel people. They are undisciplined and self-indulgent. They are immature, insecure, and insensitive. They waffle according to the tides of opposition. They participate in a secular lifestyle. They are irresponsible, and they are manipulative.

RfM researcher and current ATS Executive Director Aleshire summarizes well the importance for training the whole person:

\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 29.

\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., 31.
The most highly rated themes portray a merger of certain qualities of personhood and character with a certain competence in ministry skills. The themes evaluated as most detrimental reflect a similar merger of personal qualities (this time, negative qualities) and ministry activities that reflect incompetence in real practice. The personal self is not separated from the professional self at either the positive or negative ends. The patterns in the data imply an integrated perception of ministry not unlike the Christian concept of the incarnation. The message of grace and righteousness is incarnated in the life of the one who is called to share grace and to urge followers to righteousness. There is, of course, tension between the completeness of the truth the minister or priest proclaims and the incompleteness with which any embodiment occurs. But to contend that the minister or priest need not embody the truth of the proclamation is likely as faulty as to contend that the embodiment must be perfect in order to have the qualification to proclaim.  

Sadly, theological education tends to avoid direct influence of these two polarizing personal areas in its curricula. Typically, theological education focuses on skills and ideas. Theological education mostly prepares ministers cognitively, but it leaves the minister unprepared for the transcendent personal characteristics of the minister: personhood and faith. Contemporary theological education has adopted the university model, where lecture and debate replaced the personal discipleship of the biblical model and the early church. Contemporary theological education has adopted the research and professional model of the Berlin School, where theory trumps experience and practice, and where professional skills trump personal character. Contemporary theological education considers itself Niebuhr’s intellectual center of the church, where a transformed worldview rather than a transformed heart demonstrates readiness for ministry, thus validating Farley’s complaint.  

---

29 Ibid., 50.
30 Ibid., 32.
31 Ibid., 50.
Ministry Models Defined

The greatest factor for determining how people view ministry—greater than clergy vs. laity, men vs. women, or any other demographic marker—comes from one’s denominational family. Aleshire observes, “Of the seventeen variables considered in the various multivariate analyses, we found that differences introduced by denomination account for the largest portion of variance. No other grouping results in such marked differences in the priorities people give various kinds of ministry.” The perception of clergy and laity came in second to denomination as the most major source of variation. One might infer that people intuitively place their church in a transcendent position to all other variables in their own thinking. From an analysis of how people ranked the sixty-four core clusters along denominational families, four models of ministry—“four identifiable patterns that suggest four differing emphases in ministry”—emerged from the data. They are the Spiritual Emphasis, the Sacramental-Liturgical Emphasis, the Social Action Emphasis, and the Combined Emphasis.

**Spiritual Emphasis**

Denominational families subscribing to the Spiritual Emphasis model include Southern Baptists and those in the Evangelical A family. This model defines ministry

---

32 Ibid., 27.

33 Ibid., 88.

34 Ibid., 56-60.

35 Researchers grouped Evangelicals into two families. The Baptist General Conference, Baptist Missionary Association of America, Conservative Baptist Association, Evangelical Free Church of America, and the North American Baptist Conference comprise Evangelical A. The Church of God, Church of the Nazarene, Church of the New Jerusalem (Swedenborgian), Churches of God (General Conference),
according to the ministry area called Ministry from Personal Commitment to Faith. Of the 64 core clusters, clergy and laity agreed that their ministers should possess these: Encouragement of Spiritual Sensitivity, Theocentric-Biblical Ministry, Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety, Christian Example, Secular Lifestyle, and Theologically Oriented Counseling. These denominational families would agree that a high score in Secular Lifestyle hinders ministry. They would hope their ministers would score low on this trait. Other clusters appealing to laity included: Affirmation of Conservative Biblical Faith, Assertive Individual Evangelism, Evangelical Witness, Precedence of Evangelistic Goals, and “Born-Again” Christianity. The clusters that form this model suggest that constituents of these denominational families prefer ethical living and evangelism to other functions of ministry. Religious experience and spirituality should occupy the minister’s time, energy, and focus.

**Sacramental-Liturgical Emphasis**

Denominational families subscribing to the Sacramental-Liturgical Emphasis model include Roman Catholic, Orthodox, and Anglican-Episcopal. This model stresses the area of ministry called Priestly-Sacramental Ministry. They characterize ministry according to three of the sixty-four core clusters: Priestly Commitment, Sacramental-

Evangelical Congregational, Evangelical Covenant Church of America, and Seventh-day Adventists make up Evangelical B. The inter-denominational mix of the DTS student-body makes it difficult to categorize DTS into one family. DTS students come mostly from Evangelical A, Southern Baptist, and Presbyterian-Reformed families. Evangelical B and Anglicans comprise two more growing communities on the campus.

36 Schuller, Strommen, and Brekke, eds., *Ministry in America*, 60-5.
Liturgical Ministry, and Denominational Collegiality. The clusters that comprise this model suggest that parishioners especially expect their ministers to take their priestly vows seriously, to adopt a sacramental lifestyle, and to focus on the liturgical and Eucharistic functions of the community. Constituents in these denominational families have a high regard for ordination, wanting their ministers to have a focus on the sacred nature of their calling.

Social Action Emphasis

Denominational families subscribing to the Social Action Emphasis model include Christian (Disciples), United Church of Christ, and United Church of Canada. This model is a less definitive emphasis than Spiritual or Sacramental-Liturgical. For these denominational families, ministry to their communities and to the world takes priority over other ministerial functions. The clusters forming this model suggest that Ministry to Community and World best describe the Social Action Emphasis. According to constituents here, their ministers should score high in these clusters: Support for Unpopular Causes, Promotion of Understanding of Issues, Interest in New Ideas, Support for Community Causes, and Aggressive Political Leadership. These denominational families react negatively to high scores in clusters common to the Spiritual Emphasis: Precedence of Evangelistic Goals and Law Orientation to Ethical Issues. Often, because of their openness of style, advocates of the Social Action Emphasis are called liberal.

---

37 Ibid., 65. “Denominational Collegiality” emerged as a less distinct pattern of this group since it appears as a favorable cluster amongst many denominations.

38 Ibid., 66.

39 Ibid., 66-8.
**Combined Emphasis**

The Combined Emphasis is the least distinctive of the other three models. Denominational families of the United Methodist Church (UMC) and Presbyterian-Reformed Churches (PRC) support this model, and this model borrows from any of the previous three models. For example, the UMC values social responsibility and action, yet its Anglican-roots compel the denomination’s interests in the Sacramental-Liturgical Emphasis as well. The PRC espouses two main emphases that betray the denomination’s division between laity and clergy: one by the laity, which is evangelism and personal religious experience and one by the clergy, which is social action. Hearkening back to the denomination’s formation under John Knox, the PRC continues to promote a strong lay leadership.

**RfM Instrument Package Developed**

Out of the RfM research, three instruments emerged for measuring readiness for ministry according to the criteria discovered from the various surveys: RfM Casebook, RfM Interview, and RfM Field Observation Survey. Focused directly on the needs of theological educators and students, the RfM instrument set presents a unique profile of desirable—and undesirable—ministry functions and qualities. From this multi-method approach, the RfM Instrument Package estimated the presence or absence

---

of thirty-nine of the original sixty-four core clusters.41 Today, building on the RfM research, the PoM program maintains forty-three scales.42

While the RfM Field Observer Survey asks those who have witnessed the student’s performance in a ministry context for their perceptions of the student, the RfM Casebook and the RfM Interview form a two-pronged approach for collecting data from the student. The Casebook and Interview yield four values and benefits to the student:

1. Between the RfM Casebook and Interview, students find an assessment to their liking—whether one prefers written or oral examinations.

2. The RfM Interview depends on the student’s personalized approach to answering the items, while the RfM Casebook structures responses for the student.

3. Through both the RfM Casebook and Interview, students reflect on ministry situations and upon their own experiences.

4. Although the RfM Interview format appears open-ended, it shares a detailed scoring key for each response.43

By incorporating three different instruments, the assessment set created a more thorough profile of the student.

**The RfM Casebook**

Asking seminarrians to gauge the unlikelihood to likelihood of various responses to a specific ministerial situation, the RfM Casebook captured their

41 Ibid., 42; Lonsway, Profiles of Ministry: A Thirty-Year Study, 2. Lonsway reports that the RfM Instrument Package reduced the number of clusters from sixty-four to thirty-five.

42 Lonsway, PoM: A Thirty-Year Study, 28. See appendix C of this project for the chronology and evolution of RfM and PoM instrument development.

43 Schuller, Brekke, Strommen, and Aleshire, Assessment, 32.
transcendent doctrinal perspectives as represented by their would-be practices and behaviors. The first RfM Casebook contained thirty-five cases for analysis. After reading a case describing a ministry situation, the student would evaluate several possible ways to respond to each particular situation. On a seven-point Likert scale, students would rate the unlikelihood to likelihood that a response represented their way of responding to the situation. By using real life situations, the RfM Casebook unveiled the presence or absence of twenty-five criteria in students.

The RfM Interview

Reflecting the verbal nature of ministry, the RfM Interview sought to discover the thought, experience, and attitudes of seminarians. On the one hand, the RfM Casebook chose the language and structure of the student’s answer. The student rated each possible response according to a range of likelihood. On the other hand, the RfM Interview format produced free expression from the seminarian. The initial RfM Interview contained sixty-four scripted items. The interviewer read these items to the student without comment. All sixty-four scripted items related to seventeen criteria of the sixty-four core clusters. The student’s discursive responses to each item were recorded and replayed for scoring. The student’s response revealed the student’s relative evidence of the criteria. A detailed key later applied to the taped responses produced the scoring on

---

44 Ibid., 22. See appendix C.

45 Current PoM instruments have replaced the 7-point Likert scale with a 5-point Likert scale.

46 Schuller, Brekke, Strommen, and Aleshire, Assessment, 26.
a seven-point Likert scale. Coding the tape-recorded responses required a trained interpreter who listened for evidence of the student’s thoughts, experiences, and attitudes within each item’s response.

**The RfM Field Observation Survey**

While the RfM Casebook and Interview approach the assessment from the student’s perspective, the Field Observation Survey asks for third party evaluations of the student’s performance in a ministry context. From those constituents affected by the student’s ministry, the survey directly captured how those receiving ministry from the student and those mentoring, supervising, and consulting the student during ministry perceive the student’s abilities and competencies. Observers rated the student in two formats. First, from a list of behaviors, field observers identified the one behavior that best characterized the student. Second, using descriptive language of the behaviors, the observer rated the student’s likelihood to behave in certain ways on a five-point Likert scale. Together both formats reduced typical errors caused by an observer’s leniency toward the student.

**Ministry Profile**

From these three instruments, a student profile of ministry materializes. These instruments compare the importance of ministry function and personal characteristics

---

47 Ibid., 30.


49 Schuller, Brekke, Strommen, and Aleshire, Assessment, 36-42.
with the student’s likelihood to possess that competency, skill, attitude, value, or characteristic. As a result, the final profile reports a description of individual readiness rather than a prescribed picture of readiness. From this vantage, the profile gains its inherent value and meaning from the student’s proposed context of ministry rather than pre-assigned meaning from a phantom, global definition of ministry.\(^{50}\)

The RfM researchers summarized the interpretation of RfM’s profile this way:

The profile graphically portrays the criterion-referenced nature of the Project information. While most instrument profiles show a student’s score in reference to the norm or average of all students completing the same instrument, the Readiness profile shows the student’s score in reference to the expectation placed on that criterion by a student’s own denominational family in particular, and by the North American religious community in general.\(^{51}\)

For students, this means that their Profile is personal, not weighted against competing profiles. This format opens the door to a personal interview and consultation with the student by the institution. For the institution, this means each student is known and understood according to a personal context and in a personal way. The process demonstrates to the student that ministry is a personal, face-to-face enterprise.

The RfM researchers continue their summary of the profile’s interpretation:

This referencing strategy means that adequate use and interpretation of the Project information depends largely on interpreting the meaning of discrepancies of the student’s scores from expectations. If an individual seeks to be different from the expectations of the denomination, then the distances only reflect the effect on that conscious effort. If the individual affirms the value of the expectation, but his/her score is discrepant from it, then the distances define areas for growth and change.\(^{52}\)

\(^{50}\) Ibid., 56.

\(^{51}\) Ibid., 44.

\(^{52}\) Ibid., 45-6.
Profile interpretation becomes a validation process rather a mystical reading of tealeaves. Students affirm the peaks or spikes in their score and the deltas between their score and the expectation of their denomination. Those consulting with the students never impose an interpretation on the student. Instead, they facilitate a discovery process, in which the student explains the differences.

During the instrument set’s inaugural year, ATS tested the three instruments at thirty-five of their member schools. Two years later, profiles had surfaced that identified potential hindrances to effective ministry. RfM determined that a parallel set of instruments for matriculating and first year seminarians could identify these profiles early so that the seminary and student could address them during the student’s education—rather than discover these hindrances at the student’s graduation. With both sets of instruments in place, seminaries and their students could assess their formation for ministry by the school and denomination.53

**Subsequent Research**

In 1979, recognizing the potential of the RfM Instrument Packet for not only assessing readiness for ministry in graduating students, the RfM researchers likewise developed a casebook and interview that would also assess entering students for ministry formation. Seminaries evaluated their matriculating students in order to identify early any missing traits for ministry and to enrich the exiting assessment of graduating students.54

During the 1987 revision, ATS had realized the goal of the RfM project; they had


54 Ibid., 23.
produced a means for measuring and assessing readiness for ministry in seminary students. The RfM Instrument Packet then officially became today’s Profiles of Ministry Program.\textsuperscript{55} The set of instruments for entering seminarians became Stage I and the set for exiting and graduating seminarians became Stage II.\textsuperscript{56} In 1988, fifteen years after the initial RfM research, and again in 2003, thirty years after the initial RfM research—both through Lilly Endowment grants—ATS repeated the research survey. Each repetition of the research, using a new pool of survey respondents, validated the original conclusions of the RfM project.\textsuperscript{57}

In the 1987-88 survey, ATS wanted to verify the criteria identified in the 1973-74 survey. Were the criteria that had produced the instruments still valid and valued among clergy and laity? This 330-item questionnaire contained two revisions over the first survey. First, the second survey focused on items directly targeting the criteria of the thirty-five core clusters in the instruments. Second, it addressed a new category called Contemporary Issues, which were meant to evaluate personal spirituality, broad social justice issues, and the role of women in the church.\textsuperscript{58} Of the 5,776 sampled, 45.1 percent or 2,607 responded. This response rate was similar to that of the 1973-74 survey.\textsuperscript{59} Remarkably, agreement between clergy and laity and between the denominations

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., 1.
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., 3.
\textsuperscript{58} Lonsway, \textit{PoM: A Thirty-Year Study}, 2-3.
\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., 2.
increased regarding negative areas of personal characteristics. Respondents knew best what they did not want in their minister. They maintained some agreement regarding positive personal characteristics. The largest divergences were in criteria measuring approaches to ministry.60

During 2002-05, ATS repeated their analysis of the PoM program in a thirty-year study called Profiles of Ministry Survey. Using the same survey as 1987-88, they polled 5,570 clergy and laity with a response rate of 43.7 percent or 2,433. This survey revealed a significant difference in the criteria between gender and age groups.61

Francis Lonsway, RfM researcher and PoM Program Director, summarizes the gender differences from the Personal Characteristics section of the PoM study:

The differences between male and female respondents are clear and striking. While both groups hold high expectation for positive character traits and view negative characteristics as potentially damaging to ministry, women hold both higher expectations for positive characteristics among young clergy and are less tolerant of potential negative traits among these same clergy.62

To illustrate this difference, Lonsway concludes that two words—“relationship” for the women and “clarity” for the men—sum up the differences between genders in the Perceptions of Ministry section of the PoM Study. Women chose those scales evoking


61 Lonsway, PoM: A Thirty-Year Study, 3.


The age differences became significant between two groups: those over forty and those under forty. Out of the thirty-eight characteristics, only two demonstrate the differences between these age groups. Those respondents over forty value Competent Preaching. Those respondents under forty value Support for Women in the Church.

Lonsway summarizes the differences in these two values for these two age groups: “One can reasonably surmise that a lifetime of church attendance would bring the quality of preaching and the style of worship to the fore. So, too, the emerging presence of women in leadership positions may reflect more of a mood to ‘Let’s get on with it’ or ‘Why has this taken so long?’”

Using reliability coefficients, ATS validated instrument accuracy in 1990, 1995, 2000, and 2005. Instrument reliability determines the precision of a scale’s ability to measure a concept. It identifies an approximation of uniformity. The higher the score the more confidence one has in the evaluation of the student. The lower the score the less confidence one has in that criterion to describe the student. Do the items that make up a scale characterize the scale in a single and meaningful way? The internal reliability of the Casebook and the Field Observation Survey scores high in instrument reliability.

---

63 Ibid., 2.

64 Lonsway, PoM: A Thirty-Year Study, 19.

65 Ibid., 2.
Reliability scores range from .00 to 1.00. Normally, scores above .70 are adequate for attitudinal scales like PoM. 66

The Interview, however, has substantially less reliability because (1) the student’s answers are not points on a Likert scale but approximations on a broad spectrum and (2) the Interview has far fewer items to compare and to contribute to the scales than do either the Casebook or the Field Observation Survey. Nonetheless, reliability is less of a factor for the Interview since it measures the evidence rather than likelihood of a criterion. 67

PoM Today

The RfM researchers met their two initial goals. First, in spite of the enormous mix of diversity between denominational families and the interchange of clergy and laity responses, the RfM researchers identified the characteristics, traits, values, competencies, and attitudes necessary for the graduating seminarian and beginning minister. Second, although remaining faithful to empirical research and measurements was challenging, they developed an instrument package that would help seminarians assess these

66 Aleshire and Schuller, Advisor’s Manual, 51-2; 93-6. See appendix D for PoM’s Reliability Coefficients for this study’s research criteria. In his thirty-year study of the program, Francis Lonsway summarizes the reliability of the PoM Program’s criteria, “More than 90 percent (92.8%) of the twenty-eight Casebook scores currently rest comfortably above .60; three-quarters of them, in fact, range between .70 and .87. These are solid measures, able to be strengthened, certainly, but ‘respectable.’ Only Balanced Approach to World Missions (MSBL) and Personal Responsibility (RESP) as measured in the Stage II Casebook suggest the need for a closer look as the program goes forward.” Between 1995 and 2003, the reliability of Personal Responsibility dropped from a strong .79 to a surprising .59 suggesting to ATS the need for further study into this scale. See Lonsway, PoM: A Thirty-Year Study, 25. According to exit interviews at DTS, the low reliability of RESP may mean the aggregate score is inflated.

67 Aleshire and Schuller, Advisor’s Manual, 51-2; 93.
characteristics, traits, values, competencies, and attitudes. These assessment instruments not only uncovered characteristics for healthy ministry, but they also helped the ministry candidate discover characteristics that might prove detrimental to ministry success.

Following the thirty-year study, Francis Lonsway, who joined the RfM research team in 1976, summarizes the history and the current state of the PoM Program: “Measured by the criterion of efficiency, a useful measure for all tests, PoM holds up well. It gathers a significant amount of information on characteristics judged important to ministry, in a timely fashion, and with reasonable statistical rigor.” 68 The PoM program, he concludes, is healthy and prepared to evolve and grow. The PoM program today is a proper and right tool for seminarians and churches. 69

**PoM Reporting Features**

PoM evaluates entering and graduating students of theological education in personal formation and in ministry formation. ATS calls the measured criteria or scales for personal formation Personal Characteristics. ATS calls the measured criteria for ministry formation Perceptions of Ministry. 70

---


69 Ibid.

Personal Characteristics

The criteria of Personal Characteristics measured by the PoM report describe the qualities of the student’s relationship tendencies in ministry. These criteria describe the way personal traits inform ministry performance. ATS defines the scales under Personal Characteristics as follows:

Ministry is one of those human endeavors where personal qualities are so mingled with the performance of tasks that it is frequently difficult to separate personal tendencies from ministerial skills. Whether leading a congregation, counseling a parishioner, or preaching a sermon, personal qualities influence how the task is performed. While the scales reported in this section are not measures of personality characteristics, they do indicate ways in which personal tendencies may influence your approach to ministry. Measures include your typical approach to relationships with others, perspectives on faith, and orientation to family relationships.\(^7\)

The work of ministry, in order to be effective, requires personal traits or qualities unmatched by any other profession. Attitude, values, and faith form the ministerial profile in addition to skills and competencies. In the context of ministry, clergy and laity affirm with equal vigor, and denominations across the spectrum agree, that the intangible and invisible characteristics of the minister influence the perception of successful ministry and its execution. Even though ministers may complete their ministry assignments competently and skillfully, conflict arises when their character and faith contradict their work. Either the quality of the minister’s family life at its intersection with ministry can embellish an otherwise mediocre service, or it can derail an otherwise effective service to the parish or local church.

\(^7\) Ibid., 5.
Survey respondents rated many of the Personal Characteristics criteria as extremely important. Across all demographic and denominational matrices, respondents agreed more about these criteria than about any other PoM scales. These features of ministers make their service Christian.\footnote{Aleshire and Schuller, \textit{Advisor's Manual}, 2. See appendix B for the scales in this group.} Four groupings or clusters of criteria comprise the Personal Characteristics section of the PoM report:

1. Responsible and Caring
2. Family Perspectives
3. Personal Faith
4. Potential Negatives

This project will assess select criteria from the first three clusters: Responsible and Caring, Family Perspective, and Personal Faith. This project will not examine criteria from the Potential Negatives cluster.

\textit{Perceptions of Ministry}

The second section of the PoM criteria, called Perceptions of Ministry, describes a student’s vision or emphasis in ministry, as well as measures a student’s key skills and competencies in ministry and certain attitudes or values toward ministry. These criteria are neither competitive nor topological.

The scores on the second and third pages of the profile relate to various approaches to the work of ministry. The scores within each of the four sets cluster empirically and logically. People tend to score in similar ways on scales within a set although there will be variations. Each of the four groups of scores represents an orientation to the overall task of ministry. A person may emphasize one, some,
or all of these orientations. There is some evidence, however, that persons who tend to be strong on some sets may tend to reject other orientations.\textsuperscript{73}

Students may show signs of any number of combinations. Students may have strengths, competencies, affinities, values, and skills in multiple areas. Some students will focus on worship and preaching. Others will emphasize evangelism and missions. Still others might envision an activist role in serving the oppressed as a response to the Gospel. Some may see themselves and their ministry in helping people in general—whether the local parish, sub-groups within the church, or the local community served by the local church.

