II

IT DID MAKE A DIFFERENCE: Seminaries Can Change The Way They Teach

It's an experience like no other experience I can describe, the best thing that can happen to a scholar.... It's startling every time it occurs. One is surprised that a construct of one's own mind can actually be realized in the honest-to-goodness world out there. A great shock, and a great, great joy.

Leo Kadanoff

Leo Kadanoff is not, we suspect, everyday reading for most theological educators. He is an experimental physicist, best known for his foundational contributions on phase transitions to the emerging field of chaos science. Out of intellectual curiosity about the possibility of finding order amid the heretofore chaotically complex, he never ceased to wonder when an experiment confirmed the foresight of the human imagination.

The challenges of organizational change engaged by the PIP/GTE may seem inexorably mundane to some in comparison to both the abstract theoretical universe of most physicists and the amazing, concrete technological contributions physics has historically delivered. But few of those intimately involved in the PIP/GTE experiment would share that feeling of mundanity. Many were risking their own as well as others theological futures, and the project was an experiment. It was a test of whether or not the project model (described in the next chapter) could help seminaries change the way they teach and thereby create orderly structures through which to engage the inherent

complexity of a globalized, theological perspective. More importantly, the kinds and extent of change realized by the schools during the project were an on-going source of surprise and wonder.

Indeed, in a post-project debriefing session with foundation program officers one of the PIP/GTE seminary presidents caught everyone's attention. Did the project have an effect on his institution? "No, not really," he began with muted voice and lowered eyes. "It only helped us rediscover God and rediscover [the neighborhood around the seminary]." The turn in his voice and straight on look made it clear he was deadly serious. He went on to explain that by the former he meant to underscore the reinvigoration of the seminary's worship life, and how it became the starting point for what he described as a breakthrough from a "caucus-oriented" ethos to a more regular, communal, integrated and "trans-caucus" style of relating. By the latter he meant the reestablishment of a recently atrophied, but historically distinguished, connection to the concrete, everyday life of the racial-ethnically diverse and economically disadvantaged urban neighborhood immediately adjacent to the seminary. The president further noted that the "heat" generated by the PIP/GTE had helped stimulate the seminary's first complete curriculum review in over twenty years, a review that was just beginning and would be the real test of whether the positive communal directions of change, the re-engagement of the local community's concrete struggles for justice and equality, and the experimentation of several individual faculty in their courses would lead to a definitively new pedagogical style for the institution. And then, in uncharacteristic understatement he concluded, "not bad for a school that very nearly dropped out of the project after the first year."

Although the above president's ability to "turn an enthusiastic phrase" is somewhat atypical, even among the PIP/GTE school presidents, the extent and kinds of change he was trying to dramatize were not. The project's bottom line evaluative question was, "Did the participating schools change the way they teach in ways that moved globalization toward the center of their institutional ethos?" The short answer to the question must be, "Yes" -- profoundly so in several schools, moderately so with the momentum still building in several others, and questionably so in only one. In virtually every participating school (again, with a single possible exception) one will find:

- New courses (including greater pedagogical experimentation);
- A greater presence of and sensitivity to diversity and international experience in worship, teaching, and faculty promotion/hiring;
- Increased sensitively to alternative cultures in the U.S. (e.g., "urban," "rural," native American/Canadian);
- New and/or revised support systems for international students;
- The formalization of oversight responsibility for "globalization"

within a school's committee structure;

- Heightened emphasis on globalization in faculty and student "discourse," research, and recruitment; and
- Financial commitments to continue building on the project's experience.

And in many project schools one will find:

- New mission statements highlighting the global context of ministry;
- Curriculum changes ranging from added requirements to systematic revisions, and new degree tracks to new certificate programs;
- New faculty positions;
- New research and study centers, either locally or internationally;
- Expanded or deepened relationships with local and global partner institutions;
- New language and scholarship programs for international students;
- New board development strategies; and
- The explicit inclusion of globalization in capitol campaigns.

The challenge of this chapter is to provide an overview of these changes, in part as a commentary on the efficacy of the PIP/GTE model of change, but perhaps most importantly, *as a means of making the first fruits of the twelve participating seminaries' five years of labor available to other's who are accepting the challenge of moving globalization toward the center of their institutional ethos.*

In analyzing how an institution teaches, it is common for educational researchers and theorists to distinguish between the "formal" and the "informal" curriculum. To oversimplify, the former refers to courses and degree requirements; the latter to everything else that can shape and influence a student's experience at an institution. In keeping with this distinction we shall address each in turn, starting with the formal and then conclude with a summary discussion of the overall extent of change and of the most significant continuing challenges. But before beginning any of this we turn to the very question of the schools' operative definitions of globalization, their conceptual/visionary pull toward change.

A. Defining the Target

In 1986 the Association of Theological School's Committee on Global Theological Education used a special, spring issue of *Theological Education* to report on its work. Two statements in the issue by David S. Schuller, ATS

staff representative to the committee, delimit the subject of inquiry. The first is from his "Editorial Introduction" to the special issue. The second is from his report on a survey that he conducted for the committee in 1983.

> Globalization is a complex concept involving content and structure, "a prismatic combination of human relationships, ways of thinking, ways of learning, and ways of Christian living." Minimally it involves escaping from ignorance and provincialism; in its most serious consideration it involves us in questions regarding the Church's mission to the entire inhabited world.[1]

> In the survey globalization is a broad term that refers to programs and to resources designed especially to aid students in understanding and appreciating Second and Third World social and cultural perspectives as they influence and are influenced by religious communities. The Committee's concern is to discern ways in which theological schools seek to broaden their perspectives and resist the temptation of cultural, political and geographic provincialism.[2]

The autumn, 1986 issue of *Theological Education* was also devoted to the subject of globalization and included perhaps the broadest recognizance of the term within theological education to that date--Don S. Browning's "Globalization and Task of Theological Education in North America," the text of which had originally served as a plenary address to the 1986 Biennial Meeting of ATS. Browning notes that in preparation for his address he "immersed" himself in conversation with theological educators who used the term "globalization" and discovered (1) that it had a wide range of meanings, and (2) that "although these meanings are distinguishable, they are not necessarily contradictory." He then elaborates:

> The word globalization has at least four rather distinct meanings.... For some, globalization means the Church's universal mission to evangelize the world, i.e., to take the message of the gospel to all people, all nations, all cultures, and all religious faiths. Second, there is the idea of globalization as ecumenical cooperation between the various manifestations of the Christian church throughout the world. This includes a growing mutuality and equality between churches in First and Third World countries. It involves a new openness to and respect for the great variety of local theologies that are springing up within the church in its various concrete situations. Third, globalization sometimes

---

[1]David S. Schuller, "Editorial Introduction." *Theological Education* XXII (Spring 1986), p 5.

[2]David S. Schuller, "Globalization in Theological Education: Summary and Analysis of Survey Data." *Theological Education* XXII (Spring 1986), p 20.

refers to the dialogue between Christianity and other religions. Finally, globalization refers to the mission of the Church to the world, not only to convert and to evangelize, but to improve and develop the lives of the millions of poor, starving, and politically disadvantaged people. This last use of the term is clearly the most popular in present-day theological education; it may also be the one most difficult to convert into a workable strategy for theological education.

All of these uses of the term globalization in theological education have one element in common: the context for theological education can no longer be simply the local congregation, the local community, a particular region, state, or nation. The context of theological education must be the entire world, the entire global village that influences our lives in multitudes of direct and indirect ways and which we influence and shape in ways we do not fully understand. To say that the entire world needs to be the context of theological educators says something both very important and quite broad and indeterminate.[3]

Although adding considerable specification to the ATS Committee's delimitation of "globalization in theological education," Browning's formative statement nevertheless made it clear that the meaning and implications of the emergent term remained multiple, broad and indeterminate. Such was the milieu within which the PIP/GTE was launched in 1988; and one of the project's initial challenges to participant schools was to develop their own working definitions of globalization. Not all of the schools did this on paper, and the degree of formal acceptance at those schools that did put a definition to paper varied considerably. Nevertheless, a majority of the project schools made the effort and the definitions provide an insightful first conceptual and theological glance at what the schools felt themselves struggling to embody. The four schools in the project's Chicago cluster produced the following statement after their first international immersion:

To become "global" in theological education is to be transformed by:

- the interdependence of the unique peoples and cultures of the world;
- the all-pervasive presence of poverty and injustice as fundamental evils that must be addressed by Christians and other groups of goodwill locally and globally;
- the need to inform our ministries and service with an

[3]Don S. Browning, "Globalization and the Task of Theological Education in North America." *Theological Education* XXII (Autumn 1986), pp 43-44.

understanding of economic realities; human rights issues; oppressive structures of gender, race, class and violence; and the global environmental crisis;

- the universal significance of the reign of God as the call to discipleship and servanthood and the substance of hope for the future.

This transformation of individuals will cultivate in the theological community a new ethos of awareness of the worldwide human community and of the value of human relationships across cultural crises and will enable us to be a fuller expression of the whole people of God.

