Ambrose Seminary serves a student body that is 80% over 30 and two thirds part-time. If we think of seminary education as either preparatory, leading to a life-time of ministry, or developmental, supporting those in ministry who want more training or students moving toward pastoral ministry as a second career, Ambrose Seminary is primarily oriented toward the second kind of work. In this context, we work intentionally to build community—among students and with our diverse constituency—and to increase accessibility to our programs. Our recent educational initiatives have been oriented toward improving connections to the constituency we serve, both denominationally and geographically. As a result, the faculty teach in a variety of delivery modalities: in the traditional way—face to face—across a thirteen week semester; in one week modules; in three-weekend modules; online in eight week semester; and in hybrid formats. This project also builds on the prior commitment of Ambrose University to faculty development and to articulating policy defining standardized student workload parameters.

The professional development grant proposed two kinds of workshops and tutoring opportunities: for syllabi development and for improving communication skills for web-based media. The primary goal of the syllabus workshop was to sharpen our ability to prepare learning outcomes and link those outcomes to course delivery (in varying units) and assessment (at varying levels). The primary goal of the writing workshop was to help faculty prepare contributions for the web-based communication platform being developed by the Seminary.

In August 2017 we had what was planned as the first of two two-day workshops whose goals were to assist faculty to focus on more precise learning outcomes, more authentic student assessment, and more engaging instruction. We hired a local education professor who has done similar workshops internationally so that he was available for the follow-up tutoring. We had fifteen faculty (full-time and part-time) in the workshop when we did the workshop evaluation and they overwhelmingly agreed that the workshop had accomplished its goals. The follow-up tutoring opportunities were used primarily by new faculty—either new to the institution or new to teaching. The final test of the impact of the workshop will be on the syllabi that were used in courses in the academic year 2017-18 which will be assessed as part of the faculty annual reviews during May-June 2018.

In August and September 2017 we also offered two half day workshops to any faculty who wanted to become more effective writers for web-based communication platforms. We again hired a local communications consultant to deliver those workshops. Eight faculty attended at least one of the half-day workshops; no one took advantage of the available follow-up sessions to have their writing edited. This goal will be assessed by looking at the number and kinds of contributions faculty make to the Seminary web-site, Ambrose@ Large during its first year (January, 2019).

The most important learning has been for the faculty who applied the principles of the syllabus workshop, especially those who took advantage of the follow-up sessions with the workshop facilitator. As the one planning the workshops, I learned that it would be good to spread professional development opportunities across the year and coordinate them with other university PD initiatives rather than front-
loading them in August which proved burdensome for faculty. As well, the evaluation of the first syllabus workshop suggested pedagogical issues related to questions of race and gender were important to faculty. As a result, the workshop topic was changed (with ATS approval) for August 2018 and the workshop was coordinated with other university initiatives.

We designed the workshops as ideas to be implemented. Faculty brought syllabi to work on in the first workshop and writing samples to the second workshop. We expected that as with most professional development efforts, if the workshop learning is not used immediately, it is probably not ever implemented. We worked as professional learning communities during both workshops: faculty worked on syllabi together during the pedagogy workshop and edited our writing together during the communications workshop.

As Dean, I will assess syllabi as part of the faculty annual review (May and June 2018) but it would have been better to have had immediate follow-up by looking at all syllabi used for classes in the fall. There wasn’t time for this review before the term started, and some (especially senior) faculty already had their syllabi finalized before the workshop began.¹

Best practices in this project are those that help us to be attentive to the context in which we are serving and to develop relationships that will support our on-going work. Observation of context and relationships are the foundation on which we can move in appropriate directions. It was helpful to use local people in the workshops so that they were available for follow-up. It was helpful to use the workshops to nurture professional relationships among colleagues and to work on actual syllabi. It was good to build on directions the university and the seminary were already taking. In each of these ways we reinforced past initiatives even as we moved the overall project forward.

¹ These are all principles that the George Lucas Educational Foundation indicates are strategies for effective professional development among teachers; https://www.edutopia.org/blog/top-tips-highly-effective-pd-vicki-davis (accessed April 30, 2018).
THE DIGITAL SEMINAR SERIES
FOR FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Introduction and Abstract of the Proposal
In August of 2017, Asbury Theological Seminary received a Faculty Development grant of $15,000 from The Association of Theological Schools to support the development of a series of three digital seminars on Theological Education Learning and Teaching (TELT). This series has been designed by the Instructional Design & Technology area of the Library, Information, and Technology Services department, in collaboration with faculty members. The series will be made available to other educational institutions via live web streaming and will provide professional development opportunities for faculty both locally and nationally.

Primary Goals
The primary goal of the TELT Digital Seminar Series is to provide professional learning and development opportunities for teaching faculty at Asbury Theological Seminary and other theological institutions. Educational research studies are improving our understanding of the way students learn and how best to engage the whole student through targeted cognitive and social methods. This seminar series will show instructors how to use these strategies to strengthen their teaching skills and deepen the learning and formation experiences for students in their courses.

Timeline for the Project
The TELT digital seminars will be delivered on May 3, May 24, and June 18, 2018. At the conclusion of the series, we will follow up with our faculty to assess their retention of the information presented as well as their plan for implementation in their classes. We will include this information and the budget in our final report due August 1, 2018.

Crucial Issues and Questions
The project engages the crucial issues and questions of how to improve our understanding of the ways that students learn and how to help the faculty learn new methods to engage our students in using these targeted cognitive and social methods. The first seminar, for example, is entitled “Teaching Online in Three Steps,” and will explore specific techniques faculty can use to maximize the student learning experience in an online environment. The second seminar will focus on encouraging mindfulness from both our faculty and students, and the third will center on using the innovative collaboration software VoiceThread to create increased participation and interaction in the online classroom.

As part of our institutional strategic planning, we are committed to exploring and developing non-traditional course delivery systems. Because this seminar series features content directly related to online course delivery, it gives us the opportunity to improve significantly our online and hybrid courses, as well as our traditional courses. Equipping our faculty with a better understanding of student learning leads to greater student engagement in different class formats. Students can then take what they have learned out into the world through their future ministries, and our institution as a whole advances our mission to “prepare theologically educated, sanctified, Spirit-filled men and women to evangelize and to spread scriptural holiness
throughout the world through the love of Jesus Christ, in the power of the Holy Spirit and to the glory of God the Father.”

Challenges/Obstacles Confronted
There are always obstacles to overcome when taking on a project of this caliber. One major obstacle has been the attempt to generate interest from three outside speakers with the budget that was available. It was obvious from the beginning that with our limited budget, we would not be able to attract national talent. This led to a shift in our attention to presenters from the world of academia. We found some creative methods to circumvent this obstacle, including utilizing some graduate students as speakers and building a workshop around a pre-recorded screencast.

Another significant challenge has been to find the right technology to handle the recording and streaming of the seminars. We have a well-equipped video studio on campus but not a great system to stream content. We used our equipment funds from the grant to purchase a computer that could be used as a solid streaming device as well as a video switcher, if we needed to host any of the seminars remotely (which was the original plan).

We anticipate that another major challenge will be to get faculty involvement, especially during this time in the academic calendar. Although the timing is less than ideal, the dates were chosen out of necessity to coordinate with the presenters’ schedules. We have found that our faculty frequently ignore professional development opportunities, assuming that they are just a waste of their valuable time, which is why we will be recording the materials for just-in-time learning.

What We Have Learned
By the time we submit our final report later this summer, we hope to have learned some valuable lessons for Asbury Seminary and perhaps for other institutions as well. We will provide this information in more detail at that time.

Unexpected Insights and Recommended Practices
So far during this project, we have discovered several key recommended practices, and we expect to learn several more before its conclusion. First, we learned that it is always best to plan judiciously with the budget in mind. We have had to change the format of our seminars several times due to budgetary restrictions, and it would have been smoother if we had foreseen this from the beginning. We also think that providing professional development opportunities in the earlier parts of the semester would give faculty more incentive to attend, as opposed to later in the semester or academic year when they are feeling more pressure in their classes. We would also recommend that, regardless of the content that institutions want to develop for their faculty, they should consider providing that content in multiple delivery formats. We decided not only to provide an option for faculty to attend our seminars in person but also to attend via a Zoom meeting, as well as have on-demand access to the seminars after the fact.

Recommendations for the Association of Theological Schools
While our digital seminar series project does not seem to have any direct implications for the redevelopment of the standards of accreditation, we do have some recommendations for the Association of Theological Schools. We suggest that the Association consider adding faculty Continuing Education Units (CEUs) as a standard for faculty qualifications. This would be
another way to encourage faculty to attend institutional professional development opportunities. We also suggest that the Association consider developing a journal based on TELT findings that could be accessed by participating institutions for continued professional development.

Conclusion
Asbury Theological Seminary is very grateful to the Association of Theological Schools for this grant to help us provide development opportunities for our faculty. Any improvement in teaching practices and student learning methods can only benefit both our faculty and our students. The Association is always ready to help us develop and implement best practices in providing theological education for our constituents and we appreciate your partnership with us in this great Kingdom enterprise.
ASSOCIATED CANADIAN THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS (ACTS) OF TRINITY WESTERN UNIVERSITY

Developing Faculty Competence for ACTS Immerse MDIV and for the New DMIN Degree Programs

ACTS held a three-day faculty retreat in August 2017 with three primary goals. The first goal was to understand Competency Based Theological Education (CBTE). A second goal was to broaden faculty understanding of the Immerse MDIV. The third goal was to discuss the implementation of the revised DMin starting Fall 2017. A second ACTS faculty retreat is scheduled for June 2018.

Primary Goals

1. Give instruction on the Immerse MDIV degree online platform and becoming an Immerse mentor.
2. Allow ACTS faculty to ask questions in a collegial environment on the new degree programs.
3. Provide a time of interaction and learning off campus in a resort setting.
4. Present the new DMin curriculum, program design, and allow time for discussion.

Activities

1. Presentations from faculty, the Academic Director, and guest presenters.
2. Time for questions and further discussion.
3. Meals together and times for individual relaxation (the first retreat included spouses).
4. Events to encourage fellowship, such as a dinner boat cruise.

Innovative Features

1. Off campus retreat setting for both event (the second retreat is only during the day).
2. Presentations and retreat included faculty and administration (spouses were invited to the August retreat).
3. Opportunity to engage in the issues surrounding CBTE, assessment, and the revised DMin.
4. Social activities (e.g., meals together, dinner cruise) for those in attendance.

Key Items Learned

1. The fruitful exchange of ideas among faculty and staff present.
2. The event served as a building block for current and future innovation.
3. The five-drivers of adult student motivation.
   a. Protection
   b. Personal development
   c. Upholding values
   d. Continuous improvement
   e. Guaranteed returns
4. CBTE requires a significant paradigm shift of thinking and pedagogy for faculty.
Project Title: Developing Faculty Distance Education Proficiency in a Non-residential/high-context Master of Divinity Program

Bexley Seabury’s new non-residential/high-context MDiv program requires that our field education and formation courses be offered substantially online, so that regular interactions can take place between the seminary’s formation and contextual learning faculty, our predominantly out-of-state students, and their supervisors and congregational collaborators at their local field sites. Longer term, in furtherance of living into our vision of being a “seminary beyond walls,” the seminary intends to expand its offerings to include enriched hybrid or wholly online courses. This grant is helping to fund these initiatives.

Primary Goals and Progress to Date

Our primary goal for Phase One of the grant, to be implemented in academic year 2017-2018, has been

- To equip our Director of Formation and Contextual Learning with the theoretical knowledge, technological skills, and mentoring support necessary for her to build and to conduct the seminary’s ministerial formation and field education courses online to maximum effect.

We are meeting our goals for Phase One. This grant enabled us to hire a team of consultants who have been providing technological and pedagogical training and support to our Director and Assistant Director of Contextual Learning and Formation. These faculty members have developed proficiencies quickly as a result of hands-on expert assistance with course and syllabus development; the on-boarding of students; technological trouble-shooting; and professional coaching before, during, and after each synchronous online session. They are now working with our consultants to develop enhanced asynchronous learning resources for students, and to create an online environment in which faculty and field education supervisors can interact remotely and share best practices.

Our primary goals for Phase Two (2018-2019) and beyond are:

- To provide faculty with theoretical knowledge and familiarity with best practices for creating engaging and effective online courses that will help to facilitate the formation of collaborative communities of learning;

- To enable faculty to design and to develop online an hybrid courses and course components, and to implement effective online teaching tools and technologies;

- To produce at least two wholly online courses that can be offered by Fall, 2019.
We are on the way toward meeting our goals in Phase Two. Currently, one of Bexley Seabury’s faculty members is taking a two month course at the University of Wisconsin called *Fundamentals of Online Teaching for Theological Educators*, developed by Virginia Theological Seminary in conjunction with the Wabash Center for Teaching and Learning. He is creating for us a course that will be offered as a hybrid with synchronous elements in the Spring of 2019 and wholly online in the Fall of 2019. He will also be working one-on-one this Summer with one of our consultants on course development, and will receive further hands-on coaching by them while the course is in progress. We hope in the coming year to send our newest faculty member (and perhaps one other) to these courses, or to the extended course offered by the Wabash Center, for foundational training, and to supplement these with the continued coaching services of our consultants.

**Key Learnings**

- The technological ability to connect students in real time over vast distances has presented opportunities that would not have been available in a residential seminary community. For example, when one of our students serving in the military was deployed to South Korea, she was able to maintain visual contact, to participate in class, and to process in conversation with her cohort the tension of being a good soldier on the one hand and a minister-in-training on the other.

- The quality of formation and contextual theological education has been enriched, rather than diminished, because of the wider diversity of experiences and ministry contexts to which students are exposed in the virtual classroom.

**Key Recommended Practices**

- Use a synchronous learning platform that enables as many students as possible to see one another simultaneously on screen. This feature helps to enhance student interaction and engagement.

- Try activating the chat function in your synchronous learning platform to help make communication more dynamic, inclusive, and responsive. Students will be able to share thoughts as they occur, to express comments that help others to make connections, to ask questions, or to signal technological difficulties.

- Advise students to use earbuds and microphones to eliminate feedback and echo.

- Team teach (or have a teaching assistant) if you can. Before each class, decide who will be primarily responsible for driving the technology, keeping an eye on chat messages, virtual hands raised, facilitating discussion, etc.

- Expensive tools are not necessarily the best tools. The technology best serves when it follows, rather than drives, the pedagogy.
Project Abstract
Following upon a multi-year process of study, planning, and dialogue led by our newly created Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Committee (made up of faculty, staff, and students), we are implementing usage of the Intercultural Development Inventory among faculty and senior administrators at the School of Theology (1) to develop plans for achievable growth in intercultural competency, understood as a movement from ethnocentric orientations to more ethnorelative orientations (such as acceptance, adaptation, and integration) and (2) to measure that growth.

Primary goals of the Project
Our first goal is to see all faculty and senior administrators at the School of Theology take the Intercultural Development Inventory and then to take it again in five years. Our second goal is to see growth in intercultural competency among 75% of faculty and senior administrators who take the instrument. That aim is measurable on the basis of the IDI, and that growth is defined in terms of a movement from ethnocentric orientations to more ethno-relative orientations that signal an openness to and embrace of cultural diversity and a capacity to relate effectively across cultural difference.

How well did the project attain those goals?
All 10 senior administrators completed the IDI and received hour-long feedback sessions. That number does not include administrators who are also full-time faculty, who are reported with the faculty number. Out of 38 full-time faculty, three are retiring, so they did not participate. That leaves 35. Five were on sabbatical this year and did not participate. We will integrate them next year. That leaves 30 faculty who should have taken it, and 26 have done so. So we are at 87% of faculty and 100% of senior administrators. While that is not the 100% we hoped for, we understand that there will always be faculty who resist, and we decided early on not to force anyone. We think 87% is still a very good showing. All faculty who have taken the IDI received hour-long feedback sessions.

We conducted a faculty day retreat early in the fall in which faculty could better come to understand the IDI, the theoretical model behind it, and why it is important for us all to participate. This retreat was an important part of securing buy-in from faculty and of working together to think about how we might all begin to develop personal growth plans once we receive the feedback. The latter, however, did not get much attention, and working on those is the most important next step.

Obviously, the most important goal is growth, but we will not measure that until five years from now. Growth does not come automatically, of course, nor does it come because someone takes the IDI. So the most important work now are the workshops, training, retreats, and professional development plans we will be working on over the next few years. Our first retreat had more to
do with getting faculty and staff on-board with the IDI, answering questions about it, and helping persons understand the theoretical model behind it. Our next retreat will be this fall where we will continue to work on intercultural competency building and professional development plans.

**What are the most crucial issues and questions engaged by the project?**
The most important issues and questions are those pertaining to what is meant by intercultural competency, why it is important as educators in a religious/theological context, and how to grow in intercultural competency. This territory is far from uncontested, so we expected the discussions around these questions to be lively among our faculty. They were a bit more intense, heated, and controversial than we might have anticipated (see below).

**What are the most significant opportunities/benefits engaged by the project? How did you engage them?**
One of the most significant opportunities/benefits of taking the IDI together in our School is that it gives us a common language and framework from within which we can begin to think together and work together on intercultural competency. The theoretical model behind the IDI holds that there is a continuum of orientations toward cultural difference that point to a progression from less to increasingly more sophisticated intercultural experiences. The model identifies three ethnocentric orientations, where one's culture is experienced as central to reality (Denial, Defense, Minimization), and three ethnorelative orientations, where one's culture is experienced in the context of other cultures (Acceptance, Adaptation, Integration). Coming to understand the continuum and orientations along the continuum, and especially where one stands along that continuum is insightful, though sometimes difficult and upsetting for those doctoral students and staff who have taken the IDI early on and received feedback sessions. But at least we have a common framework and language that serves as a starting point.

**What are the most significant challenges/obstacles you confronted in the project? How did you overcome them?**
Getting faculty to buy-in to the project was challenging. Resistance was vocalized by only a few persons, but they were a vocal minority. Initial faculty council responses led us to expect resistance from the full faculty and so we decided to spend considerable time at the faculty retreat helping people understand the theoretical model, project design, and how the data would be used, including the anonymity of their profiles. We have yet to hear reports from faculty on the feedback sessions, so it is hard to know just where we stand at present. We will know more about the faculty composite scores later this summer and about what obstacles await as we attempt to move forward. We know from anecdotal responses received from administrators and doctoral students who took the IDI within the past 24 months that some felt demoralized at how ethnocentric they came out on the continuum. We expect to hear some of that also from faculty.

It is far too early to describe how we will overcome challenges because we are just getting started with this work. We can only say that we tried to address initial resistance by going slow, by not requiring the IDI from anyone, and by providing as much orientation to the IDI as possible upfront.
What did you learn of benefit for your school?
It is still too early to say, as we have not received the composite reports. Our report would be
more useful in assessing benefits for STH a year from now. We do, however, believe that it has
been beneficial for STH faculty and administrators to go through the IDI process given the fact
that faculty required it of PhD and DMin students two years ago.

What did you learn that might be of benefit for other schools in the Association?
The answer to this question is similar to the previous answer. We would advise to take time with
the IDI, help faculty understand the theoretical model behind it, and extend the time for feedback
sessions to one hour per faculty rather than the 30 minutes we initially projected.

A second learning is that there were a few faculty who resisted anyone from within the
University doing the feedback sessions. We pushed hard early on to see that someone within the
University (though outside STH – in the Danielsen Institute) was trained and contracted to
provide scoring and feedback. We were hoping to save money in not having to fly someone in to
do all this work. But a few faculty didn’t want anyone within the University knowing about their
scores, so we had to fly someone in for those few people. Thinking about these potential
challenges ahead of time might be useful for other schools.

Are there unexpected insights, innovative ideas, or possibilities that have emerged through the
project?
I don’t think we fully anticipated the way a minority of faculty would try everything possible to
resist this work (challenging the science and research behind the IDI, challenging the location of
the persons doing the scoring and feedback, etc.). It would be premature to conclude more until
we have our first data reports and present them at faculty retreat this fall.

List key recommended practices that you learned in pursuing this project.
Again, it is important to explain the theoretical model but to be aware that faculty like to get
buried in details, research methodology, etc. We also recommend the development by faculty of
a professional development plan to achieve the intercultural competency growth we are seeking.
But we are just starting out on that aspect of the project, so we are not yet ready to make
recommendations to others.

Are there implications from your project for the possible process of redevelopment of the
Standards of Accreditation?
We are definitely not ready to make that jump yet.

How might the project or its learning be sustained through a culture of faculty development in
your school?
There is no way that our project can be sustained without a culture of faculty development that
includes faculty working individually and in peer groups on intercultural competence. But we
have not yet learned how to do that, as our first phase was just to get buy-in and see everyone
take the IDI and receive feedback sessions. That’s where we stand at present.
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Carey Theological College

Introduction

Carey is undergoing a significant shift in its strategic direction as it moves from a teaching model that focuses on the faculty as a provider of knowledge and expertise to one where the faculty is an enabler of learning and co-creator and curator of knowledge for the local and global church. This change requires our faculty to update their skillset in four areas: 1) collaborating with students and colleagues in teaching and research, 2) building a strong foundation in understanding the Kolb’s learning cycle and problem-based teaching and learning, 3) curating and disseminating knowledge to the Church through practical and contextual student assignments and faculty research, and 4) developing a new set of formative assessment criteria/rubric that would invite participation of and feedback from student peers and the Church.