These scores may help students find their niche of service. These scales or criteria may help congregations and students match up with a single vision for ministry. They may help the student isolate deficiencies in education and training.\textsuperscript{74} Four groups or clusters of scales comprise the Perceptions of Ministry section of PoM:

1. Ecclesial Ministry
2. Conversionist Ministry
3. Social Justice Ministry
4. Community and Congregational Ministry\textsuperscript{75}

This project will not examine criteria from the Perceptions of Ministry clusters. This project may introduce select criteria from Perceptions of Ministry clusters to increase understanding of the scales under consideration.

\textsuperscript{73} Aleshire, Schuller, and Williams, \textit{Interpretive Manual II}, 9.

\textsuperscript{74} Aleshire and Schuller, \textit{Advisor's Manual}, 20-1.

\textsuperscript{75} For the list of scales comprising this section, see appendix B.
PoM Scales Considered for This Project

In an attempt to measure and predict the readiness for ministry of graduating DTS students, this project will select and use ten Personal Characteristics criteria of PoM Stage II. This project will assess how likely students demonstrate certain PoM Personal Characteristics for ministry. The project will evaluate group scores for these criteria collected from student responses to a series of case studies found in the PoM Casebook and the survey results from the student’s internship field observers found in the PoM Field Observation Survey. PoM Personal Characteristics criteria will be assessed from three clusters: Responsible and Caring, Family Perspective, and Personal Faith. These scales attempt to assess students in areas outside typical cognitive learning and skills training. They provide a window into the student’s heart for ministry and for God, into that which Farley called theologia.

Responsible and Caring Criteria

The five scales in Stage I and the six scales from Stage II measure the personhood of the minister—not according to personality but according to personal habits.

---

76 Aleshire and Schuller, Advisor’s Manual, 102-3. This project will not assess Personal Characteristics criteria measuring Potential Negative. Interpretation of the Potential Negative criteria requires sensitivity because they are merely potentially negative. They may be predictive but not prescriptive. Not only are these scales perceived negatively, but also they may be associated with positive characteristics. On the one hand, these criteria ask, “Is the student truly self-protective, controlling, manipulative, and perfectionistic?” On the other hand, they ask, “Is the student insecure for good reasons and needs to learn better ways of managing insecurities?” Unlike all other scales where low scores require interpretation, these scales require explanation when the scores are high. The absence of these criteria from this project, however, does not preclude their indirect value toward understanding the other Personal Characteristics criteria chosen for the project. See chapter 5.
and their affect on ministry. ATS defines the Stage II Responsible and Caring cluster as follows:

These six scores group together because of the responses of students over the years. While each individual’s scores will vary on the different scales, there is a tendency for them to group together in one general area of the profile. As a whole, they represent a responsible and caring approach to tasks and people.

Although this cluster defines six Stage II criteria, this project will assess only five. The third part of the instrument, a recorded and scripted interview with the student, measures the one additional criterion, Flexibility of Spirit (FLEX). DTS currently does not employ the interview and thus does not measure this one additional criterion.

For this project, the five PoM Personal Characteristics criteria measuring the cluster called Responsible and Caring are Fidelity to Tasks and Persons (FIDL), Personal Responsibility (RESP), Acknowledgment of Limitations (LIMT), Involvement in Caring (ICAR), and Perceptive Counseling (PRCO). From the Responsible and Caring cluster of Personal Characteristics, this project will assess the readiness for ministry of DTS graduating students according to the following five hypotheses (one through five of the ten hypotheses):

77 Ibid., 97.
78 Aleshire, Schuller, and Williams, Interpretive Manual II, 5.
79 Efforts are underway to incorporate the recorded and scripted interview at DTS.
80 See chapter 4 for a definition of each of these criteria. In his thirty-year study of the program, Francis Lonsway summarizes the reliability of the PoM Program’s criteria, “More than 90 percent (92.8%) of the twenty-eight Casebook scores currently rest comfortably above .60; three-quarters of them, in fact, range between .70 and .87. These are solid measures, able to be strengthened, certainly, but ‘respectable.’ Only Balanced Approach to World Missions (MSBL) and Personal Responsibility (RESP) as measured in the Stage II Casebook suggest the need for a closer look as the program goes forward.” See Lonsway, PoM: A Thirty-Year Study, 25.
1. After studying at DTS, students will score in the Somewhat Likely range for Fidelity to Tasks and Persons.\textsuperscript{81}

2. After studying at DTS, students will score in the Likely range for Personal Responsibility.

3. After studying at DTS, students will score in the Likely range for Acknowledgment of Limitations.

4. After studying at DTS, students will score in the Likely range for Involvement in Caring.

5. After studying at DTS, students will score in the Likely range for Perceptive Counseling.

Are DTS graduating students ready for ministry according to the five criteria of Responsible and Caring?

**Family Perspectives Criteria**

These twin scales from the Stage I and Stage II Casebook predict the tension between family and ministry.\textsuperscript{82} ATS defines the Family Perspectives cluster as follows:

Married ministers must deal with the issues that emerge from work, which require both significant time and emotional energy, and their families who also need time and emotional support. These two realities often tug at a minister in conflicting directions. The scales in this section reflect two ways of dealing with this tension.\textsuperscript{83}

For this project, the PoM Personal Characteristics criteria from Stage II measuring the cluster called Family Perspective are Mutual Family Commitment

\textsuperscript{81} See appendix F for a discussion of the different scoring scales for the Field Observation Survey and the Casebook.


\textsuperscript{83} Aleshire, Schuller, and Williams, *Interpretive Manual II*, 6.
(FAML) and Ministry Precedence over Family (MNFM).\textsuperscript{84} From the Family Perspective cluster of Personal Characteristics, this project will assess the readiness for ministry of DTS graduating students according to the following two hypotheses (six and seven of the ten hypotheses):

6. After studying at DTS, students will score in the Likely range for Mutual Family Commitment.

7. After studying at DTS, students will score in the Possibly range for Ministry Precedence over Family.\textsuperscript{85}

Are DTS graduating students ready for ministry according to the two criteria called Family Perspectives?

\emph{Personal Faith Criteria}

The two scales from the Stage I Casebook and the four Stage II scales—one from the Casebook, one from the Interview, and two from the Field Observers Survey—that form the Personal Faith cluster reveal the student’s style of religious commitment and devotion.\textsuperscript{86} ATS defines the Personal Faith cluster as follows:

There are a variety of expressions of personal faith. While the two scores in this section do not reflect all the richness or diversity that exist [sic] in Christian spirituality, they do represent the degree to which some approaches to personal faith may characterize you. These scales, unlike the ones in the “Responsible and Caring” section, do not group empirically, and your scores will likely be different

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{84} See chapter 4 for a definition of each of these criteria.
\item \textsuperscript{85} Mutual Family Commitment and Ministry Precedence over Family scores are held in tension demonstrating the student’s balance between family and ministry commitments. DTS expects students to score one grid lower or left for the Ministry Precedence over Family than for the Mutual Family Commitment. See chapter 5 for their interpretation.
\item \textsuperscript{86} Aleshire and Schuller, \textit{Advisor’s Manual}, 100-1.
\end{itemize}
on each scale. If your personal style of faith is different from anything reflected in these measures, your scores may cluster in the low evidence region of the profile.\textsuperscript{87}

Although this cluster defines four criteria, this project will assess only three. The third part of the instrument, a recorded and scripted interview with the student, measures Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety (PIET) a second time. DTS currently does not employ the interview and thus does not measure this one additional criterion.\textsuperscript{88}

This project will assess one scale from the Stage II Casebook and two scales from the Stage II Field Observers Survey. The PoM Personal Characteristics criteria measuring the cluster called Personal Faith are Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety (PIET), Belief in a Provident God (PROV), and Christian Spirituality (SPRT).\textsuperscript{89} From the Personal Faith cluster of Personal Characteristics, this project will assess the readiness for ministry of DTS graduating students according to the following three hypotheses (eight through ten of the ten hypotheses):

8. After studying at DTS, students will score in the Somewhat Likely range for Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety.

9. After studying at DTS, students will score in the Likely range for Belief in a Provident God.

10. After studying at DTS, students will score in the Somewhat Likely range for Christian Spirituality.

Are DTS graduating students ready for ministry according to the three criteria for Personal Faith?

\textsuperscript{87} Aleshire, Schuller, and Williams, \textit{Interpretive Manual II}, 7.

\textsuperscript{88} Efforts are underway to incorporate the recorded and scripted interview at DTS.

\textsuperscript{89} See chapter 4 for a definition of each of these criteria.
Theology Returned to Theological Education

These ten Personal Characteristics criteria were chosen because they addressed the issues of Farley’s *theologia*. They attempt to measure issues other than cognitive or intellectual competency. They attempt to measure issues of affection and the student’s heart in ministry. These ten Personal Characteristics scales attempt to measure issues that the church may have formed in the student by personal discipleship, experience, and practice.

Moreover, these ten PoM Personal Characteristics criteria were chosen for this project because they transcend denomination, gender, degree program, ethnicity, ministry vocation, or nationality. Participants in the three historical surveys consider these scales extremely important. They not only affect how others perceive ministry, but they also incarnate the essence of the Christian faith. Regardless of the ministry or the minister’s identity, if these criteria contradict the Christian faith, then everyone who observes the minister experience uncertainty, doubt, and confusion. Anger and scandal may be next.  

Exit interviews with DTS students by the SFL Department reveal that students equally value these criteria. They find each personal characteristic criterion applicable to their quest for ministry preparation.

**Benefits of PoM**

PoM benefits the student preparing for ministry, the church where students minister, and the seminaries that prepare students. The following summarizes these

---

benefits from the testimonials of ATS member schools that employ at least some, if not all, of the PoM program.

**Student**

ATS recommends that seminaries increase student advising during their matriculation and their graduation along the lines of personal growth issues revealed by the PoM report. The PoM report may enhance student advising and produce a higher quality end-of-year interview with students. ATS suggests that seminaries form small groups around similar personal growth themes as identified by the PoM report.

Following the ATS recommendation for increased student advising, seminaries employ a debriefing interview with students regarding their PoM report. Seminaries do not leave students to analyze the report results without trained interpretive help. Seminaries use the PoM report results as a third party between the faculty and the student, giving the report the perception of objectivity, authority, and dispassion. Those seminaries debriefing with students regarding their PoM report during matriculation create contracts of personal growth with their students during their seminary education. Those seminaries debriefing with students regarding their PoM report as an exit interview

---


strategy and as a transition into vocational ministry at graduation encourage students to pause, reflect, and celebrate (hopefully) on their development during seminary. Those seminaries using both interviews—matriculation and graduation—are able to measure the student’s growth during seminary. Wise students will add these results to their curriculum vitae to demonstrate their commitment to life long learning for successful ministry.

**Intentional Growth Plan**

During these interviews, faculty and students discuss areas revealed in the report that may affect their future ministry. Some areas need maintenance, while others need remedy because they could prove hazardous to future ministry success. As a preventive measure, faculty and students devise a strategy for maintaining some issues and for developing others. The PoM results help faculty compose a spiritual and ministry formation contract with the student. The PoM scores and scales are specific issues for personal development and growth.

For example, Colgate Rochester Crozer Divinity School in Rochester, New York invests two to three hours interviewing each student regarding his or her PoM scores. This involved interview serves as a basis for planning the student’s path through the school. During the interview, a student adviser from the faculty assesses the student’s

---


97 Molini, “PoM in a Roman Catholic Seminary,” 2.
attitude toward the plan. The adviser also takes advantage of this moment to educate the student about ministry because areas of ignorance or weakness have appeared in the student’s report.  

PoM helps students understand themselves; it exposes strengths and weaknesses; it identifies any potential negatives. PoM helps students and faculty plan for personal growth and development toward a ministry goal. As a bonus, by inviting the student’s spouse, PoM binds the couple to a ministry vision. Faculty and students review the plan on an annual cycle to monitor growth and development in the prescribed areas, holding the student accountable to the contract.

**Personal Theological Reflection**

Regardless of the student’s scores, the PoM interview gives faculty a chance to evaluate the student’s ability to reflect theologically. The PoM debriefing interviews facilitate personal theological reflection on ministry between the students and faculty. PoM helps the student connect the issues of the heart with those of ministry effectiveness.

---


Faculty can witness life transformation in their students during these follow-up interviews. Life changing insights that students derive from PoM include:

(1) their bent for evangelistic or pastoral roles, (2) insight into how they perceive family call, (3) their level of integrity in an arena with many temptations, (3) their perception and level of caring in an emotionally charged, high-maintenance ministry, and (5) their degree of understanding and inclination toward social justice issues so crucial to effective urban ministry.

The PoM debriefing interview affords faculty the opportunity to focus on student attitudes and to minister to students from this position. Students with guarded, reluctant, or dismissive reactions to those PoM results that expose areas for growth or weaknesses may reveal as much about themselves as the scores reveal. By observing student reaction, faculty can deal with the negative presentation and help the student develop a humble and teachable approach to ministry.

Student’s Curriculum Vitae

PoM results benefit the student’s portfolio or curriculum vitae. Students in interviews with potential ministry employers can distinguish themselves by adding the PoM results to their resume and to their interview presentation. Students can record their strengths for ministry as reported by an ATS assessment instrument. Students can demonstrate their initiative and their dedication to successful ministry by listing one or two weaknesses from the profile and by discussing their strategic plan for improving


these areas. Through such an interview plan, students show a would-be ministry employer their commitment to a life-long learning agenda.105

**Church**

Since implementing PoM, Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary in Columbia, South Carolina has identified benefits for the church. First, the church and the synod have increased mutual partnership in the theological education of their ministers. Second, depending on the recipient in the church of the student’s profile, various groups profit from the program. Through PoM, the church has an evaluative instrument to help select candidates for ministry. In addition to identifying congruent strengths of the candidate for the target ministry, the PoM report may send up a red flag regarding a candidate.106 For example, PoM results may help identify codependency among students. A very high score on Fidelity to Tasks and Persons plus a Very Likely score on Involvement in Caring, especially when the other Responsible and Caring scores are middle or low, may suggest that the student needs to rescue others.107 PoM may flag

---

105 During a meeting with the author and a student on September 21, 2010, former DTS Christian Education Department Chairman Michael Lawson unveiled this benefit of the PoM report to the student.


students prone to infidelity. The PoM report may serve as a diagnostic tool for troubleshooting limited effectiveness of the student’s gifts and talents.

**Seminary**

ATS recommends that member schools use PoM cumulative group reports to help seminaries with self-evaluating the institution for accreditation. When the PoM group report comes before faculty, they can analyze trends in the student body and address those issues in the curriculum. At Beeson Divinity School in Birmingham, Alabama, for example, the PoM results fostered an initiative to impose a cross-cultural ministry requirement for all MDiv students. During field education experiences, the PoM report helps the student’s mentor prepare for involvement in the student’s internship. The faculty of Baptist Theological Seminary at Richmond participated in the PoM Stage I assessment and discovered that they labored with the identical issues found in their students.

---


111 Bland, “PoM at Harding University,” 3.


113 Bland, “PoM at Harding University,” 3.

114 Vinson, Chappell, and Hartman, “PoM at Baptist Theological Seminary at Richmond,” 1-2.
PoM at DTS

ATS considers Stage II of PoM the assessment for graduating students. ATS recommends that graduating students respond to the assessment at the end of their internship or field education experience. At DTS, internship coordinators from the SFL Department administer Stage II of PoM to students completing their internships. Typically, DTS students enter their internships toward the end of their training. DTS considers the internship a capstone event to the student’s theological education.

When DTS students register for their internship, they schedule a personal interview with an internship coordinator of the SFL Department. Students cannot register for their internship apart from this interview. During their interview, students learn the academic requirements for the internship, and they learn about the evaluation step of the internship for the first time. Even though the evaluation step using PoM could be from six to fifteen months away, the internship coordinator begins to set expectations for the evaluation. The SFL Department has learned that communication is a key step to a smooth evaluation process. As the last step in the registration meeting, students complete the header information for their PoM Casebook Answer Sheet B. The internship coordinator records the unique number of the answer sheet on the registration form. The SFL Department Administrative Assistant records the answer sheet number in a master spreadsheet for tracking purposes. These pedantic steps protect student privacy in accordance with federal law.

The internship coordinator submits the completed registration form and the PoM Casebook Answer Sheet B to the SFL Department Administrative Assistant. The administrative assistant registers students for their internship with the Registrar’s Office and records their answer sheet number. The SFL Department administers the course requirements for the internship through an online site called MyDTS. The administrative assistant enrolls the student in MyDTS at the time of registration. Once students are
registered and enrolled in MyDTS for their internship, students may consider the course open to them. They may begin at once. This may give the student an additional six months to complete the requirements.

The SFL Department divides the internship into three parts. First, the student plans the internship with the student’s mentor. Students select qualified and experienced leaders in their vocational calling to serve as field supervisors and consultants during the internship. Qualifications include a minimum of three years in their ministry field, one year in the current position, and formal theological education. The mentor agrees to meet with the student regularly and to lead the student through a variety of engaging and challenging ministry activities. During the planning stage, the student and the student’s mentor complete a planning document and submit it to the SFL Department. The planning document describes the student’s activities and goals for the internship. The SFL Department approves the planning document in two ways. First, an internship coordinator from the department meets with the student and mentor to discuss the plan and goals. During this meeting, the internship coordinator offers counsel regarding the plan and goals and describes the evaluation process to the student and mentor. This is the student’s second time to hear these instructions. The planning document and the meeting with the department are due by the third Friday of the first semester of the internship. Second, the SFL Department’s Director of Servant Leadership Internships reads and approves all planning documents during the fourth week of the first semester of the internship.

Throughout the internship, the department’s internship director communicates with the interns via e-mail regarding their required internship activities. Students learn the requirements for their internship during the registration interview, from reading the syllabus, by following the online tasks of MyDTS, and from the director’s e-mails. At the halfway mark, interns submit the Mid-Internship Check-in Report. Because the internship
is unlike the traditional class, covering two or three semesters instead of one, the internship director asks students to revisit their planning document and report on their progress.\textsuperscript{115}

At the beginning of the last semester of their internship, DTS students start the evaluation process using the PoM Casebook and the Field Observers Survey. First, the students solicit feedback from at least five field observers who have witnessed the activities and performances of these students during ministry, especially during their internship for DTS academic credit. One of the five field observers must be the student’s mentor during the internship. Qualified field observers might include members of the student’s peer-led Spiritual Formation group, the student’s spouse, and/or members of the student’s church.\textsuperscript{116} Field observers complete the PoM Field Observation Survey. Using a five-point Likert scale from Unlikely to Very likely, the field observers respond to 116 items that measure the student’s likelihood to match the fifteen specific criteria in a ministry context.

For this project, students identified five or more prospective respondents to the Field Observation Survey. Students invited their respective respondents to participate in the survey via e-mail. Their e-mail included an attachment from the SFL Department’s Director of Servant Leadership Internships giving instructions for the survey. In the e-mail to field observers, students included a URL to the online survey site, and they

---

\textsuperscript{115} Efforts are underway to incorporate the recorded and scripted interview at DTS.

\textsuperscript{116} DTS requires four semesters (fall and spring for two consecutive years) of Spiritual Formation. Students meet in predefined groups of six to eight and discuss topics drawn from the curriculum.
provided the field observers with their unique PoM Casebook Answer Sheet B number. Survey respondents participated between September 11 and September 25, 2009.

DTS students complete the PoM Stage II Casebook during the final semester of their internship. The Casebook describes twenty-three ministry-specific cases designed to measure twenty-three criteria. Following each case, PoM lists ten to thirty possible ways students might respond to that ministry situation. Using a five-point Likert scale from Very Unlikely to Very likely, the Casebook asks students to measure the likelihood that each answer presented represents their personal response to the particular ministry situation in the case. For all twenty-three cases, students evaluate 528 possible responses revealing their likelihood to exhibit specific criterion measured by these cases. On the report, criteria scores indicate their likelihood to exhibit the criterion based on the instrument’s measure of the Casebook responses.

For this project, students retrieved a PoM Casebook and Answer Sheet B (Scantron format) from the SFL Department offices on or soon after September 11, 2009. Students completed and returned the Casebook to the SFL Department offices by September 25, 2009. During this two-week window, students could choose to complete the Casebook in one or more sittings and at their leisure. The SFL Department reminded the students that they must complete the Scantron answer sheet in pencil and not in ink, and they must return it in pristine condition for the scanner.117 The SFL Department included online video instructions for the convenience of the students. The SFL

117 If a student were required to start the Casebook over because it was lost or damaged, the student’s field observers would be required to complete the Field Observation Survey again. Because the unique Answer Sheet B number identifies the student with the student’s field observers, a new Answer Sheet B means the student’s original Field Observer Surveys would be lost.
Department warned students that failure to return a completed, pristine answer sheet on time could result in loss of grade or could require a petition by the student to the Credits Committee for an extension of the internship.

ATS requires six-week lead-time to compute the PoM Casebook and Field Observer Survey data into individual PoM Profiles and into a compiled report of all students called the PoM Organizational Profile. ATS ships the hard copy profiles to DTS. The SFL Department Administrative Assistant scans the profiles into individual PDFs and forwards the PDFs to their respective student via e-mail. Each student performs an initial analysis using an ATS-prescribed Intentional Growth Form and the PoM Stage II Interpretive Manual. The goal of this initial analysis is to create talking points for the student’s exit interview with the DTS internship coordinator.

For this project, DTS received, scanned, and forwarded profiles to students by November 19, 2009. Students learned of their final evaluative steps from three sources: the MyDTS tasks, the administrative assistant’s e-mail carrying their profile, and the internship director’s reminder e-mail. These three sources directed students to complete their analysis of their profile using the Intentional Growth Form and the PoM Stage II Interpretive Manual. Once students completed the Intentional Growth Form, the course syllabus instructed them to call the administrative assistant to schedule an exit interview with their respective internship coordinator. Students could complete their exit interview any time before Friday, December 17, 2009, the last day of finals and of the semester.

During the student’s internship exit interview, the internship coordinator from the SFL Department at DTS counsels the graduating student using the student’s PoM

---

118 See appendix E for a sample of the Intentional Growth Form.
survey results. The goal of the interview is to affirm the student’s vocational calling to ministry, to assess the student’s strengths for ministry, and to counsel the student regarding areas of growth.

Since fall 2005, the SFL department has collected PoM assessment data from all qualified graduating students. Internship coordinators in the SFL Department have interviewed these students during that period. Chapter 4 of this project will present the PoM results for the fall 2009 graduating students. Chapter 5 will analyze and interpret the results presented in chapter 4.

