CHAPTER SIX

Guidelines for Evaluating Globalization in Commission Schools
This chapter of the Self-Study Handbook, formerly titled Handbook of Accreditation, Section Seven, is currently under revision. An updated version is scheduled to be released in the spring of 2016. In the meantime, schools currently scheduled for their comprehensive visit through spring 2016 may continue to use the present version of Section Seven of the Handbook of Accreditation (copied here) as a guide to their self-study process when addressing what the current version of the Standards now calls "global awareness and engagement" (Standard 3, section 3.3.4). This phrase has replaced the earlier language of "globalization" throughout the Standards.

Member schools should note that while the change reflects a more nuanced understanding of "globalization," there are no fundamental changes in its meaning, substance, and implementation. Additionally, "global awareness and engagement" remains one of the five themes that run through the Standards now in effect.

Should questions arise, please contact your school liaison.

NOTE

A few references to the Standards of Accreditation in this document use the pre-2010 numbering system. They will be updated in the 2016 revision currently underway.
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Section Seven

Guidelines for Evaluating Globalization in Commission Schools
In July 2005, the accrediting work of The Association of Theological Schools was transferred to a newly incorporated entity, the Commission on Accrediting of The Association of Theological Schools. The standards and procedures remained the same, and all of the accredited and candidate status member schools of the original ATS became Members of the Commission on Accrediting of ATS as well.
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The purpose of this section of the Handbook of Accreditation is (1) to assist schools in the self-study process to consider how they will address the globalization theme in the Standards of Accreditation and (2) to provide assistance to accreditation visiting committees in the evaluation of institutional and educational efforts toward globalizing theological education. These guidelines may also serve as a resource to schools as they seek to understand, initiate, and nurture various aspects of globalizing theological education.

This section of the Handbook seeks to be illustrative and suggestive, in service to helping schools think about how to approach the standards with respect to globalization. It does not intend to be prescriptive or stipulative. Rather than explicate the standards, therefore, this section offers possible approaches to addressing the cross-cutting theme of globalization throughout the standards.

Aspects and Understandings of Globalizing Theological Education: Terminology

In an address to the 1986 ATS Biennial Meeting, Don Browning offered his now classic fourfold characterization of the globalization of theological education:

For some, globalization means the church’s universal mission to evangelize the world (i.e., to take the message of the gospel to all people, all nations, all cultures, and all religious faiths). Second, there is the idea of globalization as ecumenical cooperation between the various manifestations of the Christian church throughout the world. This includes a growing mutuality and equality between the churches of the First and Third World countries. It involves a new openness to and respect for the great variety
of local theologies that are springing up within the church in its various concrete situations. Third, globalization sometimes refers to the dialogue between Christianity and other religions. Finally, globalization refers to the mission of the church to the world, not only to convert and evangelize, but to improve and develop the lives of the millions of poor, starving, and politically disadvantaged people.¹

These four aspects or understandings of theological responses to the global continue to undergird the global understandings of member institutions of the Commission on Accrediting, but the experiences of institutions since 1986 have expanded and refined them. Many member schools have included, in their responses to global realities, addressing the increasingly plural and multi-ethnic realities of North American culture. Others have begun to reflect on whether a comprehensive global culture is emerging and what the role of the Christian church and ministry will be in that culture. The concrete experiences of member schools since Browning’s 1986 address have created a broad range of terminology by which schools describe their responses to global realities and to Browning’s fourfold characterization.

*Globalization* has had an impact on a wide range of Commission member schools. The term itself has experienced shifts in its connotation. Some schools are uneasy with the newer implications of the term itself because globalization has become popularly associated with the goals and strategies of multinational corporations. Some member schools prefer to dissociate themselves from this aspect of the term on theological or ethical grounds. Some Christians around the world object to the term globalization, which they interpret as a new form of colonialization and imperialism; they understand globalization as “Americanization.” These considerations have led some schools to prefer terms such as *global, responses to the global, global awareness, cross-cultural awareness, or globalizing theological education.*
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Others focus on contextualization or enculturation of Christianity in cultures around the globe.