The primary goal of the faculty development grant project was for Carey faculty members to understand more about instructional design methods that would promote collaboration and active student engagement with their course content and lead to students’ achievement of course learning outcomes. The retreat highlighted the best practices in contextual student assignments, problem based learning, assessment and evaluation, adult adaptive and learning styles and best practices in course design that have been proven to be consistent with how adults learn. The outputs of the retreat were instructional strategies, tactics and logistics, practical approaches to course design and instruction developed during the retreat by individual instructors and considered for deployment in their respective courses, both current and future ones.

Carey’s Response
Carey responded in three distinct but not separate ways. The first response was with a three-day retreat at Carey Theological College, devoted to workshop type, professional learning based activities on the topics listed in the paragraph above. The second response was with the design and development of an online course designed to systematically guide faculty, including adjunct faculty, through twelve important topics in the design and implementation of online courses. The course has been designed to be completed in one of two ways-monthly in a live session conducted the first Monday of each month for a twelve-fourteen-month period and/or in a ‘just in time’ and ‘just in need’ bases. Faculty can pick up any workshop topic and complete it as they need to vis a vis their respective courses. The third response was with a Resource Manual designed to serve as a ‘go-to’ reference for ideas regarding best practices in instructional strategies, tactics, logistics and relationship builders in technology supported courses.

**Three Day Retreat**

The retreat was designed to address some Carey-relevant and contextual instructional-related issues, problems and questions? Carey has been aware of the problems, issues and questions being experienced by Carey faculty and understand some relevant faculty questions to be: how do we include a fair and legitimate emphasis on assignments, course content in learning centered courses and their design; how do we establish a strong and cogent purpose for students taking our course, one that goes beyond what Carey (and other institutions) state as necessary; and, how do we design blended, hybrid and fully online courses that meet student learning needs as well as course-outcome requirements?

The retreat was supported by a Resource Manual-a practical hands-on guide for Carey instructors. The Resource Manual did not emphasise basic, theoretical or conceptual issues regarding instructional skills and technology supported course design and implementation. Instead, the Resource Manual was designed with a focus specifically on Carey’s faculty, intended to develop their facilitator-within and more specifically from the viewpoint of personal development, better understanding of Carey’s students and Carey’s unique context-people and learning, clear communication, improving processes and finding a ‘made for Carey’ unique facilitation approach for their respective courses.

The approach to developing facilitating skills, used in the retreat and described in the manual, were based on the principles that support the following: learner and learning centeredness and the active intellectual and emotional engagement of students; interactive teaching and learning;
practical activities with a minds-on component- reflective exercises that attend to learners’ application of new insights and skills; experiential learning; assessment for, of and as learning as integral to student learning, using performance assessment tactics; and, problem based learning- visibly expressed in such instructional models as design thinking, shared praxis, scenario design and case study. 

To make the most of the learning experiences presented, faculty were given regular and topic-situated minds-on activities that were designed for faculty members reflect together on each experience and consider implications and application possibilities for respective courses.

The retreat included four distinct but not separate topics, each with a stated purpose, a set of intended outcomes and design or application possibilities. They were:

**Topic 1: Problem-based learning**

Learner centred andragogy in which the student learns about a topic through solving a problem, addressing an issue or answering a question that ‘lives’ in their world. Through intentionally designed learning movements or phases, the learner reflects deeply about the problem and ‘reasons’ (thinks systematically) through to solutions to the problem, ways to address the issue and answers to the question. The purpose for including this topic was based on adult learning theory principles, specifically that motivation to learn highest in adults who have a real reason, or authentic purpose to learn. The learning outcomes of this part of the retreat were: identifying a problem-based learning strategy that would be relevant for one aspect of a course you teach; designing a course outline with one integrated problem based learning strategy; and, applying knowledge about a preferred problem based strategy to future course design decisions. This topic included application possibilities for problem-based learning. They were: design thinking; shared praxis; scenario design; case study; and, inquiry.

**Topic 2: The adult learner**

While there is more than ample literature available to teachers on adult learning principles and best practices, a lot more is known about adult learning than what is applied to design and implementation of course. If Carey wants to be included in the list of ‘go-to’ place for theological education, ‘learning,’ not teaching, needs to become our core business, our main reason to be at Carey. The learning outcomes for this part of the retreat were: ability to describe some of the characteristics of an adult learner; explain what motivates an adult to learn; design learning experiences that will involve intellectually and emotionally involve learners; apply your knowledge about preferred learning styles in creating learning experiences for adult learners; design your courses to include strategies, tactics, logistics and relationship builders that account for learning preferences; and, include opportunities in your courses for learners to
cycle through the reflection cycle described in Kolb’s Adaptive Style Inventory. This topic included the application of Kolb’s Adaptive Style Inventory to understanding adult learners and the process of cycling through the four adaptive styles for adults in a learning experience.

**Topic 3: Facilitator skills**

This topic emphasised that a ‘distinct but not separate’ ‘teaching’ mind set required in technology supported learning, i.e. courses designed in hybrid, blended or fully online ways. Strategies, tactics, logistics and relationship builders are the four typical categories in which a new mindset of new possibilities, new futures in technology supported learning can be imagined. The learning outcomes in this part of the retreat were: identify the key characteristics of an effective facilitator; describe the essence of the teaching design pitfalls to be avoided by a facilitator; and, assess your own facilitator skills (critically). This topic included a discussion of tactics that enhance facilitator effectiveness, including using questionning strategies, advanced organisers and deductive and inductive design of learning activities.


Assessment is gathering information about student learning so you can make decisions about that learning. Assessment of learning is gathering information about learning so that you can make decisions about the value or worth of a student’s learning, judging the quality of that learning by assigning a grade, mark, comment or ranking. Assessment for learning is gathering information about learning so that you can make decisions about gaps in student learning, requirements for students to further or extend their learning, decisions about your course and adjustments that need to be made for improvements in student learning. Assessment as learning is gathering information about learning so that students. Assessment as learning is an activity through which a student re-enters learning activities, re-engage with a concept or idea, principle or practice so that they are given additional opportunities to learn. Evaluation is making a judgement about the value or worth of student’s learning (assessment of learning). Measurement is the tool or criteria we use to make that judgement. Today, the most common measurement tool is a rubric reporting is how we communicate results and apply the information we gather from assessment and evaluation. The intended outcome of this part of the retreat was for faculty to consider for their respective courses the need to design balanced, high quality authentic (performance based) assessment strategies in courses. Some possibilities for authentic, balanced and effective assessment included in the manual that accompanied the retreat were: presentations; portfolios; performances; projects; and, exhibits and maker faire displays of learning.
The goals and intended outcomes of the project will be assessed over the next 6-month period. Carey will gather information from the faculty in three ways. First, under the direction of the Senior Director of Instructional Design and Assessment Carey will undertake a system designed to include a two-phase formative assessment procedure. First, selected faculty will complete a self assessment of their course(s). They will follow a guided course design and implementation structure (see Appendix B). Second, faculty involved in the pilot project will participate in a peer review procedure based on the faculty member’s self assessment. This peer review includes an opportunity for the faculty person to receive feedback regarding their specific course design and implementation strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, and as well, off feedback regarding the self/peer assessment procedures. The Senior Director of Instructional Design and Assessment will gather feedback, analyse the feedback vis a vis project goals and make a final determination regarding the degree to which the project attained its goals and intended outcomes.

The most crucial issues engaged by the project included: how to enhance and develop a better understanding of people and learning, what does clear communication look like in a technology supported course, how to create a collegial and sufficient-enough buy-in to Carey’s courses and their design, how each faculty member can enhance their personal and unique facilitation approach for your respective courses. The crucial issues and questions engaged in this project were: learner and learning centeredness and how to achieve in technology supported courses; the active intellectual and emotional engagement of students; how to achieve interactive teaching and learning; identification of problem based learning principles and practices and application to instructional design; what are practical activities with a minds-on component; how to design reflective assignment exercises that attend to learners’ application of new insights and skills; reconceptualising experiential learning as minds-on learning; using assessment for, of and as learning as integral to student learning using performance and authentic assessment strategies; and, combining content rich courses with problem based learning-visibly expressed in such instructional models as design thinking, shared praxis, scenario design, case study. To make the most of the learning experiences presented, you will be invited to reflect together on each experience, think about applications in your respective courses. In conclusion we have learned that professional learning requires four components—time; opportunities to practice; feedback and assessment for learning designed into the day to day work of faculty.

**Online Course: Topics in the design and implementation of technology supported courses**

The online course now mounted and being implemented at Carey Theological College, is a guide to teaching and learning online at Carey Theological College. The workshop has twelve modules, each addresses a specific topic in how best to design courses and then teach online so
that students are intellectually and emotionally engaged. The ‘big premise’ of this workshop is that when students are engaged because you have designed your course so that their learning is active, your course goals and intended outcomes will be achieved. The workshop will provide you with many practical tips for designing your courses so that your students are engaged. The involvement in the workshop will be an encouragement to consider new possibilities and new futures in your teaching practice. The workshop draws from best practices in applying learning principles in an online learning environment and provides you with a step by step approach to actualizing best practices in your next course. Each module begins with a set of positioning questions that alert you to important teaching and learning concepts presented in that module. These positioning questions will serve as the conversation starters in each module, between you and me, your workshop leader. Next, each module includes an instructional video that we suggest you watch after answering the positioning questions in the Discussion Forum assigned to that module. Each video identifies and describes practical strategies and tactics that are used by effective online teachers. Each video will be followed by a ‘so what, now what’ discussion forum, in which you can state your conclusions about the ‘tips for teaching’ online and identify your decision or commitment to redesigning and reteaching your next online course.

The workshop modules are officially scheduled for the first Monday of each month, 9:00 a.m. to 11:30 p.m. Pacific time. The first module is scheduled for Tuesday, April 3rd because the first Monday in April is Easter Monday. However, the workshop is designed as well to be completed on a ‘just in time; just in need’ basis. If a faculty member, including an adjunct instructor, and are interested and need to complete a module on any topic in the workshop, they are free to do so. I will work alongside each faculty person by responding to posts in their choice of a module’s Discussion Forum. By the end of this course adjuncts will be able to move closer in confidence and competence in your transition into an effective online teacher, value teaching possibilities in online formats for designing learning centered and learner focused activities, navigate through various possibilities-strategies and tactics- for how best to design your course in an online environment, and understand the importance and experience the satisfaction of being an architect of learning experiences in the online environment.

Resource Manual

The Resource Manual includes the learning activities experienced during the retreat and a six-page overview of sis performance or authentic assessment activities that have been tried and found successful in technology supported courses. The Resource Manual would be available upon request.
Association of Theological Schools Faculty Development Grant
Summary Report for ATS Faculty Development Forum
Intercultural Competence at Church Divinity School of the Pacific

Project Description and Goals
CDSP used our 2017-18 ATS faculty development grant to train faculty and key administrators as Qualified Administrators of the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) and the Intercultural Conflict Style Inventory (ICS) created by IDI, LLC. The 2.5-day training took place on the CDSP campus in January 2018.

The project was intended to accomplish the following specific goals:
- All CDSP faculty and key administrators receive individual IDI profiles, ICS assessments, and Intercultural Development Plans (IDPs).
- All CDSP faculty receive certification as Qualified Administrators (QAs) of the IDI and the ICS.
Each of these goals was fully met for all participants in the January 2018 training.

There was unanimous agreement among project participants that the Qualifying Seminar and our trainer, Dr. Akiko Maeker, were excellent. Our senior administrators (President and Dean; Vice President and COO) also committed the full 2.5 days for the training, something Dr Maeker indicated is a rare occurrence and likely to increase our ability to fully incorporate intercultural competence across the seminary.

Insights from Implementation
We began this project as a step in our ongoing response to a question that is core to our mission as a seminary - How can we best teach and prepare all of our students for effective and inclusive ministries marked by mission, discipleship, and evangelism in an increasingly diverse society?

Prior to this effort, we revised our curriculum and took steps to increase diversity in our faculty and in our student body. This project has helped us identify opportunities to increase individual intercultural competence as well as the potential for significant improvements in the effectiveness of our pedagogical approach and curriculum. At the conclusion of our training, we made an institutional commitment to continue using the IDI, the theory associated with it (the Intercultural Development Continuum), and the strategies that IDI, LLC, recommends for personal intercultural development to increase our individual and institutional intercultural competence. One of the foundational understandings of the IDI is that diversity alone does not lead to inclusion but requires intercultural competence to transform a diverse organization into a truly inclusive one.

IDI Qualifying Seminar
In our project, we chose to have the entire faculty and key administrators qualified for several reasons. First, we wanted to be able to use the IDI and IDP with students as part of the advising relationship. This requires that all advisors, which is all faculty, be qualified administrators. Second, in-depth training regarding the Intercultural Development Continuum and mechanisms for furthering development along it is not available without incurring significant consultant/trainer fees. This project provided us with enough information to determine that we want to pursue further training and consulting support, but we did not know this would happen prior to the Qualifying Seminar. Third, based on the experience of our Project Director, who was qualified prior to this project, providing IDI Profile feedback brings a much deeper
understanding of the IDC and opportunities for increasing intercultural competence, and this experience is only available to qualified administrators.

**Using the IDP for Faculty Development**
Consistent with a non-judgmental and developmental approach to using the IDI and IDP with faculty, individual IDI results remain confidential at CDSP unless shared by the faculty member. Individual IDI Profiles will not be used for assessment purposes. Faculty IDPs will inform professional development goals, and accomplishment of specific development efforts may be part of faculty performance discussions. Our group profile provides us with a baseline measure of intercultural competence; assessment of group progress will require additional administration of the IDI for all faculty.

The ultimate purpose of increasing intercultural competence among the faculty is to improve our ability to offer a fully intercultural seminary experience -- academic, formational, advisory, and social -- for our students. The IDI Qualifying Seminar provided us with necessary but insufficient information to make appropriate curricular and pedagogical changes. As an outgrowth of this project we have received additional funding to explore similarities and distinctions in strategies for increasing intercultural competence across disciplines and learning platforms and to identify specific changes to our course design and teaching that will have an immediate impact in the classroom.

**Using the IDI and IDP with Students**
Members of our faculty and administration have raised several important questions regarding the possibilities, benefits, and challenges associated with having students complete the IDI. Multiple options emerged for how we might use the IDI with our students. One is to use it for program evaluation only, by having students complete the IDI on an anonymous basis at some early point in their tenure and then again at the end of their seminary training and using the group profiles only to assess the overall effectiveness of the degree program with respect to building intercultural competence. Another is to use the IDI and IDC as a means of teaching about intercultural competence. Still another is to use the IDI and the IDP explicitly as formational tools for our students, requiring them to complete the IDI and to address and set goals for an IDP in consultation with their advisors. We recognize that there is a need for care in introducing the IDI to students. In particular, it is possible that students will resist being asked to use the IDI out of a concern that their individual results will be shared and/or used as a source for academic or vocational assessment. We will continue to engage with these questions and the associated decisions over the next 12-18 months.

**Recommendations**
We recommend the following for schools considering using the IDI.

1. Be intentional about how you want to use the IDI and adjust your approach to qualifying administrators accordingly.
2. Be aware that the IDI Qualifying Seminar alone will not be sufficient to fully interculturalize your institution. It is a starting point which will open up many opportunities for development.
3. Take advantage of a private Qualifying Seminar if possible. While the QS curriculum is well-established and must be covered to receive qualified administrator status, our Project Director was able to work with our trainer to assure the issues that were most important to us received attention.
4. Make a commitment to faculty regarding the confidentiality of IDI results. Despite, and perhaps because of, the developmental nature of the IDC, it is likely that individuals will resist completing the inventory without this assurance.
“Integrating Columbia Theological Seminary’s Integrative Courses”

Summary

Columbia Theological Seminary has long featured a series of “Integrative Courses” among its requirements for the Master of Divinity degree. Intended to help students make connections between theological disciplines, the global church, and their own faith stories and vocational objectives, these courses comprise the backbone of the MDiv curriculum. As part of a larger taskforce-driven project to shape the integrative courses during a time when our curriculum is in transition, CTS and this taskforce applied for a faculty development grant in order to better train ourselves in teaching these courses. This grant gives us the opportunity to focus on one of the most important things we do with these courses; namely, teach them in such a way that they offer a distinctive shape to the degree and are coherent with each other.

Currently, these three courses are:

- **“Imagination and Resilience,”** which is designed for entering MDiv students, explores practices associated with developing imagination and resilience in ministry by engaging in a variety of Christian practices such as study, listening, prayer, dialogue, and hospitality and then reflecting on those practices.

- **“Explorations,”** which is taken half way through matriculation, is a small group immersion experience in which students and faculty members explore a context significantly different from the ones that students are familiar with and the church’s mission in that context. Contexts may include inner-city Atlanta, the Appalachian region of the U.S., the borderlands of New Mexico, India, Ghana, Central Europe, South Korea, and Jamaica.

- **“Cross/Roads,”** which is the capstone course, begins in the recognition that imaginative and resilient communities need imaginative and resilient leaders. This course explores leadership practices that shape such communities.

These three courses share four student learning outcomes and are designed to help students become competent in each of these SLOs over the course of matriculation. These SLOs are that each of our MDiv students can:

1. Accurately name and critically engage the cultural and theological forces that have shaped his or her personal faith and practices.

2. Competently analyze social contexts by using a range of methods (e.g., ethnography, social psychology, sociology of religion) and tools (e.g., power grids, sector analysis, theologies of culture).

3. Work comfortably and appreciatively in unfamiliar contexts and with persons of other cultures.

4. Map out courses of action in contexts of change and initiate them.

We designed our grant to fund a series of four consultations, with each consultation focusing on one of the four SLO’s and the best practices for teaching toward competence in it. Recognizing that a wide
range of faculty commitments would make four separate consultations day-long within a single year unduly burdensome, we chose, instead, to hold two consultations per year, with one consultation just prior to the beginning of the fall semester and another consultation just prior to the beginning of the spring semester. By focusing on the SLOs rather than the courses, we hope not only to attract faculty who have not been especially involved in the current courses but also to provide resources and wisdom that will transcend the current incarnations of these courses.

We held our first consultation in the spring of 2018. During that first consultation, interested faculty and administrators spent an evening in informal conversations about how to shape the integrative courses and then the following day with Rev. Dr. Ted A. Smith of Emory University, who guided us in a series of conversations about how best to think about and teach toward the first of those four SLOs. In August of 2018, Dr. Leah Gunning Francis, the Dean of Faculty at Christian Theological Seminary, will lead us in thinking through the fourth SLO and in January of 2019, Dr. Natalie Wigg Stevenson of Emmanuel College of Victoria University in the University of Toronto, will lead us through the third of our four SLOs. We are in preliminary conversations about several possible consultants for the last consultation, to be held in August of 2019.

Because we are not quite half way into our project, it is premature to offer too many insights or to be too definitive about what we are discovering by way of answering the questions that we will need to answer at the end of our project. That said, we can say some things we are discovering through our conversations with each other and our consultants. Among these are:

- Successfully teaching the integrative courses involves many of the same pedagogical skills as teaching other courses. Good teaching practices are transferrable; as such, the courses are strongest when taught by strong teachers and, correlative, the skills and insights we’re addressing in the consultations are valuable to faculty in their own courses.

- Faculty are aching to spend time thinking with each other about the changing landscape of theological education in which we teach as well as how to teach in that landscape. There are, moreover, natural overlaps between conversations about the changing landscape and our project goals having to do with the integration of theory and practice, the shift from discipline-specific toward more holistic/integrative curricula, and changing student demographics in which students have less familiarity with church practices and a wider range of vocational interests than they used to.

- One component of this changing landscape in theological education that is named above is the shift away from disciplinary foci in our teaching and one complicating feature of this component is that few of us are trained to think in multidisciplinary ways. We tend to approach integration with discipline-specific lenses on: Bible scholars want to show how good exegesis can inform a wide variety of issues; historians want to ground practices in longer histories; ministry professors want to link integration to the daily life of the church, etc. Part of our challenge is to recognize, honor, and yet also overcome our tendencies to use disciplinary lenses to make sense of inter- and non-disciplinary matters.

This bullet-list of insights hardly addresses all the questions we will need to answer upon completion of our project. It does, though, start us along that path.
Summary of Project Funded by Faculty Development Grant
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

Concordia Seminary’s ATS-grant-funded rubrics and assessment project has been an important, needed continuation of an emphasis on classroom assessment that began as a key faculty development initiative during our 2016-17 academic year. Our faculty began this emphasis in response to student feedback, gained from annual end-of-year surveys, that cited a need for improvement in receiving timely feedback from instructors.

Further, the Seminary, at the beginning of its 2017-18 academic year, introduced a revised Master of Divinity (M.Div.) curriculum after more than five years of planning, study and review. As this revised curriculum follows an outcomes-based design and assessment process, the Seminary also had a need for assessments of the many new assignments within the curriculum. Consequently, our project has had an overall goal of making the Seminary’s faculty more familiar with a variety of assessment techniques and the use of rubrics in classroom assessment.

Our project comprised two phases, with Stan Kruse, a Colorado State University instructional designer whom the Seminary previously had engaged, serving as guest facilitator. Mr. Kruse began each phase with a workshop presentation to our entire faculty on rubric construction. In the first phase, all faculty were engaged through their departments, and each of the four departments produced a rubric for department-specific course assignments that will become part of the student portfolios used in overall assessment. In the second phase, smaller teams of faculty members collaborated in writing rubrics for assignments that will be evaluated during our students’ vicarage (internship) year.

Concerning our project’s specific goals, the first was to keep our faculty focused on assessment in general, and in the use of rubrics in particular, as part of a learner-centered emphasis in instruction. The project’s second goal was to foster faculty collaboration and conversation concerning the assessment of assignments that transcend a single course or department and to create rubrics that could be used successfully by others, including non-faculty supervisors, in assessing those assignments.