**Research Subjects**

The subjects of this project are students completing internships and graduating with the following professional graduate degrees: Masters of Theology (ThM), Masters of Arts in Christian Education (MA /CE), Masters of Arts in Media Communications (MA /MC), and Masters of Arts in Cross-Cultural Ministries (MA /CM).

Some DTS degree programs are exempt from the SFL Department’s two-hour internship requirement and from the PoM assessment. DTS exempts students pursuing the non-professional degree, Masters of Arts in Biblical Studies (MA /BS) and the Certificate of Graduate Studies (CGS). DTS also exempts students pursuing a professional degree in Biblical Counseling (MA /BC) or doctoral degrees (PhD, ThD, and DMin). Likewise, this project excluded them from the subject pool. The SFL Department

---

119 I have completed the beginning and advanced PoM interpretive training from ATS. I have attended an internet-based training session hosted by ATS with SFL Department colleagues. As a DTS internship coordinator, I have conducted over three hundred student exit interviews since 2005 using PoM reports.
administered the PoM assessment for this project to 100 DTS graduating students completing their internships during the fall 2009 semester.

**Conclusion**

The RfM Project began with modest goals to help constituent schools of ATS better prepare themselves for accreditation. From this small initial step, RfM grew into PoM, and PoM has found boundless ways to affect the assessment of students, faculty, curriculum, and mentors. PoM has proven to be a pedagogical tool that uncovers and deals with issues that classroom teaching might never touch. Through PoM, spiritual and personal formation and ministry have moved from theory to experience. Concerns rarely addressed in the classroom routinely surface through interviews with students over PoM scores. Students receive confirmation regarding their calling, their preparation, and their readiness for ministry. Through PoM, ATS has given ministry an objective definition. The ATS definition of ministry serves as a starting point for discussions regarding the effectiveness of the theological education of the ATS member institutions.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

Introduction

Using the PoM Organizational Profile for fall 2009 DTS graduates, this chapter will describe and report the ten PoM criteria scores from the following three Personal Characteristics clusters: Responsible and Caring, Family Perspective, and Personal Faith. For each of the criteria measured, students, after studying at DTS, are expected to score within a range that demonstrates readiness for ministry.

PoM Profile

ATS provides PoM Profiles for each student and the PoM Organizational Profile for a specified group. The PoM Organizational Profile for this project compiled the PoM criteria scores of the 100 graduating DTS students for the fall of 2009 and recorded the mean for the group and the following distributions of scores: the first quartile, the central fifty percent, and the fourth quartile. Both the Field Observation Survey and the Casebook collected data based on a five-point Likert scale. Both the PoM Profile for the individual student and the PoM Organizational Profile converted the data and measured each criterion on a scale of 1–50.\(^1\)

\(^1\) See appendix F for the conversion chart.
The Field Observation Survey criteria scores measured the student’s or the group’s likelihood to match each criterion on the following scale from Unlikely to Very Likely.

- 1–10 Unlikely
- 11–20 Somewhat Unlikely
- 21–30 Possibly
- 31–40 Somewhat Likely
- 41–50 Very Likely

The Casebook criteria scores measured the student’s or the group’s likelihood to match each criterion on the following scale from Very Unlikely to Very Likely.

- 1–10 Very Unlikely
- 11–20 Unlikely
- 21–30 Possibly
- 31–40 Likely
- 41–50 Very Likely

The scales for the Survey and the Casebook are different at three points. For the Survey, the lowest or the range from 1–10 is labeled Unlikely, and for the Casebook, the range from 1–10 is labeled Very Unlikely. For the Survey, the range from 11–20 is labeled Somewhat Unlikely, and for the Casebook, the range from 11–20 is labeled Unlikely. For the Survey, the range from 31–40 is labeled Somewhat Likely, and for the Casebook, the range from 31–40 is labeled Likely.
PoM Organizational Profile Results

This section will reveal the results of each criterion measured according to the PoM Organizational Profile. Following the identity of each criterion’s data source and each criterion’s definition according to the PoM Interpretive Manual, the distribution of scores according to total distribution, first quartile, central fifty percent, and fourth quartile will be recorded. After detailing the distribution of scores, each criterion’s hypothesis and mean score will be stated. By comparing the hypothesis and the mean score, the student’s readiness for ministry can be assessed.

Responsible and Caring Scores

Fidelity to Tasks and Persons (FIDL)

The Fidelity to Tasks and Persons (FIDL) score comes from the Field Observation Survey. ATS defines a high likelihood score for the criterion Fidelity to Tasks and Persons (FIDL) as follows:

You give evidence that respect for persons is a high priority. You believe that all persons have value, their ideas and wishes should be heard and taken into account, and we should be conscious of one another’s needs. You believe that people should be informed and included in decision-making or guideline-setting that affects them. Honest communication between persons is important to you. A score in the high likelihood range also suggests that you are responsible both to tasks and persons and consider the implications for both in decision-making. You

---

2 For the PoM Organizational Profile for fall 2009 DTS graduating students, see appendix G.

3 For the distribution of scores, see Table 1, at the end of this chapter.

4 For a summary of each criterion’s data source, hypothesized range, mean scores, and results, see Table 2, at the end of this chapter.
do not see tasks, decisions, or improvements as ends in themselves but view them primarily in terms of what they will do to or for people.\(^5\)

The total distribution of scores—the minimum and maximum scores—was 25–50 or the middle of Possibly to the highest point of Very Likely.\(^6\) The distribution of the first quartile of scores was 25–39 or from the middle of Possibly to the high end of Likely. The distribution of the central fifty percent of scores was 39–48 or from the high end of Likely to the high end of Very Likely. The distribution of the fourth quartile of scores was 48–50 or from the high end of Very Likely to the highest point of Very Likely.

The first hypothesis states: After studying at DTS, students will score in the Somewhat Likely range (31–40) for Fidelity to Tasks and Persons (FIDL). The mean score was 44 or Very Likely. The hypothesis is false. After studying at DTS, students demonstrate a Very Likely score in Fidelity to Tasks and Persons (FIDL). DTS students scored four points higher than expected.

**Personal Responsibility (RESP)**

The Personal Responsibility (RESP) score comes from the Casebook. ATS defines a high likelihood score for the criterion Personal Responsibility (RESP) as follows:


\(^6\) In order to produce a consistent description regarding each criterion’s five 10-point ranges (Very Unlikely/Unlikely, Unlikely/Somewhat Unlikely, Possibly, Likely/Somewhat Likely, and Very Likely), the low end of any range equals 3 or less; the middle of any range equals 4–7; and the high end of any range equals 8 or more. The lowest point equals 1, and the highest point of any range equals its respective score of 10, 20, 30, 40, or 50.
You try to keep commitments whether they are related to schedules, promises to other people, or to your own inner convictions. Where a previous commitment of your time comes in conflict with some newly-discovered need, you will tend to keep your prior commitment. In the face of two important but conflicting ministry responsibilities, you tend to make your decision on the basis of your original commitment.\(^7\)

The total distribution of scores—the minimum and maximum scores—was 1–42 or the lowest point of Very Unlikely to the low end of Very Likely. The distribution of the first quartile of scores was 1–12 or from the lowest point of Very Unlikely to the low end of Unlikely. The distribution of the central fifty percent of scores was 12–24 or from the low end of Unlikely to the middle of Possibly. The distribution of the fourth quartile of scores was 24–42 or from the middle of Possibly to the low end of Very Likely.\(^8\)

The second hypothesis states: After studying at DTS, students will score in the Likely range (31–40) for Personal Responsibility (RESP). The mean score was 18 or Unlikely. The hypothesis is false. After studying at DTS, students demonstrate an Unlikely score in Personal Responsibility (RESP). DTS students scored a significant thirteen points lower than expected.

**Acknowledgment of Limitations (LIMT)**

The Acknowledgment of Limitations (LIMT) score comes from the Casebook. ATS defines a high likelihood score for the criterion Acknowledgment of Limitations (LIMT) as follows:

You accept responsibility for your mistakes whether in judgment or behavior. You are not likely to attempt to shift responsibility for your mistakes to other

\(^7\) Aleshire, Schuller, and Williams, *Interpretive Manual II*, 5.

\(^8\) For the PoM Organizational Profile for fall 2009 DTS graduating students, see appendix G.
persons or outside circumstances. You readily apologize for mistakes and actively seek to make amends. You affirm the importance of humility and confession.⁹

The total distribution of scores—the minimum and maximum scores—was 29–50 or the high end of Possibly to the highest point of Very Likely. The distribution of the first quartile of scores was 29–38 or from the high end of Possibly to the high end of Likely. The distribution of the central fifty percent of scores was 38–47 or from the high end of Likely to the middle of Very Likely. The distribution of the fourth quartile of scores was 47–50 or from the middle of Very Likely to the highest point of Very Likely.¹⁰

The third hypothesis states: After studying at DTS, students will score in the Likely range (31–40) for Acknowledgment of Limitations (LIMT). The mean score was 43 or Very Likely. The hypothesis is false. After studying at DTS, students demonstrate a Very Likely score in Acknowledgment of Limitations (LIMT). DTS students scored three points higher than expected.

**Involvement in Caring (ICAR)**

The Involvement in Caring (ICAR) score comes from the Casebook. ATS defines a high likelihood score for the criterion Involvement in Caring (ICAR) as follows:

A score far to the right [high likelihood] indicates that you aid people with problems by helping them explore and evaluate their alternatives, make their decisions and act on them. You help persons express their feelings in tragic or stressful situations and encourage them to seek the help of others who have been

---


¹⁰ For the PoM Organizational Profile for fall 2009 DTS graduating students, see appendix G.
through similar experiences. You are likely to assist people who face problems by facilitating their movement through the resolutions they have chosen.¹¹

The total distribution of scores—the minimum and maximum scores—was 24–50 or the middle of Possibly to the highest point of Very Likely. The distribution of the first quartile of scores was 24–34 or from the middle of Possibly to the middle of Likely. The distribution of the central fifty percent of scores was 34–42 or from the middle of Likely to the low end of Very Likely. The distribution of the fourth quartile of scores was 42–50 or from the low end of Very Likely to the highest point of Very Likely.

The fourth hypothesis states: After studying at DTS, students will score in the Likely range (31–40) for Involvement in Caring (ICAR). The mean score was 37 or Likely. The hypothesis is true. After studying at DTS, students demonstrate a Likely score in Involvement in Caring (ICAR). DTS students scored as expected.

**Perceptive Counseling (PRCO)**

The Perceptive Counseling (PRCO) score comes from the Casebook. ATS defines a high likelihood score for the criterion Perceptive Counseling (PRCO) as follows:

> You are sensitive to the needs and feelings of people with whom you talk, and you try to be a good listener. You encourage persons dealing with feelings of failure to share their problems. You are accepting, affirming, and reassuring to people who doubt their worth or value. You seek to be ready to minister to others when their comments or concerns suggest they are in need of your care.¹²


¹² Ibid.
The total distribution of scores—the minimum and maximum scores—was 14–47 or the middle of Unlikely to the middle of Very Likely. The distribution of the first quartile of scores was 14–24 or from the middle of Unlikely to the middle of Possibly. The distribution of the central fifty percent of scores was 24–33 or from the middle of Possibly to the low end of Likely. The distribution of the fourth quartile of scores was 33–47 or from the low end of Likely to the middle of Very Likely.\textsuperscript{13}

The fifth hypothesis states: After studying at DTS, students will score in the Likely range (31–40) for Perceptive Counseling (PRCO). The mean score was 28 or Possibly. The hypothesis is false. After studying at DTS, students demonstrate a Possibly score in Perceptive Counseling (PRCO). DTS students scored three points lower than expected.

\textit{Family Perspective Scores}

\textbf{Mutual Family Commitment (FAML)}

The Mutual Family Commitment (FAML) score comes from the Casebook. ATS defines a high likelihood score for the criterion Mutual Family Commitment (FAML) as follows:

\begin{quote}
You show respect for and appreciation for your family. You value good family relationships, know their importance to an effective ministry, and therefore protect time set aside for maintaining those good relationships. You are committed to keeping commitments both in your ministry and to your family. You appear to be sensitive to your family’s needs and attempt to give as careful attention to them as to the demands of your profession.\textsuperscript{14}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{13} For the PoM Organizational Profile for fall 2009 DTS graduating students, see appendix G.

\textsuperscript{14} Aleshire, Schuller, and Williams, \textit{Interpretive Manual II}, 6.
The total distribution of scores—the minimum and maximum scores—was 21–50 or the lowest point of Possibly to the highest point of Very Likely. The distribution of the first quartile of scores was 21–37 or from the low end of Possibly to the middle of Likely. The distribution of the central fifty percent of scores was 37–48 or from the middle of Likely to the high end of Very Likely. The distribution of the fourth quartile of scores was 48–50 or from the high end of Very Likely to the highest point of Very Likely.

The sixth hypothesis states: After studying at DTS, students will score in the Likely range (31–40) for Mutual Family Commitment (FAML). The mean score was 42 or Very Likely. The hypothesis is false. After studying at DTS, students demonstrate a Very Likely score in Mutual Family Commitment (FAML). DTS students scored two points higher than expected.

**Ministry Precedence over Family (MNFM)**

The Ministry Precedence over Family (MNFM) score comes from the Casebook. ATS defines a high likelihood score for the criterion Ministry Precedence over Family (MNFM) as follows:

You believe that your responsibilities in ministry take precedence over all other commitments including your commitment to spouse and family. You believe that your family should understand the disruptions of family plans that your responsibilities in ministry create. You perceive your priorities as first to God, then to church, then to family.\(^{15}\)

---

\(^{15}\) Ibid.
The total distribution of scores—the minimum and maximum scores—was 1–37 or the lowest point of Very Unlikely to the middle of Likely. The distribution of the first quartile of scores was 1–10 or from the lowest point of Very Unlikely to the highest point of Very Unlikely. The distribution of the central fifty percent of scores was 10–19 or from the highest point of Very Unlikely to the high end of Unlikely. The distribution of the fourth quartile of scores was 19–37 or from the high end of Unlikely to the middle of Likely.\textsuperscript{16}

The seventh hypothesis states: After studying at DTS, students will score in the Possibly range (21–30) for Ministry Precedence over Family (MNFM). The mean score was 16 or Unlikely. The hypothesis is false. After studying at DTS, students demonstrate an Unlikely score in Ministry Precedence over Family (MNFM). DTS students scored five points lower than expected.

*Personal Faith Scores*

**Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety (PIET)**

Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety (PIET) comes from the Field Observation Survey. ATS defines a high likelihood score for the criterion Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety (PIET) as follows:

The higher your score, the more observers think of you as someone who lives with an open reliance on God. For example, observers think that you seek the leadership of the Holy Spirit in making life’s decisions, in times of crisis you look for comfort in Scripture, you find reassurance in your own ministry from your

\textsuperscript{16} For the PoM Organizational Profile for fall 2009 DTS graduating students, see appendix G.
sense of calling from God, and when things are not going well, you live with the confidence that God’s purpose is still being accomplished. You are the kind of person who puts Christ’s work first in your life.¹⁷

The total distribution of scores—the minimum and maximum scores—was 25–50 or the middle of Possibly to the highest point of Very Likely. The distribution of the first quartile of scores was 25–43 or from the middle of Possibly to the low end of Very Likely. The distribution of the central fifty percent of scores was 43–50 or from the low end of Very Likely to the highest point of Very Likely. The distribution of the fourth quartile of scores was 50 or the highest point of Very Likely.¹⁸

The eighth hypothesis states: After studying at DTS, students will score in the Somewhat Likely range (31–40) for Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety (PIET). The mean score was 45 or Very Likely. The hypothesis is false. After studying at DTS, students demonstrate a Very Likely score in Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety (PIET). DTS students scored five points or half a range higher than expected.

Belief in a Provident God (PROV)

Belief in a Provident God (PROV) comes from the Casebook. ATS defines a high likelihood score for the criterion Belief in a Provident God (PROV) as follows:

A score in the high likelihood region reflects your understanding that God loves humankind and offers the gift of life and hope. You repudiate the assumption that God operates by human rules or solely within the limitations of human understanding or beliefs. Rather, you believe that God’s being and actions are at times beyond human comprehension. You believe that God works, loves, and judges humankind with divine mercy and brings people to a saving knowledge.¹⁹

¹⁷ Aleshire, Schuller, and Williams, Interpretive Manual II, 7.

¹⁸ For the PoM Organizational Profile for fall 2009 DTS graduating students, see appendix G.

¹⁹ Aleshire, Schuller, and Williams, Interpretive Manual II, 7.
The total distribution of scores—the minimum and maximum scores—was 9–47 or the high end of Very Unlikely to the middle of Very Likely. The distribution of the first quartile of scores was 9–18 or from the high end of Very Unlikely to the high end of Unlikely. The distribution of the central fifty percent of scores was 18–27 or from the high end of Unlikely to the middle of Possibly. The distribution of the fourth quartile of scores was 27–47 or from the middle of Possibly to the middle of Very Likely.

The ninth hypothesis states: After studying at DTS, students will score in the Likely range (31–40) for Belief in a Provident God (PROV). The mean score was 24 or Possibly. The hypothesis is false. After studying at DTS, students demonstrate a Possibly score in Belief in a Provident God (PROV). DTS students scored seven points lower than expected.

**Christian Spirituality (SPRT)**

Christian Spirituality (SPRT) comes from the Field Observation Survey. ATS defines a high likelihood score for the criterion Christian Spirituality (SPRT) as follows:

Field observers perceive you as the kind of person who stresses the importance of prayer, is open to new spiritual insights, appears to know the spiritual heritage of the church and your denomination, and has a vision of the nature of Christian spirituality. They also think that you maintain personal disciplines of prayer and devotional study and relate spiritually to other aspects of your ministry.²⁰

The total distribution of scores—the minimum and maximum scores—was 22–50 or the low end of Possibly to the highest point of Very Likely. The distribution of the first quartile of scores was 22–39 or from the low end of Possibly to the high end of

---

²⁰ Ibid.
Somewhat Likely. The distribution of the central fifty percent of scores was 39–48 or from the high end of Somewhat Likely to the high end of Very Likely. The distribution of the fourth quartile of scores was 48–50 or from the high end of Very Likely to the highest point of Very Likely.21

The tenth hypothesis states: After studying at DTS, students will score in the Somewhat Likely range (31–40) for Christian Spirituality (SPRT). The mean score was 42 or Very Likely. The hypothesis is false. After studying at DTS, students demonstrate a Very Likely score in Christian Spirituality (SPRT). DTS students scored two points higher than expected.

**Conclusion**

According to mean scores, one out of the ten hypotheses was true. The hypothesis for Involvement in Caring was the one true criterion. Students scored in the upper middle of the Likely range. Hypotheses for nine of the ten criteria chosen to measure readiness for ministry were false. Five of the remaining nine criteria scores—Fidelity to Tasks and Persons (FIDL), Acknowledgment of Limitations (LIMT), Mutual Family Commitment (FAML), Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety (PIET), and Christian Spirituality (SPRT)—were Very Likely and higher than their Likely hypothesis for Casebook scores or Somewhat Likely hypothesis for Field Observation Survey scores. They exceed the prediction by half a grid or less, which is by five or less points. The positive nature of these scores suggests an acceptable level of readiness for ministry. These scores warrant no discussion.

21 For the PoM Organizational Profile for fall 2009 DTS graduating students, see appendix G.
The remaining four scores, however, reveal gaps in readiness for ministry. Two of the remaining four criteria scores—Perceptive Counseling (PRCO) and Belief in a Provident God (PROV)—were one grid left of their Likely hypothesis. Perceptive Counseling (PRCO) was two points less than the Likely range. Students scored six points less than the minimum for the predicted range for Belief in a Provident God (PROV). Ministry Precedence over Family (MNFM) was one grid left and four points shy of the criterion’s Possibly hypothesis. Personal Responsibility (RESP) was more than one full grid left of the criterion’s Likely hypothesis. Students scored twelve points less than the minimum for the predicted range.\footnote{In his thirty-year study of the program, Francis Lonsway summarizes the reliability of the PoM Program’s criteria, “More than 90 percent (92.8%) of the twenty-eight Casebook scores currently rest comfortably above .60; three-quarters of them, in fact, range between .70 and .87. These are solid measures, able to be strengthened, certainly, but “respectable.” Only Balanced Approach to World Missions (MSBL) and Personal Responsibility (RESP) as measured in the Stage II Casebook suggest the need for a closer look as the program goes forward.”}  

Next, chapter five will explore the implications for these results and offer interpretations of their meaning with respect to readiness for ministry. Chapter 5 will also offer recommendations and conclusions based on the interpretations of these scores.

\footnote{In his thirty-year study of the program, Francis Lonsway summarizes the reliability of the PoM Program’s criteria, “More than 90 percent (92.8%) of the twenty-eight Casebook scores currently rest comfortably above .60; three-quarters of them, in fact, range between .70 and .87. These are solid measures, able to be strengthened, certainly, but “respectable.” Only Balanced Approach to World Missions (MSBL) and Personal Responsibility (RESP) as measured in the Stage II Casebook suggest the need for a closer look as the program goes forward.” See Francis A. Lonsway, \textit{Profiles of Ministry: A Thirty-Year Study} (Pittsburgh, PA: Association of Theological Schools, Commission on Accrediting, 2007), 25.}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Total Distribution</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean Compared To Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st Quartile</td>
<td>4th Quartile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIDL</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIMT</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAR</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRCO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAML</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNFM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIET</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROV</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRT</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Central 50%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Hypothesized Range</th>
<th>Results Based on the Mean</th>
<th>Hypothesis Met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIDL</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>31–40 Somewhat Likely</td>
<td>44 Very Likely</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESP</td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>31–40 Likely</td>
<td>18 Unlikely</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIMT</td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>31–40 Likely</td>
<td>43 Very Likely</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAR</td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>31–40 Likely</td>
<td>37 Likely</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRCO</td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>31–40 Likely</td>
<td>28 Possibly</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAML</td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>31–40 Likely</td>
<td>42 Very Likely</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNFM</td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>21–30 Possibly</td>
<td>16 Unlikely</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIET</td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>31–40 Likely</td>
<td>45 Very Likely</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROV</td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>31–40 Likely</td>
<td>24 Possibly</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRT</td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>31–40 Likely</td>
<td>42 Very Likely</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5
RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This chapter will interpret the results reported in chapter four and offer suggestions toward understanding the readiness for ministry of graduating DTS students. Specifically, this chapter will identify limitations to the study, analyze the results from chapter four, and evaluate implications for DTS and its students, for theological education in general, and for future research projects.