The search for a more nuanced understanding of the global context of the church and of ministry has also given rise to several different understandings of cross-cultural or intercultural. Some see these terms as related to an anthropological analysis of cultural difference; some as the integration of various cultural perspectives into a worldwide Christian community; some as a call for sensitive and just interethnic relations.

Some schools prefer the terms pluralism and diversity to globalization, understanding diversity as the situation in which today’s Christians find themselves. For some, pluralism and diversity entail not only cultural and ethnic diversity, but also ecumenical and religious diversity; they see interfaith relationships and understanding as a key aspect of theological responses to “the global.”

It is, of course, the original sense of the term globalization that lies at the heart of this theme within the standards, the sense that these later paraphrases have sought to recapture and to reflect.

Addressing the Theme of Globalization in the Accrediting Standards

Globalization is one of four cross-cutting themes in the Standards of Accreditation, the others being (1) a priority on planning and evaluation, (2) the value of inclusion across racial/ethnic and gender lines, and (3) the importance of freedom of inquiry for teaching and learning.

In addition to section 3.2.4, which is devoted specifically to globalization as a characteristic of theological scholarship within Standard 3, one finds throughout the General Institutional Standards evidence of globalization as a pervasive theme in the standards. It
is reflected in references to *global awareness, cultural context, diversity, cross-cultural,* and other related terms and concepts. Every occurrence of these terms and concepts in the standards is not addressed or enumerated in this section of the *Handbook.* A number of specific sections of the standards are, however, highlighted herein to focus attention on the various ways in which institutions may choose to evaluate their efforts at globalizing theological education.

Many schools in the context of accreditation self-studies have found that the most effective and efficient way to address the recurring themes in the standards is to assign responsibility for evaluation of a particular theme to the self-study subcommittee that is responsible for the standard in which the theme is introduced or most fully described. In the case of the globalization of theological education, that is Standard 3—Learning, Teaching, and Research: Theological Scholarship.

*Learning, Teaching, and Research: Theological Scholarship (Standard 3)*

There are a number of ways in which an institution might understand and evaluate its approach to globalizing theological scholarship, which the standards understand as learning, teaching, and research. Several sections of Standard 3 are highlighted below in order to illustrate and explore various aspects and approaches to globalizing theological education.

3.2.4.1 Theological teaching, learning, and research require patterns of institutional and educational practice that contribute to an awareness and appreciation of global interconnectedness and interdependence, particularly as they relate to the mission of the church. These patterns are intended to enhance the ways institutions participate in the ecumenical, dialogical, evangelistic, and justice efforts of the church. The term globalization has been used to identify these patterns and practices collectively.
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Globalizing theological education, therefore, entails an “awareness and appreciation” of global interconnectedness and interdependence (the realities of globalization in its economic, communications, technological, religious, and cultural forms). It is interested in these realities, however, particularly as they relate to the mission of the church, as they create the context in which religious communities live, worship, and witness, and in which clergy and lay leaders minister.

Globalizing theological education, moreover, entails rethinking the institution’s educational goals and aims. Among the educational goals of theological learning, teaching, and research are theological, ethical, and critical responses to global realities and concerns.

*Global interconnectedness* and *interdependence* refer to two aspects of the forces of globalization. Developments in communications and business have made the world much smaller and more interconnected. We experience the world as a *global village*.

Migrations and the efflorescence of many cultural voices have created globally diverse communities across North America. No longer “over there,” the global is now local.

Thus, theological responses to globalization include both international dimensions (mission and evangelism in the global or worldwide church and attention to the many contextualized forms of Christianity across the globe) and local dimensions (awareness of cultural and ethnic diversity within North American communities and the churches).

3.1.2.2 Instructional methods should use the diversity of life experiences represented by the students, by faith communities, and by the larger cultural context. Instructional methods and the use of technology should be sensitive to the diversity of student populations, different learning
styles of students, and the importance of communities of learning, and the instructional goals.