We achieved both goals to an acceptable level. Concerning the first phase, all of our faculty members, as noted, were engaged through their departments, and all of the phase’s rubrics were completed. Seventy percent of our faculty and 75 percent of our instructional staff attended the plenary sessions. In the second phase, our project’s smaller teams engaged 35 percent of the faculty. This phase’s rubrics still are in process, but we expect them to be completed by the end of this academic year.

This project has been very beneficial for our faculty, and the improvements that its activities will bring about will be of considerable benefit to our students and the overall quality of their formation for pastoral ministry. The project has been an opportunity to improve instruction by encouraging more frequent and more helpful evaluations of students by instructors. Its plenary presentations have emphasized to our faculty how rubrics can support clear and frequent feedback to students as part of formative assessment.
In addition, given that our students during their vicarage years are evaluated by on-site supervisors rather than by faculty members, this project will lead to added beneficial assessment during their vicarages. The project has provided us the opportunity to give these supervisors the tools they need to perform evaluations in the form of a faculty-constructed rubric for each assignment.

Concerning learnings from our work on the project, we found that the Seminary has a larger than anticipated number of faculty members who, through their own study and practice, already have developed a certain expertise in writing rubrics. Further, we noted that our faculty seem to be above average in the number already using rubrics. These colleagues were extremely valuable in processing the workshops’ presentations and in writing the rubrics. We plan to build on this core of expertise within the faculty as we continue to roll out our revised curriculum.

In addition, we learned that encouraging the faculty concerning changes in instruction must be an ongoing process that clearly demonstrates the benefits of the change for the students. It must also recognize, and in some way reward, the work that faculty put into supporting such change by reviewing course assignments and writing rubrics.

Further, as we move ahead with new staff for our revised curriculum’s design and development department, it might be possible to provide staff support for the ongoing creation and use of rubrics. During our project, many of our faculty responded very positively to coaching in this area, and we believe we should sustain this in the future through our staff.

Lastly, as faculty are key to a revised curriculum’s success, we know that we must continue to invest in faculty development that supports excellent delivery of our revised curriculum in support of its outcomes. We plan to continue an emphasis begun some years ago to shift faculty toward a learner-centered model of education that has highlighted best practices in teaching and assessment. The activities supported by this ATS Faculty Development Grant have been a significant piece in our effort to create a faculty development culture in support of excellence in education.
As the title indicates, our project consisted of two distinct parts. The second part, concerning ongoing technology training, is nothing new at many ATS schools. While our online instruction is somewhat limited at the present time, it is expanding, especially in our Doctor of Ministry program. Thus, we continue to need more focused training for faculty. To that end, we have identified several faculty who are somewhat new to the online model of instruction and have enrolled them in a course on online teaching. Originally developed by the Wabash Center for Teaching and Learning in Religion and Theology, the online course has been reworked to focus on theological education in particular. It is offered by Virginia Theological Seminary in partnership with UW-Madison. We began the first round of instruction this spring, so it is too early to report any findings. Due to lower than expected costs, however, a second round of instruction for professors will begin in the fall, with an anticipated four additional faculty participating.

The first part of our grant has received considerably more attention during the past year. For several years we have been contemplating a shift in the role of the faculty from that of academic adviser to mentor of the students. Our M.Div. curriculum is fairly well set with limited electivity, which means that academic advising in the traditional sense is something of a moot point. What we have noted over the past few years is that our student body comes to us with increasingly varying experiences within the church and that what is needed more than advising is the guidance of a mentor. The grant appeared at just the right time by helping us focus on this new endeavor.

There have been two main components to the mentoring piece this year. First, we have set aside a two-hour block once each quarter to join in a campus-wide conversation. All students and faculty gather first for a 30-minute presentation by the seminary president on a topic related to student formation. Following the presentation, everyone moves to the dining hall where students gather at tables with their faculty mentors. While eating lunch, the mentor and mentees carry on a discussion of the president’s presentation.

Several learnings have emerged from this effort. First, giving the entire campus the opportunity to discuss a common topic provides rich opportunity for reflection. While students and faculty frequently engage in substantive discussion during the coffee hour after chapel each day as well as during lunch, there is a clear benefit in having the president set the tone, so to speak, for a common, collegial conversation. Second, each mentor has mentees from all three class levels, which means that the conversation brings together students of varying experiences. Thus, a
fourth-year student who has returned from his internship year is able to share insights that he
gained during his full-time experiences in a congregation. Even more surprising, at times, is for
that same fourth-year student to hear some insightful comments from a new student who has
only been at the seminary a few months. While the conversations required a little encouragement
of both students and faculty at first, most, if not all, have come to recognize how beneficial they
are and look forward to continuing them in the coming year with three new topics.

The second component to the mentoring effort has been the development of a careful plan by
which mentors will coordinate with the Dean of Students throughout the student’s time at the
seminary. We are aiming for two significant outcomes. The first pertains to student retention as
we develop a comprehensive plan to identify any impediments that a student might experience
while at the seminary that could impede progress in the program. The second concerns better
ways of ascertaining the suitability of students for ministry. To that end, we are working to be
much more intentional about advancing each student through the program, first to candidacy
status at the end of the first year, then readiness for internship at the end of the second year, and
finally readiness for certification and placement into the ministry after the fourth year of study.
Our goal is that we as a faculty are able to recommend without hesitation each student at the end
of the process.

One surprise in our work thus far is the clearer understanding we are gaining of the relationship
between the admissions process and student retention. Beginning with the new academic year in
the fall, we will consult our admission counselors as we assign faculty mentors. Since these
counselors know the new students the best prior to their arrival, our hope is that we can provide a
better match between mentor and mentee, even sharing with the mentors any concerns that they
should know about as they begin to get to know better their mentees. While taking all necessary
precautions regarding privacy, we believe this sharing of information will assist the faculty in
developing stronger relationships with their mentees and thus help them in their transition into
seminary life.
Title: Next Generation Online Teaching & Learning

Goals and Format

When Denver Seminary committed to fully-online degree programs, we employed a new model of online courses. These Next Generation courses promote active learning andragogy where students receive expert content from their professors then engage in weekly ILAs (Interactive Learning Activities). For instructors who are more accustomed to a lecture-based classroom, NextGen is a paradigm shift that requires new teaching skills and competencies.

Through our Communities of Practice, mentorships, and forums we aim to make progress on the following goals:
1. Increase faculty learning strategies and implement them in online course design
2. Develop instructional competencies for facilitating active learning with online students
3. Raise the overall adoption of NextGen andragogy among faculty
4. Raise the overall quality of the online learning experience
5. Prepare faculty to imagine and plan the next iteration of online course andragogy

Communities of Practice

“Communities of practice are groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly.”

– Wenger and Trayner

The standard formats for faculty development are seminars and in-services that provide new information and ideas for how instructors can improve their teaching skills. We found these methods to have limited, and we desired to implement a faculty development model that aligned with our instructional model. Communities of Practice prioritize just-in-time learning needs that emerge from the group rather than from a predetermined training session. The interpersonal dynamics of a COP bring the added benefit that they have the power to shift cultures and create change-momentum within organizations. We organized our Communities of Practice around two departments, Old Testament and New Testament, and one curriculum team.

Mentorships

In the course of an action research project, one of our instructional designers, Tim Rasmussen, found that many schools were also having great success with peer mentorships. We decided to offer mentorships to faculty who had little or no experience teaching online. One mentorship was professor-to-professor and the second mentorship experience was instructional designer-to-professor. A third commences this Summer with an instructional designer as the mentor.
**Crucial Issues & Questions Engaged**

The most important issues we address are almost always emotional or affective issues. They are the subtext of conversations. The COP and Mentor models both tacitly address the feelings of being alone, incompetent, and overwhelmed. These are the issues that, left unanswered, keep organizations from making progress in their change efforts. As Rabbi and Systems Thinker, Edwin Friedman, puts it: “As long as new innovations are focused on method and technique rather than the elements of emotional processes, all changes are doomed to recycle.”

On a more granular level, our COP and mentorships addressed the following issues: Evaluating learning activities and deciding what needs to be graded, time-saving workflows, facilitating synchronous sessions and threaded asynchronous learning activities, impacts and benefits of course customizations, instructor role and response to students sharing deep brokenness, consistency in grading and feedback, assessing the effectiveness of specific learning activities, using digital learning assets, online lecture development best practices

**Recommended Practices & Lessons Learned**

- We found that COP groups are most effective when organized around existing structures such as a department team or curriculum team.

- Optimal COP meeting frequency for our purposes is monthly for 1 hour and 30 minutes.

- Provide a COP agenda to help members prepare their thoughts. However, agendas should consist of questions that surface more immediate issues. E.g., Share one aspect of an online course that you are working on that you believe will impact student learning.

- COP members often referenced our Online Skills Mastery course during our meetings. The OSM course is a 5-week online training that is required for all instructors developing and teaching online courses at Denver Seminary. While by no means a necessary prerequisite for COP members, we found that it has been foundational and its benefits to be enduring.

- Encourage members to bring learning objects to share in the meeting. E.g., learning activity draft, link to course learning activity, or syllabus.

- We found mentorships to be highly effective in cases where professors are new to online learning. We recommend that mentors meet weekly or bi-weekly.

- Do not underestimate the effectiveness of providing meals during meetings, especially when meeting stretch beyond an hour. We have found a free lunch to be one of the most cost-effective ways to get buy-in, encourage attendance, and honor the work of our faculty.

- Mentors recommended that mentees first take our Online Teaching Orientation online course before beginning the mentor relationship. The OTO courses would serve to level-set understanding of basic concepts and establish a necessary common language.

- We have found that mentorships, COP groups, and sharing forums do not stand alone, but can work together as a mutually supportive system.
Cultivating and Measuring Innovative and Courageous Capacities in Theological Education

Faculty Development Grant Summary
Drew University Theological School

With the generous support of the Association of Theological School’s Faculty Development Grant, Drew Theological School planned and carried out a successful--and immensely generative--two-day faculty retreat that significantly furthered the Theological School’s current curriculum transformation project. We sought to introduce faculty to new pedagogical methodologies, inspire new content and courses, and create new assignment and assessment materials in connection with the School’s re-energized approach to theological education.

The intensive, two-day faculty retreat took place early in the fall semester. The retreat activities included:

- Work with a theological education consultant, Kenton Anderson, President of Northwest Baptist Theological Seminary and Professor of Homiletics, ACTS Seminaries of Trinity Western University, who shared his expertise in innovative pedagogical design for the graduate professional, particularly in the “mentored mastery in context” approach to Northwest’s experiment in competency-based theological education (CBTE).
- Workshops that generated a Drew-specific design framework and capacity-based assignments.
- Formal and informal faculty conversation around curriculum transformation as shared work of the Drew faculty and various partners within and outside of the theological school.

A key issue that we engaged in the retreat and the curricular work that followed was whether and how the insights of competency-based education could play a transformative role in our renovations of the traditional course-based program. The insights and energy from the retreat needed to pay forward into our work of finalizing student learning outcomes and developing new courses and rubrics for the campus-based Master of Divinity degree being implemented for launch in Fall 2018.

The retreat was organized in such a way that first established the broad principles “mentored mastery in contexts” and then put the faculty to work together in creating artifacts of these principles. In multiple round robin workshops faculty developed a “Drew Design Quad” and twelve distinctly Drew competencies. Developing material toward a Drew version of CBTE sparked our imaginations and energy for the next steps of implementing the revised Madison-based curriculum.

In many ways, the retreat was an experiment in the very kind of learning that we aspire to infuse throughout our curriculum. The new Drew curriculum aims to prepare students who are characterized by their capacity for improvisation anchored in tradition, and for problem-solving for real world solutions to enhance common good for all creation. The retreat workshops were
rooted in the Drew mission but largely improvisational insofar as the faculty are not experts in competency-based learning. Educators of teachers and engineers have long discussed how the best professionals have two kinds of expertise—one that can efficiently practice the routines of the field, and one that can adapt them to solve novel problems. Learning design focused on adaptive expertise suggests that the traditional routines of a field, in our case, are best taught after students are free to experiment and problem-solve. Through experimentation with a pedagogical framework completely different from traditional theological education, the faculty’s own adaptive capacity was increased. In the aftermath of the retreat, we saw more careful attention to student learning outcomes, principles of backward design, and building assignments and courses based in experimentation and problem-solving.

In this process, it is clearer to us that competency-based and course-based approaches to theological education are mutually exclusive from a design and delivery point of view. However, the emphases on contextual mentored mastery in CBTE has strong synergies with problem-based and student-centered learning in the traditional models. Thus engagement with one model proves to be generative for the other. For example, after the retreat, we revisited the learning outcomes developed for the new MDiv and multiplied them into a much longer list of competencies that resonate with the 27 competencies in Northwest’s Immerse program. This list provided a touchstone and resource for our more traditional work on the outcomes and assignments for the new mentored portfolio and the development of the integrative rooted courses in the campus-based MDiv.

**Insights from the project:**

- Consider unexpected partnerships. Hearing from different locations and about notably different approaches to common challenges promotes new alliances and divergent thinking that can create possibilities.
- For a faculty, curriculum transformation is often self-transformation. The approach to learning built into the process of curriculum revision is crucial to building the faculty imagination and capacity for change.
- How can experimentation and adaptation be more robustly built into accreditation standards? Can an organization effectively anticipate a true experiment (and petition for it well in advance) before the experimentation process itself? What nimbleness is required for curriculum innovation in the 21st century, and could that somehow be a part of the accreditation standards?

This ATS supported faculty retreat came at the beginning of the year in which the faculty began the work of implementing the curriculum transformation that had been conceptualized in the prior two-year process. The retreat was therefore a key element in the work of renovating the institutional culture around governance of curriculum and faculty development. As a result of the hands-on work at the retreat and in the curriculum implementation all year, the faculty has successfully constituted itself for the dynamic and ongoing work of curriculum review and adaptation.
Project Abstract
Duke Divinity School seeks faculty development grant funding to train faculty and instructional staff to better engage issues of race and identity in their classrooms and curricula. This project will consist of three components: (1) sending faculty to the Teaching for Equity Fellows Program at Duke University (TFE), (2) facilitating a retreat to share the benefits of the program with the wider faculty, and (3) developing a program by which the Teaching for Equity Fellows will train and equip doctoral students and other instructional staff to approach their own teaching and curriculum development in ways that promote the values and outcomes of the Fellows program. Together these efforts represent a comprehensive effort to positively influence course design and pedagogical practices to support more inclusive and equitable classrooms at Duke Divinity School.

Because the TFE was not opened for Duke professional school faculty participation in the current academic year (2017-18), Duke Divinity School obtained permission from ATS to carry the funding forward to the following academic year (2018-19) and to seek participation in the TFE at that time. In this report, we will simply share information about the Teaching for Equity program, anticipating a more complete report detailing results to be offered in the following year to the Association of Theological Schools.

The Program: Teaching for Equity
The Teaching for Equity program at Duke University is a year-long series of workshops that provide tools for addressing issues around identity, race and racism in classrooms across the University. Developed by the Duke Human Rights Center in the Franklin Humanities Institute, these workshops directly address issues raised by students—from all backgrounds—who report feeling at times isolated and marginalized in class. Over the course of the year, faculty fellows will become attuned to implicit assumptions about values, standards, and cultural norms attached to racial and other identities. And they will gain specific skills and strategies to create a classroom culture that benefits all our students.

Curriculum
The Teaching for Equity program is constituted by eight workshops, offered over the course of the academic year.

Foundations
The Foundations session will focus on establishing a framework for race equity, drawing from critical race theory and practice as well as guiding principles related to culturally relevant pedagogy. Borrowing heavily from proven approaches, concepts covered will include:

- The definition of race and racism;
- The history of the race construct and resistance to it;
- The institutional, cultural, and personal framework of both oppression and equity/justice;
- The power of internalizations in both oppression and equity/justice;
The pedagogical process for embedding issues of race, class, and gender in the classroom; and

The importance of relationship- and community-building in the classroom.

Participants will be encouraged to both participate in and observe the pedagogical design of these two and one-half days as an initial step in distinguishing the role of both pedagogical content and process. Participants will also be encouraged to reflect on the information presented and how it influences what and how they teach.

**Subsequent Workshops**

**September-November**

The next three sessions focus on the design of an anti-racist syllabus, learning more about student experience and classroom culture and developing skills in facilitation and classroom learning strategies. Participants will be given an opportunity to design and facilitate sample activities related to their teaching and research area. Learning and feedback will examine both curriculum content and teaching process. Opportunities for intersectional analysis will be explored. Participants can choose to work on their own, in pairs, or in small groups. Workshop faculty will play a consulting role throughout and will support participants in drawing out lessons learned.

**January-March**

The next three sessions will provide an opportunity to apply lessons learned, articulate specific next steps for piloting an equity/anti-racist lens into at least one course.

**April**

The final session will focus on program assessment designed to inform the fellowship program for the 2019-20 academic year.

**Outcomes of the TFE Program**

The Teaching for Equity program offers several benefits to faculty participants, including:

- Learning to integrate an identity and racial equity, power and privilege lens in the classroom, both in terms of curriculum content and pedagogical practice;
- Enhancing teaching abilities by building curricular design and discussion facilitation skills;
- Developing a deep awareness about student experience in Duke Divinity classrooms;
- Creating syllabi that promote successful learning for all students;
- Gaining a shared language and analytical framework about the dynamics of power, privilege and oppression;
- Participating in a cross-disciplinary faculty group that provides opportunities for collaboration and mutual support to practice integrating this lens into curriculum and classroom practice;
- Becoming part of a community of experienced and reflective practitioners who can lead and mentor others campus-wide

We look forward to fully engaging in this project in the year to come, and we offer our thanks to ATS for their support.
Between 2015 and 2018, Eden Theological Seminary has undertaken a major revision of its Master of Divinity curriculum. This is part of a larger, ongoing effort to revise the curricula of all of the school’s degree programs, including its Master of Theological Studies, Master of Arts in Professional Studies, and a Doctor of Ministry degrees, as well as developing new curricula for emerging programs such as our new Master of Community Leadership. In the course of discerning what kind of curricular goals would fit with Eden’s current mission statement and serve the current needs of church and society, the faculty wrestled with several pressing educational needs that call for particular attention in our current era. The first was the need for Eden graduates to be able to engage in conversation and collaboration with people of other faiths and no faith. The second was the need for our students to engage the church deeply and effectively in struggles for justice related to racism, as well as intersecting forms of oppression. The third was the need for Eden alumni to be creative and resilient in pursuing their vocational passion and sense of call in an era of fewer full-time ministry positions and new, emerging models of ministry. These needs were considered important enough that they should be named as curricular goals in Eden’s curriculum, and should be implemented as “infused curricular goals,” permeating all aspects of the M.Div. program.

When the opportunity arose to apply for an ATS faculty development grant, the faculty agreed that it would be helpful to consult with outside partners who could bring wisdom and expertise in the three areas addressed by the infused goals. The primary aims of the grant proposal were twofold: to gain insight into the capacities these partners thought would be needed by our graduates, and also to get their ideas about specific educational experiences and assessments that would help infuse these goals across our curriculum. We eventually settled on three groups:

- An interfaith group of religious leaders, together with staff from the Interfaith Partnership of Greater St. Louis. This included a rabbi, an imam, and a pastor who are all deeply involved in interfaith work, as well as the director of the Greater St. Louis Interfaith Partnership.

---

1“Eden Theological Seminary is called to strengthen the life of the church by educating women and men for ministry, enlivening critical reflection on faith, and supporting bold Christian discipleship.”
• A group of area artists and arts educators from neighboring Webster University and the University of Missouri St Louis, who have experience in the pursuit of artistic vocations without the benefit of long-term employment. This included a professional dancer and director of a St. Louis dance troupe, an author and professional musician, a professor of dance and choreography, a theatrical director and professor, and a professional actor turned professor.

• A group of regional activists and teachers who focus on racial equity and white privilege, together with staff from Metropolitan Congregations United, a St Louis area advocacy group that formed in the wake of the Ferguson uprising. (At the time of this writing, we are still finalizing participants and a date for this consultation.)

Each consultation included lunch and began with introductions and some storytelling about people who are models of the particular curricular goal being addressed. Discussion then moved through capacities our guests thought our students would need, then to curricular outcomes, and finally assessments. Attention was also given to how these goals might be infused across Eden’s program. Eden faculty members who attended the consultations were encouraged to listen first, and then join in the latter part of the discussion. The conversation was lively and generated plenty of ideas. Going forward, the wealth of information gathered from the consultations will be reduced to a manageable number of goals and harmonized with the format of our curricular design. After the third consultation has been completed, findings and recommendations will be shared with Eden’s Masters committee for discussion, adaptation, and implementation.

Feedback from faculty has been quite positive. The ATS grant provided the impetus for us to reach beyond the circle of our usual conversation partners and incorporate new ideas into our curricular design. We strongly recommend the kind of cross-fertilization we experienced by inviting into our curriculum design process people who work outside of theological education but who are deeply invested in similar goals. New relationships were forged in the process, making it likely that the fruits of our consultations will continue into the future. We look forward to incorporating the insights gained into our new curriculum, and the impact this work will have upon our students as they face new challenges and opportunities in the coming years.
In Fall 2018, the Vocation Formation Department at Fuller Seminary received a one-year Faculty Development grant. The overarching goal of this project was to equip seminary faculty from the three schools (Theology, Psychology, and Intercultural Studies) with reflective practices and community needed to teach and embody holistic formation of students in their courses. In addition, we wanted faculty to deepen their own understanding of their calling and consider how they are or could be sustained and shaped by God for their vocation. With this goal in mind, we created three peer-led faculty formation groups, a nine-month process in which faculty read about spiritual exercises, performed them both individually and communally, and reflected together on these experiences.