Limitations of the Study

Three limitations might be alleged regarding PoM and its application at DTS. Some might interpret the following limitations of the study in a way that would dilute the findings of this research at DTS. The SFL Department believes, however, that assessing all students helps the seminary and the graduating student regardless of the student’s degree program, age, gender, denomination, ministry vision, ethnicity, or any other socio-economic demographic category. Every student should exhibit strengths in the personal characteristics measured by the PoM assessments.

First, based on the original RfM research, ATS designed PoM to measure Master of Divinity (MDiv) students. DTS does not offer an MDiv degree. DTS offers Master of Arts (MA) degrees in Christian Education, Media Arts, and Cross-Cultural Ministry; these are less than the typical 90-hour MDiv program, and the focus of these degrees is outside the vocation of pastoral ministry. DTS also offers a 120-hour Master of
Theology (ThM) degree, which is greater than the typical MDiv program. Though large (100 DTS graduating students), the subject pool of this project contains members from various DTS master degree programs. In order to capture data regarding the significance of these degree program populations, DTS would need to delimit the testing population according to degree program.¹

Second, ATS designed PoM to measure students who anticipate ordination into the pastorate of Protestant denominations or into the Anglican, Roman Catholic, or Orthodox priesthood. Since DTS is an Evangelical, inter-denominational seminary training students from multiple denominations and traditions, including a growing contingent of Anglicans, DTS does not prepare students for ordination. Since DTS is not a denominational seminary, DTS, therefore, offers no path to ecclesial ordination. In addition, DTS attracts students from independent, non-denominational churches. The subject pool for this project contains students who have a variety of ministry vocational goals and aspirations, not limited to the pastorate or the priesthood. Although a growing number of DTS students are entering Anglican and Episcopal orders, DTS commonly subscribes to the term pastor rather than priest for describing ecclesial ministry placement or vocation. Less than half of those students seeking a ThM degree at DTS will receive ordination of any kind.

Third, ATS disclaims the accuracy of the instrument for cultures outside the United States, England, Canada, and Australia. Some of the members of the subject pool

¹ DTS began collecting data according to degree program after the research for this project was complete. As of this writing, no information is available. Because the ThM bears a heavier academic load and because MA or MDiv programs in general lack the twin language requirements of the ThM, one might speculate that the ThM student scores lower for those areas of concern in this study than the MA or MDiv student.
for this research, however, are international students. Again, the SFL Department maintains that every student should exhibit strengths in these Personal Characteristics criteria measured by the PoM assessments.

In summary, rather than dilute this study’s findings, these so-called limitations may sharpen the implications and recommendations of the study. Degrees with fewer hours than the MDiv may suggest the need for more hours in the curriculum to account for the issues here presented. More hours in a degree plan than the MDiv may reveal a poor focus of the hours toward the items measured here. The lack of an ordination objective may portend the failure of the seminary’s mission to equip godly servant-leaders. The addition of international students to this study may highlight the factors contributing to the results.

**Analysis of the Results**

Starting with a brief review of this project’s hypotheses, this section will analyze the results of the ten Personal Characteristics criteria scores for the fall 2009 graduating students at DTS. Not only does a low score indicate significance, but a higher than expected score also factors into the interpretation. Following the overview of the hypotheses, this section will analyze the scores based on organizing the criteria into two categories: positive traits and areas of concern. The positive traits will require less discussion than the areas of concern.

---

2 For the distribution of scores, see Table 1 on page 125. For a summary of each criterion’s data source, hypothesized range, mean scores, and results, see Table 2 on page 126. For the DTS Organizational Profile, see appendix G.
Individual Criterion

This section will review briefly each criterion’s hypothesis, score, and result from chapter four. This study measured three of the four Personal Characteristics clusters of PoM: Responsible and Caring, Family Perspective, and Personal Faith. The five Responsible and Caring criteria measured were Fidelity to Tasks and Persons (FIDL), Personal Responsibility (RESP), Acknowledgment of Limitations (LIMT), Involvement in Caring (ICAR), and Perceptive Counseling (PRCO). The two Family Perspective criteria measured for this study were Mutual Family Commitment (FAML) and Ministry Precedence over Family (MNFM). The three Personal Faith criteria measured for this study were Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety (PIET), Belief in a Provident God (PROV), and Christian Spirituality (SPRT).

Responsible and Caring

Fidelity to Tasks and Persons (FIDL)

The first hypothesis states: After studying at DTS, students will score in the SOMEWHAT LIKELY range for Fidelity to Tasks and Persons (FIDL). Although this hypothesis was false, students scored in the Very Likely range and four points higher than the expected Somewhat Likely range.

Personal Responsibility

The second hypothesis states: After studying at DTS, students will score in the LIKELY range for Personal Responsibility (RESP). This hypothesis was false. Students scored in the Unlikely range and twelve points below the expected range of Likely.
Acknowledgment of Limitations

The third hypothesis states: After studying at DTS, students will score in the LIKELY range for Acknowledgment of Limitations (LIMT). Although this hypothesis was false, students scored in the Very Likely range and three points higher than the expected Likely range.

Involvement in Caring

The fourth hypothesis states: After studying at DTS, students will score in the LIKELY range for Involvement in Caring (ICAR). This hypothesis is true. Students scored well within the Likely range.

Perceptive Counseling

The fifth hypothesis states: After studying at DTS, students will score in the LIKELY range for Perceptive Counseling (PRCO). This hypothesis is false. Students scored in the Possibly range and two points lower than the predicted Likely range.

Family Perspective

Mutual Family Commitment

The sixth hypothesis states: After studying at DTS, students will score in the LIKELY range for Mutual Family Commitment (FAML). Although this hypothesis was false, students scored in the Very Likely range and two points higher than the expected Likely range.
Ministry Precedence over Family

The seventh hypothesis states: After studying at DTS, students will score in the POSSIBLY range for Ministry Precedence over Family (MNFM). This hypothesis was false. Students scored in the Unlikely range and four points lower than the expected Possibly range.

Personal Faith

Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety

The eighth hypothesis states: After studying at DTS, students will score in the SOMEWHAT LIKELY range for Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety (PIET). Although this hypothesis was false, students scored in the Very Likely range and five points higher than the expected Somewhat Likely range.

Belief in a Provident God

The ninth hypothesis states: After studying at DTS, students will score in the LIKELY range for Belief in a Provident God (PROV). This hypothesis was false. Students scored in the Possibly range and seven points lower than the expected Likely range.

Christian Spirituality

The tenth hypothesis states: After studying at DTS, students will score in the SOMEWHAT LIKELY range for Christian Spirituality (SPRT). Although this hypothesis was false, students scored in the Very Likely range and two points higher than the expected Somewhat Likely range.
In summary, one of the ten hypotheses was true: ICAR. Nine of the ten hypotheses were false: FIDL, RESP, LIMT, PRCO, FAML, MNFM, PIET, PROV, and SPRT. Of the nine false hypotheses, four were false because the score was lower than expected: RESP, PRCO, MNFM, and PROV. Of the nine false hypotheses, five were false because the score was higher than expected: FIDL, LIMT, FAML, PIET, and SPRT. Of the five false hypotheses with higher than expected scores, the Field Observation Survey measured the student according to three criteria: FIDL, PIET, and SPRT. Some socially desirable responses or respondent idealism may account for these higher than expected scores. Of the remaining two hypotheses with higher than expected scores, the Casebook measured the student according to two criteria: LIMT and FAML. Student idealism may account for these higher than expected scores.

*Positive Traits*

According to the results of the ten Personal Characteristics scores from the DTS Organizational Profile, students demonstrate and affirm five positive traits or strengths that may indicate readiness for ministry. First, students want to be involved in helping others who are in need. Second, students exhibit an entrepreneurial spirit toward ministry. Third, students value humility and authenticity. Fourth, students are perceived as pious and prayerful. Fifth, students have high regard for the sanctity of the family. This section will interpret these five positive and affirming traits using the *PoM Advisor’s Manual* supplied by ATS as a guide. An analysis of the original RfM Project data results

---

3 For the distribution of scores, see Table 1 on page 125. For a summary of each criterion’s data source, hypothesized range, mean scores, and results, see Table 2 on page 126. For the DTS Organizational Profile, see appendix G.
for Evangelicals by David Allan Hubbard, former president and Old Testament professor at Fuller Theological Seminary in Pasadena, California and Clinton W. McLemore, associate professor in the Graduate School of Psychology at Fuller, will provide an evaluation of the positive nature of these qualities.

**Care for Others**

According to the Likely score for the Casebook criterion Involvement in Caring (ICAR), graduating students at DTS value the ability to express empathetic concern and to encourage those who are suffering to express fears and worries. Through their high ICAR score, students reveal their attitude toward “becoming personally involved in the mutual exchange among persons who seek to learn through suffering.” Students want to be involved in ministry; they hold one’s care for those who are hurting in high esteem; they want to help.

Among Evangelicals, ICAR is the most highly esteemed Personal Characteristic for the novice minister just graduating from seminary and beginning professional, vocational ministry. According to their analysis of the RfM Project data, Hubbard and McLemore, describe the Evangelical care for those under stress as the “most highly affirmed cluster.” Constituents of Evangelical churches call for their pastor

---


to reach out to others and to “help people recognize ways God may be working in their lives.”

**Entrepreneurial Style of Ministry**

According to those who see DTS students in ministry, students at DTS exhibit what one might call an entrepreneurial spirit toward ministry. The high mean score for Fidelity to Tasks and Persons (FIDL) indicates that field observers see and that students demonstrate competence, responsibility, dependability, and reliability. Observers say that students complete their tasks. They keep their word, their promises, and their commitments. They finish what they start. They are self-motivated and self-starters. They need little to no supervision. They are enterprising people—“go-getters” in the vernacular. They respect others and treat them warmly and impartially.

Reflecting their Protestant heritage, Evangelicals continue the Reformation’s legacy and quest for independence. In their review of the RfM Project data, Hubbard and McLemore note the lower value placed on the factor Denominational Awareness and Collegiality by most Evangelicals, especially those in the Evangelical A family. Most in

---

6 Ibid., 378-9.


8 Denominational Awareness and Collegiality was one of the eleven factors or themes of the sixty-four clusters coming out of the original RfM research. It attempted to describe the “basic knowledge and prudent appreciation of collegial openness in relation to one’s denominational identification.” See David S. Schuller, Merton P. Strommen, and Milo Brekke, eds., *Ministry in America: A Report and Analysis, Based on an in-Depth Survey of 47 Denominations in the United States and Canada, with Interpretation by 18 Experts* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1980), 24-5. Hubbard and McLemore, "Evangelical Churches," 352-8. Those in the Evangelical B family value Denominational Awareness and Collegiality more than the Evangelical A family or the Southern Baptist family. DTS fits best in the Evangelical A family because of its Dispensational theology.
the Evangelical A family center governance in the local congregation rather than in a council of ordained elders or the local bishop.\(^9\) Since autonomy ranks high amongst Evangelicals, they prize entrepreneurial qualities therefore in their ministers. Maturity, stability, integrity, and security without authoritarianism and harshness are coveted characteristics. Evangelicals see their minister as a leader and chief executive, one who manages, negotiates, plans, and delegates.\(^10\)

**Humility**

According to the high mean score for Acknowledgment of Limitations (LIMT), graduating students at DTS hold the minister’s continued growth and learning in high esteem. DTS graduating students value many important features of humility. They prize one’s acknowledgment of imperfection, studying oneself and the ministry, and readily admitting that one might not know when one does not know. They consider seeking forgiveness and apologizing for offenses to others, recognizing the need to grow in faith, and realizing one’s inadequacy for the task of ministry as important aspects of the ministry candidate. DTS students honor those accepting responsibility for mistakes, preparing to correct mistakes, and making restitution for mistakes. These are important values to DTS graduates.\(^11\)

Hubbard and McLemore affirm the positive value of humility amongst Evangelicals. Constituents of Evangelical churches recognize that their ministers need

---


\(^10\) Ibid., 383-8.

pastoral care. Evangelical ministers need a confidant. Laypeople understand their ministers need the help of others. Evangelical pastors have a personal freedom to acknowledge their mistakes and to receive ministry from others. Laity encourage their clergy to admit doubts and struggles, to be mindful that their individual abilities have boundaries, and yet to trust in God to redeem their ministry efforts.\textsuperscript{12}

\textbf{Piety}

According to the high mean score for Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety (PIET), observers testify that DTS graduating students show “profound consciousness of God’s redeeming activity in life.”\textsuperscript{13} According to those who observed DTS students in performance of ministry at their churches, DTS students freely and courageously live out their call to join Christ’s mission. Observers perceive students to be pious and sensitive to the Holy Spirit’s guidance. DTS students publicly profess their astute need for God’s presence and help. They acknowledge their sin and inadequacies to others, and they seem to receive consolation from God’s promise of forgiveness and assistance. The community believes DTS students invest in prayer and Scripture reading for guidance and daily spiritual nourishment.\textsuperscript{14}

Observers also confirm that DTS graduating students not only publicly reflect authentic Christian spirituality; they also work to lead others toward a meaningful spiritual life. Their messages during preaching and teaching opportunities stress the

\textsuperscript{12} Hubbard and McLemore, "Evangelical Churches," 382.

\textsuperscript{13} Aleshire and Schuller, \textit{Advisor’s Manual}, 10-1.

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.
importance of growth in prayer. They paint a clear vision of Christian spirituality. They advocate a balance between contemplation and action. They encourage others toward a personal relationship with God. In spite of the relative youth of average DTS graduates, they act as spiritual directors and guides.\(^\text{15}\)

Evidence that PIET is a highly desirable personal characteristic in a DTS graduating student just entering ministry hearkens back to the original RfM research. In their 1980 analysis of the RfM Project data for Evangelicals, Hubbard and McLemore concluded that Evangelicals “greatly esteem biblically based piety.”\(^\text{16}\) They predicted that the factor Spiritual Ministry from Personal Faith-Commitment would rank high for Evangelicals.\(^\text{17}\) Hubbard and McLemore summarized the importance of this RfM Project factor: “Relative to most [denominational] families, [Evangelicals] value highly a spiritual ministry that proceeds from a personal faith commitment.” They say, “Laypeople . . . admire a pastor whose life and ministry are marked by a strong sense of the new birth, coupled with a firm call to ministry and a regular practice of prayer, meditation, and Bible reading. At the same time, the laypeople seem to accept the full humanity of their leaders who live ‘with a sense of daily forgiveness . . .’”\(^\text{18}\)

In the same RfM analysis, Harold Songer, who in 1980 was the assistant provost, the director of professional studies, and the professor of New Testament interpretation at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky, concurs

\(^{15}\) Ibid., 13.

\(^{16}\) Hubbard and McLemore, "Evangelical Churches", 357.

\(^{17}\) Ibid., 361.

\(^{18}\) Ibid., 381.
with Hubbard and McLemore. Southern Baptists are near kin to Evangelicals, and they share the Evangelical expectation. Songer says, “Their ministers help people cope with their personal problems and lead people to deeper spiritual commitment.”

Constituents of these denominational families hope their ministers will discuss and share their religious experience openly and publicly. They want to hear about the minister’s daily experiences with God.

**Fidelity to Family**

According to their high mean score for Mutual Family Commitment (FAML), DTS graduating students value a deep commitment to family. They expect their family members to share their commitment for vocational ministry. DTS students value regular private family time. According to student responses to the PoM Stage II Casebook, they expect their spouse to sympathize and to join the student’s commitment to ministry as the student’s vocational calling. Students expect to keep commitments to their children and to their ministry with equal consistency. Students want to express their care and concern for their families. Their focus on the family suggests that they will guard against the invasion and intrusion of the ministry.

---


20 Ibid., 276.

21 One wonders how much Evangelical radio personality and psychologist James Dobson and his Focus on the Family ministry and his popular books have influenced these extremely high FAML scores.
For Evangelicals, their high regard for marriage and family best illustrates their care for others, their entrepreneurial spirit, their humility, and their piety. Hubbard and McLemore summarize the RfM data regarding the Evangelical pastor, the minister’s family, and their view of the pastor’s ministry this way:

The pastors strongly affirm approaches to ministry that seek to apply the gospel in positive Christian living and that show exemplary moral rectitude and Christian humility in serving without public acclaim, acknowledging mistakes, confessing a need for renewal, believing that God is at work even in the midst of serious problems, and living with a sense of freedom in the gospel. The highest-ranking item in the first two clusters is worth noting: Ministers value a marriage where the pastor’s “spouse is a companion in the faith.”

Evangelicals affirm their focus on the family and their commitment to ministry that starts first in the pastor’s home.

Areas of Concern

While the above five positive traits are encouraging, according to the ten Personal Characteristics scores from the DTS Organizational Profile, four areas of concern or needs for improvement emerge that raise questions regarding a student’s readiness for ministry. First, although students are reputed to be faithful to tasks and persons and to be entrepreneurial, they tend to hold personal convictions loosely, creating boundary issues. Second, although students express a high desire to help others, they underestimate the importance of listening and empathizing with those who are suffering. Third, although students have high regard both for the family and for the care of others, they struggle with balancing the tension between family and ministry. Fourth, although

22 Hubbard and McLemore, "Evangelical Churches", 381.
students are perceived as pious leaders of their communities and as advocates of a personal faith commitment, students are apt to vacillate regarding their personal trust in God to intervene for their needs.

**Boundary Issues**

According to their low, mean score for Personal Responsibility (RESP), graduating DTS students may be, when confronted with pressures to compromise, unlikely to “honor commitments by carrying out promises.” Said positively, when pressures to compromise threaten students, they may be likely to allow those pressures to trump their commitments. High scores for RESP would suggest that students have a high regard for keeping their word, fulfilling their promises, working unsupervised, and relating well with peers. At first blush, this criterion sounds similar to FIDL. This criterion’s low score seems to contradict the positive characteristic above labeled here as an entrepreneurial approach to ministry.

To measure the student’s commitment to people and tasks for the FIDL criterion, the best data source would come from the people whom the student served. The FIDL criterion comes, therefore, from the Field Observation Survey. Most of those

---


24 According to ATS, the true pairing is not FIDL with RESP but RESP with Flexibility of Spirit (FLEX). FLEX measures the likelihood the minister is willing to meet new situations. The student will tend to prefer one style to the other. Is the student inclined to keep promises or to change when a new situation presents itself? See Francis A. Lonsway, “Profiles of Ministry Interpretation: Suggestions for Interpreting Individual Profiles,” *Interpretation*, no. 9 (2001): 5. Because FLEX is an interview scale, DTS does not collect data for it currently.
observing DTS students are reporting on required activities. Students demonstrate faithfulness to tasks and persons during these required events.

RESP, however, is a personal scale and comes from the Casebook. RESP “measures the degree to which the individual is responsible to prior commitments over equally valid, subsequent requests that would conflict with the prior commitment.”25 RESP measures the likelihood students will “follow through with promises to people.”26 RESP measures the likelihood that the student will allow a new ministry demand to trump a prior ministry commitment. RESP reveals that despite demonstrating their commitment and their loyalty to tasks and persons, they actually hold these commitments in low esteem. Do these low scores suggest low attention span, a lack of self-discipline, or a lust for variety?

When ICAR and RESP are coupled together, these two criteria raise the question of the student’s ability to guard boundaries. A high or Likely ICAR score coupled with a low or Unlikely RESP score may indicate, for example, that graduating DTS students are likely to accept new ministry situations, even though the new ministry conflicts with a prior commitment. DTS students are reputed to complete tasks; they desire to serve people in need; but their low RESP score suggests a willingness to take on more responsibility than they can manage reasonably.

Failure to guard boundaries could have several deleterious results on the minister and ministry. For example, taking on more responsibility may threaten or jeopardize the minister’s commitment to family. When ministry candidates, however, 


take on more responsibility, they challenge their high score for FAML. In this way, they belie their low score for MNFM. Ministry candidates create a hypocritical message regarding the future minister’s verbal commitments to the family and to ministry constituents. Ministry candidates are sold on their family commitment. They attempt to persuade their families regarding their commitment to the family. With a low RESP score, meanwhile, ministry candidates are prone to give in to external pressures and to capitulate on their commitment to their families. These would-be ministers gravitate toward breaking their commitment, thus initiating a round of unmet expectations in the home. One can envision these unmet expectations setting off anger, jealousy, and resentment in the home.

Over-commitment may suggest another reason for one’s failure to protect boundaries. Coveting more responsibility in ministry may reveal a lust for ministry that forms an idol out of ministry. Idolizing ministry could jeopardize the minister’s ability to carry on personal devotion and spiritual disciplines. Too much responsibility raises the question of the minister’s loyalties. Does the minister serve out of love for God and for neighbor or for the sake of servicing one’s ego? Ministers who cannot decline ministry opportunities and the will of other people may be slaves to their ego. They may serve out of a need to please others. These ministers may be gratified more by what others think or by people pleasing than by the act of serving out of love for God.

For DTS graduating students, their low RESP and their high LIMT scores may signal unwillingness to change and a rigid approach to ministry.27 On the one hand,

27 Tisa Lewis, “Profiles of Ministry Program Introductory Interpretation Workshop” (training, Association of Theological Schools, Savannah, GA, Feb. 16-17, 2006).
the high mean LIMT score suggests an understanding that learning and growth are important aspects of the minister’s life. On the other hand, the low RESP tempers that commitment. Ministers with high LIMT scores and low RESP scores may idealize humility and a teachable spirit not in themselves but in others. When they experience rigidity and an unteachable spirit in others, they may recoil that the other has not met their expectation. The minister becomes a judge rather than a servant.