The faculty at Denver Seminary affirmed the following definition in their second year in the project, a definition that subsequently informed both a new institutional mission statement and a systematic curriculum revision:

> By "globalization in theological education," we at Denver Seminary envision the following: 1) an intensified commitment with Christians everywhere to take the whole saving gospel of Jesus Christ to the whole world under the authority of the Scriptures; 2) an empathetic understanding of different genders, races, cultures, and religions to be able to contextualize the gospel more effectively; 3) increased application and promotion of biblical principles to such global issues as economic development, social justice, political systems, human rights, and international conflict; 4) a deliberate effort to become a Christian community where under represented members feel at home; and 5) a thorough implementation of these goals throughout the Seminary and in our personal lives.

Also during the second year of the project Gordon-Conwell's steering committee produced the following "operational" statement:

> By the term "globalization," Gordon-Conwell sets forth in construct form various commitments in five areas. Globalization is about the transformation of the seminary as an institution as well as of the lives of people who participate in it by the insights, questions, and practices of people outside of Gordon-Conwell's cultural framework:
>
> 1. Christian fundamentals: worship, discipleship and self-understanding.
> 2. Evangelization.
> 3. Human promotion and development.
> 4. Interreligious dialogue: affirm the uniqueness of Christ while acknowledging the religious integrity of other religions.
> 5. Stewardship of the earth (ecology).

Gordon-Conwell theological Seminary will be said to be becoming increasingly global if increases in activity are noted in the following four areas:

1. Transformation of worship, discipleship and understanding of the gospel by the insights and practices of people outside the Gordon-Conwell cultural framework.
2. Relations with theological education programs outside of North America.
3. Provision of library resources.
4. Theological reflection in all areas of theological discourse and production of theological knowledge.
5. Mix of people on the Hamilton campus.

United Theological College, Montreal was by its own admission "cautious" about definition. "In fact," one of the school's reports states:

> There has been a preference to speak of "understanding" or "approaches" rather than of "definitions." Why? On the one hand, because there is a plurality of approaches and understandings of what "globalization" means. On the other hand, because there is a feeling that understanding will grow along with the development of the educational experience.

Nevertheless, the report proceeds to present several summative statements from internal discussions regarding its "understanding" of what "Education for Ministry in a Global Context" has come to mean for United. Among the earlier and more extensive is the following:

- it means looking critically at our assumptions (sex, class, race, "ideologies", etc) and trying to discern and realize the commonality and unity of humankind (God's creation and people).
- "globalization" has to do with building community and with redefining what is community in a culture that is diverse and heterogenous. We need a new kind of ministry to address the diversity of community.

There is a "double level" of globalization; hence the ambiguity of language:

- a forced global integration, forced by the power of economics and 'global markets," by the use of reductive mass culture and medias, etc. This "globalization" is at the same time exclusive, violent, and creates an increasing number of victims and marginalized people. This is not what we mean by "globalization."

- an "elective and mutually chosen globalization" where solidarity, mutual acceptance and support, creative interdependency, common humanity and justice are fostered. This is a humanization process, dedicated to creating a world community; as Christians we see this task as a call to co-build the Shalom Kingdom.
- education, in a global context, addresses the inter-cultural and interfaith dimensions of community; addresses how what we learn from "global experiences" will help us to deal with the deep changes in the very fabric of our Quebec/Canadian society--diversity, plurality, heterogeneity of culture, color, creed and class-and to redefine the relationship between Church and society in order to enable the ministry of the Church. . .
- education to awareness in a global context is an invitation to seek truth anew and break from systems (institutions and mindsets) that pigeon-hole us. Mutuality in learning, flexibility and openness are the essence of what being "truly global" means for us.

A subsequent statement of United's developing "understanding" was more succinct:

1. "Globalization" in Education for Ministry is about developing new interpretive frameworks for reconceiving theology that overcomes provincialism and ethnocentrism through experience, dialogue and critical reflection.
2. "Globalization" is also about strategies for engaging "first world" Christians in realities and praxis outside their home sphere and applying these learnings in their own context. There is an emphasis on providing experiences susceptible to trigger an "hermeneutical rupture."
3. "Globalization" is also about skills of social and economic analysis and theological reflection that need to be developed.

The University of Dubuque Theological Seminary represents still another tack in the "growth in understanding through experience" approach to "articulating" a definition of globalization. But as the following comment from its project steering committee's final report indicates, even after five years of "experience"--both with globalization and the implementation of several curriculum changes related to it including the addition of a cross-cultural immersion experience requirement for M.Div students and a new concentration in cross-cultural ministries--a formal definition had yet to emerge.

UDTS faculty have not as yet hammered out and defined for themselves

> the meaning of GTE. Rather, we have essentially discovered what globalization means experientially. As a result individuals have brought their own notions to the process which for some have remained static while for others, these concepts have become more energized.
>
> At the very least an operative and intuitive definition has emerged which recognizes 1) the necessity of the cross cultural within theological formation, 2) the importance of biblically rooted justice, 3) the importance of the global church to local church vitality, and 4) the possibility that theological knowledge can be understood, and might be necessarily communicated, in other than purely classical learning methods.

The "Dubuque tack" was also taken by three other project schools. After a full year's faculty seminar on approaches to and theological foundations of globalization, for example, one of these schools decided (1) that to push for a definitional consensus would be more divisive that energizing, and therefore, decided (2) to focus instead on programmatic changes that were more consensual and energizing. In contrast, another school entered the project with the goal of effecting "a seminary-wide, ongoing discussion of the meaning of 'globalization' itself. Our purpose is not to arrive at a univocal definition but to explore important dimensions and trace their implications for theological education and ministry."

In contrast, the faculty at Wartburg Seminary skipped over a particular operational definition of globalization, opting instead, during the third year of the project, to draft a new and subsequently adopted mission statement:

> Wartburg Theological Seminary serves the mission of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America by being a center for theological reflection and by training women and men to proclaim the gospel of Jesus Christ to a world in need of God and of personal and social healing. This gospel communicates God's justifying love for sinners in Jesus Christ and calls the Christian community to express God's love by working for freedom and justice in society. Justification and justice stand together at the heart of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Wartburg Seminary carries out its task through disciplined academic study and through a worshiping, multi-cultural, caring community.
>
> In carrying out this task, Wartburg Theological Seminary seeks to be a community where the church and world intersect in thought and worship and where learning leads to mission. Coming from both the United States and overseas, faculty, students and staff, together with their families, bring to the seminary their gifts of learning and experience, as well as the

questions, agonies, and insights of this age. Wartburg encourages people to think globally and act locally as they struggle to interpret and live out their faith in Christ amid the religious, social, economic, cultural and political realities of the world. This discipleship of decision and action grows out of our baptismal identity as members of Christ's body. As a resource for critical theological reflection for the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, we are called to contribute to its theology and to be intentional about provoking discussion of the religious and societal issues that confront the church.

Wartburg's new mission statement is particularly significant because, among other things, it served as the reference point for the most systematic and thorough curriculum revision initiated by any of the project schools. But as already noted, all project schools initiated changes within their formal curriculums, a subject to which we now turn.

B. Changing the Way A Seminary Teaches: the Formal Curriculum

How would Joe Seramane teach this course? What would he say? Where would he begin? Mike Reardon sat with his class notes before him as he prepared to teach the fundamental moral theology course, a course that he had taught many times in his nine years on the faculty. Once again he found himself reflecting on the story of Joe Seramane. It was a story that haunted him since his return from South Africa. The man, the story and the questions were as present to him on the cold snowy evening in Minneapolis as they had been on that August evening in Johannesburg. Six months had passed since his return from South Africa, but the impact of the experience was still very much with him. . . .

Mike knew that he could not teach any of his courses in the same way as he had taught them before South Africa. As he began to rethink the fundamentals course, he struggled to name just how it would be different. In the past he had taught that good moral action is grounded in community and not in an individualistic misuse of human freedom. That was still fundamental. However, his experience had pushed him to see new implications behind the notion. He suspected that in the past he had taught the course in a disembodied way, laying out a basic approach and understanding of ethics before even raising the question of justice. He now knew that the central focus of his teaching had to be justice. It was not one issue among many that needed to be addressed, something to be

attached to Christian ethics. It was the heart and soul of ethics. He began to recognize that he, himself, had moved from being aware of justice to having a passion for justice. But, how do you teach this?

Something else pushed into his awareness. He wanted to convey to this students that any viable Christian morality must have a strong global dimension. The inter-dependence of all peoples had to be a consideration. He wanted them to realize what it means to live justly in the real world, not the small provincial world that was familiar to the majority of his students. To do this he had to make an effort to avoid an overemphasis on intellectual arguments and elaborate systems. He needed to root his approach in the power of stories. Looking again at the class notes before him, Mike knew what he wanted to say, how he must begin. He picked up his pen and began ...

> I want to draw us into the world of Christian ethics through the door of justice, and to do that I want to begin with a story about a man named Joe Seramane . . . .