As institutions have globalized theological education, they have learned that the effort requires more than simply adding subjects to the curriculum; it also entails changing the way that theological education is practiced.

Schools committed to globalizing theological education have often discovered the extent to which their curricula were based on cultural assumptions about teaching and learning that reflected white Euro-American values and worldviews. One consequence of this discovery is that these schools have sought ways to make their courses and their teaching more cross-culturally hospitable to and effective for international students and students from diverse cultural backgrounds.

Some examples of these institutional educational efforts include offering courses with intentional cross-cultural goals, using cross-cultural or bilingual pedagogies and resources, reading assignments and bibliographies that draw on a variety of cultural perspectives, and advisement and formational programs for diverse student constituencies. Other examples involve specialized academic programs for particular constituencies, field and experiential educational opportunities to develop cross-cultural awareness and skills, and clarifying the over-arching frames of reference by which teachers and learners understand and evaluate life experiences.

Appropriate curricular adjustments will depend upon the particular student population and cultural mix that comprise the learning environment of the institution. The school committed to global theological education aspires to become a learning environment in which persons of diverse experiences and backgrounds can educate one another in cross-cultural sensitivities and skills.
Faculty and students may need grounding in social sciences (particularly anthropology) and religious phenomenology to develop skills for cross-cultural analysis. Faculty may need to develop an awareness of and respect for other cultures or a deeper understanding of the relationship of person and culture. The teaching of students who are going into or coming from cross-cultural environments will need to be contextual, and faculty may need training in contextual pedagogies and strategies.

Schools may choose to use developments in technology as one means to globalize their teaching, either by bringing into their educational programs students who cannot come to the campus (and thereby diversifying the student body), by creating cross-cultural or international conversations through the use of educational technologies, or by creating patterns of alternative course scheduling, thereby making education accessible to bivocational persons.

Globalizing instructional methods is a significant venture that requires care in both formulation and evaluation. Schools and accreditation visiting committees may address questions such as:

• How are students and faculty in the institution prepared for cross-cultural experiences?
• How are their on-site responses processed and monitored?
• What sort of postexperience reflection is required?
• How are Western academic standards reconciled with genuine inclusivity? That is, how is teaching made hospitable to students of diverse cultural backgrounds?
• Are admissions requirements appropriate for applicants from all relevant cultural settings?
• To what extent should the institution reconsider or broaden the dominant Euro-American model(s) and ethos of education, including those of student evaluation?
• How is the commitment to academic quality integrated with the needs of the church so as to educate for ministry persons who lack traditional academic backgrounds?
• If students require bilingual or other special pedagogical strategies to flourish in the school’s environment, how are these strategies integrated into the total academic program?

Evaluation is not limited to the quality of each specific program or venture, but should also address the ability of the institution to dedicate to the program the resources required.

• Are unreasonable expectations being placed on the faculty? How much can the faculty be expected to handle?
• How many diverse groups can the school serve well?
• What are the school’s institutional limits?
• Does the school have to respond equally to all its constituencies? If not, how does it choose the appropriate constituencies to which to respond?
• What resources does the school require to do particular programs well?

3.1.2.3 Courses are a central place of interaction between teachers and learners. The way the instructor arranges the work and structures the class should encourage theological conversation. Courses and programs of study should reflect an awareness of the diversity of worldwide and local settings. In the development of new courses and the review of syllabi, faculty should interact with one another, with librarians, with their students, with the church, and with the developing fields of knowledge. Course development and review best occur in the context of the goals of the entire curriculum.

The section of Standard 3 above restates the need for theological students to apprehend the diversity of the world and the interconnectedness and interdependence of global and local settings within a theological frame of reference, so that they understand the context in which religious communities live and in which they will minister. The standard also reflects the need for courses and
programs of study that are designed to address the various audiences of theological education in the complex global world.