**Missing Empathy**

DTS students have an admirable desire to serve and care for others. They reveal, however, a reluctant or hesitant approach to caring. They are reluctant, or they hesitate to employ empathy as a style of serving and caring for those who are suffering. The lower than expected Possibly score for Perceptive Counseling (PRCO) indicates a less than expected value for listening and presence as a means of ministry. DTS students seem ambivalent about “reaching out to persons under stress with a perception, sensitivity, and warmth that is freeing and supportive.”28 This scale conveys “the minister’s care for persons, [the minister’s] eagerness to understand a person’s problems, [the minister’s] acceptance of others readily, and [the minister’s] identification with them.”29

---


29 Ibid.
In order to capture a complete perspective on the student’s approach toward caring for others, ATS directs PoM interpreters to “yoke” together the three scores for ICAR, PRCO, and Theologically Oriented Counseling (THCO).\textsuperscript{30} ATS defines THCO:

A score in the high likelihood region indicates that, at least in some situations, you help people deal with personal problems or decisions by explicitly encouraging them to be sensitive to God’s purpose in their lives and to use the resources of Scripture and faith in dealing with problems. It suggests that you communicate to others the value of prayer, faith, Scripture, and the church community as resources in times of personal crisis or distress. It also implies that you make use of specific faith-related terminology in counseling situations. A very high score, on the other hand, may indicate too sharp a focus on faith-filled answers to issues at the expense of listening.\textsuperscript{31}

Scores for ICAR, PRCO, and THCO form a three-legged stool of ministry. If one leg is out of balance with the other two, then the minister may fall off the stool of ministry. In this case, the minister hurts others in the fall. Their Likely ICAR score means students are concerned for people generally. The PRCO and THCO scores indicate two counseling approaches to suffering people that students should apply to their ICAR. PRCO measures the presence of the minister; THCO measures the minister’s concern for assigning faith responses to those suffering.\textsuperscript{32} The fall 2009 graduating class scored Possibly for PRCO and Likely for THCO. The ICAR and THCO legs of the ministry stool match, but the PRCO leg is shorter, indicating a problem for future ministry.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item Ibid., 11.
  \item Ibid., 6.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
ICAR means students value readiness and willingness to help. PRCO means students value discovering the need. THCO means students value applying the faith to the need. The Likely ICAR score among DTS graduates means that students want to be ready for ministry. A Likely PRCO score would mean that students would be willing to take aim at the ministry need. The Likely THCO score among DTS graduates means that students are willing to fire at the ministry need with their faith response. In balance, these three scores form a healthy ready, aim, fire approach to ministry. Out of balance, however, these three scores for DTS graduating students indicate a ready, fire, aim approach to ministry.

Using a medical analogy, PRCO would be the doctor’s diagnosis of the patient. The doctor listens, asks questions, runs tests, probes, and forms a diagnosis of the problem. The doctor would encourage the patient to reveal all symptoms and complaints for the most accurate diagnosis leading to the most appropriate prescription. THCO would be the doctor’s prescription. Based on the diagnosis, the doctor prescribes therapies and remedies for the patient. From simple rest and diet to major surgery and rehabilitation, the doctor offers a solution for the presenting health problem. Prescription without a strong diagnosis, however, risks malpractice. The patient could suffer further injury, could become more seriously ill, could be handicapped, or even could die at the hands of an incompetent doctor who failed to diagnose thoroughly and to offer therapies congruent with and effective for that diagnosis.

Likewise, if students fail to take a healthful approach to counseling into their ministry, they too risk spiritual malpractice. If students fail to listen to those under their soul care, they too risk offering harmful counsel. A good perceptive approach to
counseling includes listening for feelings and words, using silence and presence judiciously, creating an atmosphere of honesty and reality, alleviating worry and fear, and organizing others to help.\textsuperscript{33} A perceptive counseling approach requires time and patience.

The low score for RESP may minimize opportunities for taking the necessary time for a perceptive approach to counseling. Feeling the pressure of over-commitment, ministers may jump to prescribing ahead of a thorough diagnosis. They may forego careful, prayerful, perceptive counsel for a quick reaction from the Bible or theology. Regardless of the motive—a low attention span, a lack of self-discipline, or a lust for variety, for example—an inability to deny over-commitment could portend this ready, fire, aim approach to ministry and spiritual malpractice.

Given the Likely score for THCO and the Possibly scored for PRCO, DTS students may tend to overreact. They may fail to reign in their premature offer of hope from the Scriptures. THCO involves “using theologically sound counseling approaches to help people cope with personal problems.”\textsuperscript{34} DTS graduates measure high for this approach to counseling. They prize a strong balance between ICAR—“their “concern for people”—and THCO—“bringing the gift of faith.”\textsuperscript{35} Once diagnosed, counselees need ways and means for increasing their faith. They may be struggling to see how and where God is working on their behalf. They may be tempted to doubt God’s goodness, wisdom, and power. They may find themselves enmeshed in sin and in need of a way out and in

\textsuperscript{33} Aleshire and Schuller, \textit{Advisor’s Manual}, 8.

\textsuperscript{34} Ibid., 32.

\textsuperscript{35} Aleshire, Schuller, and Williams, \textit{Interpretive Manual II}, 6.
need of forgiveness, but if offered too soon, the minister’s premature therapies may prove harmful.\footnote{Aleshire and Schuller, \textit{Advisor’s Manual}, 32.}

\textbf{Balancing Family and Ministry}

The ministry and the minister’s family both require the minister’s time and energy. These two tug jealously at the minister’s commitments.\footnote{Aleshire, Schuller, and Williams, \textit{Interpretive Manual II}, 6.} One might think that a PoM profile with both scores—FAML and MNFM—in the same range might mean balance, but it does not. While this equitable pattern may say that ministry and family are mutually important, the expectation is impossible to manage.\footnote{Francis A. Lonsway, “Profiles of Ministry Interpretation: Suggestions for Interpreting Individual Profiles, Part 2,” \textit{Interpretation}, no. 10 (2002): 5.}

ATS specifically designed the FAML and the MNFM scores to pull at each other. The higher score for FAML would result in a lower score for MNFM and vice versa.\footnote{Ibid. Ideally, the SFL Department would prefer to see FAML higher than MNFM by approximately one grid or ten to fifteen points. ATS is comfortable with a FAML score higher than MNFM by two grids or twenty points.} A high or Very Likely FAML score suggests idealistic thinking on the part of the student. The high mean score for FAML and the much lower Unlikely mean score for MNFM may indicate that DTS students view the tension created between family and ministry unrealistically or less seriously than they should. The further apart the FAML score is from the MNFM score, the less likely students will operate based on reality. The

\footnotetext[1]{Aleshire and Schuller, \textit{Advisor’s Manual}, 32.}
\footnotetext[2]{Aleshire, Schuller, and Williams, \textit{Interpretive Manual II}, 6.}
\footnotetext[4]{Ibid. Ideally, the SFL Department would prefer to see FAML higher than MNFM by approximately one grid or ten to fifteen points. ATS is comfortable with a FAML score higher than MNFM by two grids or twenty points.}
closer these two scores are—within about one grid—the more realistically the student values keeping balance between the family and the ministry.\textsuperscript{40}

The twin markers of this Family Perspective cluster measure expectation setting. Are students aware of the precarious balancing act they must manage between family and ministry? They must assure the family that the ministry is not a threat without over-promising or setting expectations too high. They must assure their ministry constituents that they are available, but the ministry must understand that it cannot violate and intrude upon the family’s integrity. Solving one problem—the ministry crisis—must not produce another—ignoring the minister’s family needs.

An extremely high FAML score coupled with a low RESP score suggests that students are prone to over-promising and attracted to over-commitment. Invariably they will under-deliver. If they are in seminary, experience says, they have undoubtedly under-delivered that promise within the first year—maybe the first semester. Unlike ministry where ministers presumably can deny ministry opportunities, the seminary proves to be an unrelenting taskmaster.\textsuperscript{41} Syllabus due dates come and go like enemy tokens in a mindless video game. By the time DTS internship coordinators see Stage II profiles and counsel graduating students, spouses may be angry and suspicious.\textsuperscript{42}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{40}Helen M. Blier, “Profiles of Ministry Program Interpretation Webinar” (training, Association of Theological Schools, Pittsburgh, PA, February 4, 2010).
\item \textsuperscript{41}Some might see the church as an unrelenting taskmaster.
\item \textsuperscript{42}One student admitted that his wife had dubbed the seminary and any prospective future ministry as the “other woman.” The danger of seminary commitments and the temptation to superimpose those commitments onto ministry implore DTS to reinstate Stage I and to require a first-semester interview of the results. This score alone is justification enough for the labor and investment necessary to protect families both while in seminary and while serving in ministry as graduates of the seminary. The Apostle Paul understood this tension well: “But I want you to be without care. He who is unmarried cares for the things of the Lord—how he may please the Lord. But he who is married cares about the things of the
A low score such as Unlikely for MNFM means the student may set an improper expectation for ministry constituents. Communicating with any employer, including the church, that one is unavailable beyond the normal working agreement could result in termination. A reputation for clock-watching could preclude future employment. Ministers should never attempt to set an expectation with their ministry constituency that ministry will never trump the family. Not only is that expectation unreasonable, it is unrealistic. Seminarians have violated that expectation before they even arrive at ministry. Thus, they should know how unrealistic the expectation is.

Balance is the key to expectation setting. Students must persuade their family members that they are part of the ministry. Family members must feel they are included in and connected to the ministry. They must see themselves as the first constituents of the minister’s ministry. They must know confidently that the minister is doing everything humanly possible to protect the integrity and boundaries of the family. Ministers must avoid the predicament of the cobbler whose children have no shoes, or the plumber whose pipes at home leak.

The ministry constituents must realize that their employee is a sold-out team member. They must also agree that trumping the minister’s family will be difficult but not impossible. Using the terms of the PoM profile, the minister Likely will protect the family’s boundaries, and the minister Possibly will allow the ministry to trump the family. The minister manages these expectations and keeps these relationships in balance.

world—how he may please his wife. . . . The unmarried woman cares about the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit. But she who is married cares about the things of the world—how she may please her husband. And this I say for your own profit, not that I may put a leash on you, but for what is proper, and that you may serve the Lord without distraction” (1 Cor 7:32-35).
T**ruting in God to Intervene**

Of all the scales for the PoM profile, Belief in a Provident God (PROV) causes the most anxiety. What causes all this anxiety? First, ever since DTS internship coordinators conducted their first interviews and interpretive sessions with students, PROV of all the PoM criteria has provoked the most debate and study within the SFL Department. Routinely, students have scored lower than the SFL Department expects or desires. DTS students who score above Possibly are few. More than seventy-five percent score below Likely. In other words, fewer than twenty-five percent of DTS students score Likely or above to believe in a provident God.

Second, and in addition to lower scores, initially the SFL Department attempted to minimize concern for this criterion because one might detect an allusion to universalism within the definition, the description, and the Casebook responses. DTS

PROV is the only scale that does not draw value from the instrument’s three historical surveys. See Aleshire and Schuller, *Advisor’s Manual*, 12. PROV does not relate to a criterion area. It is a scale born of its potential value. Lonsway reports in an e-mail to the author dated September 10, 2010 that Aleshire, who led the 1987-88 revision, discovered a cluster of items from Case 16(R) of the Stage I Casebook, which is the same as Case 18 of the Stage II Casebook. This cluster of responses emerged with a strong reliability co-efficient of .76. The new cluster was labeled “Belief in a Provident God” (PROV). According to the *Advisor’s Manual*, because the four Personal Faith scales (PIET-I, PIET-F, PROV-C, and SPRT-F) come from all three instruments, one should avoid predicting patterns between scales. PIET-I, the interview version of Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety, measures the student’s view of the church’s primary message. PIET-F, the Field Observation survey version of PIET measures how others perceive the student’s piety. From the interview, the student reveals that the church proclaims God’s love to the world rather than moral guidance. From the survey, the student demonstrates sensitivity to the work of the Holy Spirit and the need for forgiveness. These two criteria reinforce Belief in a Provident God. See ibid., 100-1. Currently, DTS does not use the interview, so PIET-I is not available to students. Efforts are underway to incorporate the recorded and scripted interview at DTS.

---

43 PROV is the only scale that does not draw value from the instrument’s three historical surveys. See Aleshire and Schuller, *Advisor’s Manual*, 12. PROV does not relate to a criterion area. It is a scale born of its potential value. Lonsway reports in an e-mail to the author dated September 10, 2010 that Aleshire, who led the 1987-88 revision, discovered a cluster of items from Case 16(R) of the Stage I Casebook, which is the same as Case 18 of the Stage II Casebook. This cluster of responses emerged with a strong reliability co-efficient of .76. The new cluster was labeled “Belief in a Provident God” (PROV). According to the *Advisor’s Manual*, because the four Personal Faith scales (PIET-I, PIET-F, PROV-C, and SPRT-F) come from all three instruments, one should avoid predicting patterns between scales. PIET-I, the interview version of Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety, measures the student’s view of the church’s primary message. PIET-F, the Field Observation survey version of PIET measures how others perceive the student’s piety. From the interview, the student reveals that the church proclaims God’s love to the world rather than moral guidance. From the survey, the student demonstrates sensitivity to the work of the Holy Spirit and the need for forgiveness. These two criteria reinforce Belief in a Provident God. See ibid., 100-1. Currently, DTS does not use the interview, so PIET-I is not available to students. Efforts are underway to incorporate the recorded and scripted interview at DTS.

44 Kent Eaton, “History and Interpretation at Bethel Seminary San Diego,” *Interpretation*, no. 14 (2004): 2. Eaton reports that students score Possibly on PROV. Eaton writes, “Since most of our students do not embrace universalism, they routinely react negatively to what they perceive to be these implications in some questions related to the category of God’s providence.” Unless a DTS internship coordinator draws attention to the case from which PROV is derived, DTS students do not know which
rejects outright a doctrine of universalism. If PROV, however, does measure one’s theological commitment to universalism, then DTS would expect and prefer lower PROV scores than Possibly, such as Unlikely and Very Unlikely. Yet, DTS students score mid-Possibly (25 of 50). Are DTS graduating students possibly adopting a doctrine of universalism? This seems highly unlikely. Equally disconcerting and unlikely is the implication that DTS graduating students might not be able to discern universalism from a set of case responses.

Moreover, during internship exit interviews, students have never dismissed or justified their low PROV score because they detect universalism either in the Casebook responses or in the interpretive manual. Neither have the few students with acceptable and desirable PROV scores indicated their belief in universalism. If students are not attributing their low or high scores to universalism, then either universalism is not the correct interpretation for the scale, or DTS graduating students are missing a key theological doctrine. In the final analysis, according to ATS, students are the context of interpretation. The only scores for which one may have certainty are scores to the right or high scores. Students with high scores demonstrate that they match the definition of the criterion found in the interpretive manual. The instrument offers no interpretation for low scores. The reason for low scores must come from the context of the score, which is the student. Students must explain why they believe their scores fall short. Graduating DTS students never attribute their lower scores to a rejection of universalism.

responses are involved. Regardless, DTS students have never explained their scores—high or low—because of universalism.

45 Helen M. Blier, “Profiles of Ministry Advanced Interpretation Workshop” (training, Association of Theological Schools, Pittsburg, PA, February 7-8, 2008).
Lonsway acknowledged that a high Very Likely score (45–50) for PROV would “indicate a deep consciousness of God’s providence for His creation and might suggest universalism.” In this case, the student would have idealized God’s providence to an extreme level of care and mercy for all creation.

ATS Executive Director Daniel Aleshire categorically denies that PROV attempts to measure one’s commitment to universalism or that PROV stems from any theological agenda. On the one hand, the ATS Advisor’s Manual states that a high Very Likely PROV score “portrays a theological position, which holds that God is a God of love not hate, that God’s nature is not bound by what we believe, that God will bring all to a saving knowledge, and that in matters of eternal destiny, God is the final judge.”

On the other hand, one should not confuse the portrayal of a “theological position” taken from a high Very Likely score of PROV with Aleshire’s insistence, that “there is not theological intent in the construction of the instrument, one way or the other.”

Lonsway confirms Aleshire’s conclusion that researchers did not construct the instrument out of a theological agenda, an easy accusation to assume since the PROV criterion does not come from the original research surveys. Lonsway reports that Aleshire, who led the revision, discovered a clustering of unused responses from Case 16(R) of the Stage I Casebook, which is identical to Case 18 of the Stage II Casebook.

---

46 Francis Lonsway, e-mail message to the author, September 10, 2010.

47 Daniel Aleshire, e-mail message to Helen Blier forwarded to the author, August 27, 2010.


49 Daniel Aleshire, e-mail message to Helen Blier forwarded to the author, August 27, 2010.
This cluster of responses emerged with a strong reliability co-efficient of .76. The new cluster was labeled “Belief in a Provident God” (PROV).  

Since PROV does not measure a theological position on universalism or any other view of God’s providence, then a question arises. What do lower PROV scores mean? Identifying these possible meanings forms a third reason for the anxiety that surrounds PROV. These meanings are elusive and varied. Taken together, however, these meanings weave a rich tapestry of counsel toward helping seminary graduates reach readiness for ministry.

ATS officials, for example, have offered some disconcerting explanations for the seminary’s lower PROV score. On one occasion, ATS suggested that DTS students score possibly for PROV because the school subscribes to Dispensational theology. ATS believes that the Dispensationalist views of future events—the pre-tribulation rapture and the premillennial return of Christ—create a certainty, dogmatism, or determinism that minimizes or even dispels trust in God’s intervention. According to ATS, Dispensationalism focuses on the externals and not the internals; it majors in moralizing rather than mercy. Although ATS may have uncovered a legitimate aspect or possible influence of the PROV score’s lower trend at DTS, ATS has not justified the lower scores at DTS universally. DTS has a substantial student community of non-Dispensationalists to undermine this theory as a blanket answer. One would need to remove all non-Dispensationalist student scores from the group to determine if the scores would decrease further.

50 Francis Lonsway, e-mail message to the author, September 10, 2010.

51 Blier, “PoM Training Webinar.”
One should note as well that ATS predicts that because of the seminary’s Dispensationalism, DTS students will score higher than non-Dispensationalist schools for Law Orientation to Ethical Issues (LAW).\(^5^2\) Students with high scores for LAW emphasize “God’s demands and condemnation as a basis for solving personal problems and wrong-doing.”\(^5^3\) DTS students also belie the ATS prediction for a high LAW score. For the subject pool of this study, the LAW score was a well-adjusted twenty-five or Possibly rather than the ATS-predicted Likely or Very Likely. Seventy-five percent of the pool scored less than Likely and the maximum score was only thirty-six or the middle of the Likely range.\(^5^4\) Thus, ATS handicapping for lower DTS scores has not proved fruitful, and so demonstrating the need to consider the score’s context, which is the student.

To arrive at a consensus for what lower scores might portend for DTS graduating students, one must understand first what PROV intends. PROV measures the likelihood that one believes in “a God whose love and mercy extend beyond human

\(^5^2\) Ibid. LAW is a Casebook score under Perceptions of Ministry. ATS defines a high likelihood score for LAW: “You affirm God’s moral law and the personal consequences of breaking them. You believe that the Scriptures are the only dependable guide to God’s intentions for life and that obedience is a Christian discipline that needs more emphasis. Because persons will not be saved apart from Jesus Christ, you feel the urgency of bringing the Gospel message to persons lost in sin. You think that people should have their erroneous beliefs and wrongdoing called to their attention and be reminded of God’s judgment in the hope that they will repent and change their lives.” See Aleshire, Schuller, and Williams, *Interpretive Manual II*, 10. For the group score, see appendix G.

\(^5^3\) Aleshire and Schuller, *Advisor’s Manual*, 31. During his exit interview, one student wondered if his low PROV score might come from his theological struggles with Calvinism and the debate between free will and the sovereignty of God.

\(^5^4\) A LAW score higher or lower than Possibly does concern DTS and signals a need for discussion with the student. A low score may suggest license; a high score may suggest legalism.
imagination and understanding." This explanation adds to the seminary’s concern for its graduating students. This definition would suggest that DTS students Possibly believe in a God Whose love and mercy extends beyond their imagination and understanding. Inversely, could a Possibly score imply that students might not believe in a God Whose love and mercy extends beyond their imagination and understanding? Might they believe in a God Whose love and mercy are quite imaginable and comprehensible? Would this suggest that DTS students are prone equally to avow as to disavow Paul’s quote of Isaiah: “Eye has not seen, nor ear heard, nor have entered into the heart of man the things which God has prepared for those who love Him” (1 Cor 2:9)?

Another explanation according to the ATS Advisor’s Manual for PoM says PROV rates the student’s acceptance or rejection of God’s provident care for humanity. Aleshire explains this definition. He adds that PROV appraises the likelihood that students expect God to intervene. As an approach or style of ministry, Aleshire says, PROV attempts to measure the regard students have for trusting in God. Keeping this explanation in mind, DTS scores of Possibly for PROV might mean that DTS students equally could accept or reject God’s provident care for humanity. They equally might or might not expect God to intervene or to trust in God. For a Christian ministry candidate

55 Helen Blier, e-mail message to the author, August 27, 2010.

56 Aleshire and Schuller, Advisor’s Manual, 12.

57 Daniel O. Aleshire, “Interview with the ATS Executive Director” (interview, Association of Theological Schools, Pittsburg, PA, September 8, 2009).

58 Ibid.
to ride the fence regarding God’s provident care, to waver between hope and hopelessness regarding God’s intervention, or to live out an indecisive trust in God would seem oxymoronic. How does such a candidate hope to lead the people of God? If one takes away trust in God to care for humanity and to intervene, what hope does the minister offer to the people who are in crisis?

To exacerbate concern for this score, DTS internship coordinators and PoM interviews discovered another unique feature of PROV. Not only is PROV the only criterion formed after the research, PROV also stems from a unique case in the Casebook. A survey of all the cases in the Casebook reveals that PROV comes from a unique perspective. While in all other cases the student vicariously serves as minister, in the one case measuring PROV, the student is not principally the minister. An allusion is made in the case that the student might be a minister, but this is not the student’s role in the case. This case is the only one where the student is not in the role of minister. The student identifies in the case, instead, as the hurting woman’s sibling. Unlike in other cases where the student’s role is clerical, this unique perspective of the case infuses the student’s responses with intense emotion and with a highly personal tone. This feature elevates PROV above the role or approach of minister. PROV measures the student and would-be minister as a Christian in everyday living. This case asks about the student’s Christian faith in God's providence as a Christian man or woman regardless of vocation.

Could the new cluster Aleshire discovered in the 1987-88 revision actually depict a ministry candidate who is first and above all a Christian man or woman of faith in God's loving and merciful care for all His creation and that this faith resonates at the deepest core of the minister's being? Is this not how the early church chose deacons in Acts 6? If the ministry candidate demonstrates a Likely faith in a provident God, then can one surmise that the ministry candidate will love God and his neighbor, who may one day join the minister's ministry constituency?
In addition, DTS finds a fourth point of anxiety with the lower than expected PROV score. On the one hand, by virtue of their high mean score in PIET, DTS students demonstrate to the public their religious faith. On the other hand, they personally reveal through their relatively low score in PROV a missing “internal strength of the power of God in their lives.” Their verbal and public affirmation of faith does not match their internal belief. On the outside, they present a trust or belief that God will intervene, but on the inside, they have doubts and waver.