"Mike Reardon" is not, of course, the ethics professor's real name, nor does "Mike" work in Minneapolis. But the story is real. It is the story, as presented in a teaching case study of the impact of one of the PIP/GTE's international immersions on "Mike Reardon's" teaching.[4]

An essay in that same volume by Craig Blomberg, Associate Professor of New Testament at Denver Seminary, provides another example of how globalization has changed the way a faculty member teaches. In the conclusion to his essay Blomberg writes:

> The nature of this essay by definition has been primarily hermeneutical and exegetical in nature. Isasmuch as this entire volume impinges on theological education, however, certain personal illustrations of the impact of globalization on my teaching in a Christian seminary, in the five areas discussed here [Liberation Theology; Feminism; Religious Pluralism; Economics; Contextualization], may prove apposite. In teaching a variety of required New Testament survey courses, elective English Bible book or theme studies, and required and elective Greek exegesis courses, I try to dwell more heavily on key teaching passages on the topics discussed here. Choices for topics to research for term papers include a liberal dose of issues related to liberation, women, minorities, and wealth and poverty. Required inductive Bible studies regularly assign

---

[4]"Case Study: More Questions Than Answers." Pp 288-292 in Evans, Evans and Roozen (eds.), *The Globalization of Theological Education.*

texts like Ephesians 5:18-27 or 1 Timothy 2:8-15. One of our three required Greek exegesis courses deals solely with the book of James; required texts include both evangelical (Davids and Moo) as well as liberationist (Tamez) commentators. One quarter of the final exam in that course involves an integrated essay responding to the latter.

An elective on parables of Jesus concludes with a field trip to meet personally and talk with leaders and participants in Mile High Ministries--a Denver inner city partnership of suburban and urban church and para-church organizations running a street school, home for unwed mothers, outreach to gays and lesbians, and the like. That field trip is led by one of our graduates, who gave up suburban ministry and residence for the inner city, in part, he claims, due to research on Luke's view of the poor for a seminar I taught on the theology of Luke-Acts. An English Bible elective on Matthew uses as one of three primary texts the cross-cultural commentary by the Roman Catholic priest and former missionary George Montague [*Companion God*, New York: Paulist, 1989]. Input from international students, women and minorities in all classes is sought and valued. Guest speakers from divergent perspectives are periodically invited. Examples could be multiplied; the possibilities are enormous.[5]

"Mile Reardon" is a particularly dramatic example of how the PIP/GTE international immersions precipitated change both in how and in what a faculty member taught. And the pervasive and systematic way in which Craig Blomberg has integrated "globalization" themes and experiences into his teaching is likewise exemplar. Nevertheless, complete documentation of all the ways that the PIP/GTE stimulated changes in participating school's formal curriculum would fill several volumes. To repeat Blomberg's conclusion: "Examples could be multiplied; the possibilities are enormous." At the minimalist end of a continuum of such changes one would find the addition of "cross-cultural" references to course bibliographies and heightened attention to "cross-cultural" examples in the class room experience. At the other extreme one would find a school's addition of an entirely new degree track or a school's pervasive revision of its M.Div curriculum. Such a complete documentation is, of course, beyond the scope of this report. Rather, in the following we attempt only to provide select examples that provide an overview of the range of ways that project school's either have or are trying to change the way they teach.

---

[5]Craig L. Blomberg, "Implications of Globalization for Biblical Understanding." Pp 213-228 in Evans, Evans and Roozen (eds.), *The Globalization of Theological Education.*

1. Course Syllabi and Bibliographies

Over 135 faculty members participated in the international immersions of the PIP/GTE. In evaluation questionnaires and interviews the vast majority of these faculty indicated that, at a minimum, the combination of their immersion experience and their school's participation in the project had prompted them to change their existing course syllabi and bibliographies to include, or in some cases to include more, cross cultural references. Comments such as, "The PIP/GTE has made all of our faculty aware of the need to be more global in the context of every course" and "Just about all of our faculties' course syllabi are beginning to reflect an effort toward multicultural awareness" were typical. In several schools the inclusion of multicultural sources in course syllabi and bibliographies became an informal requirement and in one school it became a formal requirement. The Biblical department at Wesley Seminary systematically revised all department courses to include international voices as required texts; Catholic Theological Union commissioned a bibliographic search for cross-cultural references in theology; Weston Seminary compiled a listing of all courses related to globalization taught in North American, Catholic seminaries; and Denver Seminary hired a consultant with broad international and cross-cultural experience in theological education to review every course and make suggestions, in consultation with individual faculty members, about how to incorporate "globalization" themes and resources into their teaching. At the beginning of the PIP/GTE faculty frequently said they would like to add multicultural sources to their bibliographies but had trouble tracking any down. By the end of the project, such queries typically could be directed to someone else in the project who had already dealt with the same issue.

Such changes place obvious demands on library collections. In response, at least four schools conducted extensive studies of their library holdings of multicultural resources. Published reports from these studies include the University of Dubuque/Wartburg Theological Seminary Library System's, "The Globalization of Theological Education: An Evaluation of the Library Collections (September, 1992)," and Allen Mueller's, June 1993 report to the Wesley Seminary faculty, "Globalization and Theological Libraries: Challenges, Responses and Expectations."

2. *Attention to and Inclusion of Multi-Cultural Illustrations and Examples in Teaching*

While the definitions of globalization developed by the different PIP/GTE schools vary somewhat, they all share with the draft ATS standard's definition--and indeed with every extended discussion of the globalization of theological education of which we are aware--one clear commonality, namely heightened appreciation for contextualization. Although all twelve of the PIP/GTE schools had at least some appreciation for issues of "cultural contextuality" at the beginning of the program, by the end of the project it was an absolutely foundational and unavoidable part of the educational ethos at every school. Whatever else "globalization" might mean at these schools, it is grounded in "cross-cultural" awareness, and this grounding is foundational for the vast majority of structural, programmatic, and cultural changes implemented during the project (indeed, for better or worse, it is the primary "content" of many of these changes). And in this sense, "Mike Reardon's" and Craig Blomberg's efforts to bring cross-cultural examples from "outside" into their everyday class room discussions--"Mike" drawing, for example, on his international immersion experience and Craig drawing on his local immersion experience--are typical of the vast majority of project school faculty.

Our exemplars also point to a second way in which project faculty have typically come to incorporate multicultural awareness into their everyday teaching, namely, by encouraging students to raise and address issues through their own contexts. With increasingly diverse student populations this is perhaps the "easiest" and most natural path to incorporating multi-cultural perspectives into the everyday classroom experience. Indeed, it may be hard for some readers to imagine that drawing on the experiences of students would be a "change," and that therefore the only real change is an increasing diversity of students. But our interviews with minority and international students at several of the project schools suggest that it was, in fact, something that changed over the course of their school's involvement with the PIP/GTE. As one international student put it:

> I used to keep quite when I had a hard time fitting the professors' white, North American examples with my back-home experience--keep quiet not so much because I wanted to, but because none of my professors seemed very interested in my experience or my cultural situation. I think that has changed. At the very least I feel that all the focus on globalization on campus has given me permission to speak about my back-home situation, and in many cases my professors now actually turn to me and ask me how this or that issue, idea or passage might play out back home.

Or, as one of the project school deans put it:

> It seems that it is increasingly the case that both faculty and students are able to view the presence of substantial numbers of Koreans, Hispanics and international students as a rich and valuable resource rather than as students who are in some sense problematic because they don't fit the "mold."

Several schools that have advanced international graduate students have even created courses in which these students are either co-teachers with the regular faculty or lead teachers. The Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, for example, has begun to use international fellowship students in co-teaching roles in its world religions and missiology courses. And the University of Dubuque Theological Seminary lists the following among its January term courses:

> A new one credit hour (4 three hour classes) module enlists international students as the teachers on the theme "Who Is Jesus?" (theologically, historically, culturally). Students speak personally from within the local contexts of Indonesia, El Salvador, Guayan and Korea.

3. New Courses

All of what we have said thus far about changing the way the project schools taught could have, and often did, happen within existing courses. To move globalization toward the core of a school's formal curriculum, therefore, does not necessarily require the heavy investment of new courses or totally re-engineered programs. Nevertheless, at least in terms of courses, all the PIP/GTE seminaries also invested heavily in the "new." Virtually every participating school added new courses stimulated by project involvement. Typically these new courses were either (1) specifically developed to provide students with local or international cross-cultural experiences, and/or (2) specifically developed to provide students with reflective, analytical, and/or practical methods and skills related to globalization. The kind of multi-cultural syllabi and/or engagement of students' multi-cultural experience described above were foundational. A comprehensive list of these courses is beyond the scope of the present report. A quick comparison of 1988 and 1994 course catalogues from the PIP/GTE schools places the number of such new courses at just under 100.

Overall, the balance of these new globalization-related courses was slightly weighted toward mission, world Christianity, and specialized context courses (e.g., urban, rural, Native American, Asia, Africa or Latin America) that stressed cross-cultural techniques of reflection and analysis. The latter included

one or more new immersion type course at every participating school. Indeed, immersion type experiences of just about every imaginable shape and form were developed, ranging from a local, mini-experience incorporated into an existing course such as Craig Blomberg described above, to a semester-long international placement such as United Theological College developed as part of its new M.Div fourth year diploma program, "Ministry in A Global Context." All of the project schools developed a "local immersion"--i.e., North American immersion--as a requirement of their participation in the PIP/GTE, comparable in duration, intensity, and expectations to the project's international immersions. A description of each is contained in the next chapter. Suffice it to note here just two things. First, half of the schools' local project immersions followed the project's international seminar model very closely, typically traveling to two locations, one an "inner city" site and the other a rural or Native American site. Union, Weston, and the Chicago cluster, however, developed different models that provide a rich array of alternatives for other schools seeking to create intense, North American, cross-cultural experiences for their students and faculty.