In their content and format, these groups bring faculty through key elements of the seminary’s core curriculum for many masters programs (i.e., our Integrative Studies courses). These courses assume each of us is invited to participate in God’s work in the world and that our habits and disciplines shape us for this vocation.

**Format of the Faculty Formation Groups:** These faculty groups were designed to focus specifically on spiritual formation, vocational reflection, and inter-disciplinary collaboration. Every faculty group included three components: 1) Monthly online content, featuring short videos, readings, and vocation formation exercises about particular Christian practices (45-50 min/week); 2) Monthly small group lunches to process learning from online content (1.5 hour per month); 3) Quarterly Retreats – one full-day, two overnight, and two half-day retreats to meet with God, pray, engage in spiritual practices, and enjoy friendship and fellowship. Faculty were required to participate in all aspects to receive a $900 stipend from the Provost’s office.

**Vocational Development, Spiritual Practices, and Disciplines:** Throughout the 9-month process, faculty received emails inviting them to complete assignments related to their calling (e.g., an articulation of their participation in God’s mission in the world), specific Christian practices (e.g., lament, gratitude), and spiritual disciplines (e.g., Examen, developing a rule of life). Faculty also completed the StrengthsFinder questionnaire and spoke with a CoreClarity coach to explore their talents in light of their work as a professor.

**Example of overnight retreats:** Over the period of nine months, faculty met for two 2-day overnight retreats at a local retreat center, one half-day at a local arboretum, and one half day in downtown Los Angeles. In addition to times of silence, the retreats included facilitated discussions by our Executive Director of Vocation Formation and the Executive Director of Formation Groups, various expressions of prayer, scripture reading, and small group discussions.

**Other Learning Opportunities:** One particular learning activity was an urban "retreat" to listen for God in the midst of LA life. The faculty rode the metro to downtown LA to visit a religious non-profit organization that serves ex-gang members, and then a major religious center in LA. The faculty spent time engaging with God's presence and hope in the city of LA and utilized tools and Scripture to exegete the city and experience God's love for both people and place.

**Learning through the process:** The facilitator, small group leaders, and cohort leader reflected below on several key insights from this 9-month process.

- **Lowering Faculty Resistance:**
  
  "...resistance is normal for all people in a Formation process - but it was unique for faculty. It was more about definitions - related to world view and frames of academic reference."

  One of the central questions in creating this 9-month cohort experience was the extent to which faculty would embrace this radically different experience, which was far more about spiritual formation in a community, requiring honesty, vulnerability, and prayer. The faculty initially resisted the process due to vague definitions and framing; however, when the facilitator engaged the faculty in agreement/understanding around particular concepts (i.e. spiritual formation, vocation, practices, character formation) the resistance lowered and faculty freely participated.

1 In the core curriculum, we ask students to respond to the Central Integration Question (CIQ), “At this point in your Christian journey, how do you envision your call to God’s mission in the world?”
• Practice Over Ideology:
  o “Formation for faculty was fruitful by leaning into practice over ideology or theology. They needed a place to enact or embody all of
    their good thinking.”
  o “Faculty are eager to understand how it is they blend their life in academia with life at home, life in the community, life at church.”

The faculty found that these formation groups engaged a needed aspect of their life—a place to practice many
of the concepts that they embraced intellectually, but did not necessarily enact nor embody with others. The
faculty identified a common need to enact practices that form them as faculty who are also in a process of
Christian formation.

• Faculty are Lonely and Busy, and Desire Spiritual Learning Communities
  o “Faculty are profoundly lonely – and were deeply grateful for a community in which to admit their fears and struggles – as well as
    celebrate their work. Academia is a solitary calling – particularly the PhD process. Inviting them into the community of faith and
    practice was a gift.”
  o “We all require a safe place of confession, of sharing hopes and dreams, of lament, with others who will love us and encourage us.”

Faculty expressed factors such as loneliness, isolation, struggle, and busyness as serious challenges in their
vocational lives. Many faculty noted that they do not have safe places to express their challenges and fears with
others who share similar struggles. The regular practice and interaction within these small groups communities
of similar calling and faith was an encouragement and a gift to faculty.

---

**FACULTY FORMATION COHORT SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welcome Assignment</th>
<th>Send Assignment</th>
<th>Week One - Learn</th>
<th>Week Two - Practice</th>
<th>Week Three - Reflect</th>
<th>Week Four - Relate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RETREAT ONE</td>
<td>September 14 &amp; 15, 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Retreat Reflection</td>
<td>Sept 18</td>
<td>By Sept 24</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation of Calling (CIQ)</td>
<td>Oct 4 (sent)</td>
<td>By Oct 20</td>
<td>By Oct 27</td>
<td>By Nov 6</td>
<td>between Nov 6 &amp; 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Rule Of Life (ROL)</td>
<td>Nov 7</td>
<td>By Nov 17</td>
<td>By Dec 1</td>
<td>By Dec 8</td>
<td>between Dec 1 &amp; 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoreClarity/StrengthsFinder</td>
<td>Dec 4</td>
<td>By Dec 13 Assessment</td>
<td>13-30 Coaching Call</td>
<td>By Jan 7 Video</td>
<td>Discuss At Retreat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RETREAT TWO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January 12, 2018 (Half Day Retreat)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retreat Two Reflections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RETREAT THREE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>February 26, 2018 (Whole Day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revised CIQ/ROL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RETREAT FOUR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April 6, 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gratitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure &amp; Blessing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RETREAT FIVE**

| May 31 – June 1, 2018 |
Summary of ATS Faculty Development Grant Report
Grace Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, Indiana
“Developing Competent CBTE Faculty for Deploy”

Implementing a competency-based theological education (CBTE) model has been uncharted territory for Grace Theological Seminary’s (GTS) faculty. As a result, the need for faculty development was and continues to be substantial. The ATS Faculty Development grant has provided the resources necessary to make significant progress toward meeting this need.

The primary goal for this faculty development project has been to ensure that all GTS faculty have a functional understanding of the goals and best practices of CBTE. Ironically, this has required each faculty member to assume the posture of a student as they explore new pedagogical paradigms and practices. In order to achieve this goal, several faculty workshops have been scheduled.

- Half-day interactive workshop with CBE expert Charla Long on “Faculty Coaching”—an overview of the faculty role in CBE (December 2017).
- Half-day interactive workshop planned with the President of Sioux Falls Seminary, Greg Henson, on using the LMS to orient faculty and students to CBTE (Fall 2018)
- In 2019, additional opportunities to learn from experts and assess strengths and weaknesses will lead to further growth and proficiency.

An immediate benefit of this project has been the funding and accountability to pursue collaboration.

A crucial question for this project has been: “How does a small seminary with limited resources adopt CBTE best practices regarding the faculty role without utilizing a ‘fully – unbundled’ faculty?” In most successful CBE programs, the traditional roles of faculty are unbundled, meaning their responsibilities are partitioned and then delegated to a number of different individuals. At present, several administrators and support staff have provided assistance on the academic side of things, while in-context mentors assist the faculty in coaching students in ministry skills and spiritual growth. As Deploy grows, Grace will continue to evaluate the role of faculty and whether or not further unbundling is necessary.

The most significant challenge encountered in this project has been the steep learning curve that comes with shifting from a traditional, residential model to CBTE. The complexity of this paradigm shift has been compounded by the fact that Deploy faculty are concurrently teaching in residential, blended, and Deploy programs. While significant progress has been made in establishing a common understanding of CBTE among faculty, staff, and administration, work still remains. Grace would recommend that other schools work toward that same goal through internal and external collaboration. There is great benefit in sending faculty, staff, and administrators to the CBE Exchange, as well as engaging a consultant early in the CBTE journey. The CBE Exchange provides dozens of workshops specializing in every phase of CBE implementation from design to scalability, and offers invaluable insight to an institution’s key players who are tasked with implementation. Accessing these resources early and often will
strengthen CBTE programs and alleviate potential anxiety and confusion between faculty, staff, and administration caused by a lack of unified understanding of CBTE best practice.

Some of the most exciting aspects of Deploy are the potential for partnership with churches and ministry agencies to fill gaps in their current training programs, as well as to provide students with a contextualized learning experience. In offering Deploy, Grace has been able to remove some of the larger barriers preventing prospective students from pursuing seminary. Grace is also exploring how the resource modules (week-long intensives) within Deploy could solve some of the continuing education needs for lay-people who desire certificates or badges rather than a master’s degree. Equally exciting is the idea of using resource modules as a supplemental way for Deploy students to pursue informal specialization (e.g., intercultural studies, leadership, multi-cultural church planting, church administration, worship arts, etc.), as it relates to areas of professional interest or gaps in their current ministry training.

Some of the key practices that Grace has learned and would recommend to other institutions are: 1) Embrace collaboration: The collaborative spirit within the CBE/CBTE world is an incredible resource. Deploy is better and has launched more successfully as a result of collaboration. 2) Involve faculty and stakeholders early: Faculty have played as crucial of a role as the pastors and churches who helped shape the program. 3) Invite all institutional parties to the table: Given the complexity of establishing a new CBTE program, internal collaboration has been essential to fitting a square peg into a round hole. A CBTE task force should be created, and all relevant support departments should have a point person on that team. At Grace, this team has streamlined and strengthened CBTE decisions. Several months prior to launch, Grace held an “All Hands on Deck” meeting that included everyone intimately or remotely involved in Deploy so that the entire campus was moving in unity toward an effective launch. 4) Embrace a dynamic model: Just as technology must be updated regularly, so must effective CBTE programs. Support systems and curriculum should be regularly evaluated and modified, and teaching methods adapted to meet the emerging needs of constituents. 5) Strong execution and communication are essential: No one wants to buy a product that does not deliver on its promises. The Deploy team has worked hard to deliver the promised outcomes, and when obstacles arise, to respond with timely solutions. Communication has been the greatest need and challenge, internally and externally. In CBTE, there are so many people involved in the planning, implementation, maintenance, and growth of a program that clear pathways for communication are crucial to success. Similarly, most constituents require multiple conversations before they fully understand the nature of CBTE. A lack of clear, thoughtful communication will greatly hinder the successful launch of a CBTE program.

The Deploy program and the Faculty Development Grant Project have affirmed our desire to see ATS redevelop the Standards of Accreditation to include CBTE programs as an approved pathway of seminary education. The implications of this project and the implementation of Deploy are already bearing fruit in making theological education more accessible to students, and strengthening churches through equipping ministry leaders. Through Deploy, Grace Seminary has seen that innovation is essential to our survival and relevance as a training center for equipping and sending out those called to serve God among the nations.
The curricular and pedagogical life of the Iliff School of Theology has transformed dramatically over the last seven years with the implementation of our Journey Hybrid MDiv program. As this program has become a regular and integral part of the institutional life of Iliff, we have worked as a teaching and learning community to understand and develop best practices for online learning, translating the best of our residential teaching heritage to the online context and capturing the best of our online innovation for use in traditional classrooms. One of the teaching innovations with this program has been the investment in very brief gatherings of the entire learning community, both residential and nonresidential, during the mid-quarter “Gathering Days.” Rather than investing in longer intensives, we have worked productively with short-burst 8-hour in-residence days for each class, coupled with opportunities for community worship, social events, meals and community building. We are finding that this model has allowed us to build a vibrant cohort of students within the learning community without the downside of staying in class for days on end that comes with extended intensive courses.

As we have become increasingly invested in the design and delivery of hybrid and online courses, we have sought to measure and continuously improve the learning experience for students. A recent survey of our non-residential students polled their attitudes about Iliff’s curriculum and online delivery, and a major finding of that study was that the social presence of faculty in online courses was key to positive student experiences and learning outcomes. This matches what faculty have experienced and related anecdotally: that no matter how good the course design, there is an uncanny valley between digital presence and “the person” that is challenging to overcome in online pedagogy. We need to find ways to translate and convey faculty presence (and, for that matter, student social presence to one another) where bodies are not co-located.

To address this question of social presence in digital contexts, we engaged with Sean Michael Morris, a consultant from the Digital Pedagogy Labs. Morris, who has deep and long experience in imagining and crafting precisely the kinds of learning spaces we employ, provided an infusion of energy and creativity into Iliff’s pedagogical system. He helped us to think about how we model social presence—a sense of personhood—in our teaching online. To do this, we met three times with Morris, each part building on prior work:

1. A two day visit in April 2017, in which Morris helped Iliff faculty, adjuncts, students and staff to develop new vocabulary (critical digital pedagogy) and innovative frameworks (narrative module format) for our common work of teaching and learning in hybrid/online formats. This phase of our plan was funded by the Learning Lab at Iliff.
2. A month-long online institute during the summer months, in which 11 faculty and key adjuncts (those who teach 2-3 courses a year or key degree requirements) developed or redeveloped courses with an eye to creating and enhancing faculty social presence and interpersonal connection with students. These courses were presented to the entire full-time faculty during the annual faculty retreat in September of 2017 so that learnings from the summer institute could be shared with the entire faculty.
3. A final consultation and debrief with Morris in the fall of 2017, in which key insights from the prior two experiences were collected, reflected upon, and shared in the broader work of the faculty.

Key Learnings

Perhaps the most significant benefit gained by those faculty who participated was how much they learned by becoming online students. For many faculty in the class, this was their first chance to
take a course in Canvas in the student role. Many of us saw ourselves making similar mistakes to those of our students, coming to understand what it means to navigate someone else’s “intuitive” course design and to plan for work that may or may not make sense to us. Others experienced conflicts with other work we had on our plates and frustration with a strategy to wait until the last minute to release assignments for the next week creating conflicts with course events and other work responsibilities.

We were perhaps naively surprised by how much empathy for and insight into our students’ experiences was generated by being students ourselves. Additionally, being a student in a classroom where the professor was using very different teaching strategies in the same learning management system that we use to teach both raised awareness about our own “conventions” in teaching within that system and helped us assess their effectiveness and limitations in generating faculty social presence in new ways. Renewed attention to some pedagogical basics such as the function of the syllabus, forms of assessment, and how to frame discussions also allowed for development of important skills for those newer to the online environment and identified areas of improvement for others.

Another major benefit was the cross-fertilization of having adjunct, affiliate and full-time faculty working together for an extended period of time on pedagogical issues. The course discussions both on-topic and tangential involved a great deal of sharing of experiential wisdom and strategies for better teaching across divisions in faculty that sometimes are more heavily drawn. This cross-pollination of faculty experience and insight was named as truly transformative by several participants. The strengths of many of our adjunct and affiliate faculty who only teach in hybrid/online formats was allowed to shine through and impact the work of full-time faculty.

Key recommended practices that we learned in pursuing this project:
- Develop an online course within your LMS for new faculty teaching online to participate in as students, possibly with more seasoned faculty coming along side to increase the zone of proximal development. Having this opportunity available twice a year to help as an on-ramp for those new to teaching online and in your particular LMS could really improve faculty skill level in teaching.
- Opportunities for full-time and adjunct-faculty to learn together and to resource one another about teaching online is a cost-effective and community-building approach to faculty development.
- Good online teaching is just good teaching. Investing in basic instruction for faculty in course design may seem pedantic, but attention to the basics of syllabus function, assignment design, assessment forms, and shaping discussion questions brought everyone’s skill level up a notch.
- Being a student in an online class is essential to development as an online teacher, and can build empathy and awareness of adult learners.
- Narrative course design allows for the personal presence of faculty to help contextualize course materials and assignments and to build relationships between students and faculty, students and material.
- Recognizing your own community’s conventions for how you habitually use the LMS and being exposed to completely distinctive forms of course design within that LMS stimulates curiosity that is generative for taking course design to the next level.
April 30th, 2018

Mr. Stephen Graham
Senior Director, Programs & Services
Association of Theological Schools
10 Summit Park Dr.
Pittsburgh, PA 15275-1110

SUBJECT: Faculty Development Grant Report

Dear Mr. Graham,

The IFTM proposal sent to ATS for the Faculty Development Grant was accepted in June 2017. At the end of August 2017, a new senior management team was appointed where Mr. Jorge Pacheco, PSS, Director of Studies was promoted to Rector, and Mr. Diego Arfuch, PSS, was nominated as the new Director of Studies and took over the Faculty Project.

From Monday, October 16th to Thursday, October 19th, Mr. Arfuch and a professor, Fr. Jean-Philippe Auger participated in the World Conference on Online Learning: Teaching in The Digital Age – Re-Thinking Teaching & Learning, the 27th edition of the International Council for Open and Distance Education (ICDE) World Conference, organized and hosted by Contact North. The previous edition had been organized and hosted by the University of South Africa (UNISA) in Sun City, South Africa.

Our presence at this Conference enabled us to learn more on the Flipped Classroom method of teaching in the broader context of blended learning, by participating in different conferences and workshops. They reinforced our belief that blended learning is a positive influence because it offers more flexibility, allows to better adapt to the type of learning preferred by the student, and significantly encourages self-efficacy and classroom performance. Blended learning, especially Flipped Classroom, is a recognized approach that bears fruit in the University circles. Its introduction in a school such as IFTM, is primarily related to the efforts of senior management and faculty who see the immediate benefits of this teaching method, such as improving group dynamic in a classroom and the students’ individual performances.

With the Flipped Classroom method, the teachers’ role changes as they, at times, become observers as well as actors while the students become actors and not observers as before. The biggest challenge is not the students, but the teachers, as their collaboration with everyone involved is essential.
Fr. Auger and I asked ourselves how to think “technology at the service of learning”. Especially with regards as to how IFTM can support the teachers in developing a new course and putting it online, or making changes to actual courses.

After the Conference, we met with Faculty to see what their level of interest was, we reconsidered the need to buy a distance learning platform (Canvas) as specified in the budget sent with the initial proposal, since we already had one (Via) and at the time thought that Via could not be used for the Flipped Classroom teaching method, and we also evaluated our classrooms’ setup and equipment. We then concentrated on which direction the project should be headed rather than continuing with our initial proposal. In November 2017, we sent a letter to Mr. Stephen Graham, ATS Senior Director of Programs and Services, asking to re-allocate, if possible, part of our fund initially earmarked for the Canvas platform. Our intention was to equip at least one classroom with high quality technology. Mr. Graham accepted our request and we now have a classroom equipped with an interactive projector, a porcelain magnetic whiteboard, a wide angle conference camera and a lapel microphone, all of which were installed during the December break.

Also in December, we started collaborating with the Association for the Educational Application of Computer Technology at the Post-Secondary Level (APOP), a nonprofit professional association, established in 1982, who works to promote the pedagogical integration of Information Technology into teaching and learning. For 35 years now, hundreds of volunteers, through their professional contributions and willingness to support its goals, have made the use of IT for academic purposes a reality in Québec’s Colleges and Universities.

At the January faculty assembly, we presented the modified project on the Flipped Classroom method and informed the professors that we were in the process of organizing a basic training session on how to use our Via distance learning platform. On February 19th and 20th, twelve directors and professors participated in the Via training session given by APOP. They learned its basic functionality such as how to use the camera, the microphone, the speakers, etc. but also how to work in groups, upload various types of documents, write on the whiteboard, prepare surveys, give exams, etc. The feedback from all was positive. A virtual class was created so that they could practice what they had learned.

In March, we asked APOP to prepare a detailed Flipped Classroom training plan (see annex) for those willing to learn more on this method of teaching. We initially wanted to offer it in April but, mostly because we were during the exams period, the professors and the directors who also teach were not available.

We are now halfway through the project. The next faculty assembly is scheduled for early September where we will notify the professors of the new dates for the training.

Sincerest regards,

Diego Arfuch, PSS
Director of Studies
ATS Faculty Development Grant Summary

Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary
Teaching Restorative Justice for Ministry
Scott C. Williamson, Project Director
May 11, 2018

Abstract:

Faculty development is an integral part of a larger project that Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary has proposed for receipt of an ATS Innovation Grant, “Restorative Justice for Ministry.” We envision Louisville Seminary as a center for educating and resourcing congregational ministers, chaplains, and therapists in restorative strategies for building just communities. If received, the complementary Faculty Development grant will fund the design and implementation of new courses and curricular tracks in Restorative Justice, and the purchase of library resources to support the project. (The new courses and tracks complement the larger project but could be developed independently of it.) Restorative Justice for Ministry is a project that will make the city our campus and invest deeply in face-to-face meetings in local churches, and as such will serve as a model for other residential seminaries and divinity schools seeking to enhance their relevance to the church and recognition within their communities.

Primary goals:

The grant will enable us to accomplish three focused initiatives:

Initiative 1: Develop three new courses that will integrate RJ theory and practice with particular academic disciplines for the purpose of educating ministers and therapists who are competent and knowledgeable about RJ.

Initiative 2: Schedule a half-day training session for faculty in January 2018 to bring them up to date on the progress of the Restorative Justice for Ministry project. The session will be fully funded by the Indiana Center for Congregations, of which Louisville Seminary is a supported organization.

Initiative 3: Purchase relevant books on RJ-related topics, along with other instructional items (including videos) for the campus library, to resource faculty and students as they implement this new curricular emphasis.

Benefit for LPTS and other schools: One of the primary benefits for LPTS is that the project enables a small seminary to experiment with the integration of models of course development, faculty development, and curriculum development. A successful hybrid model requires the cultivation of shared research and teaching interests, faculty buy-in, peer learning, collaboration with students and faculty, and ongoing quality assessment and course evaluation.
**Insights and innovative ideas:**

- This model attends to the mutual development of courses, faculty, and curriculum.
- The ATS Faculty Development Grant was essential to the cultivation of faculty buy-in for an emphasis in restorative justice. Were it not for the grant that we received, LPTS faculty would not have created the space to discuss the development of an emphasis in restorative justice. Filling gaps in the curriculum, curriculum review, accreditation, and changes in administrative personnel are active and ongoing concerns. The grant created space for a constructive conversation, and ultimately for a new curricular emphasis.