During the five years that the SFL Department has administered PoM to graduating students and has conducted internship exit interviews with students, the department has determined that lower than Likely scores are worrisome and worthy of study and correction. Christians and especially Christian ministers must do everything from faith (Rom 14:23). Pleasing God is impossible without trusting in God (Heb 11:6). Christians who live by faith are justified (Hab 2:4; Rom 1:17; Gal 3:11; Heb 10:38). Christians should walk by faith and not by sight (2 Cor 5:7; Col 2:6) because “faith is the assurance of things unseen, the conviction of things hoped for” (Heb 11:1). Is not walking by faith synonymous with walking by the Spirit? Christians who walk by the Spirit—and by extension who walk by faith—do not fulfill the lusts of the flesh (Gal 5:16). Faith is the hallmark of the Christian experience. Faith coupled with love produces good works (Gal 5:6).

\[59\] Lewis, “PoM Training I.”
\[60\] Francis A. Lonsway, “A Call to Growth: The Potential of the Profiles of Ministry Program,” *Theological Education* 39, no. 2 (2003): 70. Although Lonsway makes this assertion for Stage I, it applies to Stage II as well since items for both Stages are identical.
Working in the ministry with only a possible likelihood of trusting in God means that DTS students have a possible likelihood not only of living but also of serving out of the flesh rather than by the Spirit. How can DTS graduates hope to serve and lead congregations well and according to biblical and spiritual expectations with only a possible likelihood of trust in God? This marker’s score taints the strengths DTS graduates take with them from seminary into ministry. Caring for others without trusting in God may turn into social work. An entrepreneurial spirit toward the ministry without trusting in God may risk devolving into fleshly ambition and a lust for power and control. A minister who values humility but fails to trust in God may become judgmental, critical, and unable to receive criticism. A high view of family commitment without trusting in God may reduce ministry to a nine-to-five job. Public admiration for the minister’s piety without the minister’s trust in God may translate into hypocrisy.

**Implications of the Study**

This section will discuss three implications from this study. What are the implications for DTS and for its graduates who are entering the ministry? What are the implications for theological education? What are the implications for future research?

**Implications for DTS and Its Graduates**

The implications of this study for DTS graduating students hinges partly on the implications for the seminary and partly on the initiative of the student. Students in seminary today should pay special heed to avoid succumbing to the cognitive rich environment of the seminary and to the consumer rich environment of the culture. The implications of the study for the seminary may require radical adjustments to pedagogy and curricula.
**Implications for DTS Graduates**

The implications of this study discloses a warning for DTS students regarding a ministry where the minister only possibly trusts in God and where the minister is likely to let pressures trump personal convictions. That ministry can be a danger to the minister’s spiritual health and to the balance between the minister’s family and ministry. The most important weapon for the warfare the minister must wage is trusting in God through constant prayer.

**A Dangerous Occupation**

Why would people consider the ministry for a vocation if they did not want to help others in need? Why would anyone invest in seminary for a vocation in the social services arena? Candidates for ministry, one would hope, aspire to serve for altruistic reasons, out of love for God and neighbor.

Low scores in RESP send up warning flags to interpreters. They signal the need to compare several scores with the RESP score and to probe students for possible explanations. While caring for others is noble, an extreme PoM score for ICAR coupled with a very high score for FIDL and a low RESP score may indicate a co-dependency. Ministers may have a need to please people. They may derive ego gratification from rescuing or caretaking. Some interpreters even recommend that the interviewers ask their students if alcoholism or drug abuse is a problem for the student or for someone close.  

RESP also measures personal conviction. The low mean score suggests the likelihood that DTS students will compromise their convictions. Combinations of RESP

---

with other scores may mean a faulty motivation for the work of ministry and portend failure. For example, would a high score for Interest in New Ideas coupled with a low RESP score indicate willingness to compromise truth? Might this combination predict the possibility of doctrinal concessions under pressure? Might this combination or a combination of RESP with criteria from the Potential Negatives cluster suggest the possibility of moral concessions under pressure? For example, a Possibly score both for RESP and Self Protective Behavior (SELF) may signal boundary issues in relationships. If one adds to these two Possibly scores, high scores in FIDL and ICAR, might the student be attempting to meet private needs via public means?

---


63 ATS defines Interest in New Ideas as follows: “A score toward the right provides evidence that you respect people of other cultures and religious traditions. Your own commitment to the Christian faith can be best understood in terms of the alternatives that other world religions represent. You seek to establish dialogue with others and would encourage individuals to learn about other faiths. You tend toward the conviction that there are elements of truth in all religious faiths.” See Aleshire, Schuller, and Williams, *Interpretive Manual II*, 11-2. If DTS employed the interview, the student and interviewer could compare RESP with Openness to Pluralism, which ATS defines as follows: A high evidence score suggests that you respect and want to hear others’ opinions and views. You have an interest in what they believe, what they are thinking, what motivates them, and how they go about making value judgments. A score to the right also implies that you are hesitant to force your own beliefs or religious position on others and think it is good for persons in your congregation to be exposed to very divergent opinions. Your approach to those whose beliefs differ from your own is cooperative rather than competitive. A very high score may indicate a drift into a valueless approach to faith in which no personal convictions are held.” See ibid., 11. Would this pairing suggest a low resistance under stress to compromise?

64 Sanstrom, “Possible Indicators of Vulnerability to Infidelity,” 4. Sanstrom named this profile the “Wanderer.”
Another example of potential moral concession might be the student with a Possibly score for RESP, SELF, and Pursuit of Personal Advantage (PADV). Add to these high scores in FIDL, ICAR, and a Possibly or higher score for MNFM and the student may be exhibiting high motivation for public success and ambition in ministry. This ministry style may cross into narcissism and manipulation with an air of entitlement.

Questions of personal convictions also arise in areas of self-discipline. Low RESP scores have prompted interviewers to probe students about their walk with Christ. During exit interviews with DTS students at the close of their internships, internship coordinators routinely press students for reflection regarding devotion, prayer, scripture reading, regular church attendance, and any other signs of a healthy commitment to the Christian way of life. The vast majority of DTS students confess readily to their failure to keep up with an active spiritual life in the face of seminary demands. They are disappointed to admit that seminary has trumped their relationship with God.

---

65 PADV is a Personal Characteristic of the Potential Negative cluster. It is an interview score measured in PoM Stage I. ATS defines PADV: “A score in the very likely region means you may have a tendency to try to get other people to do what you would like them to do without directly asking them to do it. You resort to indirect approaches that can be manipulative of other people. A score to the right may also reflect a tendency to want administrative structures to meet your needs rather than being willing to do things that best meet the administrative needs of an institution or organization.” See Daniel O. Aleshire, David S. Schuller, and Dorothy Lowe Williams, Profiles of Ministry Interpretive Manual Stage I, ed. Daniel O. Aleshire and Francis A. Lonsway, rev. ed. (Pittsburgh, PA: Association of Theological Schools, 2005), 7. Currently, DTS does not administer Stage I. Administering Stage I would be helpful for students and DTS. Identifying these tendencies early in seminary would give the student and faculty an opportunity to form the student away from a manipulative approach. When students score high in PADV, interviewers could intervene in the student’s tendencies to usurp seminary administrative procedures.

66 Sanstrom, “Possible Indicators of Vulnerability to Infidelity,” 4. Sanstrom named this profile the “Predator.”

67 During one exit interview, the student admitted casually that he did not pray privately because he felt it was a waste of time.
Balancing Family and Ministry

DTS and its students are aware of the trail of destruction wrought by the intrusion of ministry into the minister’s family. DTS internship coordinators cringe when they read a PoM profile with a MNFM score higher than Possibly. Although high MNFM scores at DTS are very rare, interviewers are especially leery of MNFM scores higher than FAML scores. Perhaps unlike any other profession, ministry requires careful management of family and ministry expectations. Interestingly though, a very high FAML score may suggest a couple of warnings for students as well.

A very high score may indicate significant changes at home. The interviewer might ask how seminary or ministry has affected the family or about any major life changes. Students may be overreacting to the demands of seminary or ministry and setting expectations for themselves and the family that are unrealistic. They have entered a self-protecting mode for the family’s sake, even though they cannot hope to achieve the level of segregation they have in mind.

A very high FAML score coupled with a low MNFM score may suggest that self-care has exaggerated into selfishness. The primacy of the family may turn away all special requests for ministry. Turning down special ministry opportunities may mark the end of ministry. Much of ministry is special, spontaneous, and non-routine. Much meaningful ministry occurs while ministers are off the clock. Not only will pastors miss

__________________________


ministry opportunities, pastors run the risk of termination by their constituency if they reject the call of the congregation too often.\textsuperscript{70}

*Trust in God through Prayer*

Since the beginning of PoM assessments at DTS, lower than expected PROV scores have concerned the SFL Department. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, some interpreters have attempted incorrectly to justify a lower than expected PROV score to the student’s reaction against universalism.\textsuperscript{71} In the beginning of its employment of PoM at DTS, the SFL Department staff dismissed the scale because the criterion smacked of universalism.\textsuperscript{72} During interviews with students regarding their profile, internship coordinators would test the theory. Internship coordinators would ask students to read the criterion’s definition in the interpretive manual. Internship coordinators would ask students to agree or disagree with the definition. Internship coordinators sought to uncover any possible universalism in the student’s thinking by asking students to identify what part of the definition they might discount or reject. In this informal survey, no student ever identified universalism as part of the definition. Currently, internship coordinators first ask students to justify their lower than expected PROV score. Students

\textsuperscript{70} I attended a church whose pastor attempted to keep hours of ministry from nine to five. The elders of the church protected him from the growing anger of the congregation for just so long. Then, they fired him. To this pastor’s credit, he changed professions and took a job that started at 9 a.m. and ended at 5 p.m. According to his greatest desire and priority, he was home for dinner with his family every night.

\textsuperscript{71} Eaton, “History and Interpretation at Bethel Seminary San Diego,” 3.

\textsuperscript{72} Not everyone on staff agreed with the universalism interpretation. Both parties and views have been vindicated. PROV, on the one hand, does not measure a theological position called universalism. A high Very Likely PROV score, on the other hand, could signal an idealization of God’s providential care akin to universalism.
routinely address the issue from a practical position rather than from a theological position.

If DTS or ATS wanted to validate that in fact students believe or affirm a certain theological position demonstrating that a provident God exists or that students give mental assent to a provident God, then the most effective and efficient way to accomplish this assessment would be to ask students to accept or reject the definition outright. They would check the box. Theology courses validate such theological positions throughout the student’s studies. PROV, however, does not measure doctrinal compliance. It measures the likelihood that students will trust in God. PROV measures the likelihood that students expect or trust in God to intervene in the affairs of humanity and in their lives.

Publicly, the answers to these questions are undeniable. Field observers testify enthusiastically that DTS students believe in a provident God and that they encourage others to trust in God for their needs. The public testimony, however, does not match the revelation of the heart. While students publicly present themselves as giants of the faith, they are cowering in a modicum of doubt, skepticism, and unbelief. Where do students acquire their doubt? They are studying the Bible and theology at a seminary that prepares men and women for ministry. How does one leave DTS possibly doubting the providence of God? How does one graduate with a Master of Theology degree with only a possible trust in God? Stated positively, how does one leave DTS only possibly trusting in God to intervene in the world and in one’s life?

Over the course of the last five years and by way of several hundred, student interviews, the SFL Department staff has identified four influences for the lower than expected PROV scores. During internship exit interviews, internship coordinators routinely survey students to validate any or all the reasons that have surfaced from the previous interviews. Internship coordinators continue to poll for new reasons.
First, and sad to say, students may be acquiring their skepticism and cynicism regarding God’s providence from the seminary and from the student’s theological education. As discussed in chapter one of this paper, the academy of theological education has reduced the study of theology to an objectified, scholarly, and academic exercise on the level of any other academic subject. Theological education has reduced God to the level of something observable and quantifiable. How does one trust in a God who is manageable and comprehensible according to human reason?

Second, when do students need God? When do they cry out for His help? In the American and in most of the western culture of consumerism, Christians have developed levels of need for God. For example, students may need money. How much money do they need before they cry out for help to God? Do they need $10, $100, or more? Students may become sick or injured. How sick or injured do they have to be before they cry out for God to intervene and heal them? Will they seek God’s help for a cold or for cancer? When students travel, do they ask God for protection and guidance? If they travel to school, to employment, to church, and back home, they may not ask God for help. If they travel back to their hometown or cross-culturally for a mission trip, they might be more inclined to seek God’s intervention for the unforeseen. When students are asked if they feel closer to God in Dallas, Texas, or in New Delhi, India; American students unanimously answered New Delhi. They travel in a tunnel of trust in themselves and their culture while in America. Once they leave Dallas and the friendly and comfortable confines of American shores for the unknown and uncomfortable, they immediately and intuitively invoke the Lord’s name for help and comfort during the stress and uncertainty of travel in foreign lands. Likewise, during exit interviews, international students at DTS acknowledge a similar experience. They sense an increased need for and trust in God when they leave their homeland.
Third, the culture of the West embraces materialism, secularism, and consumerism and teaches its citizens that they do not need God. Media bombards DTS students, like all Christians and all people living in America, relentlessly with nihilistic messages. Students are told they need deodorant and how to get it. They are told they need a new car and how to get it. They are told they need something to eat and how to get it. They are told everything they need and how to get everything they need. Missing from the list of needs is God. Missing from the ways to get what they need is the providence of God.

If their God is too small, they cannot trust in Him. If students can live comfortably without God, then they will and do live without God out of habit and convenience. If students rarely hear about or are rarely aware of their need for God’s intervention, then they are less likely to call upon Him. If they rarely hear messages that tell them to call upon the name of the Lord for their needs, then they are less likely to call as well. Given these three reasons for a lower than expected score in PROV, one might retort with surprise, “Why is their score not Unlikely or worse, instead of Possibly?” The true surprise is that some students (nearly twenty-five percent) score Likely or Very Likely to trust in God. When these students are asked to explain why their scores are so high, they testify to their near-constant need for God. Students returning from trips overseas seem to score higher. How long after the trip before they revert to a lower likelihood of trust in God? Students ministering in impoverished and needy areas seem to score higher. If these students changed ministry to a wealthier constituency, would they abandon their need for God’s help? Students in health crises seem to score higher. If the
health crisis should end with the anticipation of long life, will students forget the God Who delivered them?³¹

Continuous trust in God amounts to spiritual warfare. While the world and the flesh seek out comfort and convenience, the Spirit of God prompts Christians for trust, dependence, and reliance for the smallest commodities of life. The Spirit expects faith for all things and for all times. “In everything give thanks,” the Apostle Paul says (1 Thess 5:18). The Spirit of God expects Christians to pray for health and long-life and to give thanks for the status of one’s health regardless of one’s condition.

The Spirit of God expects Christians to walk continuously in the presence of God regardless of the distance of the journey. The Bible, especially the Psalms and Proverbs, paints the whole of life as a journey. Jesus declared He is the Way. No one comes to the Father except through Him. Christians, says the Apostle Paul, walk in Christ the same way they received Christ—by faith with thanksgiving (Col 2:6). God walks with His people through unceasing prayer (1 Thess 5:17).

The Spirit of God expects Christians to set their affections on things above and not on the things of this earth (Col 3:2). In His Sermon on the Mount, Jesus taught His disciples to seek first the kingdom and its righteousness, and the provision of all one’s needs—from a penny to infinity—God would provide (Matt 6:32).

Fourth, low scores in RESP may predict a lower PROV score. If students have allowed the pressures of seminary and the syllabus to trump their walk with Christ, their

³¹ During an interview with an internship coordinator, an international student was asked to justify his high Likely PROV score. He unhesitatingly replied that he was not an American. Routinely students born and raised in less consumer-oriented cultures score higher on PROV. Given that the subject population for this project includes international students, this anecdotal evidence suggests that the mean Possibly PROV score for DTS graduating students may be artificially high.
time and commitment to devotion, then one should not be surprised to find their PROV scores low. Rather than succumb to the pressure, should not the pressure signal the need for more time with God? Should not the stress or crisis act like a dashboard light on a car telling the driver to pull over and stop before damage occurs to the engine?\(^74\)

Before take-off, when the flight attendant presents the safety features of a commercial airliner, one hears the procedural order for both an airline and a spiritual emergency. In the event of a loss of cabin pressure, who receives the oxygen mask first? If one places the oxygen mask on the child or the infirmed first, then those wishing to serve others first before themselves—a commendable though deadly aspiration—will die and never help another needy person on the plane. If those in ministry fail to bask in the oxygen-rich atmosphere of the Spirit of God, then they will perform a dead ministry without the aid of the Holy Spirit.

In both Hebrew and Greek, the term that is translated *spirit* is also translated *wind*, or *breath*.\(^75\) Wind reveals the sovereignty and power of God, while breath reveals the Spirit’s role as giver of life.\(^76\) The Spirit hovered over the surface of the deep in Genesis 1 revealing the sovereignty of the Spirit. God breathed into Adam the breath of life in Genesis 2 revealing the gift of life from the Spirit. Jesus told Nicodemus, “The wind blows where it wishes and you hear the sound of it, but do not know where it comes

\(^74\) The pressure of seminary can even trump church attendance. In order to assure itself that its students attend church, DTS requires each graduating student to present a letter from their pastor on church letterhead affirming the student’s faithfulness to church. Since DTS only encourages students to practice a devotional life, no accountability is required.


from and where it is going; so is everyone who is born of the Spirit” (John 3:8). The Spirit entered the upper room at Pentecost like a rushing wind and lighted upon the Apostles as tongues of fire (Acts 2).

The breath of the Christian carries the words of prayer. In spiritual battle, the only offensive weapon described by the Apostle Paul is the sword of the Spirit (Eph 6:17). He equates the sword of the Holy Spirit with the word of God. The word translated word is not the expected Greek word λόγος (logos), however. The Greek term translated word is ῥημα (rēma), which refers to a spoken word, a word that is audible. This word is what is said, the saying of the thing. This word requires breath to speak it. This word proceeds from the mouth of God, and is that word by which everyone should live (Matt 4:4).77

To drive home the point that prayer is the sword of the Spirit and the Christian’s weapon in spiritual warfare, Paul closes his letter exhorting his readers, “With all prayer and petition pray at all times in the Spirit . . .” (Eph 6:18). Wielding the sword of the Spirit requires constant diligence and fortitude. This sword’s blade should never see the darkness of the sheath. At all times in the Spirit, Paul says, “Be on the alert with all perseverance and petition for all the saints . . .” (Eph 6:19). Elsewhere, he exhorted Christians to “pray without ceasing” (1 Thess 5:17). He modeled his teachings on prayer. This was not academic for the Apostle. According to his own testimony to Philemon and his household, he gave thanks always for Philemon, making mention of him in his prayers (Phlm 4). DTS students do not learn to pray in a classroom. They do not learn to

pray from a lecture or from writing a paper. They learn to pray in the privacy of their prayer closet.

Before crisis comes, Christians ought to be praying fervently and diligently without ceasing. Because when the crisis does come, when the cabin pressure suddenly plummets to life-threatening levels, and the oxygen mask drops, Christians cannot consider for a moment how they should respond. Breathing and reaching for the oxygen mask should be second nature, a habit engrained from long practice and constancy. Only then does the Christian minister remain spiritually composed to help others during the crisis.

Although this study might offer many recommendations, only one recommendation for DTS students demands immediate attention. Students should focus primarily on growing their trust in God. They should grow their faith through renouncing this world’s consumerism and through advocating a life of simplicity. They should grow their faith by centering their priorities in life on the three spiritual disciplines Jesus ordains in the Sermon on the Mount: prayer, fasting, and mercy. The degree to which DTS students learn to master these three disciplines and the degree to which these three disciplines master DTS students is the degree to which boundaries, listening and presence in ministry, family commitment, and trust in God have opportunity to become strengths. Ministry candidates must generate their care for the needs of others, their entrepreneurial spirit, their public piety, and their commitment to their family in balance with their ministry from their heart and from their love for God and love for neighbor. DTS graduating students need to find a spiritual guide or director who can coach them in these disciplines, who can help them learn to love God and neighbor, and who can help them learn to minister from their heart and out of a love for God and neighbor.
Implications for DTS

This section will suggest applications of the research for the various programs of DTS. How might the implementation of the entire PoM Program affect DTS and the administration and execution of its mission to equip godly servant leaders? What implications are observable following these PoM results?

Academic Advising

This project may provide information to DTS that helps counsel individual students regarding their readiness for ministry. By offering PoM Stage I to matriculating students, DTS could advise students regarding their vocational goals and their seminary degree choices. By concluding the degree program with PoM Stage II, DTS could help the student discover what other education or training is required toward readiness for ministry.78

One recommendation for Academic Advising arises from this study. Using PoM Stage I, Academic Advisers should meet with students and advise students regarding vocational goals and degree planning.

Admissions

One of the original intents of the RfM Project and the resultant assessments were to catch students who were a poor fit for ministry. This project may identify trends

78 The mostly paper-based and labor-intensive PoM Program logistically challenges school administrators of the program. With the number of students needing PoM assessments at DTS, having the instruments available through automated online delivery is required to maximize these implications and recommendations.
that help Admissions understand and address their audience better. If DTS were to administer PoM Stage I during matriculation and were to evaluate the PoM Organizational Profile for each entering class, admissions could monitor the profile of the typical entering student. They would know whom their message attracts.\(^7^9\) If the Organizational Profile revealed a trend toward extremes, admissions would know to tighten standards around that item of the profile.\(^8^0\) Conceivably, this could reduce dropout rates and increase degree completion rates because more students would match the key characteristics needed for ministry upfront.

Is ICAR an admissions question for students? Should Admissions administer PoM to student candidates before matriculation or during the application step to disqualify those who show a low regard for involvement in caring?\(^8^1\) Since DTS graduating students score so well here, is a self-eliminating scheme already in place? Is ICAR a pre-supposition or an intuitive or default component for applying to a seminary? Does the admissions process already preclude and exempt, disqualify, or discourage those with little care for people? Is ICAR a feature of ministry that the seminary may want to nurture in otherwise good ministry candidates?

One recommendation for admissions arises from this study. Using PoM Stage I, the Admissions Department should meet with the SFL Department every summer to discuss the Organizational Profile for Stage I and to learn the student enrollment profile.

---

\(^7^9\) Blier, “PoM Advanced Workshop.”

\(^8^0\) Blier, “PoM Training Webinar.”

\(^8^1\) Before implementing an assessment as a pre-screening tool, the seminary must consider any legal ramifications that might preclude this kind of assessment.
This project may help faculty understand the needs of their students better and, so define their course objectives more accurately to address those needs. By consulting the PoM Stage I Organizational Profile regularly, faculty could fine tune course objectives to match areas of need. Even though a course discusses theology or the Bible, the objectives could target personal characteristics such as PROV. By consulting the PoM Stage II Organizational Profile, faculty could assess the effectiveness of their course designs.