Second, the majority of project schools have built variations of their PIP/GTE-required local immersion, typically with a shortened duration, into their on-going curriculum. Schools with a January term, for example, may offer a menu of week-long immersion experiences to various urban or rural sites. At least three schools have built a one- or two-day mini-immersion into their required orientation program for all entering M.Div students. Weston and Union have incorporated their unique local immersion models into regularly offered elective courses. And at least one school is planning to use it's project developed and tested local immersion as one option that student's might take to meet the school's new requirement for all students to have a significant cross-cultural experience.

The project has also intensified various schools' efforts to provide their students opportunities for international immersion experiences. Indeed, as we will elaborate later, over half the project schools now require for graduation--primarily of their M.Div students--a significant local or international cross-cultural experience. In most instances schools are working to develop an "approved" menu of experiences provided by other organizations and agencies through which students can fulfil this requirement. Anticipation of the requirement also serves as encouragement for faculty to experiment with developing their own "traveling seminars," usually in partnership with an international host organization. The following except from Wesley Seminary's third year project report is typical:

> **M.Div Latin American Immersion; Mexico City.** Nine seminarians and one faculty member participated in the first Latin American immersion

seminar offered for two-hours credit. The trip was arranged by David Hopkins and designed and staffed by GATE (Global Awareness Through Experience). Evaluations were overwhelmingly positive. The trip participants have had a more than perceptible impact on the Wesley community through pre-trip promotional efforts and post-trip feedback, including a worship service, the sale of t-shirts, and the display of a quilt stitched in light of the experience. Two members of the group returned to Mexico City to work with GATE during the spring break. Five of the nine students elected to take the course for credit. A second immersion will be offered next year.

Does an immersion experience have to include travel? In one of the more unique experiments stimulated by the project, Frank Benz, Professor of Old Testament at Wartburg Theological Seminary coordinated the efforts of students to demonstrate that it does not. The following commentary from a Wartburg report describes an experience developed for a January term seminar. The "immersion" was held in an African village recreated on the Wartburg campus, for a seminar titled *Faith Journeys Together: A Globalization Seminar in Culture and Christianity.* More than twenty students from the two Dubuque seminaries enrolled in the course which focused on African Culture and Christianity. The students planned two experiential events open to the public, to share African culture through a variety of means. All together about 200 people from the community participated. The seminar was so positively received that it was continued in subsequent years.

A drum rolled. "The dancing will begin," came the announcement. The village gathered as the last dance began. It had been a full evening of food, crafts, storytelling, drama, music, games and worship planned by the participants in Faith Journeys Together--a new adventure for the Dubuque seminaries in global education.

The January interim experience was facilitated by Frank Benz with the help of international students. Africa was chosen as the continent to experience with emphasis on Tanzania and Zimbabwe. Resources included readings, videos, displays and one-on-one conversations with Peter Kijanga, Anastasia Malle, Jim Knutson and Ambrose Moyo (Chair of the Department of Religion, University of Zimbabwe and a PIP/GTE partner-host) to learn about the geographic, historical, economic, political, spiritual and cultural aspects of the continent. The seminar culminated with two events open to the public to share what was being learned.

The best learning, of course, was the dialogue with one another. Students began to make connections between their cultures. Of lasting significance

for transformation are the tools of critical analysis which allow people to look at their own situations and begin the process of mutuality and lasting relationships.

While all of the project schools developed a heightened appreciation for the pedagogical efficacy (if not necessity) of an experiential grounding for cross-cultural consciousization and developed new immersion-type opportunities though which students could gain this, the majority of new courses embodying project-related themes were more class-room oriented and thereby more readily incorporated into existing curriculum structures. These courses represent a means of globalizing one's curriculum readily available to virtually every seminary. We therefore present an extended list of examples. The length of the list notwithstanding, the courses are only a fraction of the new course efforts of PIP/GTE schools. We have only included M.Div level courses and have sought to cover the spectrum of typical M.Div curriculum areas while generally limiting ourselves to only two courses per school.

"Bible" is a foundational discipline for every ATS seminary and accordingly has a long established and typically dominant place within existing M.Div curriculums. From a North American location the Bible is an internationally, as well as historically, cross-cultural text--a reality that, under different rubrics, is intrinsic to most modern forms of biblical scholarship and exegesis. Perhaps for this combination of reasons, the PIP/GTE tended to generate more revisions within existing Bible courses than new ones. Nevertheless, new courses were even evident in this field.

Jesus and the Gospels. An intense study of selected gospel texts that illustrate Jesus' conflict with the religious, political, and economic forces of his day is coupled with an investigation of the distinctive ways in which the four Gospels recast this Jesus story in terms of their contexts. (Wartburg)

The Social World of Early Christianity. This will help the student to understand the social environment of early Christianity, from the time of the New Testament through the Patristic period. Attention will be given to the political, economic, literary, and social influences which shaped the development of the early Church, with special reference to the Jewish and Greco-Roman cultural traditions... (Gordon-Conwell)

Different seminaries categorize their course offerings differently, and this is especially true of the PIP/GTE schools' handling of the areas of theology, history, ethics, world Christianity and missions. As might be expected, this constellation of areas was fertile for new courses which ranged from introductory methodology or survey courses to the treatment of relatively specific themes and topics; course content ranged from a global sweep to

finding the global in the immediacy of the local. One also finds in several of the new courses not only an engagement of diversity, but also the struggle to make the unity of the Gospel a central theme.

Cross-Cultural Theology. Jon Sobrino, a theologian from El Salvador, gave the following advice to a gathering of European theologians: "Let the European churches open their ears, their heart, and their minds to other voices, other experiences, other theologies, other committed engagements, other martyrdoms . . ." In this course we shall seek to identity and overcome some of the barriers that hinder this kind of openness. Through cross-cultural understanding we shall discover ways in which Christ is known and proclaimed in different cultures of the world. (Dubuque)

Christianity in a Global Perspective. The course aims at theological integration in light of religious and cultural pluralism and with reference to issues of world wide concern (e.g., gender, ethnicity, poverty, work environment. (United)

Jesus Christ in Context. Christology from an historical and cross-cultural perspective. (CTS)

Finality of Christ. Contemporary experience of religious and cultural pluralism in local and global society and the affirmation of the uniqueness and finality of Jesus Christ as salvific revelation. (Wesley)

The Global Church: Mission and Ministry. Appreciation of Christianity as a global religion in various cultural milieu: theological reflection on the church's diverse presence in the world. (Wesley)

The Globalization of Theology and Ministry: Immigrants, Refugees, and the Church. The responses of local churches in the Boston area to the challenges and concerns raised by growing numbers of new immigrants and refugees will be explored using selected case studies. Attention will be given to the biblical and theological foundations that inform pastoral practice, as well as the ecclesiologies and world views operative within each particular faith community. (Weston)

The Racial Struggle for a Christian America. This course employs the theme of race and religion to study the various campaigns to establish a Christian America. The role of race and religion in the construction of different Christian Americas and the intersection of race and religion in the theologies, ethics and social practices of the various periods will be examined. Groups to be studies: Native American, African-American, Asian American, Anglo-American. (McCormick)

Unity and Diversity: Christian Identity in a Pluralistic Context. This double course exposes students to classical theological statements in Catholic Christianity and in the Lutheran tradition. It also addresses the global and multicultural mission of the church and how Christian/Lutheran identity is defined by this context. It introduces the twin dynamics of contemporary theological education: the faith heritage and the missiological challenges. (LSTC)

Evangelization and Domination: A Theological Critique. The common reading of documents related to the events that marked the beginning of the Latin American and Caribbean cultures. An examination of the theological-juridical justification of the conquest and evangelization, making a theological critique applying the same biblical and theological paradigms used to give it legitimacy. (McCormick)

Conflict and Reconciliation: Christian Encounter with People of Other Faith. Many modern issues are acknowledged to be "deeply inter-religious" but the inclination to seek solutions unilaterally persists; most challenges posed by social and industrial change are challenges equal to all religious communities and to discuss them in isolation can be misleading. Many religious communities in Asia such as Buddhism, Hinduism and Confucianism meet the challenges with rather different resources than do most western Christians. We know there have been serious conflicts of interest; are there also potentials for reconciliation? The purpose of this course, team taught by those specialized in the different religious traditions, is to explore carefully what these other resources are and to examine them in light of our own faith commitments. (LSTC)

Inter-Faith Dialogue: Theory and Practice. This course develops a ministry of inter-faith dialogue. Experiencing the rich heritage of significant faith traditions (e.g., Native American, Asian) will provide an opportunity to appreciate/understand their rituals and symbols and to reflect theologically on the meaning of inter-faith ministry. (CTU)

Cultural Apologetics. This course will present biblical examination of the nature of unbelief with attention to the anatomy and dynamics of idolatry as expressed in contemporary culture. The course will also examine various challenges to Christian truth with a view to challenging the challenger with the gospel. The basic purpose of the course is to equip the student to effectively present the gospel to unbelievers in their own cultural setting. (Gordon-Conwell)

Soteriology in a Pluralistic Context. An examination of the doctrine of salvation as found in the Scriptures, developed in tradition, and interpreted in

contemporary theology. Emphasis will be given to the question of theodocy and to interreligious dialogue on the nature of salvation. (Weston)

Communication for Christian Witness. Christian mission cannot exist without communication. This course explores how we communicate with others interpersonally, interculturally, institutionally and intuitively through symbols within the contexts of faith and across the barriers of unbelief. Biblical and contemporary models will be evaluated for their application to actual situations. (Dubuque)

The practice of ministry was also a prolific area for new courses within the PIP/GTE schools. Such courses ranged from general, integrative courses to virtually every specialty and sub-specialty.