An institution may implement research programs and educational outreach programs (including continuing education and non-degree programs) for particular communities, or it may develop particular degree programs in service to a regional constituency, to its denomination, or to a particular international constituency. Possible approaches a school might take include becoming an international training center for the denomination to assist it in providing the resources and support to educate students from around the globe, or developing connections in the global mission networks of its denomination, order, or movement, and thus positioning itself to train students for mission fields around the globe. Other approaches might include establishing a branch campus in a geographic context other than that of the main campus in order to serve the needs of an additional constituency or developing specialized bilingual programs to serve important constituencies within the denomination or region.

Possible evaluative questions might include:

- How does this program help to fulfill the institution’s purpose?
- How has the constituency it has been designed to serve played a role in the development of the goals for the program and in its ongoing evaluation?
- Are the structure of the program, its content, and its pedagogies appropriate for the needs of the special constituency served and for the modes of student evaluation?
- Do all programs (on and off campus) provide for all students an awareness of global diversity and the interconnectedness and interdependence of the global and the local?
- Do the educational goals of the program help to increase the global awareness and cross-cultural skills of the students? Do they prepare students for ministry and citizenship in the global church?
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- Do the programs enhance mutuality, interdependence, and empowerment across cultures?

3.2.4.2 Globalization is cultivated by curricular attention to cross-cultural issues as well as the study of other major religions; by opportunities for cross-cultural experiences; by the composition of the faculty, governing board, and student body; by professional development of faculty members; and by the design of community activities and worship.

Globalizing theological education cannot be achieved exclusively by sending students and faculty off-site for cross-cultural experiences. The “global” will still tend to be abstract and “out there” until it is genuinely reflected on the campus. Thus, it is important for an institution to have sufficient representation of cross-cultural students, faculty, board members, and staff who reflect that institution’s distinctive understanding of “the global.” When the composition of students, faculty, board, and staff reflect global diversity as the institution understands it, then the institution will have the experiential base and the requisite voices to globalize theological education effectively. This ideal is often difficult to realize in practice, but many schools have adopted some version of this aim as a long-term aspiration that shapes their immediate goals.

How to globalize the learning environment and community life of the school is an important evaluative issue. Given the institution’s theological understanding of the global and its institutional goals, how does it measure its success at globalizing its learning environment and community? Efforts to achieve a globalized learning environment and community are likely to include such elements as recruiting and sustaining appropriately cross-cultural faculty and student bodies and diversifying extracurricular aspects of theological education such as worship, campus ethos, and the celebration of many cultural traditions.
An institution and an accreditation visiting committee might address questions such as:

- How has the institution’s response to globalization changed the way faculty teach and students learn?
- What kind of faculty is needed to achieve the school’s goals in globalizing theological education?
- How does the faculty make use of the diversity in the student population to enrich the educational experiences of all students?
- As current faculty members retire, what role do global and cross-cultural goals play in plans for adding new faculty?
- Do the governing board members bring the appropriate backgrounds and expertise to achieve institutional goals for globalizing theological education?

Globalizing learning, teaching, and research, then, entails the development of a board, faculty, staff, and student population that can embody the institution’s goals for achieving globalized theological education. Globalizing theological education thus has implications for Standard 6 (Faculty), Standard 7 (Student Recruitment, Admission, Services, and Placement), and Standard 8 (Authority and Governance).

3.2.4.3 Schools shall develop practices of teaching, learning, and research (comprehensively understood as theological scholarship) that encourage global awareness and responsiveness.

Globalizing learning, teaching, and research also entails thoughtful educational goals. How “global awareness and responsiveness” are to be understood and achieved will vary from institution to institution. Some institutions have a particular aspiration to cross-cultural sensitivities and awareness, some to a sense of citizenship in the global church, others to cross-cultural skills and awareness to prepare for ministry in today’s church. As the understanding of
the forces of globalization deepens, the effective school will seek to engage these forces critically and creatively, taking some risks in order to address and help shape the emerging order. Achieving such goals is a challenge that requires establishing an appropriate educational environment and adjusting teaching, learning, and research strategies in light of the new goals.