DTS should include a PoM assessment review during its annual faculty workshop. The PoM review should include not only a report of the PoM Organizational Profile for the last academic year, but it should also recommend course design and pedagogical changes. The Academic Dean and Department chairs should review syllabi and assignments for implementation of these recommendations. Student evaluations of faculty and courses should include items that address PoM issues that have surfaced during the review.

ATS recommends that seminaries regularly administer PoM assessments to their faculty.\textsuperscript{82} As reported in chapter 3 of this study, the faculty of Baptist Theological Seminary (BTS) at Richmond participated in the PoM Stage I assessment. Their original intent was to increase empathy amongst faculty for all the efforts required of students during matriculation. They discovered, however, that the faculty labored with the identical issues found in their students. Scores were nearly the same. This raised two

\textsuperscript{82} This recommendation came up repeatedly during ATS training. Lewis, “PoM Training I.”; Blier, “PoM Advanced Workshop.”
possible interpretations: (1) Does BTS attract students identical to the faculty? (2) Is BTS different enough from its students to challenge them? They now see PoM as a possible faculty development tool.83

Five recommendations for DTS arise from this study: First, DTS should administer PoM Stage I to the current faculty.84 Second, DTS should administer PoM Stage II to the faculty every ten years as part of its ATS self-study. Third, DTS should administer PoM Stage I to new faculty upon hiring. Fourth, faculty should consult annually at the faculty workshop with the SFL Department regarding the PoM Organizational Profile to discover ways to encourage and exhort students toward more experiential learning activities that avoid making God imaginable and comprehensible. Fifth, DTS should administer PoM to staff members who regularly interface with students to help staff minister effectively to the student population.

SFL Department

This project may provide information to the SFL Department that aids in curriculum development and toward a more personal spiritual formation experience, one that might go further toward educating the student’s heart. By counseling the entering student through PoM Stage I during the spiritual formation experience, the department


84 As an internship coordinator in the SFL Department, I conduct exit interviews using the PoM report with students. In order to prepare for these interviews and to understand the experience I was expecting of my students, I completed the Casebook. I was saddened to discover that I match the profile of most of my students. My areas of concern are identical to their areas of concern. This new self-awareness, however, has compelled me to work on the very issues in my own life that I expect students to master in their lives. How can I help them otherwise? How can they help others as well?
could identify personal characteristics that require the student’s focus during seminary and during the spiritual formation requirement. Students could share these needs with a mentor, spiritual advisor, or small group. Students could ask them to hold them accountable to a long-term growth plan during seminary. This approach to spiritual formation and counsel might foster personal responsibility for spiritual formation. Growth would become intentional and purposeful.

By offering personal interviews and interpretations of both Stage I and Stage II profiles, the department could help students identify their philosophy of ministry, their call to ministry, their ministry style and tendencies, and their application of theological principles. Students could reflect on matters of obedience and conflict in the performance of ministry and family while in seminary. Students could engage intelligently and intentionally in a spiritually forming plan with a mentor during seminary.

Three recommendations arise from this study for the SFL Department: First, the SFL Department should implement PoM Stage I assessment instruments for all entering students. Second, the SFL Department should conduct personal interviews with students using trained PoM counselors during the student’s first semester at DTS. Third, the SFL Department should present the PoM Organizational Profile, its implications, and any recommendations to DTS faculty during the annual faculty workshop.

Mission Statement and Curriculum

How might this project’s report on graduating students help DTS formulate decisions regarding its mission, and its curriculum and programs? Given the diversified student body of DTS, extremes in the PoM Stage II Organizational Profile would suggest
shortcomings in the curriculum. According to ATS standards, the profile would provide evidence of educational efforts.³⁵ On the one hand, the Stage I profile could answer the curriculum design question: What changes should students experience from the DTS curriculum? The Stage II profile, on the other hand, could answer the curriculum assessment question: How has the DTS curriculum changed students? All of which begins with the DTS mission statement.

Early in the DTS catalog on page 6, DTS reveals the seminary’s mission: “The mission of Dallas Theological Seminary as a professional graduate-level school is to glorify God by equipping godly servant-leaders for the proclamation of His word and the building up of the body of Christ worldwide.”³⁶ DTS President Mark Bailey faithfully reminds faculty and staff of the seminary’s mission. To help focus the faculty, staff, and administration on the seminary’s mission and to create points of assessment, DTS has identified six competencies expected of every graduating student:

1. Biblical Interpretation
2. Theology
3. Communication
4. Christian Spirituality
5. Servant Leadership
6. Cultural Engagement³⁷

³⁵ Blier, “PoM Training Webinar.”

³⁶ James H. Thames, ed., Dallas Theological Seminary Catalog 2010-2011 (Dallas, TX: Dallas Theological Seminary, 2010), 6.

³⁷ Ibid.
DTS intends the curricula and extra-curricular experience to develop these competencies as a sign that DTS has accomplished its mission. Although DTS charges all faculty with the responsibility for measuring all competencies, students tend to find their assessment for two of the competencies—Biblical Interpretation and Theology—within the Biblical and Theological Studies Division. Likewise, students tend to find their assessment for the remaining four competencies—Communication, Christian Spirituality, Servant Leadership, and Cultural Engagement—within the seminary’s Ministry and Communications Division.

The overall goal of the seminary is “to glorify God.” Equipping godly servant-leaders is the means DTS intends to use to accomplish the goal of glorifying God. According to the DTS mission statement, DTS aims to accomplish two objectives in students preparing for ministry. In other words, once equipped, DTS expects these godly servant-leaders to proclaim God’s word. The further result of proclaiming God’s word seems to be the building up of the body of Christ. The scope of their proclamation is worldwide.

How does the mission statement fit with the actual experience of the student? Studying the catalog with the results of this project in mind reveals that one aspect of the mission statement is under-developed in the DTS curriculum. DTS expects students to be godly servant-leaders in need of training for the proclamation of God’s word and the building up of the church. The results of this project suggest, however, that students do

---

Although it appears to have little to do with this project, a second possibly under-developed aspect of the mission statement has also surfaced. How much does the curriculum invest in the student toward “building the body of Christ?” What does the seminary mean by the building metaphor? Does it refer to adding members to the church?
not graduate as godly servant-leaders. DTS graduating students because of their entrepreneurial nature and their high desire to serve others may qualify as servant-leaders, but because of their low scores in personal conviction and their lower than expected or desired scores regarding their trust in God’s providence, they fall short of qualifying as godly. This raises the question that students may not be godly when they matriculate. Either the pool for prospective students has changed or the Admissions Department has relaxed standards to meet this criterion for acceptance to the seminary. In either event, students leaving DTS for ministry are not ready for ministry as godly servant-leaders.

Confusion reigns on the question of who DTS expects matriculating students to be. Are they godly servant-leaders or not? On the one hand, the Christian Spirituality and Servant Leadership competencies suggest that DTS expects to form students into godly servant leaders. On the other hand, the focus of the curriculum would suggest that DTS expects students to be godly servant-leaders in need of preparation for the global proclamation of God’s word and the building of the church worldwide. Regardless, the low scores in PROV and RESP implicate key missing components in the formation of students so that they might be classified as godly servant-leaders.

Nearly three quarters of the curriculum targets the competencies—Biblical Interpretation, Theology, Communication, and Cross-Cultural Engagement—deemed necessary for globally proclaiming the word of God. Of the 120 hours for the ThM degree, students invest eighty-eight hours (nearly 75% of their degree plan) toward the following core or required courses that prepare students for biblical exegesis, preaching, and cross-cultural ministry:
19 hours Bible Exposition\textsuperscript{89}
29 hours Greek and Hebrew Languages\textsuperscript{90}
24 hours Systematic and Historical Theology
11 hours Communication (preaching, counseling, and education)
5 hours Mission and Evangelism (cross-cultural)\textsuperscript{91}

The ThM curriculum clearly targets the global proclamation part of the mission statement.\textsuperscript{92} It clearly targets three of the competencies: Biblical Interpretation, Theology, and Communication. Cross-Cultural Engagement might be a distant fourth on the seminary’s radar.\textsuperscript{93} Lacking, however, are courses of substantial number that specifically target Christian Spirituality and Servant Leadership.

With such a high curricula investment toward four of the seminary’s competencies and toward the global proclamation aspect of the seminary’s mission statement, are students ready for ministry? A glance at the Perceptions of Ministry criteria of the PoM Organizational Profile for fall 2009 shows that DTS hits these four competency targets.\textsuperscript{94} DTS prepares students well for the global proclamation aspect of

\textsuperscript{89} From the beginning, DTS has required survey courses in all sixty-six books of the Bible.

\textsuperscript{90} The MA degrees have no language requirements.

\textsuperscript{91} Thames, ed., \textit{DTS Catalog}, 22-3.

\textsuperscript{92} The subject pool for this project included students in various MA degree programs that have no language requirement. Otherwise, they complete a similar proportion of course work toward global proclamation.

\textsuperscript{93} Two of the five academic credit hours towards Mission and Evangelism are an introductory course in world missions. The remaining three hours are a course in personal evangelism.

\textsuperscript{94} See appendix G. Except for the criteria called Competent Worship Leading, the criteria in the Ecclesial Ministry cluster, plus Assertive Individual Evangelism and Theologically Oriented Counseling criteria from the Conversionist Ministry cluster, and Encouragement of World Missions
their mission statement. According to their field observers who were surveyed regarding the Ecclesial Ministry criteria of PoM’s Perceptions of Ministry cluster, graduating students at DTS score in the high end of Likely or in the Very Likely range for the following PoM criteria related to the DTS mission of equipping students for the proclamation of the word of God worldwide:

1. Relating Faith to the Modern World
2. Theocentric Biblical Ministry
3. Competent Preaching
4. Clarity of Thought and Communication
5. Assertive Individual Evangelism
6. Encouragement of World Missions

DTS requires one course, however, where one might expect to find focus on personal characteristics and on the formation of students into godly servant-leaders. The description for Christian Spiritual Life, a 2-hour course, reads, “A study of the biblical principles that govern true Christian character and service, with emphasis on the sufficiency of the divine provisions and the heart conditions necessary for holy living and spiritual power in ministry.”

Is this one course enough? Can students become godly in two academic credit hours? Does this course actually invest in the spiritual formation of students, or does it invest in the intellectual development of students? Does this course teach the student about transformation, or does this course transform the student?

criterion from the Community and Congregational Ministry cluster represent those criteria of the PoM profile closest to the seminary’s mission statement.

95 Thames, ed., DTS Catalog, 114.
Developing a course about transformation rather than a course that sets out to transform students is consistent with the publicly stated intentions of the seminary to encourage students to grow. According to the seminary’s catalog, “In order to equip men and women for ministry as godly servant-leaders, Dallas Theological Seminary encourages the development of godly character in each of its students.”

Early in its public statements from its catalog, DTS announces that the seminary would prefer to prepare students who arrive on campus as godly servant-leaders. Early in the DTS catalog, DTS announces that the seminary is ready to prepare “students who are deeply committed to Jesus Christ and are marked by biblical and theological knowledge and [are] maturing spiritually.” DTS encourages its students to assert themselves and “to grow spiritually in their personal relationship with God, to function responsibly within the Christian community, and to engage and witness to the world from a life of faith and integrity.” DTS “is committed to helping leaders develop a biblical philosophy of servant-hearted leadership.” DTS must re-consider this ideal of their mission statement. Preparing students in godliness and spirituality, who today are less godly and spiritually formed than former ministry candidates, must become part of the mission.

In spite of these early catalog expectations, DTS requires the student to complete four semesters of Spiritual Formation (SF) through the SFL Department. DTS requires SF for graduation but offers no academic credit to the student. In addition, DTS requires two academic credit hours toward an internship. The stated purpose of the SFL Department is to “contribute to the development of future leaders.”

---

96 For all these quotes from the DTS catalog, see Ibid., 6.

97 Ibid., 133-8.
would prefer to equip students who come to campus godly and spiritually forming, the seminary recognizes to some degree that forming godliness and Christian spirituality are necessary. DTS also recognizes that forming godly students is not a classroom event. Formation requires a paradigm of education more akin to the first thousand years of church history. Formation demands personal discipleship. Thus, the seminary mandates four semesters of small group Spiritual Formation and four hundred hours of evaluated contextual ministry experience. PoM scores for the ten Personal Characteristic criteria measured for this project, however, suggest this may not be enough, especially given the over-balanced curriculum toward global proclamation.

DTS must re-evaluate its commitment to the spiritual formation of its students. The SFL Department should expand its offering into more opportunities for personal mentored ministry experience and into more episodes of personal one-on-one discipleship.

At one time in its history, DTS may have equipped men and women who came to the seminary already formed as godly servant-leaders. The results of this research point to a need for change. DTS students graduating from the seminary today lack critical personal characteristics necessary to qualify as godly servant-leaders. A revised DTS mission statement might require two distinct steps: (1) transformation of students into godly servant-leaders and (2) equipping these godly servant-leaders for the proclamation of the word of God and for the building of the church worldwide.

98 See chapter 1. Farley was not a prophet. He records his observations regarding theological education and the candidates for ministry in 1983. Factors arising among DTS students in the 1980s that precipitated the addition of four semesters of Spiritual Formation in the early 1990s suggest the changes occurred at DTS thirty or more years ago. PoM scores further suggest that more inventions are necessary.
Accomplishing both parts of the new mission might entail a different philosophy of education. Rather than the Berlin model of research and professional school and rather than the Medieval Scholasticism model of lecture and debate, the new paradigm of education would be discipleship. Rather than sitting as an independent ministry from the church, the seminary should consider a partnership with the church, a collaborative effort of ministerial preparation. Therefore, one suggestion for a revised DTS mission statement might be:

The mission of Dallas Theological Seminary, as a professional, graduate-level partner with Christ's church, is to glorify God by working with the church to form Christian men and women, who are called for ministry, into godly servant-leaders and by equipping these godly servant-leaders for the proclamation of the word of God and the building up of the body of Christ worldwide.

Based on this project, then, and in order to accomplish these points of the re-focused mission statement, three recommendations or principles of curriculum development arise. First, DTS should balance the curricula and extra-curricula experiences between spiritual formation and global proclamation. Second, DTS should re-think its commitment to the Berlin paradigm of theological education. DTS should consider replacing the graduate research model and professional school in favor of a model of personal discipleship and faith enrichment. Likewise, DTS should re-think its commitment to the Scholasticism of the Middle Ages and its pedagogies of lecture and debate in favor of supervised contextual and experience learning models. Third, DTS should consider developing a curriculum that equally focuses on personal characteristics—the formation of godly servant-leaders—and their competent performance of a global proclamation ministry.

If DTS prefers, however, to equip students who already arrive on campus spiritually formed and who demonstrate godly servant-leadership, one recommendation arises. Based on the PoM Organizational Profile for students graduating in the fall of 2009, the DTS Admissions Department needs better tools and discernment regarding the
acceptance of its prospective seminary candidates. This implies a much smaller student body. It suggests that DTS should limit enrollment to those very few who today qualify as godly servant-leaders.

**Implications for Theological Education**

This study offers three implications for contemporary theological education. First, theological education should return more of the preparation of ministry candidates back to the church. Theological education should incorporate more hours of residency in the field where students work in mentored relationships with experienced clergy. Theological education should view its role as collaborative. Institutions should see themselves as partners with the church. Theological education should humbly come alongside the church. The theological academy should draw its faculty from experienced godly servant leaders in the church. Institutions should serve the church rather than judge her.

Second, theological education should balance its high value on training the head with training the heart. Theological education should decrease cognitive learning outcomes in preference for an increase in affective learning outcomes so that students are prepared in areas of the heart. Contemporary theological education has focused on the head and forgotten or ignored the student’s heart. The modern Evangelical seminary invests most of its training hour on forming a worldview rather than on shaping a heart of faith, hope, and love, from which a transforming worldview comes. Prior to the Great Schism of 1054 and the invention of the university system and Scholasticism, the tradition of theological education emphasized the heart over the head, the affections over the cognition, the desires, the passions, the loves of their ministers over their reason. Ministry during the biblical and patristic eras targeted the Christian’s heart, and to participate in that ministry, ministers had to have experienced a personal transformation
of their own heart. Thus, preparation of ministers was centered on transforming the minister’s heart. Theological education today should return to the ancient, biblical model of preparing ministers in the church through a model of discipleship.

Third, contemporary theological education should restore faith as the higher order of knowledge over rationalism and empiricism. Modern theological education has usurped faith with reason. It has trumped faith with rationalism. For the disciples, believing meant they could understand. For modern theologians and academicians who are preparing ministerial candidates, understanding means they can believe. The source today is reason over revelation. Theological education today should distinguish itself from the world as the herald of faith against a sea of rationalism and empiricism. This may mean that theological education may not receive the world’s approval for scholarship and research.

**Implications for Future Research**

This research seems to lead to at least four implications for future research. First, are DTS students ready for ministry according to other criteria and clusters of PoM? Are students ready for ministry according to the one remaining Personal Characteristics cluster, Potential Negatives? According to the PoM Organizational Profile, DTS students demonstrate competence for the Ecclesial Ministry criteria. Are these very low Very Unlikely Potential Negative criteria scores signal a similar concern to interpreters? Have DTS students reversed their idealism regarding Potential Negative criteria?

---

99 According to the PoM Organizational Profile, DTS graduating students score on average in the low end of the Very Unlikely range for these criteria. If for the other Personal Characteristics criteria a score at the high end of the Very Likely range might indicate idealism and potential problems, then should not these very low Very Unlikely Potential Negative criteria scores signal a similar concern to interpreters? Have DTS students reversed their idealism regarding Potential Negative criteria?

100 See appendix G. Of the four clusters under Perceptions of Ministry, the Ecclesial Ministry cluster represents those criteria closest to the seminary’s mission statement.
DTS students, however, competent for ministry according to the other Perceptions of Ministry clusters: Conversionist Ministry, Social Justice Ministry, and Community and Congregational Ministry?

Second, what might be the differences between entering and graduating students in all PoM criteria? Should DTS adopt Stage I for entering students and compare entering and graduating scores? How could DTS use Stage I to counsel and advise entering students toward a more productive and effective ministry preparation experience at DTS?

Third, what are the differences between groups within the student body? For example, what are the differences between degree programs, between tracks and concentrations, between male and female, between age groups, and between ethnic and international populations? What are the PoM differences between graduating students and graduates after five, ten, and twenty years in ministry? What are the PoM differences between students and faculty?

Fourth, how would faculty compare with students? Would faculty PoM scores be better or worse than student scores? Based on the same instrument, is the seminary’s faculty ready to prepare their students for ministry? Might faculty have greater empathy for students by knowing how they compare with their students? Might faculty adjust their course objectives to include more affective learning in order to address the heart more intentionally because they are aware of their own struggles in battling an overly intellectual faith? How do affective learning outcomes affect PoM scores, especially scores for Personal Characteristics criteria?

**Conclusion**

The PoM Stage II assessment of 100 graduating DTS students during the fall 2009 semester revealed five positive characteristics. DTS graduates care about people
and want to minister to them. They value a humble approach to ministry. They have a high regard for the sanctity of the family. Those served report that DTS graduates are pious and prayerful and that they encourage their constituents to a pious and prayerful Christian life. They also report that DTS graduates show an entrepreneurial spirit toward the ministry.

The PoM assessment also revealed four areas of concern about these same candidates for ministry. Although entrepreneurial toward the ministry, DTS graduates may be reluctant to maintain personal convictions and to protect boundaries. Although caring toward others in need, students may short change the counseling process and fail to empathize with those people in need. Although they value a high regard for ministry and family, these students evidence a propensity toward a losing struggle to maintain balance in the tension between family and ministry. Although they are seen as publicly pious leaders of their communities and although they are viewed as vocal advocates of prayer and piety, DTS graduates are apt to forget to trust in God for their lives, for their families, and for their ministries.

Contemporary theological education has morphed over the last thousand years away from its Founder’s collegial, discipleship example. While Jesus taught His disciples in the open air of ministry, contemporary theological education has devolved into lectures and debates according to the university pattern set by Medieval Scholasticism. Jesus and His heirs prepared candidates for ministry by doing ministry together in an apprenticeship model. Modern prospects for ministry sit in classrooms listening to lectures; they visit libraries and debate biblical, linguistic, and theological controversies on paper. How does contemporary theological education return theology to theological education? How does the seminary reinstate theologia in ministry preparation?

Jesus asked His disciples, “[W]ho do you say that I am?” (Matt 16:15). Peter answered, “You are the Christ, the Son of the living God” (Matt 16:16). Where did Peter
learn his answer? According to Jesus, “[F]lesh and blood did not reveal this to you, but my Father Who is in heaven” (Matt 16:17). The source for Peter’s answer was faith in divine revelation.

On another occasion, Jesus the teacher asked His disciple Peter, the leader of the twelve, “[D]o you love Me more than these?” (John 21:15). Jesus issued a new commandment to His disciples: “A new commandment I give to you, that you love one another, even as I have loved you, that you also love one another. By this all men will know that you are My disciples, if you have love for one another” (John 13:34-5). A lawyer wanted to test Jesus and asked Him, “Teacher, which is the great commandment in the Law?” (Matt 22:36). Jesus confirmed that Moses records the greatest commandment according to the Law in Deuteronomy: “You shall love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your might” (Deut 6:5). “The second [great commandment],” Jesus informs the lawyer, “is like to it” (Matt 22:39). Jesus then quotes Leviticus: “[Y]ou shall love your neighbor as yourself” (Lev 19:18). 101 These two commandments fulfill the whole Law (Matt 22:40; Gal 5:14).

Following their Master’s lead, the Apostles Peter, James, Jude, and John pick up this love theme in their writings. They continue the teachings of their Master. Peter acknowledges his audience’s love for Christ: “[T]hough you have not seen Him, you love Him” (1 Pet 1:8). “Above all,” Peter exhorts, “keep fervent in your love for one another, because love covers a multitude of sins” (1 Pet 4:8). 102

101 Moses places loving one’s neighbor as oneself in contrast to taking vengeance or bearing a grudge against one’s neighbor.

102 Could the multitude of sins to which Peter refers be the sins of one’s neighbor for which one should not take vengeance or bear a grudge?
The Lord’s brother James encourages his audience to remain faithful during trials and temptations because God rewards those Who love Him (Jas 1:12; 2:5). James connects loving God with remaining faithful because to please God—as the author of the letter to the Hebrews asserts—one must believe in God and in His benevolence toward faithfulness (Heb 11:6). James also quotes Moses in Leviticus as Jesus does. He calls the second greatest commandment the “royal law” (Jas 2:8).