Training for Cross-Cultural Ministry. A quarter-long intensive based on Paulo Freire's methodology providing theological, spiritual and experiential dimensions, designed to help practitioners prepare for cross-cultural ministry overseas and/or at home. Emphasis is placed on ecumenical/inter-faith dialogue and the development of attitudes for global mission and spirituality. (McCormick and CTU)

The Church at Prayer: Ecumenical Trends in Worship. This seminar will explore the variety of ways Christians worship. Each week we will study the genius of a tradition through the participation of guest faculty of the Boston Theological Institute, culminating in an examination of interfaith and ecumenical worship. Traditions include Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Anglican, Presbyterian, Unitarian, Methodist, Congregational and Baptist, Evangelical and pentecostal Worship. Students will be required to make on-site visits of local congregations during the semester. (Weston)

New York City: Its Living Religious Symbols. Firsthand experience of worship and its theological significance in active religious communities in New York City. Included will be Hindu, Buddhist, Islamic, Voodoo and Jewish. (Union)

Topics in World Spirituality. This course will assist the student in understanding the scope of world spiritual traditions, current attempts to facilitate communication between them, and the challenge of assisting them in cooperation on the critical life and death issues which face our species and our planet. (CTS)

The Experience of God in Human Oppression. A study of the spirituality of liberation (Latin-American, Asian, black, feminist) which explores biblical models and their applications for the present. Themes include appeal to

radical conversion, discipleship and commitment, poverty and the poor, the liberating experience of prayer, ministry of solidarity, love and anger, the experience of the Spirit. (CTU)

Cross-Cultural Counseling. This course is designed to assist the student in preparation for work with American subcultures, American minority groups, and internationals living in the United States. The course also explores how one works with culture overseas such as in missions. Attention is given to the psychological needs of missionaries and the children of missionaries. (Denver)

Local Theologies and Preaching. The local context is increasingly being seen as a basis for and place of theological reflection. By examining this setting, we will begin to understand how local theologies work, gain skill in describing them, and consider how those called to public ministry can relate to theologies so situated. Implications of this for preaching will be explored through sermon preparation, delivery and evaluation. (Wartburg)

Teaching in a Multicultural Context. The course will focus on two important aspects of teaching in a multicultural context: a critical understanding of the multicultural debate in education, and how to incorporate multicultural awareness into effective teaching strategies. Participants will utilize teaching exercises, videotapes of teaching sessions, and theoretical understandings to strengthen and critique teaching praxis. (Union)

World View Change Among Internationals. This course explores the changes in attitudes, values, relationships and behavior that typically occur as newly-arrived internationals adjust to the American cultural environment and then as they readjust to their own cultural environment upon their return home. Students also consider the effects of cultural adjustment on receptivity to the gospel. (Denver)

4. A Note On Pedagogy

We have already noted that whatever else globalization might imply for theological education, contextualization is foundational. Both the faculty discussion papers generated within the PIP/GTE, as well as the last decade's more general academic literature in the theological disciplines, contain extensive discussions of the scholarly methods and approaches appropriate to the contextual challenge. But the PIP/GTE forced a confrontation with contextuality from an additional angle: What does contextualization imply about modes of learning and teaching in theological education? The further into the project faculties got, the more urgently they felt this pedagogical question. Few if any feel a definitive answer has emerged. Nevertheless, one

consistent thread in the discussion of changes in PIP/GTE schools was a strong "experiential" dimension to teaching approaches. As one faculty member succinctly put it:

> Our path to globalization may look traditionally research and course oriented. But the privileged place now given to field experience as a resource for theological reflection is destined to revolutionize the way research is performed and the method by which courses are generated and taught.

He went on to add that the experiential comes into play at two different points--first, an experience with "otherness" that then provokes critical reflection on one's own experience. A similar insight prompted one immersion team to suggest Romans 12:2 to its school as THE BIG IDEA undergirding the challenge of globalization:

> Do not be conformed to this world but be transformed by the renewal of your mind, that you may prove what is the will of God, what is good and acceptable and perfect.

William Bean Kennedy, national staff coordinator of PIP/GTE consultants, notes in his extended essay on the pedagogical implications of the project:

> Every mode of learning connects new experiences to old ones, according to how each of us has been shaped in the past. . . . A first step in transformative learning is to affirm and use our past experience as a valid source of knowledge as well as a fundamental influence in all our learning. Our pedagogies must develop ways to help persons bring that patterning into consciousness where it can be recognized, analyzed and utilized.[6]

He then proceeds to suggest, building on the prior work of many, that the empathetic entering of another's experience is one proven step toward transformative learning. It is also a process that comes with the additional benefit of learning from the other. Further, entering another's experience is necessarily an interactive or relational process that should push toward the search for commonalities as well as the appreciation of differences. Drawing on the diverse experience of class room students is an immediate resource for doing this, and makes a strong case for seeking increased diversity in a school's

---

[6]William Bean Kennedy, "Liberating Pedagogies in the Globalizaion of Theological Education. Pp 278-279 in Evans, Evans and Roozen (eds.), *The Globalization of Theological Education.*

student recruitment efforts. The appeal of immersions seems to follow naturally from this perspective. Many PIP/GTE faculty have also found themselves being increasingly drawn to the use of case studies (what some have referred to as "vicarious" experiences) and a variety of other narratively oriented books and media.

PIP/GTE faculty frequently noted that an increasing emphasis on experiential learning also pushed them to engage in two other dimensions: (1) the practical, or as one faculty person put it, "the real;" and (2) multi-disciplinary approaches. "It has taken us out of our ivory towers and put us face to face with very real problems," is how one person put it. "It's forced direct, hands-on exposure to the problems of those we encounter. Not just theory, but practice," are the words of another. Why? Because the "experiences" being used are seldom those of professional scholars, but rather of practitioners, either professionals, professionals-in-the-making, or just everyday folk struggling to survive and/or practice their faith. The wholeness intrinsic to "experience" also cuts across traditional academic disciplines. The "experience" is not, however, an end in itself. The real pedagogical challenges, as William Kennedy reminds us, are (1) bringing critical skills to the analysis of one's experience including connecting it to the historical resources of faith, and then (2) utilizing one's experience and analysis toward the construction of more life affirming and forward spiraling systematic and action frameworks. As one scholar put it, "it is the challenge of a critically reflective, experientially/contextually grounded method ***in*** ministry." There is also near universal agreement among PIP/GTE faculty that it is a challenge that requires a great deal more creative attention.

5. New Degree Requirements and Systematic Curriculum Revisions

During the first year of the PIP/GTE one of the school's faculty project coordinators lamented:

> We offer lots of courses in world Christianity, including one or more taught every year by a visiting, international professor--all prominent scholars in their countries. Unfortunately, the visiting professors' courses are all electives. Many, in fact most, of our students therefore leave here without ever being exposed to this globalizing resource.

The coordinator then perked up a bit and added with determination, "One of my personal goals is to see to it that they [the visiting, international professors] teach in required courses!" By the end of the project the coordinator had achieved his goal. We tell this story to reinforce the point that in terms of moving something to the core of one's educational ethos, some courses count

more than others, required courses being among those that count the most. There are at least two reasons for this. Perhaps most obviously, because all students have to take them (or, in some schools, demonstrate equivalent experience or competency). Not only does a required course have symbolic weight in defining what a curriculum takes as foundational, changes in degree requirements demand the attention of a school's entire faculty (not to mention students, administrators and trustees) in a way that changing electives does not. The fact that nine of the twelve PIP/GTE school's added a globalization requirement, at a minimum, to their M.Div programs during the project is one of the key, concrete indicators of the project's impact.

The kind of globalization requirement added by project schools varied, falling into one or more of the following five general categories: (1) including globalization as a "perspectival" requirement; (2) including a cross-cultural dimension in a required, new student orientation "course;" (3) using globalization as the foundational theme in a required, integrative seminar; (4) requiring a cross-cultural immersion experience; and (5) creating an entirely new curriculum in which globalization is one of the foundational themes. Many seminaries have distribution requirements for their M.Div programs, including Weston Seminary. But during the PIP/GTE Weston added to this what they call "perspectival requirements," including one related to globalization. Weston's catalogue describes these requirements in the following way:

> Perspectival requirements: 9 hours. In the light of Vatican II's invitation to learn from the "signs of the times" and the Society of Jesus' efforts to re-think its mission in terms of a "faith that does justice" in an increasingly global context, students should become acquainted with three major perspectives within which contemporary Catholic theology is developing: the interreligious and ecumenical perspective (PE), the global and social justice perspective (PG), and the interdisciplinary perspective (PI). To this end, students are encouraged to take one course in each of these three perspectives during their M.Div studies.

Many seminaries include a pre-first-semester retreat or course, or a first semester course in their orientation program for new students. Those framed as a course are it typically designed to serve the dual purposes of attention to some substantive area and, because all new students must take it, orientation to seminary life. Prior to the PIP/GTE, for example, a pre-fall-semester, three week intensive in Greek served these purposes at the Lutheran School of Theology, Chicago. During the project, LSTC replaced the three-week intensive in Greek with the three-week intensive course, Unity and Diversity, described in our above list of "new courses."