**Recommended practices:**

The key insight that I learned in pursuing this project is that a collaborative process can illuminate the interrelationship between courses, faculty, and curriculum, and advance their mutual development.

The practice that I developed in accordance with my insight is a practice that integrates a faculty development model with a student-centered learning model. The faculty development model uses the following program designs: self-teaching, peer mentoring, collaborative course design, quality assurance evaluation, and the development of a community of practice (Dittmar & McCracken, 2012). The student-centered learning model is dedicated to the proposition that learners are co-creators in the teaching and learning process. Further, learners should have voice in what they learn, how they learn, and how their learning is assessed. Instructors should encourage discovery, peer learning, and motivate learner participation. The student-centered learning model uses the following program designs: learner individualization, learner interaction, and learner integration of prior and new learning (Moffett & Wagner, 1992).
Forming Faculty for Integrated Ministerial Formation

Faculty Development Grant 2-Page Summary
Institute of Pastoral Studies
Loyola University Chicago

The Project:

Formation is a critical co-curricular component of excellence in ministry education. The Association of Theological Schools—throughout its Degree Standards—presumes that high quality theological ministerial education incorporates opportunities for personal and spiritual formation. Such formation focuses on "growth in personal faith, emotional maturity, moral integrity, and public witness," by developing a variety of personal capacities required for a life of pastoral leadership: "intellectual and affective, individual and corporate, ecclesial and public" (Standard A.2.4).

In Spring 2015, the IPS faculty approved as a Major Initiative in its 2020 strategic plan:

*Develop and implement an innovative and nationally-recognized integrated formation program for students and faculty that includes intercultural competency.*

A first step in this multi-year process is to engage faculty in attending to their own "total formation." While intellectual formation is a strength among IPS faculty, their human formation is often presumed rather than attended to explicitly; pastoral formation across a faculty hailing from highly academic theological programs can often be uneven; and the structure of the academy—even in schools of ministry—presents challenges to faculty in understanding spiritual formation as part of their professional work of teaching and forming people for ministry.

In order to develop and implement the formation program envisaged in its strategic plan, the IPS faculty must lead by example. By attending to their own formation faculty will they be able to sustain a robust formation program for their students.

Goals

Primary goal: Develop and implement an innovative and nationally recognized integrated formation program for students and faculty that includes intercultural competency.

Immediate goal: Detail steps for building a culture of formation at the IPS by conducting research and engaging faculty in their own personal and spiritual formation.
Activities:

- August 14-15, 2017: Opening faculty retreat at the Chicago Cenacle Retreat and Conference Center facilitated by Frederick W. Schmidt, Ph.D. Rueben P. Job Associate Professor of Spiritual Formation, Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary.

- September 2017 through April 2018: Hour-long monthly faculty formation meetings in which faculty members reflected theologically on shared readings chosen by them at the conclusion of the August 2017 retreat.

- December 30, 2017: Dr. Timone Davis concluded her research on peer schools’ best practices in faculty and student formation. She emailed a report of her findings to IPS faculty for their review (Attachment: SHAPING THE WHOLE PERSON).

- January 31, 2018: Faculty met and participated in a 2-hour focused discussion regarding Dr. Timone Davis’s research findings.

- May 9, 2018: Closing faculty retreat facilitated by Frederick W. Schmidt, Ph.D. Rueben P. Job Associate Professor of Spiritual Formation, Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary.

Key Learnings:

1. Faculty formation is of critical importance overall to the mission of IPS and is as important as student formation. IPS has always been committed to the intellectual formation of students. We desire to institute a more holistic approach of tending to the personal and professional formation of students as well, so IPS is committed to providing excellent spiritual formation too. Spiritual formation not only enhances the faculty’s own faith experience and practice, but it has the potential to inspire and deepen the spiritual life and practice of students when we enthusiastically share the meaning and purpose of our faith and spiritual life practices with them. We become living examples of what it means to be faithful in our relationship with God and others. By doing so, we invite students to reflect on the meaning and purpose of their faith and spiritual life for their own enrichment and in consideration of how they can be of service to their community.

2. Creating the space and scheduling the time for meaningful sharing on the part of faculty is a sine qua non. We also learned that though not all faculty are churchgoers, all faculty have rich and fruitful spiritual lives rooted in religious tradition. Each of us, in our own way, live fulfilling lives of purpose and meaning. We are all the richer for sharing our gifts and passion for living with each other and helping each other realize our full potential individually and collectively.
Luther Seminary
ATS FACULTY DEVELOPMENT GRANT PROJECT REPORT

Laurel Forsgren | Dr. Amy Marga, Faculty | Dr. Dirk Lange, Dean
Project Abstract:
Luther Seminary is exploring the next iteration of online teaching. We have seen an increase in residential students attending fully online courses with distance learners. We have recently included several courses offered in a hyflex format. In the hyflex format, we stream content with residential and virtual students participating synchronously and/or asynchronously. This helps us achieve our goals of making our courses accessible to students in ministry across the country. The most common challenge in these online courses is its ability to create community among learners and leaders who participate in different modes within the same course. September 2018, we will pilot a new model for our courses that blends intensive residential learning with online components. We will examine whether this forms community among residential and distance learners in new ways.

This project will help faculty build community within the online classroom through discussion groups and conversations with experts in the field. The goal is to build expertise in a small group of faculty/staff for ongoing coaching and development of their peers, specifically by developing a checklist of pedagogical tools to leverage in the classroom.

Primary Goals:
The primary goals of this project include:
1. Develop a group of faculty’s knowledge and expertise around building community in the online classroom and supporting student formation through readings and small group discussions
2. Faculty will review and discuss online pedagogy and community building with their peers and Dr. Meri MacLeod, online learning consultant
3. Faculty will incorporate (or plan to incorporate) a new activity or technique to improve online course community and overall student learning
4. Faculty will foster a sense of community and scholarly inquiry around online pedagogy and community building
5. The project activities will equip a small group of faculty for ongoing coaching and development of their peers, specifically by developing a checklist of pedagogical and technological tools to leverage in the classroom

Attaining Project Goals:
1. We developed a book list for small group discussion with two faculty additions. One of these books, Minds Online, proved to be a powerful discussion tool that other faculty are now asking to read. At our final plenary, faculty shared a variety of learnings from their readings and discussions.
2. One of our small groups decided to share their online courses with each other for peer review. The small group members were able to freely question and affirm one another’s course design, and several borrowed ideas from each other for future implementation.
3. Our consultant, Dr. Meri MacLeod was an excellent facilitator for discussion and faculty freely opened up to her and to each other. Faculty preferred to meet with her as a large group (vs. one on one).
4. Faculty incorporated new community building techniques:
   • Students were asked to create a local field report/case study within their context to share with the group. Students incorporated visuals into their presentation. Maps,
photos, videos and other visuals were used to convey messages. This approached piqued student interest in each other’s projects more so than a written narrative

- Students were asked to share image artifacts on a topic/concept. Artifacts were collected by the instructor and rotated weekly on the course homepage with information from the student. This provided more dialogue for the entire class and community engagement.
- Faculty incorporated course design tools with inspiring visuals, creating a more welcoming online environment
- Existing and new ideas are being incorporated into a pedagogical resource for faculty

5. Faculty also expressed ideas and next steps to improve pedagogy overall:

- Cutting down on readings and chunking videos better
- Introduce online elements into residential courses
- Wider variety of assignments (interactive, groups, etc.)
- Will incorporate new types of community building beyond simply answering posts in small groups
- Provide more time for students to see each other and share with each other

**Next steps:**

Our faculty fully engaged in this endeavor and their energy and enthusiasm was contagious. The group has expressed interest to continue our conversations – especially as we consider course redesigns. We will continue dialogue throughout the summer and some of our faculty will continue in the project by attending the Distance Learning Conference in Madison, WI. We will also remain in touch with Dr. MacLeod over the summer as needed. Faculty have demonstrated that they are committed to this work. Moving forward, we will need to explore how to provide them with the time and resources to build upon what we have achieved with this project. We recognize that our faculty have decades of experience teaching online. With enough support, we can build upon these experiences and serve as a resource to the greater community.
Meadville Lombard Theological School
Global Pedagogy for a Global Educational Model
ATS Faculty Development Grant Report

Meadville Lombard Theological School’s [MLTS] mission has been globally oriented from the beginning. Originally founded to train ministers to serve congregations in the “West” (the frontier beyond the east coast US), MLTS is now poised to train religious leaders throughout the world. Our geographical setting in Chicago (a cosmopolitan crossroads in the Midwest, a city where worlds and religions intersect) and our low-residency educational model make our degree programs more accessible to increasing numbers of international students. To support them, as well as to prepare our domestic students for religious leadership in a globalizing world, we have used our ATS grants (Faculty Development and Educational Innovation) to begin to develop a comprehensive internationalization strategy. We were guided by a shared understanding of internationalization strategy as a process that is:

- Comprehensive (infused throughout all functions of the institution)
- Directly connected to our Anti-racism/Anti-oppression/Multicultural mission
- Not an “add-on” but core to the historical mission of the school as well as its current identity
- Transformational. A process that changes not only international partners and students but the institution itself, from its curriculum to its administrative operations

GOALS AND IMPLEMENTATION:

The broad purpose of our Faculty Development project was to help our faculty to cultivate the intercultural mindsets and skills necessary to teaching in a global learning community. In support of this broad purpose, our project included three primary activities that served as a container for an intentional cultural change in Meadville Lombard:

a) Two members of our faculty attended the Distance Teaching and Learning Conference offered by University of Wisconsin. This experience resulted in three changes: a) the development and implementation of a Universally Designed Syllabus template (which makes interpreting syllabi easier for international students, ESL students, and students with learning disabilities); b) establishing policy recommendations that will make course bibliographies more accessible to international students (e.g. more e-book readings, downloading article PDFs onto USB drives); c) the exploration of new teaching/learning communications platforms more suitable to international students (e.g., WhatsApp).

b) One faculty member and the Director of International Formation and Recruitment participated in an Intercultural Development Inventory Seminar (IDI, LLC). Since receiving this training, the QA’s have tested our core and four affiliate faculty members and helped them to move forward on a plan of continuing development. Now, we are developing a multi-year plan to fully integrate intercultural development competences and the IDI evaluation and tracking into every level of institutional life.

c) In April 2018, we hosted a two-day Integrative Retreat with our core and affiliate faculty members to discuss what we have learned about internationalization through the year and to plan how to move that learning forward into a comprehensive internationalization strategy. During our first day together, we heard how the core faculty worked on their intercultural skills while meeting with international partners, reconnected with the global history of Meadville Lombard, and reflected on the stories we heard from our international stakeholders. This discussion gave us the grounding we needed to map, during the second day, how we could respond to the needs of liberal global religious leaders.
LEARNINGS:

More intentionality:

One of our most valuable learnings was that our first step to deepen our work with international students is to be more intentional about what we’re already doing. A deeper formation experience for our international students will require us to be more deliberate about every phase of their educational experience. For example, by making our pedagogy more explicit (explaining the theories that support our approaches to teaching and learning) and lifting up and enabling co-curricular and extra-curricular learning opportunities.

The Practice of Listening:

We learned the importance of intentional listening. We have focused more on what we have to teach international communities and less on what we need to learn from them. We need to shift from a transactional to a mutually transformational approach to international teaching/learning.

It was in the conversation with our international partners that we became aware of our “liberal exceptionalism” and US ethnocentrism. Being well trained in US racial discussions does not mean that we are interculturally competent or attuned to international issues. This learning is already shaping the content of our core classes and the way faculty engage class discussions and most importantly has helped us to recognize that our commitment is to better serve our international community but also to form religious leaders who have the skills to respond to the challenges and opportunities of today’s globalize world.

We also need to create intentional space and time to get feedback from our international students as a group. It will help us to respond in real-time and longer-term to their needs. For example, through focus-group work with our students, we are beginning to learn best practices and guidelines for technology use in other countries.

The practice of listening to our partners and students has shaped the way we see ourselves in the global context of Unitarians, Universalists, and Unitarians Universalists. It is also transforming our relationship with international partners, which is now allowing us to be more creative and inclusive as we fulfill our mission to form religious leaders who serve from the values of justice, equity, and compassion.

Intercultural Development:

Working with the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) helped us to see the gap between our perceived institutional intercultural development and our actual institutional intercultural development. We have identified where and how our faculty needs to grow in intercultural competency.

Through the intentional practice of acquiring intercultural skills, we started to see international education from the perspective of those who benefit from it. Global education is not a product that the school creates; instead, its impact lays in how it creates value for religious communities and leaders. Actually, discovering our ethnocentric liberal exceptionalism was an invaluable learning opportunity for us. Ongoing work with IDI, among other initiatives, will help us to recontextualize this.

International Education in a Theological School:

Theological schools need to develop our own models for international education. Attempting to replicate what works for larger universities is inappropriate. As theological schools, we are committed to the importance of the social, emotional, and spiritual formation of religious leaders. We understand that learning in our schools does not happen only in the classroom. It happens within cultural and emotional contexts.
We had three goals for our faculty development grant project: a. Support faculty in developing and offering hybrid classes; b. Create on-campus resource for developing and offering hybrid classes; c. Create support for further expansion of hybrid courses within the course offerings and degree programs at Memphis Theological Seminary.

Each of the three goals listed for the project were attained. The four faculty members (and others) developed and offered hybrid courses so that there was a total of seven hybrid courses offered in spring 2017. The fall of 2017 was used to do the work of development, which included regular meetings to share pedagogical and practical information/resources for developing the courses. The cohort of faculty in the grant provided a catalyst for other faculty to join in developing such courses.

Also contributing to this growth was the development of an on-campus resource center: Working with the Director of the Library, books addressing developing hybrid or other forms of online courses were purchased and displayed in a faculty section of the library. Additionally, other books were purchased specifically for the use of the faculty directly involved with the project.

The increase in offering of hybrid courses led to support for further expansion of hybrid courses at MTS: The faculty moved to approve the offering of our MDiv degree through hybrid courses. This ATS Faculty Development Grant was instrumental in moving us forward to offering hybrid courses and perhaps opening the door to fully online courses. By having four faculty participate (out of a total of 14 faculty) along with a few others who had experience in offering online or hybrid courses, we finally moved forward with hybrid courses as a regular offering in our class schedules and the MDiv degree program. This perhaps underlines the importance of starting with an enthusiastic and dedicated cohort of faculty to launch hybrid education at the school.

The most crucial issue the project engaged involved the pedagogical challenges of moving from the sage on stage pedagogy typical of face to face teaching to being a facilitator of online work, and figuring out which approaches to online interaction with students would work best. Knowing what we know now we should have also moved to have faculty either participate on online courses related to such pedagogical development and/or drawn upon some local resources (a nearby university) for consulting in this area. This is what we will be doing going forward.

Faculty involved in teaching the hybrid courses reported that the amount of time to effectively teach these courses was greater than their traditional courses. We are still discussing if this is a result of engaging in new pedagogical approaches, trying something new, or if it is typical of a hybrid class. Whatever the case, the developing and offering of hybrid courses, at least in the beginning requires more faculty time and energy than a regular/traditional course face to face. This may have implications for course load going forward once we get more experience with the offering of hybrid courses.

Another major issue raised was that the preparation of students for hybrid classes was inadequate. We did not anticipate fully the need for direct orientation for students who would be engaging in these classes so that they clearly knew the expectations and realized that the intensives on campus were not negotiable in terms of attendance and participation. We are developing an orientation for students who will be taking hybrid classes, and also sharing
information more broadly with all students so that they are aware of the special demands of taking a hybrid class.

It was student preparation (or the lack thereof) for the demands of taking a hybrid course coupled with related pedagogical challenges that shaped most of the faculty recommendations coming from teaching these courses.

One faculty member wrote, “The most important lesson I’ve learned is that instructors need to be very clear with students that this class requires weekly engagement and assignments cannot just be done in a “chunk” at the student’s convenience. To that end, it is very important that instructors have assignments that require student interaction each week. I would also encourage instructors to generally make assignments due at the same time each week to give students a basic consistency. I also found that quizzes were more effective than discussion assignments in holding students directly accountable for reading assignments and interaction with online videos. I started requiring both quizzes and discussion interaction each week. I’ve also learned is that, ideally, online videos recorded should be shorter and more focused than a typical classroom lesson. This is not always possible and I hope to work more on it in future hybrid courses.”

A second faculty member observed, “Detailed planning is key. With an in-person course, there are some places where the syllabus can offer flexibility to plan content as the course meets, but with hybrid, it's key to have all of those details nailed down before the course even starts. Students get “clicky” into the course and open up things you aren't necessarily ready for them to see, and if you don't have a strong game plan, it can go badly quickly. It's also important to stay engaged with the Learning Management System daily to catch student concerns before they escalate and to intervene in discussion threads when necessary.”

A third major issue was the need for a clear statement of policies on hybrid courses within our Catalog so that the criteria for a hybrid course are clearly understood by faculty and students, and that the processes for proposing such courses and their assessment are clearly stated, understood, and practiced by faculty.

A fourth and final major issues was recognizing the need for additional training for faculty as they craft and offer hybrid courses. There is a direct need for ongoing consultation as faculty develop and offer these courses. We are currently exploring several options for further training by people/consultants with more experience in online/hybrid pedagogy and course design.

A Few Key Resources:
Sharon L. Miller and Christian Scharen, “(Not) Being There: Online Distance Theological Education,” Auburn Studies, 23 (Fall 2017), http://auburnseminary.org/report/not-being-there/
Arizona State University’s TeachOnline (http://teachonline.asu.edu)
Vanderbilt University’s Center for Teaching (https://cft.vanderbilt.edu)
Summary of Faculty Development Project for Multnomah Biblical Seminary

Description
Faculty-Pastor Learning Community for the Local Church – Created a learning community of seminary faculty and local area pastors for the purpose of listening to one another. For the faculty to hear from pastors about the needs of their congregation and the community they ministered to, and for pastors to hear about what the faculty were doing for their students to prepare them to serve the Church.

Goals
The primary aim for the faculty was/is to learn from the ministry leaders participating in the learning group about what they and the local church need from our seminary graduates (and seminary grads, in general).

A secondary outcome, a desired goal, was for the faculty and pastors to create opportunities to work together either in the classroom, at the seminary, or in a ministry setting of the church.

Activities
We had 4 meetings over the course of the academic year. The meeting locations were distributed throughout the metroplex to give pastors the opportunity to meet in the various areas that they are doing ministry, respectively. Each meeting was moderated by an outside facilitator to assist with the conversations faculty and pastors would be having.

The meeting times and agenda were structured such that the group would, over time, get to know one another (personally and their respective ministry call), identify and discuss ministry opportunity and challenges (in one’s respective context), describe perceptions of how the church could help the academy and vice versa, and discuss ways respective needs/wants could be met.

Features
To be honest, there was nothing that was particularly innovative about what we did. Perhaps the two distinguishing aspects of what we did that we think helped our project was: a) getting an outside facilitator to help guide the meetings and conversations along, and b) creating an atmosphere of humility and honesty that allowed the discussions to be candid and relational.

Key things learned
• Have the number of pastors outnumber the faculty. Unexpected conflicts and the priority of ministry affected pastor attendance and participation. A 2:1 to 3:1 ratio of pastors to faculty would be a good number for the meetings.
- Pastors and ministry leaders need a compelling reason to meet with faculty and do more than just talk. Financial or ministry resource incentives would be helpful.

- Pastors are looking for various ways to get training for their congregants, but what they want may not necessarily be advantageous to a seminary (at least based on our current approach to education). The amount of work and study the academy expects does not align very well with what people can commit to and/or is less than what the “academy” expects for a seminary-level class.

There may be a misalignment in what seminaries want (students seeking degrees or even a certificate) with what churches and congregants can provide (people who want to grow in their faith but they are not necessarily looking for the academic training offered).
Faculty Development Grant Summary  
Nazarene Theological Seminary  

Re-imagining Faculty’s Formative Engagement with Distance Students:  
A New Model for Residency

Abstract
Like many theological schools, NTS has responded to changes in culture, technology, and higher education by developing innovative course delivery systems. Recent assessment of NTS’ distance MDiv identified continued challenges for students, prompting NTS faculty to redesign its module and residency structure for distance MDiv students. The new structure will deepen interaction with faculty and other students, provide regular exposure to the main campus community in Kansas City, and more intentionally resource ongoing personal and communal spiritual formation. Additionally, the model—which we have named Convene—improves residency tracking, provides clearer course sequencing, and reduces ancillary costs for most distance students. The new structure represents a paradigm shift for the NTS learning community and demands significant faculty investment to ensure quality hybrid teaching, integrated experiential learning, and cross-discipline spiritual formation. The proposed grant will support essential faculty development and establish a structure of ongoing evaluation of NTS’ distance education.

Primary Goals
1. Faculty will:
   a. Plan and implement new and improved strategies for teaching and mentoring students
   b. Express ownership of and confidence in the new model of residency and formation for distance students
   c. Articulate an integration of spiritual formation with their vocation and discipline in theological education
   d. Experience improved relational connection with students
2. Students will:
   a. Consistently engage in spiritual formation practices and integrate with other aspects of the academic learning process
   b. Experience improved relational connection with students and faculty.

Activities
These goals were facilitated primarily through:
1. The implementation of Convene, a new model of residency for distance students at NTS consisting of four, one-week intensive, hybrid courses.
2. Two Faculty Development Workshops facilitated by Wabash on hybrid teaching and learning methods.
3. A spiritual formation sub-committee that planned and implemented the spiritual formation component of the one-week intensive.