Establishing an appropriate environment requires taking account of many factors, including:

**Readiness for Cross-Cultural Experiences.** Some students may not be ready to take advantage of cross-cultural/globalizing experiences. Advance preparation will make the experience more valuable, and intentional follow-up will help participants to integrate the experience cognitively, theologically, and pastorally.

**Diverse Faculty and Student Body.** Where such diversity exists, cross-cultural experiences will help students and faculty to negotiate their “home” learning experiences with more awareness and understanding, and the “home” campus ethos will set the stage for the importance of cross-cultural awareness.

**Fostering Cross-Cultural Communications Skills.** This is an unending and challenging process—but an important one. In addition to the need to recognize “anthropologically” defined cultural skills, this may also entail awareness of how sexism, racism, and cultural chauvinism create barriers to cross-cultural understanding. Addressing such barriers can be vital aspects of a school’s response to global realities.

Practices that foster global awareness and responsiveness cultivate certain skills in students and faculty. Institutions define or express those skills and attitudes in a number of ways, depending on their particular understandings of and theological responses to global realities.
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Cultivating such skills requires the development of learning models or experiences to enable the achievement of these skills. Such models might include learning to enter another frame of reference; encountering the unfamiliar experientially and then sympathizing, identifying, and critiquing it; or de-centering participants from their own cultural experiences, so that they learn to deal with the discomfort and then reflect on the experience. Other examples include challenging participants with a different cultural experience and then reflecting on the challenge, or conversely, challenging participants to think about their own culture and their understanding of Christianity in light of the cross-cultural experience. Another example would be examining and/or encountering multiple aspects of another community, including cultural, economic, political, social, and religious aspects.

Questions to assist in evaluating such learning models or experiences might include the following:

- Did the experience have a long-term impact or make a difference in how the participant sees the world and his or her community?
- Were participants open to the experiential aspects of learning?
- How relevant was the experience to the participants’ work and ministry?
- Were there cultural misunderstandings? Tensions? Failures? What was learned from the “hard side” of the cultural encounter? How were these difficult experiences processed and understood?
The Theological Curriculum (Standard 4)

Standard 4, on the theological curriculum, contains the following statement:

4.1.2 The emphasis placed on particular goals and their configuration will vary, both from school to school (depending on the understanding of institutional purpose and within each school (depending on the variety of educational programs offered). The ordering of teaching and learning toward particular sets of goals is embodied in the degree programs of the school and in the specific curricula followed in those programs. The theological curriculum, comprehensively understood, embraces all those activities and experiences provided by the school to enable students to achieve the intended goals. More narrowly understood, the curriculum is the array of specific activities (e.g., courses, practica, supervised ministry, spiritual formation experiences) explicitly required in a degree program. In both the more comprehensive and the more narrow sense, the entire curriculum should be seen as a set of practices with a formative aim—the development of intellectual, spiritual, moral, and vocational or professional capacities—and careful attention must be given to the coherence and mutual enhancement of its various elements.

The curriculum structures all the educational practices of the institution with an aim to achieve its established educational goals. Given the multiple aspects of the life of the school, its constituencies and publics, and its theological understandings, those goals will be several. The challenge in a school’s response to global realities is how to structure the curriculum to globalize and also to meet all the other curricular goals. Institutions pose the challenge of balancing the goals and aims of the curriculum in a number of ways:
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- Are the forces driving the curriculum sufficiently all-encompassing to provide a place for addressing globalization?
- Are the global/cross-cultural learning experiences always extracurricular and therefore marginal?
- How does experiential learning interface with or relate to core academic courses?

Globalizing the curriculum may include a variety of aspects, each with evaluative questions that might be posed.

Reviewing the curriculum in light of how well it achieves cross-cultural goals.

- What attention is given to cross-cultural global realities in the structure and aims of the curriculum?
- Are cross-cultural/global perspectives included in core courses?