McCormick Seminary initiated a new fall semester orientation course called *Pilgrimage in Faithfulness*, in 1988--the year PIP/GTE began. It is described in McCormick's 1988 catalogue in the following way:

> All students beginning Master's level study in the fall of 1988 and thereafter must enroll in the one-unit course titled *Pilgrimage in Faithfulness*. This course, taught in the fall quarter by a faculty team, is designed to lay the foundations for integration of the curriculum around major themes of concern in Christian life, worship, and witness as these themes emerge in the tradition of the Church and are appropriated today both in thought and in action. *Pilgrimage in Faithfulness* brings the entire entering class together with a team of four or five faculty. It meets during the late afternoon and evening one day each week, and includes on these occasions presentations, preceptorials, a common meal, and an act of worship.

The 1994 catalogue description of the course is virtually the same. Two relevant points, however, are missed in the catalogue descriptions. First, because of the nature of McCormick's student population--almost evenly divided among Blacks, Latinos, Asians and Anglos--the course is both a cross-cultural experience in and of itself, and this cross-cultural reality is made an explicit part of the substantive development of the course. Second, while the cross-cultural dimension has been an explicit part of the course since its inception, during the PIP/GTE an explicit concern with "internationalization" was added.

For over a decade, Wesley Seminary has begun its new student orientation with a several day, pre-fall-semester retreat. During the PIP/GTE it began incorporating one or more "mini-immersions" in various locations in Washington D.C. into this retreat format--an experiential, cross-cultural pedagogy also used in LSTC's Unity and Diversity course. At Wesley the experiences of the orientation retreat lay the groundwork for a required three-year sequence, totalling eight credit hours, called, *Practice in Ministry and Mission* (PM&M). PM&M combines a monthly, three-hour PM&M Colloquy across all three years with weekly participation in an on-campus Covenant-Discipleship group in the first year, a relatively standard field experience-education placement in the second year, and an immersion experience in a cross-cultural, developing context, either internationally or in the United States in the third year. A Wesley faculty report provides the following description of the immersion requirement:

> Students will design their immersion experience in consultation with a faculty member with particular interest, expertise, or experience in the setting or issue with which the student wishes to engage. This may be

> done individually or in small groups. Faculty members may wish to initiate opportunities (for example, international study trips or exchange programs). Students will identify lay persons and mentor pastors with whom they will develop a learning/serving covenant for activities and experiences that will occur during the immersion. The Globalization Committee will develop a list of opportunities (such as existing programs like AMERC, study tours, or established exchange programs) and develop guidelines to help students design their immersion experience. Students are strongly encouraged to live in the context of the immersion although other commuting arrangements may be possible. A minimum of three weeks participation is expected.

A reflective paper on the immersion experience is also required. Typically coming in a student's final semester, the paper is to be integrative of a student's entire seminary experience.

The United Theological College's new course, *Christianity in Global Perspective* (described above), also is an integrative requirement for M.Div students. Because of the unique consortium structure of United's M.Div, the course also serves as a requirement for M.Div students at United's two partner seminaries--Montreal Diocesan Theological College and Presbyterian College--and as an elective for masters level students enrolled in McGill University's Faculty of Religious Studies. The course is taught by a McGill professor as the final course in the two year M.A. sequence that the three seminaries' students take at McGill, before doing their third and "in-ministry" M.Div year at their respective seminary.

At Wesley Seminary students receive three credit-hours for fulfilling their immersion requirement--the same as a typical course at Wesley. Denver Seminary, The University of Dubuque Theological Seminary, and Wartburg Theological Seminary also added three-credit-hour cross-cultural experience requirements during the project. Dubuque's 1994 catalogue provides the following description:

> The faculty has approved a required three-hour cross-cultural component with the curriculum for students entering [the M.Div] beginning in the 1992-93 academic year.
>
> Such an experience would be a structured encounter with persons of a different culture within the context and on the theological, social and experiential terms of the host culture. Objectives of such an encounter involve the following:
>
> - to wrestle with the particular ways two-thirds world Christians understand their beliefs and express their ethos and faith;

- to explore organizational patterns for church leadership which are culturally based;
- to encounter first hand the economic, political and social reality of the marginalized;
- to learn how to dialogue across different theological, ideological, ecclesiastical, cultural, social and economic boundaries.

This requirement may be met through, but not limited to, such offerings as rural, urban and native American immersions, January term urban immersion in Chicago as part of the SCUPE program, January term rural plunge, study seminars to Mexico, Central America, to name a few of the opportunities.

Like Wesley, Dubuque, and Denver, Wartburg's three-credit-hour cross-cultural immersion requirement incorporate's a balance between an openness to a student's initiative and a menu of both regular curriculum immersion offerings and "approved" offerings from external agencies. Wartburg is, however, unique among project schools in the location of the immersion requirement in a totally re-designed curriculum structure. Several of the project schools undertook a curriculum review prior to changing course requirements and several others were just entering a review process "in anticipation of revision" as the project formally ended. None of the other project schools, however, moved or has yet to move to as systematic a restructuring of their M.Div curriculum as has Wartburg.

Wartburg's new curriculum is so unique that it defies easy, narrative summation. We therefore include for the reader's own review a complete diagram of it from Wartburg's 1994-96 catalogue, including the foundational prevalence of globalization. We add just four interpretive comments. First, the curriculum was explicitly designed to embody Wartburg's new, 1991 mission statement (presented above). Second, the curriculum is designed to lead a student sequentially through the engagement of six evolving "meta themes," one theme each semester, beginning with "to learn to think religiously about the context and to think contextually about religion." The meta themes move through *leitourgia, didaskalia, kerygma, and diakonia*, and conclude with "where learning leads to mission." Third, rather than a cycle of multiple, semester-long courses, a variety of course (or perhaps better, subject) time-frames are used, especially in the first and last semester. Fourth, although it is not evident in the course titles on the "map," many of the courses are team taught and explicitly cross-disciplinary. The design for each year was drafted by a different cross-disciplinary team of faculty members.

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

MASTER OF DIVINITY CURRICULUM

JUNIOR YEAR BEGINNING 1994-95

Prerequisite: Greek Summer: BI 003-004W New Testament Greek

FALL SEMESTER *To learn to think religiously about the context and to think contextually about religion*		
Week 1	IN 100W Local Theologies	1 cr. hr.
Week 2-4	IN 102W Religion, Anthropology, and the Human World 3 cr. hrs.	BI 160W Exegetical Readings in the Greek New Testament 2 cr. hrs.
Week 5-12	BI 190W Jesus and the Gospels 3 cr. hrs.	
	HT 104W Foundations of the Church 2 cr. hrs.	
	HT 198W Justification and Justice 1 cr. hr.	
Week 13-14	IN 104W Religious Issues in Contemporary Life 2 cr. hrs.	
Total		14 cr. hrs.
INTERIM	*Elective	3 cr. hrs.
SPRING SEMESTER *CONTEXTS OF/FOR CELEBRATION* *(Leitourgia)* *Worshiping in faith and thinking the faith to share the gospel*		
Week 1-14	BI 192W Pauline Letters and Mission	3 cr. hrs.
	MN 130W From Text to Sermon	1 cr. hr.
	HT 106W Ages of Faith and Reform	2 cr. hrs.
	HT 140W Systematic Theology	3 cr. hrs.
	MN 106W Parish Worship	3 cr. hrs.
	*Elective	3 cr. hrs.
Total		15 cr. hrs.

Summer	MN 280W CPE	6 cr. hrs.

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
MASTER OF DIVINITY CURRICULUM

MIDDLER YEAR BEGINNING 1995-96

FALL SEMESTER *CONTEXTS OF/FOR INQUIRY* *(Didaskalia)* *Faith seeking wisdom and understanding to teach the gospel*			
Week 1	BI 244W	Interpreting the Bible	1 cr. hr.
Week 2-14	BI 222W	Hebrew Language and Bible, Part I	4 cr. hrs.
	HT 212W	Lutheran Confessions	2 cr. hrs.
	MN 250W	Educational Ministry	3 cr. hrs.
	IN 200W	Racism Workshop	1 cr. hr.
		*Electives	3-6 cr. hrs. / 6-8 cr. hrs.†
Total			14-17 cr. hrs. / 17-19 cr. hrs.†
INTERIM		*Elective	3 cr. hrs.
SPRING SEMESTER *CONTEXTS OF/FOR WITNESS* *(Kerygma)* *Knowing and doing the truth to proclaim the gospel*			
Week 1-14	BI 224W	Hebrew Language and Bible, Part II	4 cr. hrs.
	HT 222W	Global Christianity in the Modern World	2 cr. hrs.
	MN 230W	Preaching	3 cr. hrs.
	IN 206W	Theology of the Congregation	1 cr. hr.
		*Electives	3-6 cr. hrs. / 6-8 cr. hrs.†
Total			13-16 cr. hrs. / 16-18 cr. hrs.†

INTERNSHIP YEAR

MN 370W	Internship	27 cr. hrs.