Innovative Features:

- Each week of Convene provides face-to-face class time for three hybrid courses: two 3-hour courses in the theological disciplines and a 1-hour spiritual formation course. These sets were carefully considered to create cross-disciplinary discussions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1 (2017-18)</th>
<th>Relationships &amp; Ministry (3)</th>
<th>OT or NT Bible (3)</th>
<th>Sabbath/Jubilee (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 (2018-19)</td>
<td>Missional Theology (3)</td>
<td>Congregational Mission (3)</td>
<td>Prayer/Study (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 (2019-20)</td>
<td>Church History (3)</td>
<td>Bible in Context (3)</td>
<td>Fasting/Simplicity (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4 (2020-21)</td>
<td>Ecclesiology</td>
<td>Christian Ethics</td>
<td>Service/Community (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The schedule for the one-week residency incorporated the spiritual formation component (morning and evening prayers) and was centered on the one-day guided, formation experience. So, the focus of the residency was the student-student and faculty-student relationships through shared experience and spiritual practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thurs</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Morning Prayers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Morning Prayers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>Guided Retreat Day</td>
<td>Open Day for Worship &amp; Rest</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2</td>
<td>Class 2</td>
<td>Class 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Class 2</td>
<td>Class 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evening Prayers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evening Prayers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What Was Learned

- Program development for Convene created and opportunity for faculty to commit their attention to hybrid teaching and learning, which resulted in engagement and learning.
- Distance students can create substantive relationships with one another as well as faculty and staff through well-planned, asynchronous activities.
- It takes time to plan content that invites substantive interaction. The faculty and staff must be heavily invested in the process and excited to engage in the work.
- Online portions of each hybrid course cannot be designed to replace what would have taken place in the face-to-face sessions of a course
- Careful distinction should be made between orchestrating and dictating. Orchestrate courses and face-to-face intensive modules without dictating how participation should happen. The former creates opportunity for spontaneity and genuine student participation; the latter limits the potential for meaningful interaction and formation of relationships.
Northern Seminary’s project involves three primary goals for faculty development. This short summary reports on one of those goals: how to address multiculturalism in our classrooms and how to train students to address multiculturalism in their ministry contexts.

In January 2018, Northern held faculty seminars on multiculturalism led by Dr. Juan Martinez, Professor and Vice President for Diversity at Fuller Seminary and co-author of *Churches, Cultures, and Leadership: A Practical Theology of Congregations and Ethnicities* (InterVarsity, 2011). Northern’s faculty have discussed this multiculturalism in a retreat setting and have created a strategy plan for making our classroom and course content more diverse and relevant to students and ministry contexts of various cultures (see below).

**Summary of Learnings on Multiculturalism**

As theological faculty for a diverse and often international student body, many of whom will serve as pastors in cross-cultural settings, it was the privilege of the faculty at Northern Seminary to learn from Dr. Juan Martinez in the areas of leadership, ecclesiology, and worship in the context of ethnic and linguistic pluralism and multiculturalism. Dr. Martinez’s seminars, “Preparing People For Ministry in a Multicultural Environment” and “Thriving in a Culturally Diverse Classroom,” helped us to clarify and reinforce best practices in our churches and classrooms as well as engendering new theological and practical insights into cross-cultural communication for pastors and educators.

An important aspect of Dr. Martinez’s presentation was the foundational insight that different cultures **see the world differently**. This axiom is easily and readily affirmed but of course often difficult to incarnate in practice. Dr. Martinez made the point that our patterns of socialization naturally tend to inhibit our cross-cultural fluency because our culture “shapes [our] social identity in narrow and defensive ways.” Further complicating the cross-cultural encounter, we often perceive and characterize those of other cultures and ethnicities through the frame of stereotypes (often jokes), and as a corollary, we are conditioned to assume that our own culture is “normative and natural.”

Because Dr. Martinez was trained as a practical theologian and missiologist, he communicates a deep conviction that for effective multiculturalism and cross-cultural communication to reside in both the Church and the classroom, pastors and educators respectively must not be content as theoreticians but must instead become reflective practitioners. Dr. Martinez’s focus on praxis can be seen in a robust set of concrete recommendations for improving cross-cultural relationships and communication.
Recommendations & Practices

With respect to pastoral and ecclesiological praxis, the most basic ingredients are intentionality and maximizing the organic resource—the community itself. The pastor must possess a commitment to improving his or her cross-cultural competency and fostering constructive mutuality and harmony among constituent cultures in the church. The pastor should collect stories, both personal and ecclesial, from locals and members of the constituent cultures. On the personal level, individuals are empowered to give their own stories; collectively, we can narrate the journey of the congregation over time. Likewise, the process of making the Christian classroom a space of harmonious and constructive cross-culturality also depends on asking empathetic and reflective questions.

Dr. Martinez introduced a powerful Biblical and theological frame for discussing cross-cultural issues in the idea of the ‘slow conversion.’ Peter had a ‘slow conversion’ towards inclusion of the Gentiles in the Church because he had a strong conditioning toward Jewish superiority and about Greek-Jewish relations in general. Today, in the same measure, we harbor insidious conditioning about the ethnic and linguistic “Other” which prevents us from incarnating a Biblical vision of cross-cultural shalom. At a practical level again, Dr. Martinez counseled that if cross-cultural perspectives are to be shared effectively in a classroom setting, professors must strive to protect and perhaps amplify the perspectival voice of minority students. (If class discussion is routinely dominated by white males, for instance, all the white males could constitute one group in a group talk).

As the Church and the seminary continue forward into the 21st century, the issue of multiculturalism is, of course, not going away. Dr. Martinez’s work further reminds us that, while certain practices and frameworks ought to be in place to facilitate constructive collaboration and mitigate misunderstandings, cultural pluralism is not at its core a ‘problem’ to be solved. Rather, we can affirm that God intends a church that is multicultural, that is enhanced by the ethnolinguistic treasures of all the nations. The Biblical vision of cross-cultural shalom further entails that Christians dissolve the cultural and ethnolinguistic antagonisms which have, sadly, animated much of American Evangelical church life. Pastors and educators competent in the methods and frameworks presented by Dr. Martinez will have much to contribute in the coming years with respect to fostering churches and seminaries that are truly multicultural and cross-cultural in their respective domains of worship, governance, and instruction.
Appendix:
Northern Seminary
Lisle, IL
Strategies for Diverse Educational Experience

Under the larger umbrella of making our curriculum more diverse and relevant to diverse cultures, Northern’s faculty developed a strategic plan for improving the diversity of its curriculum involving these eight elements:

1. Faculty will commit to increasing the diversity of course materials. The Director of the Library will support and assist the faculty in selecting readings and other materials from a diverse range of voices.

2. The seminary will seek to increase the number of women and persons of ethnic minority on the faculty.

3. The faculty will be intentional about listening to the voices of all students in the classroom and understanding their diverse backgrounds and ministry contexts.

4. The faculty will seek to deliver a curriculum that is relevant and applicable to diverse cultural contexts, particularly those of ethnic minorities. Faculty will model cultural engagement and help students learn to apply knowledge and ministry skills to their own contexts.

5. The seminary will increase the number of courses that serve persons of ethnic minority, including, but not limited to, black studies and urban ministry.

6. Consider a new introductory course that gives students an orientation to the importance of diverse voices and a preview of where those voices appear in Northern’s curriculum. The course may involve multiple teachers, including guests, who will expose students to the diversity of Northern’s faculty.

7. Schedule Christian Heritage courses that bring together cohorts from different degree programs into the same classroom.

8. Develop better channels of student feedback about the curriculum.
Northwest Baptist Seminary

Reflections on Implementing a Competency-Based Theological Education M.Div. Program

Northwest Baptist Seminary is mindful of the unique role its leadership and faculty have played in the development of CBTE and desires to steward well its role to help other schools and faculties navigate this path. The ATS grant provided time and opportunity for NBS faculty and staff to distill the lessons learned in the collaborative development of the program. Our vision for the project involved two phases. First to retreat, allowing faculty and staff opportunity to reflect deeply on our journey, reframe our strategies, and re-“vision” the next steps for ongoing development of CBTE. Phase two is currently in process, as our leadership and faculty brings further clarity to what was learned and frames the lessons and principles to share with others.

Northwest defined these Immediate Goals for the project:

1. To distill the lessons learned from our collaboration with our Immerse partners with the purpose of assimilating the principles, procedures, systems and knowledge gained in the development and delivery of Immerse.
2. To distill those thoughts and reflections into a meaningful strategic construct to develop resources to use in consultation with other schools and organizations.
3. To identify the significant challenges as well as the resulting opportunities this model has presented, with particular focus on visioning pathways for faculty professional development in using this model.

Crucial Issues and Questions

One of our priority learning goals was to gain insight into the undercurrent of fears and concerns that is a natural part of introducing a disruptive model of programming to an established institutions systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Concerns</th>
<th>Leadership Concerns</th>
<th>Administrative Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Becoming a generalist vs a specialist</td>
<td>Institutional humility</td>
<td>No example to follow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable time commitment</td>
<td>Partnered Champions</td>
<td>Availability of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual formation</td>
<td>Aligned learning cultures</td>
<td>Training churches, mentors and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of academic control</td>
<td>Valuing the academic role</td>
<td>Grading and Record Keeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team approach to evaluation</td>
<td>New financial model</td>
<td>Transferability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varying standards</td>
<td>Board and constituency support</td>
<td>New Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Evaluation Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional credibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**School Learning Points**

One of the most significant learning moments grew from the question, “what convinced you?” It was obvious that while the program concerns are real and relevant, the positive gains realized in the Immerse program tipped the scales significantly toward the value of pursuing the CBTE model.

**Learning of Benefit for other schools in the Association?**

Northwest identified a number of encouraging outcomes in response to the question “what convinced you?”

- Combined Theory and Application
- Engaging Students at Depth
- Mentoring Team Partnerships
- Direct Connection to Churches
- Direct Connection to Pastors
- Developing Trust
- ATS Accreditation
- Validation and Adoption by others
- Seeing Students Develop
- Strong Leadership
- Confidence in the Graduates
- Continued Participation in ACTS Programs
- “Worth the Gain”

**Recommended Practices**

Advice to schools considering CBTE:

- Start wisely – get leadership support; identify program champions; initiate CBTE as a parallel, separate program; build on the work of others.
- Communicate – communicate widely; communicate frequently; communicate clearly.
- Re-think program design – distinguish between the CBTE philosophy and program model/content; collaborate on curriculum development; design for simplicity; develop a candidacy process.
- Plan carefully – know the systems you need; choose technology carefully; clarify the financial model; train and equip mentors; establish program supports; evaluate and iterate often.

**Conclusion**

Northwest is already deeply committed to expand and encourage a wide adoption of the CBTE methodology and has dedicated resources to this mission over many years. We believe that we have learned much that will be of value to other leadership, administrators and faculty who are making the paradigm shift in their schools, and in their personal practice. While many schools are currently focusing their immediate attention on the detail of “what and how” as they enter into the CBTE arena, we have sought to leverage the learning of Northwest’s faculty and administration to assist other networks and lead the way as the next stages of CBTE are envisioned.

Northwest has found itself in a unique position to learn from our past and prepare for our future. This project has enabled Northwest to make record of its experience through the process, focusing particular attention on the implications for faculty in transition and understanding the future opportunities that this model creates for creative response to the challenges of implementing the competency-based philosophy.
Executive Summary:
Design a Teacher Mentoring Program for Teaching a Culturally, Linguistically, and Theologically Diverse Population

Faculty Development Program (Grant Abstract)

Oblate School of Theology Faculty Development Program aims to design and implement a faculty development project to address two challenges that arise from the School’s diverse student population. The first challenge is teaching many second language students from Hispanic, African and Asian cultures along with fluent English speaking students. The second challenge derives from teaching students from many different Christian traditions and backgrounds. These challenges are made more complex for the professor because they all exist in the same classroom setting with students pursuing a variety of graduate degrees (M.Div., MA, and MAPM). We hope that faculty would benefit from additional training in both content and skill to address the needs of the students in these diverse classrooms.

Primary Goals: The primary goals of this project were:

To identify the ways Hispanic students, especially those from other countries, struggle with graduate learning within the US context.
To help faculty design and implement learning activities which could address these areas of struggle
To help faculty research materials in Spanish which students could use to complete their readings and assignments
To help faculty identify areas in their syllabi which could be challenging to non-Roman Catholic students
To strengthen syllabi content which would address Protestant theological issues.

What did the project attain of the goals listed:

We began the project at the Faculty Retreat by giving an overview of the proposal and using focus groups of faculty to clarify their perception of the challenges they face in the classrooms where they teach. The results showed the struggles in the area of linguistic ability include: limited English language ability-speaking and reading the theological texts, writing papers, following directions, and participation in class. The key areas of struggle for those students coming from other Christian denominations include difficulty with or fear of Roman Catholic perspectives/dogmas, culture, vocabulary, piety and different ways of approaching Scriptures. Thinking critically about theological issues, traditions, the meaning of faith pose a challenge for those students from faith traditions that usually do not encourage such.

Faculty has been asked to submit the titles of research materials in Spanish from their particular discipline to the librarian to assist students whose first language is Spanish. Acquisition of resources in Black Church Studies and Protestant theological issues also continues to be a priority. Faculty development in teaching and content support continues to take advantage of colloquia with scholars in various fields of African American theology, ministry, and history.
Hispanic scholars also provided colloquia for faculty each semester which has resulted in similar results. In both cases, the faculty response has been a greater openness to make needed changes in teaching strategies, classroom activities, required reading, course assignments, class discussions, and suggested resources for research.

**Insights, innovative ideas, or possibilities that have emerged:**

The development of a common theological language has proven to be a challenge. Faculty have worked to include time for developing a common language as courses begin or concepts are introduced.

The presence of African American Protestant students in the classroom with Catholic seminarians added yet another dimension of diversity. Already we had students from at least 14 different countries speaking at least six different languages including Spanish, Vietnamese, Tagalog, and Bengali. The conversations around race and mission became more concrete as students from a variety of backgrounds listened to one another. The hermeneutic involved in various communities began to become part of how we taught at OST. We think this is the unique factor. There is a hermeneutic in the life of the Christian community that interprets our understanding of faith. Having such a diversity of students and traditions in the room together creates a new hermeneutic that builds a new community.

**Some Key Recommended Practices**

- Students must be free to explore their distinctive tradition. Build assignments and readings that allow for broad-based participation. This requires work on the part of the faculty.
- Instructors have to become familiar with the traditions and practices of the students in their class. They have to be willing to ask students, “How does your tradition understand that?” They have to model the learning we want to see in the class.
- Language and cultural options are important. Allow students to work in their first language if at all possible while developing English proficiency.
- Faculty have to develop their knowledge of how faith is expressed in different cultures as well as how learning takes place in different cultures. Faculty development sessions on this are crucial.
- Possibilities are limited more by how we imagine things will work than by how they actually do. Imagine success and unity.

**Implications for Redevelopment of Standards of Accreditation**

As outlined, Standard 3, *The Theological Curriculum: Learning, Teaching, and Research*, does not need redevelopment as much as it needs attentiveness to those aspects of the Standard calling for recognition and sensitivity to the diversity of student populations. Teaching and learning methods would necessarily include a diversity of approaches and assessment tools. Course content, structure, classroom dynamics, and teaching methods should address the learning needs, and life experiences of the students in the classroom, the school, and the broader community served. Ongoing education and formation of teachers, students, and staff is needed:

> “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, the importance of communities of learning, and the instructional goals.” (Standard 3)
Project Description

Oklahoma Christian University’s (OC) Graduate School of Theology (GST) is engaged in developing an online M.A. in Christianity and Culture (MAC&C). This 36-hour degree program will be offered entirely online. In order to prepare our faculty for teaching in this program and to add distinction to the program, we proposed to our administration that all of our GST faculty be trained and certified in online teaching through the Online Learning Consortium’s (OLC) Institute for Professional Development. The administration fully supported this idea, but requested that seek a grant to offset the cost. We applied for and were awarded a Faculty Development grant from the ATS. A total of seven full-time faculty, all of whom will teach in the MAC&C, were enrolled in the OLC Online Teaching Certification.

Project Goals

- Faculty training and certification through OLC
- Following training and certification, carefully design, with the online learner in mind, online courses for the MAC&C that is in development
- Apply the principles and concepts learned from the OLC training to design intentionally the online program to include not only courses but also GST community events in order to allow for as much personal touch as is possible in an online context
- Partner with OC’s North Institute for Teaching and Learning, especially with the instructional design team and instructional technology expert, for further training and support
- As a result of the implementation of OLC training and an appropriately designed, student-centered course of study, increase enrollment in the GST and, thereby, increase revenue, yet without sacrificing academic quality or personal touch

Innovative Features & Activities: OLC Training and Certification

The OLC training and certification program that our faculty will complete includes three phases: (1) a ten week foundations course; (2) three electives (usually week-long workshops) that focus on area of emphasis (e.g., online learners, online instructional design, online teaching tools); (3) a capstone project & presentation, which is, typically, a course or instructional design project.
The ten week foundations course covers many topics and issues that are familiar to face-to-face teaching, including such things as syllabus and schedule design; yet, these items and issues are discussed and explored for an online context, which can change—sometimes quite significantly—they way they are designed and delivered. Other topics include: designing to foster and facilitate a community of learning in an online environment (including online human touch); design and delivery of course content for online environment (e.g., best practices in multimedia use); strategies and techniques for learning assessment in online context; content curation (i.e., not re-creating the wheel whenever possible); online discussion and other forms of engagement; accessibility requirements and tools to help meet them; and workload management.

Following the Foundations Course, each person must complete three electives. These are (typically) week-long intensive “bootcamps.” Trainees take electives that focus on the area of emphasis for which they are seeking certification: online learners, online design, online tools, or online management.

Finally, each of our faculty in this program will complete the final capstone project, which completes the certification process. OLC describes the capstone this way, “The Final Presentation consists of a synchronous, online presentation demonstrating the participant’s fully developed and/or revised online course, specific developed course components and a reflection of key learning points. This invitation-only presentation is attended by the participant’s mentor and is the capstone event for this program.”

Dr. Jim Dvorak  
Chair, Graduate School of Theology  
Oklahoma Christian University  
jim.dvorak@oc.edu
A three-year strategic plan approved by Pittsburgh Theological Seminary’s board in the spring of 2015 called for faculty to “review, reimagine, and reconfigure the curricula.” In response, during the 2016-17 academic year Pittsburgh Theological Seminary began its first major curriculum revision in decades. Prompted by the board’s planning and guided by the faculty’s recognition of the changing nature of the church, world, and theological education, PTS revisited the curriculum in all master-level programs. As part of the curriculum reconfiguration, we recognized a need for faculty to adapt not only courses but also pedagogy, academic calendars, delivery methods, and engagement with technology. Grant funds were used to hold a faculty development retreat in the summer of 2017 at which we finalized program level curricular details and outlined implementation plans for the 2017-18 academic year.

One of the innovative aspects of our curriculum revision has been that all faculty members, not just a sub-committee, have been involved throughout the curricula review and revision process. This extraordinary institutional commitment of time and resources began with a faculty development retreat in August 2016 followed by weekly faculty lunch meetings during the 2016-17 academic year that focused on our context and changes in theological education more broadly. Weekly gatherings deepened within the faculty commitment to – and knowledge of – needed changes and fostered a renewed collegiality that supported and strengthened decision-making. We punctuated weekly meetings with offsite, overnight retreats that enabled us to move through the work of curriculum revision with speed and focus.

The summer 2017 retreat supplemented prior two-day retreats in February and May 2017 and forms part of an overall program of faculty development in support of the seminary’s aim to “equip women and men in Christian vocations both on campus and beyond” (PTS Strategic Plan FY 2017-2020 Objective 3.1). The immediate goal of the summer retreat was to finalize details of the new curricula and to create an implementation and launch plan. The desired benefits of the project included: 1) equipping faculty members with strategies for new course development, 2) providing resources and information for using technology to deliver course materials, and 3) reinforcing a method of faculty development at PTS that involves the entire faculty in an atmosphere of shared teaching and learning. Altogether, our hope was that the summer retreat, as part of the larger curriculum revision, would pave the way for the next steps in curricular design and implementation and continue to model a process of cooperation and community engagement that best equips our students for service in Christian communities and the world.

Throughout the curriculum revision process, we followed a backwards design model. Five months of engagement in research projects about the theological landscape, curricular innovations at other schools, and the shifting nature of the church and world culminated in the February 2017 retreat where the faculty formulated student learning outcomes (SLOs). We then discerned the calendar, delivery methods, and course of study would help students achieve those SLOs. Those deliberations were informed by insight from alumni/ae, students, and staff, as well as conversations with administrators and faculty at approximately a dozen ATS-affiliated
institutions that have undertaken recent curriculum revisions. We defined the overall MDiv course of study at a May 2017 retreat and outlined core commitments for new two-year master’s degrees. By the summer 2017 retreat, the formal input process was complete and we had vetted student learning outcomes with key constituents.

The success of each stage of the curriculum revision has been measured rather quickly, including results of the summer 2017 faculty retreat. We left the retreat with specific course design and implementation plans for the 2017-18 academic year. In October 2017 we submitted petitions to ATS for two new master’s degrees. In November 2017 the faculty and administration presented to the Board of Directors the curricula for all master’s programs, proposed delivery methods, and a process for implementation. By that time, faculty course development teams were at work outlining the details of each of the 27 courses in the new MDiv curriculum and additional coursework for the new 2-year master’s degree courses.