Developing degree programs for particular constituencies, including overseas constituencies.

- How appropriate and effective are educational opportunities and support services for international and multicultural students?
- Do courses recognize different cultural styles, learning styles, and student expectations?

Encouraging broader faculty participation in cross-cultural teaching and immersions.

- What is the extent of faculty ownership and participation?
- How well are the faculty prepared for such participation?

Globalizing the campus learning environment and community life.

- How is global diversity reflected in worship, campus activities, community life?
• How does the school nurture awareness of diverse spiritualities?

Enabling students to understand the importance and benefit of cross-cultural learning experiences and their connection to educational goals and to understanding ministry.

• How will globalizing theological education benefit the student vocationally?

Integrating the experience into the structure of the curriculum begins to address that question, because the experience is linked to educational goals and to an understanding of ministry. Thus an important issue is:

• How well are cross-cultural experiences integrated into the requirements of degree programs?

This aspect of Standard 4 thus has impact on the standards for all degree programs of the school.

Purpose, Planning, and Evaluation (Standard 1)

The guiding elements of an educational institution are its purpose and the evaluation efforts used to identify how effectively the institution is fulfilling that purpose. (See the Introduction to the General Institutional Standards.)

1.2.1 The purpose statement shall guide the institution in its comprehensive institutional planning and evaluation procedures, and in making decisions regarding programs, allocation of resources, constituencies served, relationships with ecclesiastical bodies, global concerns, and other comparable matters.

Institutional purpose, evaluation mechanisms, and assessment of how well the institution is meeting its purpose are the context and starting point for all the Standards of Accreditation, includ-
ing the emphasis on globalizing theological education. The nature of an institution’s response to the global depends upon its theological articulation of its purpose and goals. By relating its globalization of theological education to its institutional purposes, a school can define its understanding of “the global” (based on the school’s distinctive theological self-understanding), contextualize its programs so that they fit the school’s distinctive location within church and world, and build on the school’s networks and connections. These activities can help a school to decide what to do, how much it can handle, and how to evaluate its efforts.

A school considering its approach to globalizing theological education might begin by reflecting on its theological understanding of the global. Questions that might be posed in this process include:

- What is a school’s understanding of its relationship with the global church?
- How does the gospel address and inform global realities?
- How is the gospel interpreted in light of global realities?
- How do these reflections relate to the theological self-understanding and institutional purpose of the school?

A school’s response to the global cannot succeed by replicating what other schools have done because what others have done may not fit this particular school’s context. That context is the starting point: its history, its region, its denominational and church relationships, its cultural context, and its global networks. Each school is positioned differently by virtue of its location (regional, urban, or rural), its position within its denomination or church, its particular student and faculty population, and the nature of the churches and constituencies served by its graduates.

For example, a school might begin by asking questions like the following:
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- Does the school have a history of mission connections in certain parts of the world?
- Is it the only school in the denomination with a Hispanic, Chinese, Korean, or French language program, for example?
- Do most of its graduates minister to rural parishes?
- Do many graduates enter the international mission or service field?
- Have the regional judicatories identified a need to serve a particular constituency?
- Has recent immigration radically changed the complexion of the local churches or judicatories in the region served by the school?
- Do lay leaders or pastors in particular cultural groups have need for further theological education?
- Is the school positioned to perform a distinctive service to the local or international church?
- With what nearby community or church agencies might the school cooperate in developing a cross-cultural relationship or program?
- Are there opportunities to work collaboratively and pool resources with other theological schools in the region?
- Are there denominational or mission networks or personal connections of faculty, alumni, or trustees upon which the school can build its global programs?

An institution’s response to global realities, then, is grounded in its institutional purpose and its understanding of the mission of the church, developed in dialogue with its particular location, built on its established networks and denominational structures, and integrated into its educational and institutional practices. It is also evaluated against these contexts.
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Establishing and Evaluating Globalizing Goals

Comprehensive Institutional Global Strategies

Multiple demands on limited resources and aspirations to higher standards of quality have led some schools to develop mechanisms for evaluating the full range of their cross-cultural and global activities.