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
MASTER OF DIVINITY CURRICULUM

SENIOR YEAR BEGINNING 1997-98

FALL SEMESTER *CONTEXTS OF/FOR SERVICE* *(Diakonia)* *Integrating learning and ministry to serve the world*			
Week 1	MN 380W	Pastoral Theology Method	1 cr. hr.
Week 2-14		*Biblical Distribution Elective	3 cr. hrs.
	MN 350W	Church and Ministry	3 cr. hrs.
		*Electives	6-9 cr. hrs. / 9-12 cr. hrs.†
Total			13-16 cr. hrs. / 16-19 cr. hrs.†
INTERIM		*Elective	3 cr. hrs.
SPRING SEMESTER *Where learning leads to mission*			
Week 1-10	HT 322W	Christianity in North America 2 cr. hrs.	*Electives 3-6 cr. hrs. 6-9 cr. hrs.†
	IN 306W	The Bible in the Parish 2 cr. hrs.	
	IN 308W	Leaders in Mission: A Theological Task 2 cr. hrs.	
Week 11-14	IN 310W	Theology in Transition 1: Context 2: Outreach 3: Nurturing Community 4: Service and Justice 3 cr. hrs.	
Total			12-15 cr. hrs. / 15-18 cr. hrs.†

6. New Degree Tracks and Certificate Programs

A final way in which several PIP/GTE schools changed their formal curriculums was through the addition of new tracks, concentrations, or specialties to existing degree programs, or the addition of entirely new programs. Building on its local project immersion, Denver Seminary added an M.Div specialization in urban ministry using 32 of the total 144 hours required in its M.Div curriculum. Dubuque Seminary added a concentration in cross-cultural studies requiring 18 of the total 96 hours required in its M.Div curriculum. The Dubuque catalogue description of the concentration in cross-cultural studies begins with the following paragraphs. The first presents a passionate apologetic for the importance of globalization for a local pastor; the second notes the multiple immersion type experiences available through this relatively small school located in a relatively small city in America's heartland:

> In a time when we have become internationalized scientifically, economically and culturally, how the Church responds and witnesses to this global community is a challenge of increasing importance. The Globalization Program at UDTS seeks to train ministers to speak and lead in this new reality that faces the Church and the world. Such training includes a search for faith and cultural self-understanding in a group context, cross-cultural studies, travel and leadership exchanges, and action for peace, environmental health, justice and human rights at local and global levels. The very existence of the global Christian Church *oikos* requires its leaders, however local they may be, to have a knowledge of Christian faith as it is expressed and captured through a different social, cultural, political and ecclesiastical lens than their own.
>
> Here in America's heartland students have many opportunities to take advantage of intense exposure to Christianity in another culture and context. Local immersions of four-day duration occur among the Dakota Sioux people and the neighborhoods of Chicago. All students are encouraged to attend a January three-week term at Cook Theological School for Native Americans where faculty also teach at regular intervals. Immersions to Central America and the Middle East are available. Overseas immersions provide students opportunity to study in Seoul, Korea at the International Center for Theology where church leaders from around the world study. Other reciprocal options are available with seminaries in Ghana, Mexico and Puerto Rico.

Catholic Theological Union, Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago and McCormick Theological Seminary developed a joint Doctor of Ministry

Degree Program with concentrations in liturgy, spirituality, and cross-cultural ministries. As described in the CTU catalogue:

> The term "cross-cultural ministries" is understood here to designate ministries exercised by persons who are not members of the culture in which they are ministering, or ministries exercised in a minority culture. In the latter case, the minister may or may not be a member of that same minority culture. Thus, the program hopes to address both outsiders and insiders in varied cultural situations.
>
> This is a concentration for persons who already have experience in cross-cultural ministry, not for those who wish to enter it for the first time. Consequently, the five years of ministerial experience prerequisite for the entry into this concentration must have been in a cross-cultural setting and in not more than two such settings.
>
> The concentration focuses on areas of ministry where cultural differences raise special challenges to pastoral and missionary activity. Skills development focuses on tools for analysis of cultures, communication across cultural boundaries and differing styles of leadership appropriate to living on cultural boundaries. Theory will center on the understanding of culture, the region where culture and theology intersect and formation of communities within and across cultural and faith boundaries. The concentration is interdisciplinary and ecumenical.

Wesley Seminary also developed a new option within its "extensive" D.Min program--that is, its D.Min program for those who live within commuting distance of Wesley. The new specialization is in "contextual theology" and includes in the second year "an immersion experience in Puerto Rico, El Salvador, or other locations." This new specialization is in addition to the Wesley's "Intensive International D.Min," which was piloted in 1988-89, and offered on a selective basis beginning in 1994.

Perhaps the most unique new program developed during the PIP/GTE is the Ministry in a Global Context Diploma, initiated by United Theological College in cooperation with the entire Joint Board of Theological Colleges in Montreal. The program, to be supervised by the Joint Board, is "a post M.Div/S.T.M./Dip.Min Diploma aimed for ministers with 3 years or more of experience, *and for selected students wishing to do a 4 year M.Div*" (emphasis added). The eleven month program consists of two parts: a six-month, supervised, overseas internship/immersion in a "2/3" world country, set up by the respective Joint Board seminary's national church office in consultation with the school; and a full term of work in Montreal including two courses taken at the McGill Faculty of Religious Studies (one elective and *Christianity*

in Global Perspective--the latter described above in the list of new courses), a colloquium, a local practicum, and a tutorial study project. During one's overseas experience, the costs of which "are expected to be absorbed by the Churches," a student is required to:

- Participate in the life and work of the Church and community.
- Participate in regular, supervisory sessions.
- Engage in sustained reflection and analysis in connection with the student's learning center.
- Keep a regular log/journal of events, insights, and theological and analytical reflections, which will be a "key" document for reflection in the program's 'back-home" Colloquium.
- Identify bibliographic material and learning resources for use in a student's tutorial study project.

The Local Practicum is intended as a supervised field placement in a site that "will provide in local context, continuity with issues met in the overseas experience." In choosing the local site, "experiences of crossing into different cultural, spiritual, value systems and existential milieus will be privileged."

The above describes the structure of the program. Its heart and soul, however, is better captured in the following "considerations regarding globalization" contained in the preamble to the program's initiating proposal:

- *Contextualization* and *globalization* need to go hand in hand as "global awareness" allows us to look at our own context with new eyes and understanding.
- Considering the shifts and changes in the *multi-cultural* Montreal, Quebec, Canadian social fabric, we recognize that the "local" reality has become "global" with the presence and juxtaposition of a great variety of cultures, value systems, religious and spiritual diversity.
- Taking seriously the changes in the Quebec/Canada social fabric and seeking to explore its implications for theological education and training for Christian ministry, globalization means *engaging critically our inter-cultural reality* with an attitude of dialogue and respect, a readiness to re-examine our own assumptions and world views and to come to a new understanding about the mode of presence and self-understanding of Church, Ministry and of the Gospel in a pluralistic society.
- Direct *experience* and *exposure* are key components in engaging in a critical reflective process which hopefully will result in a

new understanding representing an epistemological rupture.

- Globalization has a *justice* and *human rights* dimension, nurtured by a vision of just relationships, working for social change and solidarity.
- Addressing together *world issues* from the perspective of the underside of history (ecology, economy, North/South relationships, racism, gender, class, work, etc).
- Globalization is about engaging in a mutually enriching and questioning *two-way learning process,* based on experience and reflected upon with rigor and vulnerability.

C. Changing the Way a Seminary Teaches: The Informal Curriculum

"Dalton DuBose" graduated from seminary several years ago, but not without a vocational crisis in her senior year. As described in the case study, "To Go Home Again:"

> By the time she entered seminary, her oldest child was in college, the youngest was a freshman in high school, and her husband was well-established in his law firm. Dalton served as president of her Junior League, spent one day a week working in a downtown soup kitchen, and was an elder in her church--a large, affluent, downtown congregation in a Southern City. She had come to seminary because, as she put it in her application, she "wanted to help people with their problems," and she believed that counseling from a Christian perspective was the way she could be of most help.[7]

Until January of her middler year she had felt called to work in a suburban congregation, especially to help people like herself with their family problems and to try to get the congregation involved in social ministry. Her seminary required all M.Div students to take a course that placed them in a significantly different social context. Dalton selected a three-week immersion course experience in Central America to fulfill the requirement. The pain and poverty of the people and the people's perception of the duplicity of the United States in their suffering was, in Dalton's words, "the most powerful and important learning experience of my seminary career." It also precipitated a wrenching year-long dialogue with herself, her classmates and her advisor, "Professor Ben

---

[7]"Case Study: To Go Home Again." Pp 200-202 in Evans, Evans and Roozen (eds.), *The Globalization of Theological Education.*

Palmer" over her calling after seminary:

> Was she to push away from Central America to home, to forget what she had heard and seen in Central America, to repress the questions that had been raised, and continue to live a life marked by kindness and the acceptance of civic responsibilities? Or was she to abandon the road that led smoothly from her past, from her home and place, give up the assumptions about the nature of the United States and her place in it, and adopt some radical--God knows what--ministry in solidarity with the poor? Or was there some middle way, some way to avoid extremes?
>
> The closer she came to graduation, the more Dalton wondered why the seminary had put her in such a situation. Was it, she finally asked Ben, fair or right to require such a course of her? Was the course intended to do anything more than produce "liberal guilt" in her? *Or did the seminary, with its growing endowment, really expect her to make radical changes and become alienated from her family and the congregation that had nurtured her? She didn't see any of her professors doing that.*[8]

One consequence of providing students the tools of social analysis is that it should heighten, as it seemingly did for Dalton, students' awareness of their seminary's institutional practices and policies, and correspondingly enhance the importance of this "informal curriculum" in a student's formative experiences. In the following we look at changes that PIP/GTE schools made in their informal curriculums, first in their symbolization, then in their practices, and finally in their structure.