What did we learn?
1) Clarity of process enables moving quickly. We made a conscious decision to move through curricular revision quickly, aware that this would require shared commitment alongside attention to timelines. Committing to weekly meetings, defining and sharing the research and planning work among the full faculty, and agreeing to checkpoints and delivery timelines helped us move toward a fall 2018 launch of the new curriculum. Having clear goals and objectives for retreats, including the summer 2017 retreat, helped keep us on track.

2) There is value in being away, together. Ongoing full-faculty involvement helped fuel and sustain the fast pace of the curriculum revision process and being away from campus created periods of needed intense focus alongside space for collegiality. This time together has helped shift faculty culture (for the good) as we’ve come to know more about each other’s pedagogical and other commitments. This insight will not only deepen our ability to teach the new curriculum well, but will also help us function more effectively as a full faculty in a wide variety of curricular, administrative, and other matters. Future faculty development opportunities will have this prior work as a base for growing a deeper, richer set of academic programs and fostering faithful and fulfilling vocations (individually and collectively.)

3) Even well-functioning systems can only handle so much change. We anticipated that the summer 2017 retreat would include attention to diversifying course delivery modes. What became clear during time together in August was that the amount of work that lay ahead to redesign every master’s level course and move from quarters to semesters would preclude other significant innovations. Though we had hoped to be ready for significantly diversified course delivery options with the 2018-19 launch of the new curriculum, we realized we lacked the capacity (and energy and resources) to change everything at once. Wholesale change in our delivery modes proved unachievable alongside redesign of every course, and we instead turned to a mode of research and experimentation that will inform future planning.

Altogether, the work of curriculum revision has been deeply significant for the PTS faculty and the institution as a whole. We’ve learned to work together in new ways. We’ve deepened our attentiveness to the variety of contexts in which the seminary engages and we are looking forward to launching a reconfigured curriculum this fall!
Gerald C. Liu, PhD
Assistant Professor of Worship and Preaching
Princeton Theological Seminary

Director’s Summary: Showing Our Faith with Artworks

Project description:

For the 2017-18 academic year, I, Gerald Liu, Princeton Theological Seminary (PTS), invited artists from Artworks of Trenton, New Jersey, into a set of extended lunchtime consultations with seminary faculty. The consultations were held on the campus of PTS and in the city of Trenton to imagine and plan two complementary, community-wide art projects to be installed in Princeton and Trenton. The theme is the celebration of the unlimited love of God available to people of all kinds. Artworks was originally based in Princeton. (The ultimate hope and key innovative feature of our project is that if the plan to develop installations is realized, administrators, faculty, students, staff, and neighborhood residents would take part in building the installations.)

The conversations are intended to incarnate a seminary-wide anti-racist dialogue from the last academic year – the 2016-17 Presidential Series on Race. With the Artworks consultations, we hoped not only to “talk” about how to forge community deeply knit by human difference and Christian faith, but to plan for “doing” what the school is now calling “covenant community” in the shared design and building of socially transformational public art.

Goals:

We have aimed to reach 2 primary goals by August 2018:

1. Sites selected in Princeton and Trenton for large-scale public arts projects.
   This goal is nearing complete. We have narrowed down possibilities to the following:

   Princeton:
   a) a utility building wall next door to the Princeton public library.
   b) somewhere on the seminary campus as part of the “master plan.”

   *The master plan is a multimillion-dollar campus infrastructure plan that will establish a framework for improvements to our facilities and dormitories to create a more cohesive and united learning ecology for students, faculty, and staff. Architectural renderings for the master plan exist. Designated master plan funding may be available by next academic year (2018-19). If the Artworks initiative is included in the master plan, one idea is to build an installation that acknowledges the transgressive history of the seminary’s relationship with slavery and looks forward into a new future of celebrating the human differences of God’s people.
Trenton:

a) the corner of State and Broad Streets where a public sitting alcove currently exists.
b) the "Ghandi Garden," a free public garden and art venue located at 223 East Hanover Street.

2. Two detailed visions for carrying out the large-scale arts projects.

We have begun discussing renderings of installation ideas from the Artworks artists. A next step remains of selecting the final two installation designs.

Activities:

We have initially planned for three consultations to occur on the campus in Princeton and three consultations to occur in Trenton. Four are completed. In early September of 2017, we had a lunch consultation as part of our Fall Faculty Conference that introduced the grant initiative and the executive director of Artworks, Lauren Otis. In late September, we combined two planned visits to Trenton into a longer site visit for faculty and administrators. We chartered a bus for an afternoon, and took a group of 15 to the Artworks headquarters and gallery space in Trenton. We also toured public art projects in Trenton to give us a sense of what might be possible to undertake. In February of 2018, Mr. Otis and three other artists from Artworks were invited to a lunchtime conversation with faculty where we discussed current renderings of installation proposals. Faculty members were especially enthusiastic at that meeting to think about how the proposed installations might fit into the larger master plan of the seminary, and how the planned Trenton and Princeton art installations could be made clearly complementary to any ordinary passersby. I was also able to confirm from our Director of Facilities and Construction that skilled seminary members such as master electricians, plumbers, and carpenters would also be happy to help with the buildout of the art installations if and as they come to fruition. This kind of comprehensive participation in the design and building from our skilled and often overlooked seminary members is another key innovative feature.

Two conversations remain: 1) to finalize the sites for the installations and 2) to choose final designs for the installations.

Key Things Learned:

The project is still underway, and it seems as if extending the timeline into the next academic year might be best, given the disappearance of faculty as summer begins. We have learned more about the municipal efforts to rejuvenate Trenton through the arts, how PTS might become a part of that revitalization, and how this project and our curriculum might find ways to dovetail with concrete urban witness of God's love in Trenton. Princeton University also recently commissioned a temporary monument from artist Titus Kaphar to mark their historical audit of the university's relationship with slavery. So, a neighboring template exists for how we might incorporate the Artworks project into the larger master plan and identity of PTS going forward.

How to include the conversations into our curricular offerings is still nascent. I am taking sabbatical and research leave next academic year, 2018-19, and am thinking about what other grant opportunities I might seek to expand our current conversation with Artworks while I am on leave.
SUMMARY OF  

ENHANCING PEDAGOGY FOR A REVISED CURRICULUM AND A NEW STUDENT BODY 

A Faculty Development Project at 

SACRED HEART SEMINARY AND SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY 

Hales Corners, WI

Sacred Heart Seminary and School of Theology (SHSST) proposed three projects focused on developing our faculty’s pedagogical skills I) in regard to student-centered learning in general [two of the three projects] and II) in regard to a dramatic increase in the presence of millennials in our classrooms [the third project].

Student-Centered Learning

I. Implementation of Student Learning Outcomes: The immediate context of our development work on student-centered learning is the recent revision of our entire M.Div. core curriculum. This revision involved a shift in our stated communal philosophy of teaching from ‘instructional objectives’ to ‘student learning outcomes.” Every desired outcome on our MDiv profile was articulated in terms of discreet, measurable student learning outcomes (SLOs) on our syllabi.

Goal: The remaining step, which this grant served, was to train our faculty in the pedagogical implications of this move from instructor-focused instructional objectives to student-centered learning outcomes.

Activity: Faculty needed to revisit their individual course syllabi to address the new SLOs. We therefore proposed a faculty development session training in the classroom pedagogy of employing SLOs, to be led by an experienced consultant in theological education.

II. Implementation of Flipped Classroom Pedagogy: The so-called ‘flipped classroom’ is a second, important aspect of student-centered learning. The primary purpose of this approach is to provide the student with the intellectual knowledge, skills, and abilities to think theologically within pastoral contexts, ultimately allowing for a dynamic and integrated learning experience for the student. The newly revised curriculum had been purposely organized to foster the integration of theological learning. Training in the basics and best practices of flipped classroom andragogy, as well as instruction on utilizing relevant technology is vital.

Goal: This preparation will better equip faculty with more tools with which to engage adult learners, a greater utilization of technology inside and outside the classroom, and a better use of class time utilized for application and critical thinking skills.

Activities: To this end, we are attempting to arrange a development workshop with an expert in flipped classroom education. Faculty members will also receive a copy of Flip Your Classroom: Reach Every Student in Every Class Every Day, by Bergmann and Sams. Lunch-
time discussions will be hosted by the Faculty Development Task Force to discuss the book *Flip Your Classroom*, with an emphasis on concrete ideas for classroom use. Additionally, faculty will receive quality materials for ongoing individual exploration into the use of the flipped classroom style.

**Teaching Millennials**

III. From its beginnings, SHSST had traditionally been focused on the education of older, ‘second-career’ seminarians. Over the course of the last decade, however, the younger, traditional student has come to represent approximately half of those present in the institution.

**Goal:** Through this grant, therefore, we intend to school ourselves in the cultural backgrounds and learning styles of our millennial students.

**Activities:** To this end, we would like to have a workshop from an expert on millennials/millennial seminarians. Faculty members will also receive a copy of *MILLENNIALS: Professional Resource Guide for Bishops, Priests, Faculty, Psychologists, and Family & Youth Ministers*, by Christina Lynch.

**Innovative Features**

- Moving from curriculum revision to andragogy: As indicated, the first of these three projects was born of a desire to bring the long, hard work of curriculum revision into the concrete experiences of teaching and learning. In this way, the revision of the curriculum began to involve the originally unforeseen revision of teaching our philosophy from instructor-focused objectives to student-centered learning outcomes.
- Creation of more useful and student-friendly syllabi.
- While insisting on SLOs and active-student learning are not innovative in the wider academy, it is for SHSST.
- Flipped classroom will be innovative for SHSST on the technology side, as well as the new impetus to offer classes more accessible to busy lay persons.

**Key Learnings:**

- SLOs are an important factor of how a student understands how to apply their knowledge and skills in a variety of academic and pastoral settings.
- Varied Performance Assessments are necessary to evaluate students in light of the SLOs for each course.
- There seems to be an almost necessary connection between teaching in terms of student learning outcomes and employing a flipped, or student-centered, classroom. Once the student learning outcome is foregrounded and guiding pedagogical questions become “can the student use this material? And how will I know?,” the lecture (while still useful) is relativized.
- These projects make more evident the generational differences among and between
faculty members. Younger faculty members do not find student-centered learning and outcomes-based education as much of a novelty as older faculty. Interestingly, while part of this project was inspired by awareness of a new diversity present in our student body, it has also disclosed a diversity (which is not to say a tension) present among our faculty
SUMMARY

ATS - EDUCATIONAL MODELS AND PRACTICES IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION PROJECT

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS
San Francisco Theological Seminary

Developing Skills for Digital Neophytes

In order to help participants prepare for the Forum, we also ask each project director to prepare and submit by May 1 a 2-page summary describing their project,

Goals:
• Assist faculty in acquiring the pedagogical skills necessary to providing high quality online courses
• Secure the services of Dr. Mary Hess to provide our faculty with practical strategies for effectively translating elements of in-class coursework to an online learning environment
• Produce a comfortable environment for our faculty to construct a pedagogical vision and shared methodology for engaging with online teaching platforms

Activities:
• One-on-one and group meetings to help our faculty acquire the technical and pedagogical tools necessary to transition in-class courses into a digital format
• Faculty members experimented with online tools, gaining more familiarity with Moodle, the primary platform for developing online classes,
• Faculty frequently used videochat software including Zoom.
• Developed curriculum roadmaps that were tailor-made for each course
• Developed creative and engaging course content in a hybrid format (in-class and online), so that DMin students can explore various innovative tools to develop their ministry
• Dr. Hess made group presentations to the faculty, which reiterated some of the primary lessons and insights that emerged through her one-on-one consultations
• Dr. Hess reemphasized some key policies and practices for transferring in-class course content to a digital format and encouraged our faculty to explore these resources further

Innovative Features and Key Learnings:
• The major benefits of this project were the opportunities it provided for faculty to explore various online technological tools and to deeply engage with Dr. Hess’ expertise in online teaching and religious education.
• The work on online pedagogy produced an unexpected insight: faculty’s realization that some SFTS students need online courses in order to thrive
Faculty awareness of the strategic importance of online education to the future of theological education increased dramatically.

An increased appreciation for the importance of providing alternative ways of learning that are more diverse and modern was also noted.

Faculty digested the wealth of information that Dr. Hess was able to provide through large group, small group, and one-on-one discussions.

Dr. Hess’s presence on campus gifted our faculty with a space to have honest and in-depth conversations about the benefits of online teaching, its drawbacks, along with any feelings of hesitation, resistance, and intimidation related to digital learning.

Faculty are continuing to gain familiarity with Moodle and basic technological tools used for online teaching including videochat software (Zoom, Skype), Voicethread, recording software and powerpoint software.

Faculty are exploring the ways that digital media can serve as helpful teaching tools for online courses (Youtube videos, TEDtalks, podcasts, etc.)

Faculty reviewed pedagogical literature that discusses effective hands-on approaches to online teaching (provided by Dr. Hess via Moodle).

Challenges:

- Continuing work is needed on curriculum roadmaps for in-class courses in order to deeply assess how to transform the content of these courses into an online format.
- Time management when teaching online courses needs further attention.
- The ability to create organic group conversation through synchronous platforms is still being developed.
- Faculty are still exploring their questions about whether an online environment can facilitate the kind of robust learning environment that face-to-face group discussion produces.
Project Title: “Rethinking Contextual Education for the 21st Century”
Primary Investigator: Mark Chung Hearn, PhD

**Project Goals**
The primary goals of the project initially consisted of developing new skills and content-knowledge for Contextual Education faculty in order to help students engage issues of faith and theology through a multi-stakeholder approach. It would be ideal, for instance, if faculty understand how legal, policy-making, and technological systems function in our society with the hopes that our students – future ministers – would learn these systems to better facilitate change for a more just and humane world.

These goals aimed to help the Contextual Education program expand its long-established foci on vocational formation and an internship experience in a house of worship to include a greater emphasis upon public theology and ministry. We understand public theology and ministry broadly as having a collaborative posture with multiple fields to facilitate theological and ministerial engagement beyond the religious private sphere. This emphasis seeks to better bridge theology, faith matters, and the Church with a non-theological world.

To achieve these original goals, activities included: (1) training Contextual Education faculty in online pedagogy and course design, (2) Contextual Education faculty attending conferences in non-theological and non-ministerial fields and disciplines (e.g., business leaders’ conferences), (3) hosting meetings with community organizations, and (4) outside consultation with faculty concerning community organizing and development.

**Activities**
Due to unanticipated changes in personnel, we altered some activities. Consequently, the new activities entail: (1) faculty training in online course design and pedagogy, and (2) hosting conversations with faculty, school administrators, invited panelists, identified denominational partners, and select students. Increasing student need for online learning is causing the Contextual Education program to rethink its course delivery platforms. The first activity of the grant assists with training faculty to create and teach online courses for the Contextual Education program. This activity has currently begun implementation.

With increasing numbers of students looking for Contextual Education experiences outside of the local parish, the purpose of the second activity is to curate conversation with invited panelists around the changing nature of theological education amidst increasing professional development and ecclesial needs to better engage church and society. The primary question to be addressed is: How do we engage a theological degree for a non-theological world? Identified community leaders will offer insight into their experiences of having attained a theological degree while currently (not) working in an explicitly religious field. Faculty will
consider from these conversations ramifications and potential changes for theological higher education. These hosted conversations will take place in AY2018-19.

Innovative Features
Three innovative features for our school highlight the project. First, we are in the process of training faculty tied to the Contextual Education program in online course design and pedagogy. Faculty are in the process of redeveloping courses for online or hybrid delivery.

Second, the introduction of ePortfolios in a Contextual Education course has helped us consider how to leverage a digital platform in a student’s learning. Each student in the course is provided with a WordPress shell that offers students the opportunity to showcase their learning artifacts according to degree program outcomes. We also focus in the ePortfolios on student blogging in order to help students commit to their beliefs and to develop an accessible and bold public theological voice.

Finally, the project will curate conversations on the topic of engaging a theological degree in a non-theological context. As we find that less students want to pursue Contextual Education experiences in a local house of worship, we will host conversations with panelists who have acquired a theological and ministerial degree but do not work or serve in a local house of worship either full-time or part-time. We anticipate that these conversations will spur further reflection around theological education and training.

Key Learnings
There are two key learnings at the mid-point of the project. First, collaboration with other centers and units is key. As an embedded school within a larger university, we have the ability to partner across the university and collaborate with units such as the Center for Digital Learning and Innovation and Office of Career Services. These university units are key to developing capacities in faculty and students not usually found in traditional theological education. Building one’s own WordPress site is one example of this as it is a collaborative effort across university units.

Second, theological education must continue to evolve to help students claim a public voice that is both bold and accessible. We need to integrate faith and theology with social issues and communicate this integration in a way that is accessible to persons who have not experienced theological education. Directions for the blog posts in the Contextual Education course, for example, state that the student is to write not for a theological professor as much as they are to write for their neighbor, co-worker, and community citizen. This curricular and pedagogical change continues to propel theological education into the Twenty-first century.
ATS Educational Models project summary, May 2018

**Project title:** Teaching in changing contexts

**Abstract:**
At any given time, a St. Andrew's College faculty member may be teaching a semester course in a classroom and a semester course online and preparing to teach a one-week intensive course, while looking ahead to preparing a non-credit lay education course. Students in one basic degree course may be from different degree programs or specialties; some may have prior theological education and others have none. Some students are native English speakers, while others have only just gained proficiency. This situation is markedly different from even five years ago. This project aims to foster discussion about new opportunities and challenges in this situation, to help faculty learn and apply teaching strategies, and to develop practices for assessing and supporting faculty teaching. The format of the project aims to model practices for an on-going college-supported faculty development program.

**Primary goals and their attainment:**
1. Discussion and reflection on changing contexts (demographics, degree programs, program delivery) and how these contexts affect teaching
2. Learn about research into a variety of teaching and learning strategies and processes
3. Develop formats for on-going faculty development

So far, all three goals are being met, and we anticipate them being fully met by the end of the project in early 2019.

**Project activities:**
One day-long faculty retreat in October 2017 facilitated by a consultant from the teaching and learning centre at the University of Saskatchewan, followed by a series of individual faculty-led lunch-and-learns on topics generated at that retreat. A final wrap-up development day will be held in early 2019. A student researcher assists with the research on each topic undertaken by individual faculty members. We have acquired some resources for our library collection.

**Benefits for St. Andrew’s and for other schools:**
So far, we have learned about:
1. Differences between lay and professional education, and unique requirements for lay education, especially with respect to “life-long learning”
2. Whether and how diverse delivery formats of the same course have an effect on meeting course goals
3. Problem-based learning
Future topics are:

4. Peer-mentoring effectiveness
5. Developing e-portfolios for students
6. Identifying threshold concepts for students in the study of theology

Topics that may be addressed after the end of this project:

7. How to orient students to (theological) education
8. Dealing with 18-30 year olds (for the past several decades, the bulk of our students have been second-career, but now we are finding younger students in our classes)
9. Diversity in student body, including a discussion of linguistic vs. cultural assumptions

Because these were topics generated out of our own collective sense of what we need to explore based on our school’s mission and changing contexts, we can see immediate applicability. Undertaking this project in the way we have reminds us that the most meaningful learning comes out of self-assessed needs and interests.

**Recommended practices:**

1. Faculty-designed professional development programs are preferred over imposed programs.
2. We don’t need to reinvent the wheel: many issues we have tackled have already been well-researched and best practices have been developed by scholars in other areas of higher education.
3. Faculty need food to develop: this is a little facetious, but trying to get faculty to show up and participate without either coercion or bribery is difficult. Bribery is better. Plus sharing food helps build community.

**Sustaining the learning:**

Already, the faculty has seen the benefit of this style of faculty development. The difficulty in sustaining a monthly schedule of lunch-and-learns means that two or three a year is more sustainable long-term. Topics that were not covered during the project have been put on a list of topics for the future lunch-and-learns. However, at this point responsibility for following through and maintaining a culture of faculty development has not been assigned, and it is unclear how this will happen. One thing that may help make the learning sustainable is continuing to have a student research assistant, and we should look into how we can make that happen.
Exploring the Evolving Vocational Identity of a Faculty: Vision, Priorities, and Cohesion amid Institutional, Ecclesial, and Cultural Change

Union Presbyterian Seminary
Richmond, VA and Charlotte, NC
Project Director: Ken McFayden, Academic Dean

Context

The past decade has witnessed significant change at our seminary. Amid this change, the vocational identity of the faculty seems to be shifting with the changing vocational identity of the seminary. This initiative has generated new areas of substantive conversation within our faculty, better patterns of communication within and between our campuses, and the beginning of a modestly new faculty culture. It is our hope that increased clarity about the vocational identity of our faculty in relation to the vocational identity of our institution will increase the alignment of these vocational identities.

Primary Goals

1. Developing a shared vision of the shared vocation of our faculty;
2. Identifying priorities for the use of faculty time, individually and collectively, in relation to this vocation; and
3. Increasing the cohesion of our faculty in relation to its vocational identity.

Activities

- August 30-31, 2017: Faculty retreat at a retreat center in Durham, NC, with a facilitator
- September 21, 2017: Follow-up faculty conversation at our monthly faculty meeting
- May 3, 2018: Faculty development conversations at our faculty lunch and monthly faculty meeting, with the facilitator from our August 2017 faculty retreat
- August 29-30, 2018: Two-day faculty retreat at a retreat center in Durham, NC (upcoming)

Innovative Features (innovative to us)

- Time: Historically, we have had faculty business meetings every month during the academic year (September-May) and a faculty retreat in late August that has resembled a two-day faculty meeting. This initiative has allowed us to re-envision the faculty retreat as a critical
context for using time and space to focus on our evolving vocation and to experience more collegiality and cohesion as a faculty.