When different faculty and various constituencies have developed international and racial/ethnic cross-cultural programs, institutions may experience tension between these two aspects of responses to the global. Some schools also experience tensions between ethnic groups and international constituencies. In order to transcend what they see as destructive and unfortunate tensions, schools may seek ways to develop institutional ownership of an overall strategy of globalization, diversity, or cross-cultural relations, to find the right balance of initiatives that is mutually reinforcing rather than conflicting. Beyond evaluation of individual programs, this can lead to an articulation of the theological goals of the curriculum, seeking not only how each program serves a special constituency but also how the presence of all programs and constituencies creates the desired ethos to accomplish education for ministry for all students.

Evaluation of Programs and Ventures

In addition to the decennial, comprehensive evaluations of institutional strategies, the culture of evaluation requires ongoing evaluation of specific programs and ventures.

Offices and administrators of global and cross-cultural programs may be reviewed within the school’s administrative structures. Global programs and initiatives that are part of degree programs may be reviewed as the academic program of which they are a part is reviewed. Their goals and objectives may be defined in re-
iation to the program objectives. Student participants may be reviewed regularly as part of these programs, courses reviewed by course evaluations, and programs reviewed through exit interviews of graduates.

International exchange and immersion programs may provide a wealth of informal feedback because the cultural adjustment required of participants before, during, and after these programs is generally addressed through some structure of briefing and debriefing.

When programs are mounted in cooperation with another school or with a church agency or judicatory, the cooperative relationship may provide another venue for review. Parties to cooperation frequently ask themselves: How is this cooperation working? or Why should we cooperate? Moreover, because the cooperating parties each bring slightly different motives for entering into cooperation, each provides a distinctive angle of vision on the program.

Informal channels of evaluation frequently provide valuable feedback about the quality of programs. Such feedback might include the level of satisfaction or concerns of field site supervisors, comments from church or denominational officials about how well graduates are functioning, or comments by participants or community members during the field placement. The institution may need to develop strategies to capture, learn from, and act on such informal feedback in an effective manner.

When an institution’s responses to globalization include relationships or partnerships with international or ethnic communities or agencies, the institution should also evaluate its relationships by asking questions such as the following:

- To what extent are relationships mutual, reciprocal, and sensitive to the needs and priorities of the partners?
- What have been the level and dynamics of communication? How well has the school listened to the needs, goals, and pri-
orities of the international/multiethnic community? What evidence would document the level of listening?

- How patiently and well has the school worked to identify parallel goals and a “shared stake” with diverse communities?
- Has the school balanced its own needs and those of the partner communities to avoid seeing the communities simply as “markets”?
- How well has the school acknowledged the risks the other community takes in entering into relationship?
- Is there an intention to form a stable environment in which the relation between the program and the mission of the church can be sustained?

Completing the Evaluation Circle

The evaluation of an institution’s globalizing goals is part of a circular process that takes many forms and may begin at different points. It often includes the following elements:

- It is rooted in theological reflection and the establishment of institutional goals and purposes in light of accrediting standards and global realities.
- It is embodied in programs and ventures that aim to achieve those globalized goals and purposes.
- As programs come into being, participants and faculty needed to teach them will come to reflect the global diversity and values that the school has espoused.
- The curriculum of a school with a diverse student population will be hospitable to persons with a broad range of backgrounds. As the on-campus student population becomes more diverse, skills in cross-cultural listening and communication become a more critical requirement for learners, who are preparing for effective ministry and leadership in the global church, and for their teachers as well.
The quality of teaching and the suitability of the curriculum will thus be evaluated, in part, in terms of the effectiveness of each in preparing students for global awareness.

Assessing the performance of graduates stimulates further theological reflection, which becomes an occasion for reviewing and revising programs and for refining the theological understanding of institutional goals.

ENDNOTE