Jude, the other brother of the Lord, challenges his audience to continue in the love of God (Jude 21). How does Jude expect his audience to continue in the love of God? The means by which one continues in the love of God is by building up one’s faith and by praying in the Holy Spirit (Jude 20). What does loving God look like to Jude? He describes it as mercy: “And have mercy on some, who are doubting; save others, snatching them out of the fire; and on some have mercy with fear, hating even the garment polluted by the flesh” (Jude 22-3).

John, the disciple whom Jesus loved, reveals that God is love: “Beloved, let us love one another, for love is from God; and everyone who loves is born of God and knows God. The one who does not love does not know God, for God is love (1 John 4:7-8). John returns his audience to the very words of Jesus: “[W]hoever keeps His word, in him the love of God has truly been perfected” (1 John 2:5). Loving God means one abides in the light; it means that one loves his brother (1 John 2:10). By contrast, one cannot love God and the world: “Do not love the world nor the things in the world. If anyone loves the world, the love of the Father is not in him (1 John 2:15). What does it mean to love the world? “For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the boastful pride of life, is not from the Father, but is from the world” (1
John 2:16).\textsuperscript{103} Indulging the flesh, avarice, and pride equal loving the world. Christians cannot love the world and love God and one another at the same time. Christians must choose whom they love. Do they love the world or God?

The apostles continue this teaching and hand it down to their disciples. The most eminent of the disciples following the Lord’s resurrection was Paul. His compositions are freighted with exhortations to love God and neighbor. For Paul, Christians can persevere in the face of trials because the love of God has been poured out upon their hearts by the Holy Spirit (Rom 5:5). Ministry according to Paul requires love (1 Cor 13). Love is the more excellent way (1 Cor 12:31); compared to the other two of the three Christian virtues faith and hope, love is the greatest (1 Cor 13:13).

Disciples will hand down the new commandment to love God and neighbor as the preeminent teaching of the Christian faith. Some 350 years later Augustine echoes John’s first epistle and the apostolic tradition: “[W]hen the tyranny of cupidity [desire] has been overthrown, charity reigns with its most just laws of love for God for the sake of God and of one’s self and of one’s neighbor for the sake of God.”\textsuperscript{104} So enamored with the reign of love, Augustine pronounces love a hermeneutical ideal for reading the Bible: “Therefore, in the consideration of figurative expressions a rule such as this will serve, that what is read should be subjected to diligent scrutiny until an interpretation contributing to the reign of charity is produced.”\textsuperscript{105}

\textsuperscript{103} These three—the lust of the eyes, the lust of the flesh, and the boastful pride of life—form the paradigm of Satan’s temptations of Eve in Genesis 3 and of Christ in Matthew 4. When the Apostle Paul asserts that Christians know the schemes of the evil one, he may be collaborating John’s account here.


\textsuperscript{105} Ibid.
For Augustine, the proper approach to reading the Scriptures has seven steps and begins with fear and piety:

Before all it is necessary that we be turned by the fear of God toward a recognition of His will, so that we may know what He commands that we desire and what He commands that we avoid. Of necessity this fear will lead us to thought of our mortality and of our future death and will affix all our proud motions, as if they were fleshly members fastened with nails to the wood of the cross. Then it is necessary that we become meek through piety so that we do not contradict Divine Scripture, either when it is understood and is seen to attack some of our vices, or when it is not understood and we feel as though we are wiser than it is and better able to give precepts. But we should rather think and believe that which is written to be better and more true than anything which we could think of by ourselves, even when it is obscure.\(^{106}\)

After warning Bible students to adjust their perspective regarding themselves and the divine text with fear and piety, Augustine identifies three forms of knowledge that define what students will read there:

After these two steps of fear and piety, the third step of knowledge confronts us, which I now propose to treat. In this every student of the Divine Scriptures must exercise himself, having found nothing else in them except, first, that God is to be loved for Himself, and his neighbor for the sake of God; second, that he is to love God with all his heart, with all his soul and with all his mind; and third, that he should love his neighbor as himself, that is, so that all love for our neighbor should, like all love for ourselves, be referred to God.\(^{107}\)

Like John in his first epistle, Augustine continues the tradition of contrasting the Christian’s love for God and love for the world. They are antithetical to one another. Love for the world is incompatible to faith. He continues to describe the affect of the Scriptures on the Bible student: “Then it follows that the student first will discover in the Scriptures that he has been enmeshed in the love of this world, or of temporal things, a

\(^{106}\) Ibid., 38-9.

\(^{107}\) Ibid., 39.
love far remote from the kind of love of God and of our neighbor which Scripture itself prescribes.”¹⁰⁸ With such knowledge, how does one react to the Scriptures? What steps does the Bible student take next?

Then, indeed, that fear which arises from the thought of God’s judgment, and that piety which can do nothing except believe in and accede to the authority of the sacred books, will force him to lament his own situation. For this knowledge of a good hope thrusts a man not into boasting but into lamentation. This attitude causes him to ask with constant prayers for the consolation of divine assistance lest he fall into despair, and he thus enters the fourth step of fortitude, in which he hungers and thirsts for justice.¹⁰⁹

Hunger and thirst need satisfying (Matt 5:6). Through these first four steps of fear, piety, knowledge, and fortitude, Christians emerge bathed in the love of God. This love of God yields union with God: “And by means of this affection of the spirit he will extract himself from all mortal joy in transitory things, and as he turns aside from this joy, he will turn toward the love of eternal things, specifically toward that immutable unity which is the Trinity.”¹¹⁰

The counsel of mercy constitutes the fifth step for reading the Bible according to the Bishop of Hippo. Reading the Bible and seeing the Holy Trinity off in the distance, Bible students realize their inability to see the light. They purge their mind because only the pure will see God (Matt 5:8), and they mount to the sixth step unwilling to judge their neighbor:

Here he eagerly exercises the love of his neighbor and perfects himself in it; and now, filled with hope and fortified in strength, when he arrives at the love of his

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.
¹⁰⁹ Ibid.
¹¹⁰ Ibid.
enemy he ascends to the sixth step, where he cleanses that eye through which God may be seen, in so far as He can be seen by those who die to the world as much as they are able. For they are able to see only in so far as they are dead to this world; in so far as they live in it, they do not see. And now although the light of the Trinity begins to appear more certainly, and not only more tolerably but also more joyfully, it is still said to appear “through a glass in a dark manner” for “we walk more by faith than by sight” when we make our pilgrimage in this world, although “our community is in heaven.” On this step he so cleanses the eye of his heart that he neither prefers his neighbor to the Truth nor compares him with it, nor does he do this with himself because he does not so treat him whom he loves as himself.\footnote{Ibid., 39-40.}

The Bible student has ascended six steps: fear, piety, knowledge, fortitude, counsel of mercy, and love. Peace and tranquility born of wisdom awaits the student next:

Therefore this holy one will be of such simple and clean heart that he will not turn away from the Truth either in a desire to please men or for the sake of avoiding any kind of adversities to himself which arise in this life. Such a son ascends to wisdom, which is the seventh and last step, where he enjoys peace and tranquility. “For the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.” From fear to wisdom the way extends through these steps.\footnote{Ibid., 40.}

Where do modern seminaries insert teachings that lead the student through steps like these? Through the PoM profile, this project reveals that DTS graduates lack sufficient education in these most critical subjects of the heart.\footnote{To their credit, the DTS Doctor of Ministry program begins with a course on the minister’s heart.} DTS tends to graduate students preparing them for ministry who lack superior love and passion for God. They love their families; they love the ministry; they love people; they love the idea of piety. Echoing in the exit interview as they review their PoM results, however, students should hear Jesus asking, “Do you love me more than these?”
For DTS graduates, for DTS, and for theological education, the implications and conclusions of this study hone to a single, fine point. The 1000-year focus of ministry preparation that targets the minister’s head rather than the minister’s heart does little to prepare students to obey the Bible’s two great commandments to love God and to love neighbor. Current ministry preparation, moreover, does little to train ministers to help ministry constituents to obey these two commandments. Those preparing for ministry and those preparing candidates for ministry should alter their focus from the head to the heart. They should learn first to transform their own hearts through obedience to the teachings of Christ. Second, candidates for ministry should learn and those who prepare them should teach them how to teach and lead others to love God and neighbor. This project concludes that contemporary theological education and DTS should obey the command of its Master and follow the simple practice of the early church: “Make disciples of all nations . . . teaching them to observe all that I commanded you” (Matt 28:19), which means teach them to love God and their neighbor.
APPENDIX A

RFM’S SIXTY-FOUR CORE CLUSTERS

1. Relating Faith to the Modern World
2. Theocentric-Biblical Ministry
3. Relating Well to Children and Youth
4. Encouragement of Mutuality in Congregation
5. Competent Preaching and Worship Leading
6. Encouragement of Spiritual Renewal
7. Aesthetic Sensitivity
8. Openness in Style
9. Sacramental-Liturgical Ministry
10. Alienating Activity
11. Pastoral Service to All
12. Mission-Mindedness
13. Initiative in Development of Community Services
14. Promotion of Understanding of Issues
15. Support of Community Causes
16. Active Concern for the Oppressed
17. Personal Evangelism
18. Aggressive Political Leadership
19. Precedence of Evangelistic Goals
20. Resistance to Community Involvements
21. Perceptive Counseling
22. Enabling Counseling
23. Ready Availability
24. Counseling as a Pastor
25. Caring from Existential Involvement
26. Co-Ministry to the Alienated
27. Law Orientation toward Personal Problems
28. Intelligence Demonstrated in Communication
29. Being Informed by Theology
30. Stimulating Use of Broad Knowledge
31. Affirmation of a Biblical Faith
32. Denominational Knowledge
33. Open to Current Ideas
34. Service without Regard for Acclaim
35. Christian Example
36. Acknowledgment of Limitations
37. Religious Commitment
38. Acknowledgment of Own Humanity
39. Acceptance of Counsel
40. "Born-Again" Christianity
41. Priestly Commitments
42. Personal Integrity
43. Responsible Functioning
44. Positive Approach
45. Flexibility of Spirit
46. Realistic Tolerance of Diversity
47. Acceptance of Clergy Role
48. Mutuality in Family Commitments
49. Denominational Loyalty
50. Championship of Unpopular Causes
51. Secular Life Style
52. Emotional Immaturity
53. Undisciplined Living
54. Self-Serving Ministry
55. Community Building
56. Conflict Utilization
57. Sharing Congregational Leadership
58. Effective Administration
59. Person-Centered Relationship with Staff
60. Intuitive Domination of Decision Making
61. Evangelistic Witness
62. Accepting Mutual Intercession
63. Manipulative Insecurity
64. Irresponsibility to the Congregation

1 David S. Schuller, Milo Brekke, and Merton P. Strommen, Readiness for Ministry: Criteria (Vandalia, OH: Association of Theological Schools, 1975), i-iii. See also pages 21-70.
APPENDIX B

POM SCALES AND THEIR ABBREVIATIONS

Personal Characteristics

Responsible and Caring

FIDL  Fidelity to Tasks and Persons
RESP  Personal Responsibility
LIMT  Acknowledgment of Limitations
FLEX  Flexibility of Spirit
ICAR  Involvement in Caring
PRCO  Perceptive Counseling

Family Perspective

FAML  Mutual Family Commitment
MNFM  Ministry Precedence Over Family

Personal Faith

PIET  Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety
PROV  Belief in a Providential God
SPRT  Christian Spirituality

Potential Negative

SELF  Self-Serving Behavior
PADV  Pursuit of Personal Advantage
SPRTC  Self-Protecting Behavior
DMNA  Intuitive Domination of Decision Making
### Perceptions of Ministry

#### Ecclesial Ministry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LITG</td>
<td>Sacramental-Liturgical Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELT</td>
<td>Relating Faith to the Modern World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBIB</td>
<td>Theocentric-Biblical Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRCH</td>
<td>Competent Preaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAR</td>
<td>Clarity of Thought and Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNOM</td>
<td>Denominational Collegiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRSH</td>
<td>Competent Worship Leading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Conversionist Ministry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVAN</td>
<td>Assertive Individual Evangelism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL</td>
<td>Precedence of Evangelistic Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONG</td>
<td>Total Concentration on Congregational Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>Law Orientation to Ethical Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THCO</td>
<td>Theologically Oriented Counseling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Social Justice Ministry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLIT</td>
<td>Aggressive Political Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>Support of Unpopular Causes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORL</td>
<td>Position on Conservative Moral Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEN</td>
<td>Openness to Pluralism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPRS</td>
<td>Active Concern for the Oppressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA</td>
<td>Interest in New Ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUST</td>
<td>Concern for Social Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMN</td>
<td>Support for Women in the Church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community/Congregation Ministry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SERV</td>
<td>Pastoral Service to All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUTH</td>
<td>Relating Well to Children and Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISN</td>
<td>Encouragement of World Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLDG</td>
<td>Building Congregational Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNFL</td>
<td>Conflict Utilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDRS</td>
<td>Sharing Congregational Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSBL</td>
<td>Balanced Approach to World Missions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDR</td>
<td>Promotion of Understanding of Issues¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX C

INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT CHRONOLOGIES

**Chronology of the Readiness for Ministry Project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>TITLE OR FORM</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Case Assessment</td>
<td>Book 1</td>
<td>28 cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case Assessment</td>
<td>Book 2</td>
<td>27 cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Field Observation Survey</td>
<td>Prototype</td>
<td>“Tree” rating plus 60 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case Assessment</td>
<td>Form AB</td>
<td>43 cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Entering &amp; Graduating Students</td>
<td>56 questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field Observation Survey</td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>130 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>Ministry: A Professional and Personal Profile</td>
<td>43 cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisor’s Interpretive Manual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Entering and Graduating Students</td>
<td>48 questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>Casebook for Entering Students</td>
<td>30 cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Chronology of Readiness for Ministry Project Instruments and Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>TITLE OR FORM</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Assessment</td>
<td>Book 1</td>
<td>28 cases</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Book 2</td>
<td>27 cases</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form AB</td>
<td>43 cases</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>Ministry: A Professional and Personal Profile</td>
<td>43 cases</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Casebook for Entering Students</td>
<td>30 cases</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Entering and Graduating Students</td>
<td>56 questions</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entering and Graduating Students</td>
<td>48 questions</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Observation Survey</td>
<td>Prototype</td>
<td>“Tree” rating plus 60 items</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>130 items</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor’s Interpretive Manual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Chronology of Profiles of Ministry Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>TITLE OR FORM</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>Stage I</td>
<td>24 cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
<td>23 cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Stage I &amp; Stage II</td>
<td>46 questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Advisor’s Manual</td>
<td>Stage I &amp; Stage II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Field Observation Survey</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
<td>116 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Stage I &amp; Stage II</td>
<td>46 questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisor’s Manual</td>
<td>Stage I &amp; Stage II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>Stage I</td>
<td>24 cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
<td>23 cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field Observation Survey</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
<td>116 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>Stage I</td>
<td>24 cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
<td>23 cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>Stage I</td>
<td>24 cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
<td>23 cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Stage I &amp; Stage II</td>
<td>46 questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Field Observation Survey</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
<td>116 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretive Manual</td>
<td>Stage I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretive Manual</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisor’s Manual</td>
<td>Stage I &amp; Stage II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chronology of Profiles of Ministry Program Instruments and Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>TITLE OR FORM</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>YEAR(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage II</td>
<td>23 cases</td>
<td>1985, 1999, 2003, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Stage I &amp; Stage II</td>
<td>46 questions</td>
<td>1985, 1997, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Observation Survey</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
<td>116 items</td>
<td>1988, 1999, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive Manual</td>
<td>Stage I</td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage II</td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor’s Manual</td>
<td>Stage I &amp; Stage II</td>
<td></td>
<td>1987, 1997, 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 For all of the above charts in this appendix, see Francis A. Lonsway, *Profiles of Ministry: A Thirty-Year Study* (Pittsburgh, PA: Association of Theological Schools, Commission on Accrediting, 2007), 37.
APPENDIX D

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR RESEARCH CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible and Caring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity to Tasks and Persons</td>
<td>Field Observation Survey</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Responsibility</td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement of Limitations</td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in Caring</td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptive Counseling</td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Family Commitment</td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry Precedence over Family</td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Faith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety</td>
<td>Field Observation Survey</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in a Provident God</td>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Spirituality</td>
<td>Field Observation Survey</td>
<td>.82(^1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX E

ATS INTENTIONAL GROWTH FORM

Profiles of Ministry Intentional Growth Form

Name:
Student ID Number:

Personal Characteristics (top three blocks on page 1 of the Profiles of Ministry Stage II printout)

• Responsible and Caring
• Family Perspective
• Personal Faith

A. Examine your scores in these three areas on this first page. List three strengths which your profile indicates you bring to ministry (the Interpretative Manual will help evaluate these scores):

1. 
2. 
3. 

B. Select any area of growth indicated by this section. Be specific about how you plan to work on that area. What resources (people, groups, readings, experiences, etc.) are available to help you?

Potential Concerns (bottom section on page 1 of the Profiles of Ministry Stage II printout)

• Potential Negative

A. Examine your scores in this section. Which score concerns you the most?

Why?

B. Select any area of growth indicated by this section. Be specific about how you plan to work on that area. What resources (people, groups, readings, experiences, etc.) are available to help you?
Perceptions of Ministry (pages 2 and 3 of the Profiles of Ministry Stage II printout)

- Ecclesial Ministry
- Conversionist Ministry
- Social Justice Ministry
- Community and Congregational Ministry

A. Examine your scores in these four areas. List three strengths which your profile indicates you bring to ministry:

1. 
2. 
3. 

B. Select any area of growth indicated by this section. Be specific about how you plan to work on that area. What resources (people, groups, readings, experiences, etc.) are available to help you?

Overall Thoughts

A. Which scores did you believe would come out more “likely” or “very likely”?

Why?

B. Which scores did you believe would come out more “unlikely” or “very unlikely”?

Why?

C. Which feature of the Profiles do you find confusing, unclear, or irrelevant?

Why?\footnote{Francis A. Lonsway, “Profiles of Ministry Introductory Interpretation Workshop” (training materials, Association of Theological Schools, Savannah, GA, February 16-17, 2006).}
APPENDIX F

POM PROFILE SCALE CONVERSION CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>1-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Observation Survey</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Somewhat Unlikely</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>Somewhat Likely</td>
<td>Very Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casebook</td>
<td>Very Unlikely</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Very Likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Casebook scale settled on a five-point Likert scale from Very Unlikely to Very Likely and provides the most complete information from the student’s perspective.¹ Students respond to the various cases by designating the likelihood that they would subscribe to each of the various courses of action, goals of action, or justification of action described for that ministry context. Their self-measure of probability for each item relates to many dimensions of ministry and produces a comprehensive profile.² The five-point Likert scale of Very Unlikely to Very Likely also alleviates any tendencies students

¹ David S. Schuller, Milo Brekke, Merton P. Strommen, and Daniel O. Aleshire, Readiness for Ministry: Assessment (Vandalia, OH: Association of Theological Schools, 1976), 66.

² Ibid., 66-7.
may have toward measuring themselves better or higher than they might be. Students are asked to judge every item independently for its merits as their response.

The Field Observation Survey scale uses a modified five-point Likert scale ranging from Unlikely to Very Likely. Compared to the scales for the Casebook, the Survey’s lowest score Unlikely is less extreme sounding than the Casebook’s Very Unlikely, and the Survey’s two middle scores Somewhat Unlikely and Somewhat Likely are more tentative or less definitive sounding than the Casebooks Unlikely and Likely. The choices come from a pool of five respondents who are asked to weigh the likelihood that the student fits each of the survey’s assertions about that student. The respondents’ choices are averaged to calculate the student’s score.


4 Ibid.

5 Ibid., 23.

6 Ibid.
### Profiles of Ministry - Stage II

**Meaning of Your Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Possibly</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C, I, F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fidelity to Tasks and Persons</th>
<th>Personal Responsibility</th>
<th>Acknowledgement of Limitations</th>
<th>Involvement in Caring</th>
<th>Perceptive Counseling</th>
<th>Family Perspective</th>
<th>Personal Faith</th>
<th>Potential Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Meaning of Scores:**
  - **C:** Casebook, interview, field observation.
  - **I:** Mean score.
  - **F:** Indicates minimum and maximum scores. If either value is equal to the mean score, it will not be displayed.
  - **I:** Indicates 1st and 3rd Quartiles. Only one bar is displayed if the values are equal. If either quartile is equal to the minimum, maximum, or mean score, no bar will be displayed to represent the quartile.

- **Legend:**
  - **Very Unlikely:** < Little Evidence
  - **Unlikely:** Somewhat Unlikely
  - **Possibly:** Possibly
  - **Likely:** Somewhat Likely
  - **Very Likely:** Much Evidence

- **Notes:**
  - **** Not enough data available to calculate this score.
# Profiles of Ministry - Stage II

## MEANING OF YOUR SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VERY UNLIKELY</th>
<th>UNLIKELY</th>
<th>POSSIBLY</th>
<th>LIKELY</th>
<th>VERY LIKELY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; Little Evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f- UNLIKELY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f- SOMETHAWN UNL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f- POSSIBLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f- SOMEWHAT LIKE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f- VERY LIKE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PERCEPTIONS OF MINISTRY

### Ecclesial Ministry
- Relating Faith to Modern World
- Theocentric Biblical Ministry
- Competent Preaching
- Competent Worship Leading
- Clarity of Thought and Communication

### Conversionist Ministry
- Assertive Individual Evangelism
- Precedence of Evangelistic Goals
- Total Concentration on Congregational Concerns
- Law Orientation to Ethical Issues
- Theologically Oriented Counseling

### Social Justice Ministry
- Aggressive Political Leadership
- Active Concern for the Oppressed
- Interest in New Ideas
- Concern for Social Justice
- Support for Women in the Church
# Profiles of Ministry - Stage II

## PERCEPTIONS OF MINISTRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community and Congregational Ministry</th>
<th>VERY UNLIKELY</th>
<th>UNLIKELY</th>
<th>POSSIBLY</th>
<th>LIKELY</th>
<th>VERY LIKELY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral Service to All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Well to Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement of World Missions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced Approach to World Missions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Congregational Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Utilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Congregational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Congregational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of Understanding of Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Compiled from 100 scores.*

*Organizational Profile 2009 - 2010
Dallas Theological Seminary*
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