- **Topics:**

  a. Our faculty, individually and together, has named and lamented various losses experienced as a professor and institution of faith and learning. (material loss, relationship loss, intrapsychic loss, functional loss, role loss, and system loss)

  b. Collegial conversations have stimulated personal and corporate imaginations to inform future discussion and action.

  c. We have experienced better energy and substantial discussion of topics of importance to the faculty. Focusing on matters at the core of our teaching and vocation has been powerful.

  d. As we have navigated these discussions, we have begun to consider new aspects of serving our mission, “For the Church in the World,” particularly in relation to matters of racial/ethnic diversity, white privilege, and the Millennial Generation in and beyond the classroom.

- **Space:** A retreat center, where participants have traveled to a site equidistant from our campuses in Richmond and Charlotte, has created new space for us to engage each other.

**Key Learnings**

- The magnitude of change in the past decade has impacted the vocational identity of the faculty. The seminary to which most came to teach does not exist as it did at that time.

- The faculty has demonstrated significant resiliency during the past decade of change and loss. Yet the vocational identity of the faculty seems to be shifting with the changing vocational identity of the seminary.

- We have experienced anew the importance of the quality of the faculty’s life together in relation to the quality of the seminary’s life. Choices of time, topics, and space are critically important as we think of how the faculty gathers and engages its work, individually and collectively.

- The investment of time and space for substantive conversation has been critical as we imagine the shape of our teaching ministries in the future and as we re-form faculty relationships and rhythms as we develop and live into a shared vision of our shared vocation.
ATS Faculty Development Grant Summary
United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities

3000 Fifth St. NW
New Brighton, MN 55112

May 11, 2018

PROJECT:
Narrative Formation Across the Curriculum: Cultivating Spiritual and Vocational Formation through the Narrative Process

United Theological Seminary proposes to train faculty to cultivate and assess spiritual and vocational formation in students through the development of students’ life story narratives. This training program emerges from our pilot program to cultivate spiritual and vocational formation in contexts of theological, cultural, and geographical diversity, by using written and oral narrative to develop the student’s identity. A request for support for this educational model as an innovation grant was submitted simultaneously with this request.

PRIMARY GOALS and ACTIVITIES of our faculty development grant project:

United received support from the ATS for the academic year 2017-18 to:

a. Train select faculty to coach students to enrich their understanding of their lives as narratives and increase their capacity to tell their stories. This was also done by integrating personal narrative with academic content toward the call to seminary and vocational goals.

b. Train all residential faculty to interpret and assess student course narratives in ways that foster theological and cultural diversity.

To date, we’ve made more progress on the first goal through our retreats and workshops and the new course offering. This was done through 3 faculty retreats, 3 workshops and individual coaching with faculty. We began by enriching our own understanding of our lives as narratives and increased our own capacity to tell our stories BEFORE we attempted to coach our students.

In our fall faculty retreat, we practiced telling our own vocational story in small groups and practiced a specific way of responding to one another’s narratives (telling, retelling, and retelling the retelling).

In our three subsequent fall faculty workshops, we continued experimenting with different narrative prompts and were introduced to another approach for responding to narratives (contemplative listening and asking contemplative questions).

In our winter faculty retreat, we invited each faculty member to practice constructing your course-related prompt is that it be informed and shaped by your course’s subject matter and invite the student to connect more deliberately what s/he has learned to his or her life story.

At the close of spring semester, we will have further information to share about our progress on the second goal.
ATS Faculty Development Grant Summary  
*United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities*

In the last faculty retreat (April 27), we will be delving into individual faculty’s narrative identity (exploring the major events impacting their calling) in relation to their own subject matter/scholarship. This is to demonstrate the narrative process in determining meaning and purpose as they move forward.

**SIGNIFICANT THINGS LEARNED**

This project, in correspondence with the innovation grant, has helped to begin to embed the narrative aspect of formation across the curriculum. It has also enhanced and expanded our current personal and spiritual formation course offerings.

For the faculty participating in the fall narrative workshops, they reported a deepening engagement and relationship with each other. The qualitative aspect of faculty candor and comfort between them was appreciably deepened leading to more open interactions. This process has offered potential opportunities in the future for community building among the faculty as well as onboarding new faculty and adjuncts. We hope to see the impact of this first-hand encounter in the types of narrative prompts and opportunities faculty create for their students in their courses.

Moreover, faculty participants agreed that the focus on narrative identity should not be limited to personal narratives; they seemed interested in exploring how the faculty might become more mindful of the story they are telling about the seminary and committed to broaching the role of institutional narratives in future faculty meetings/retreats. They believe this narrative approach may be pertinent to draw upon for the purposes of institutional learning. Correspondingly, we hope to have increased our understanding of how students integrate their narrative identity with a particular subject matter.

Given the great emphasis placed on peer groups for sustaining pastoral leaders, our narrative formation approach equips our students with a toolkit (drawn from narrative therapy and group spiritual direction) for cultivating inner exploration in the context of community and has the potential for creating enduring friendships among our students. This seems to have resonance with later vocational settings, such as Clinical Pastoral Education and small group discernment.

Students described this process as relational formation and viewed it as an essential complement to their coursework in personal and spiritual formation as mentioned above. This may also serve as a template for their formation process leading into a contextual education placement and reflection and then culminating in a senior capstone seminar where they will begin to discern the next phase of their vocational journey after graduation.
Project Description
The Seminary Formation Council (SFC) is a new initiative described in their mission statement as “The Seminary Formation Council serves diocesan seminary formation by providing education, practical tools, spiritual enrichment and fraternal support to seminary formators. Under the patronage of Our Lady of Guadalupe, Star of the New Evangelization, we serve the bishops who have the “responsibility for the formation of those who have been given the task of educating future priests” (PDV 66) in order to equip missionary disciples to proclaim the Gospel of Jesus Christ to all nations.”

The SFC offers a two-year certificate program of eight modules, focused on formation of seminary faculty who serve in seminary formation. Mundelein Seminary is a contributing partner to the SFC and has two formation faculty participants in the program, who will in turn enrich the Mundelein Formation Program and seminary community with new insights gained through the modules.

Project Goals
1. To bring together the community of seminary formation teams from across the country.
2. To process the topics and skills that need to be applied for successful formation of seminarians.
3. To increase the understanding of the Ratio document regarding seminary formation.
4. To fill the need for the training of seminary formation teams at a seminary.

Activities
1. Attend and actively participate in eight educational modules over a two-year time frame.
2. Twenty-two seminaries are represented and forty-two formation faulty members participate in sharing and learning as much as possible.
3. The schedule during each module included daily time to connect with the members of formation staffs.
4. Topics are addressed in several sessions per week and formation skills are role-played so the participants can participate in the procedure skills that are taught.
5. Sessions of discussion regarding the Ratio Fundamentalis Institutionis Sacerdotalis are processed and clarified.
Innovative Features
1. A national, collaborative, and Catholic seminary formation faulty learning community
2. Methodologies of discussing personal topics are quite insightful.
3. Processing the goals of a student with the lens of the joy experienced as one focuses on the completion of this goal is inherently motivating for students (motivational interviewing).
4. The importance of processing complicated life experiences with others truly assists everyone’s ability to articulate the direction of topics for students to learn from in terms of discussing personal growth within an individual.

Brief Listing of Key Things Learned Through its Implementation
1. In conversations with formators of other seminaries during sessions, and scheduled social time, we have learned about different ways of how to achieve the same goal. We have also lived a spirit of communion as we share the same mission as formators from around the country. We have formed friendships with faculty from other seminaries.
2. We learned a new method of interviewing our men to help them grow personally.
3. We learned about psychological assessment so that we could change our own procedure for the upcoming year. We realized the benefit of working closer together with our psychological services as a resource for the students, but also for the formators’ ongoing formation.
4. With the formation we received, we started a process of systematic revision of our own human formation program for this coming year.
5. The importance of motivational interviewing regarding the system of one-on-one personal formation sessions with our students.
6. Being attentive to personal growth opportunities in daily life experiences in personal reviews.
7. Continuous dialogue with other formators regarding ongoing formation.
8. The importance for our formation team to experience the opportunity to grow through the experience of on-going formation in the context of our personal life.
This VTS faculty development project, designed to customize online teacher training for theological educators, involves a unique collaboration between Virginia Theological Seminary (VTS) and the University of Wisconsin-Madison (UW-Madison). Based on two programs developed at UW-Madison and successfully used at Wabash Center workshops, VTS worked with the Distance Education Professional Development Office of UW-Madison to develop two certificate programs: Fundamentals of Online Teaching for Theological Educators (FoOT-TE) and Design and Teach Online for Theological Educators (DTO-TE).

The most critical issue we engaged in the project was adapting and expanding the UW-Madison certificate material to meet the needs of theological educators. A first step was to determine which languages and pedagogical paradigms are “universal” and which must be replaced or supplemented to fit the seminary culture. This challenge increased design time and impacted start dates for the pilot programs. We recognized that getting it done right was more important than getting it done fast, so we revised our timelines and focused on the front-end of the development process. Since helping faculty move from “teachers” to “learners” was critical to the success of the program, incremental changes were prioritized as the best means to encourage participants, at all skill levels, to apply their learnings. This meant that enhancements to existing courses were equal in importance to the crafting of new courses.

The greatest lesson we learned is that designing training for teaching online is time consuming and is difficult, if not impossible, to do alone. We began this project believing that collaboration with UW-Madison would allow us to make more progress than we could on our own, resulting in better content for the certificates. This prediction has been confirmed. Also, the agreement with UW-Madison provides for annual updates that will be made available to any theological school, which will benefit all ATS schools and VTS.

As part of this grant, we are offering three iterations of FoOT-TE and two iterations of DTO-TE. Below is a summary of the participants who took part in or have enrolled in FoOT-TE as of May 1, 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Jan – Mar 2018</th>
<th>April – May 2018</th>
<th>Sept – Nov 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VTS Fulltime Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTS Doctoral; Core Faculty: Part-Time, Multi-year Contract</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTS Adjunct Faculty/Lifelong Learning Instructors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTS Partner Institution in Hong Kong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Rabbi/Cantor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty at Other Seminaries</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fundamentals of Online Teaching for Theological Educators (FoOT-TE)

How might learning about teaching in hybrid and online environments strengthen my pedagogical skills across all settings, including traditional residential courses?

- Emphasizes the ability of technology to deepen learning in online, hybrid, and traditional course environments.
- Focuses on designing learning activities and structuring teaching in online and hybrid courses.
- 35-hour, asynchronous course in which participants receive personalized feedback and commit to an introduction week (~2 hours), 6 weeks of course content (~5 hours per week), and a final project consisting of a plan for an online learning activity (included in the ~35 hours total).

Design and Teach Online for Theological Educators (DTO-TE)

How can I get the skills I need to design and teach in the hybrid and online environment so that it won’t just end up being more work for less reward?

- An interactive learning community supports participants in developing an online course they are planning to teach.
- Co-facilitated by an expert in online and hybrid pedagogy from the University of Wisconsin-Madison and a theological educator with digital learning experience.
- 65-hour, comprehensive, and cohort-based experience that provides the knowledge, skills, and resources needed to design and teach quality online courses.
- Participants commit to an introduction week (~2 hours), 12 weeks of course content (~5 hours per week), and a final project consisting of a plan for an online course (included in the ~65 hours total).

UW-Madison will be piloting the DTO-TE content as part of a Wabash workshop this summer and VTS will advertise the two iterations we will run in 2018-19 at the ATS Biennial in June and through other theological school networks. We are in the process of finalizing the dates for the two iterations of DTO-TE that VTS will offer in the Fall of 2018 and Spring of 2019. These dates, and registration for both, will be open and available to participants beyond VTS beginning with the ATS Faculty Development Forum on June 18, 2018.
Summary
Ministry Studies and Faculty Development at WFUSD

Wake Forest University School of Divinity alumni work not only in congregational ministry but also in chaplaincy, not-for-profit work, and a range of bi-professional contexts. Previously, every student was required to take “Introduction to Homiletics and Worship” and “Introduction to Pastoral Care.” Through a series of small group discussions between faculty and staff, we had discerned that these requirements did not best serve the diverse vocations and placements of our students, nor did they reflect the changing nature of congregational ministry. In 2016, the School implemented a revision to the Ministry Studies curriculum. Rather than focusing on particular content or craft, these new requirements aim to cultivate four dispositions for ministry—Proclamation, Relational Care, Community Building, and Formation—which can be fostered across the curriculum.

Project Goals and Activities: This project supports new interdisciplinary course development, primarily through team teaching, through three main project activities.

- Summer stipends for faculty to develop interdisciplinary courses in ministry studies;
- Funds to offset the cost of faculty co-teaching with ministry practitioners (in new or redesigned courses related to Transgender Affirmation, Immigration, Disability, Postmodern Media, and Faith/Health/Community);
- Support for two meetings—at the beginning and end of AY 2017-2018—to build faculty community around these activities.

Innovative Features

- Institutional: Promotes substantive involvement with practitioners that are not just “one-offs.” The teaching-with-practitioners model builds students’ ability to lead in diverse settings by drawing upon shared wisdom from intersecting contexts.
- Pedagogical: Explores best practices for structuring class sessions when co-teaching in order to go beyond the “play-by-play” and “color commentator” approach (in which the practitioner usually plays the latter role). These practices include scheduling ample time to plan and brainstorm, crafting course outcomes and assignment rubrics together, meeting in the practitioner’s context, and building on these partnerships in order to develop the practitioner as an instructor over time. When done well, the expertise of faculty about how to teach in a theological school combines with the ministry experiences of the partners to promote learning for all involved.
- Collaborative: Provides a community of peers that supports interdisciplinary collaboration, and promotes the development of each partner’s pedagogical voice, in order to help students engage ministry in a holistic manner.

Key Learnings

- Practitioners in Theological Education: We recognize that “professor/practitioner” is not a binary. Many faculty members in ATS institutions bring experience from diverse ministry settings. Some may even be appointed with titles such as “professor of the practice.” Still, every skill for ministry can or should be learned from faculty with terminal degrees. Most schools lack the
resources to support faculty appointments in skills such as financial literacy, multi-media proficiency, writing for the public, non-profit leadership, administration, community organizing (and the list goes on). Identifying and training practitioners experienced in these skills is a worthy practice for theological schools as the ministry landscape continues to change. An initial co-teaching experience, such as those we are piloting at WFUSD, might be a qualifying factor for some adjunct faculty who also have the relevant years of ministry experience.

- **Cost Benefit:** The most significant obstacle to co-teaching is the cost (followed closely by limited time to meet in person to plan class activities together). Although it is costly to support two instructors for a single course, there may be long-term benefits. These partnerships with practitioners have the result of apprenticing them to the work of a professor, so that they develop syllabi, institutional and technical knowledge, and pedagogical approaches that they might later use as solo adjunct instructors. The result may be a well-trained cohort of instructors that can offer higher quality instruction, avoiding the steep learning curve experienced by practitioners when they begin as adjunct faculty. In light of this challenge, we have also begun to experiment with other cost-effective models, such as a “consultant” model for faculty to serve as mentors for practitioners who teach adjunctively.
ATS Faculty Development Grant
2017-18 Project Summary
Wesley Theological Seminary

Wesley Theological Seminary has long been committed to its mission of equipping persons for Christian leadership in the church and the world, which has required being attentive to changing student needs and to emerging opportunities in educational technology. In early 2017, the Wesley Faculty committed to offering a flexible pathway of required and elective Master of Divinity courses that would allow regional students who work full time to complete the MDiv in 5 years. To accomplish this, the faculty planned out a regular rotation of weekend, evening, on-line, hybrid and short-term intensive courses, particularly strengthening online and hybrid options. However, not all Wesley faculty had the confidence and skills to regularly teach online, so development opportunities were essential.

Our goals were to ensure excellence in the course offerings and to create a degree model that could be effectively implemented while providing faculty with the support, training, time, and resources they needed to confidently build high-quality online courses. In preparation for the new program structure, Wesley Theological Seminary created a comprehensive online course rubric to adhere to accreditation and C-RAC guidelines (Council of Regional Accrediting Commissions, 2011). This rubric is used to assess the quality and productivity of all online classes. Guided by the Educational Innovation faculty committee, Wesley staff created a customized online training program for instructors that ensures support and quality assistance in the online pedagogy and course design process while adhering to the online course rubric. The program is being offered to all current Wesley full-time and adjunct faculty through three different cohort modules over the course of two years.

The training program is 13 weeks long, requiring an average of four hours of work per week. Each week, faculty participants create aspects of the online course they intend to teach, so by the end much of their online course is created. To help motivate faculty to make the time for the training course, each faculty satisfactorily in the training program receive a stipend. As a result of the stipend and the quality of the training program, about 65% of the core faculty have completed or are in the process of completing the training course, with the remaining faculty scheduled to complete the course next year.

The training course was designed to teach online pedagogy as well as full use of Blackboard and Panopto (lecture capture system). Each week, participants were exposed to new content on an overarching topic in the online course rubric and were tasked with applying that material in creating their own course. Peer review allowed participants to be exposed to different ideas that they might incorporate into their own courses. The course used about 90% of the available tools in Blackboard and Panopto. Participants were exposed to tools in a pedagogical context from the student perspective and could assess their options of what technology to employ in their own courses.

Key learnings:
• Designing a solid quality assurance rubric for our online courses was essential. We had to start with a way to measure the quality of online courses. From there, we could teach how to use that quality assurance rubric from the start, creating positive habits.
• A balance of pedagogy and technical teaching is important.
• Training helped faculty understand more pedagogically. When they experienced the tools in a pedagogical context they were able to understand the use far better than just reading about the concept.
• Having faculty, staff, and administration working together to create solutions to a problem was essential.
• We hope now to regularly provide incentivized training in new pedagogical methods to all faculty, not just the newest/greenest.
• Peer review, and the ability for faculty to see how others are constructing and facilitating courses, was incredibly helpful for learning and accountability.
Date: 5/1/2018

Institution: Western Seminary

Project Title:
Teaching Formation in Variable Learning Environments

Project Abstract:
Western Seminary’s mission is to be a catalyst and resource for spiritual formation through its ministry leadership programs. As the learning environments have become more diverse (e.g., residential, extension, online, and competency-based settings), faculty must adapt their instructional strategies to the variable learning contexts of its students. This faculty development project intends to improve institutional effectiveness through teaching formation in variable learning environments.

Summary Report:
Western Seminary’s various degrees and programs are delivered in several different formats. Faculty are learning to adjust to these modes of delivery, and the growing diversity of instructional modalities and learning environments creates the need for refinement of our approach to student formation and sharpening of faculty skills for instruction.

As we continue to focus on improving instructional design, pedagogy, co-curricular activities, and assessment, this project, funded by the Faculty Development Grant, is intended to assist in these efforts. One of the primary goals of the project is to gain a more robust understanding of student formation as a complex construct. We aim to apply that understanding in meaningful and measurable ways through improvements in pedagogical approaches and learning activities appropriate to variable learning environments.

In summary, the goal of the project is to improve institutional effectiveness through teaching formation in variable learning environments.

We are currently in the middle of the planned process for the project. One workshop occurred in March, and we have solicited feedback from faculty participants, asking them to reflect on insights gained from the first workshop and ideas for implementing those ideas. In subsequent communication we will gather data on actual implementation of those ideas. Then we will conduct another workshop in several months to build on what
we will have already learned, discussed, and begun implementing. Then, following that second workshop, we will again solicit reflective responses from faculty members, and then gather and record any data related to ideas and implementation. Together, these stages of the project are intended to cultivate a culture of learning and development among our faculty in this area of institutional and pedagogical effectiveness in variable learning environments.

The first workshop took place on March 27\textsuperscript{th} of this year. The workshop leader was Dr. Joanne Jung, Associate Professor of Biblical and Theological Studies at Talbot School of Theology and a leader in Talbot and Biola’s online education programs. The group of sixteen participants from Western included mostly core faculty members and also some adjuncts who instruct in our online campus courses.

The topic of the workshop was character formation in online education, which is one of Dr. Jung’s areas of expertise. She covered five key terms, corresponding to five points of emphasis: Holistic, Engaging, Attentive, Reflective, and Transformational. Each of these points were used to highlight pedagogical principles and practices that will enhance our online education at Western.

We are now in the process of gathering insights and reflections from faculty participants. They have been asked to communicate qualitatively and quantitatively what they have learned, what they plan to implement into their courses and teaching, and what they have already implemented.

One insight we gained from the first workshop was that it proved effective to get a significant group of faculty together in the same room at the same time discussing these issues and thinking collaboratively, guided by an expert in the area. Faculty shared activities, strategies, and methods they have used successfully.

This kind of workshop was a fertile environment for enthusiastic faculty engagement. With several faculty participating, the workshop elicited the kind of interaction that is not always easy to reproduce. The feedback from faculty has quite positive and optimistic. The workshop experience was stimulating and faculty see the potential for implementing insights for improved pedagogy and institutional effectiveness.

One particular insights Dr. Jung shared had to do with the limitations of online education. Our faculty likely assumed she would only highlight the
positive aspects of distance learning and avoid any kind of comments related
to the advantages of the in-person classroom environment. However, Dr.
Jung challenged the group in the workshop to focus on what online education
can do well and shore up the weaknesses of what it cannot do as well. For
example, an online classroom cannot reproduce the informal mingling and
community building that occurs when students and their professor go out to
lunch together or talk after class. However, community and formative
relationships can be built in different ways in an online classroom with the
right strategic efforts. Moreover, the online environment has the potential
advantage that some introverted students and those less likely to engage in a
traditional classroom setting might be more likely to contribute substantially
in a video conference, online forum, or collaborative document.