1. Symbolization

Talk of mission statements is so prevalent today in the literature on and practice of organizational change that it is almost dismissively faddish to do one's "vision thing," and then get on with life--more often than not in the latter case, business-as-usual. Despite the heap of dead or dying mission statements notwithstanding, there is no doubt that such statements also can represent the positive energy of new expectations. In comparing his school's old mission statement to the new one developed during the PIP/GTE, a faculty member captures both the best and the worst case scenarios:

> The PIP/GTE did serve as a catalyst for both a new mission statement and

[8]Ibid. p 202.

> the beginning of curriculum revision based on that new mission statement. Our immersion experiences surely helped shape the statement. It seems to be the case that our immersion experiences also made us much more eager to tackle the mission statement question. My recollection is that our prior mission statement was developed out of a sense of duty and the looming fact of a reaccreditation visit. This mission statement grew out of our sense that the old statement was not adequate and did not reflect our new view of the seminary's mission. The curriculum changes are still quite gradual, but we have in mind a fairly dramatic change in the curriculum in order to orient it more toward our sense of mission.

In fact, half of the PIP/GTE schools developed new mission statements during the project which explicitly note globalization's increasing centrality to the schools' understanding of ministry, mission and theological education. We have already presented, for example, Wartburg's new statement with justification and justice at its heart, recognition of a pluralistic world, and encouragement to "think globally and act locally." Chicago Theological Seminary framed its new statement in terms of both mission and commitment. It concludes:

> Inclusive in spirit and practice, the Seminary is deeply committed to:
>
> - Sharing the Gospel of God's love and justice in word and action;
> - Relating the historic faith to the issues of contemporary life;
> - Being a multi-cultural, multi-racial and international community; and
> - Sustaining a global and interfaith environment in which the meaning of the Christian faith and its relation to the world is evoked through free inquiry and debate.

The University of Dubuque Theological Seminary shared in the framing of the following, new University mission statement:

> The mission of the University of Dubuque, College and Theological Seminary, is to prepare women and men for leadership and service in our global community by nurturing the intellectual, spiritual, emotional and physical development of students through college education with a foundation in the liberal arts and through theological education focused on parish ministry. The University, an ecumenical community affiliated with the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), places emphasis on acquisition and application of knowledge, communication and understanding among people of different cultures, and awareness and stewardship of the environment.

It should also be noted that all of the schools that did not reframe their mission statements during the project, entered the project with commitments to globalization already in their mission statements. Article Six of Gordon-Conwell's mission statement, for example, reads: "To develop in students a vision for God's redemptive work throughout the world...." A statement in Wesley Seminary's catalogue dating back to at least 1988 reads:

> John Wesley, the founder of Methodism for whom the Seminary is named, looked upon the world as his parish. Wesley Seminary likewise has a global vision of ministry which demands responsiveness to the aspirations and needs of peoples throughout the world, readiness to learn from the experience of Christians in other lands, openness to dialogue with the world's religious and secular faiths, and cooperation with all those on earth who seek to advance the quality of human life and of our environment.

Mission statements, like any set of intentions, directions, and expectations, do not always capture an institution's primary, enacted commitments. Perhaps for this reason it has become a near truism among organizational consultants, to paraphrase one veteran's translation of putting one's money where one's words are, that "It ain't a priority until I see it in the budget!" At the minimum level of funding the variety of new courses, positions, programs and partnerships noted in this chapter, all of the PIP/GTE schools were meeting this priority-test at the conclusion of the project.

Perhaps more significantly, at least eight of the twelve project schools made "cash" budgetary commitments--equal to their $10,000 annual contribution to the PIP/GTE--to continued involvement with external agencies or consultants to further develop their globalization efforts. For six of these schools--Dubuque, McCormick, Wartburg, Wesley, Union and United--this took the form of a joint, three-year, continued relationship with Plowshares Institute, informally referred to as PIP/GTE-Phase II and formally called, Local-Global Connections (L/GC). Three new schools--Montreal Diocesan Theological College of the Anglican Church of Canada; the Presbyterian College, Montreal; and the Faculty of Religious Studies, McGill University--also joined L/GC, working in a mentoring relationship with United. The L/GC continuation project includes four formal structural components:

- Two slots per year per school in one of Plowshares' regularly scheduled international immersions;
- One on-campus workshop per school per year focusing on the institutionalization of a global perspective and chosen from a menu developed by Plowshares in consultation with the participating

schools;

- Seed money for individual faculty development and student cross-cultural experiences; and,
- An annual, joint meeting of the participating schools' presidents and project coordinators for consultation and collaboration among participating schools.

L/GC is totally funded by the participating schools. Indeed, one of the motivations for this was to experiment with the self-sustainability of the PIP/GTE experience without external money.

Denver Seminary and Weston School of Theology provide two alternative models of self-financing external assistance. Denver committed its continuation funding to hiring a consultant to work with individual faculty on their course syllabi and bibliographies (as already discussed) and to continue international travel opportunities for faculty. Weston committed its funding to continued work with immigrant agencies and communities in the Boston area.

Also related to funding: (1) several of the project schools either had received grant funding or were in the process of developing grant proposals at the conclusion of the PIP/GTE for special projects related to their globalization efforts; (2) two of the project schools were including explicit mention of globalization efforts in capitol campaigns; and (3) Wartburg seminary's graduating class of 1993 provided "global travel scholarships" to the seminary as a class gift. The first paragraph of the "Gift Charter" reads as follows:

> In the spirit of Wartburg Theological Seminary's commitment to more fully globalize theological education, we, the Class of 1993, wish to enhance that with a class gift. Through the class's gifts and intentions, we wish to establish an endowed fund for Global Travel Scholarships.

Grant proposals stimulated by PIP/GTE ranged from relatively typical academic endeavors (e.g., "developing a shared hermeneutic for contextual analysis and theologizing across the divisions of Bible, History/Theology and Ministry) to McCormick Seminary's "language lab" (which we describe in more detail below), to the University of Dubuque's application to the Pew Partnership for Civic Change program, certainly the largest and possibly the most unique PIP/GTE-stimulated proposal. The University of Dubuque's proposal for "Project People Link" was developed by David Scotchmer, the university seminary's PIP/GTE coordinator and an anthropologist with extensive international mission experience. Scotchmer credited his exposure to "the global within urban America" during the PIP/GTE and his desire to create an on-going vehicle for involving seminary students in this reality as major motivating factors for his effort. He also credited both his missionary

experience and the PIP/GTE international immersions for suggesting some of the techniques of economic and community empowerment "with and among" the poor that were contained in the proposal. The opening paragraph in the project's proposal provides the following summary:

> In a community deeply divided by social, economic, and racial strife--Dubuque, Iowa, Project People Link will create a model for civic change through a new broad-based coalition of partners in the educational, religious, business and governmental sectors that will plan and implement a coordinated strategy for worker training and job creation **with** and **among** the poor in [Dubuque] Census Tracts 1-5. The bases for economic development will be addressed by (1) normalizing the relationships between the powerless and the powerful, (2) creating new networks of communication and care, (3) exploring new business creation among the poor, and (4) making available the means of life assessment and self-development.

At the conclusion of the PIP/GTE the Dubuque proposal was one of seventeen semi-finalists in the Pew Partnership for Civic Change national competition.

An increasingly prevalent reminder in the recent, critical literature on theological education is that whatever else theological schools are, they are communities of discourse. Perhaps at its pen-ultimate level, therefore, the challenge of the PIP/GTE was to change the nature of a school's discourse. Some of the things we have already noted about bringing new voices and experiences into the conversation suggest that the nature of the PIP/GTE schools' "conversation" did change over the course of the project. In commenting on the impact of the project's immersion experiences, three faculty members, each from a different school, are more direct in their assessment:

> The immersion experience provided a context for examining and thinking about globalization that was invaluable. Through the opportunity provided us, we [the school's immersion team] had a chance throughout the three weeks to be challenged by and continually reflect on matters of globalization. In other words, there was a "community of discourse" established, which has remained crucial for our continued exploration of these matters.

> By being involved in the PIP/GTE's immersions, globalization became a "natural" or automatic part of this seminary's discussion.

> Participation of [our school] in the project has allowed for discussion, formally and informally, on the conditions of the places in which we were immersed, as well as the world in general. I would be sitting in the

> cafeteria and hear people discussing their immersion with other people, [and] this became a springboard for further discussion and sharing. I truly believe it [globalization] needs to start at this level in order to bring it to a deeper and more broad level.

In many ways we think the latter comment about "cafeteria discussions" may be the most telling indicator of the extent to which globalization permeated the ethos of the participating schools. And after sitting in the cafeterias of every project school several times across the duration of the project, the project evaluator can report that: (1) stereo-types about cafeteria food are firmly grounded in reality; (2) by the end of the project, globalization was a prevalent theme in the constellation of mini-discussions--whether among faculty and/or students--found in every cafeteria, and (3) the evaluator did not initiate meal-time conversation with a single student, staff, or faculty member during his final round of site visits that was not at least aware, and in most cases highly enthusiastic about, their school's increasing involvement with globalization. During the project a notable change in the content of material on student bulletin boards provides further evidence of the heightened presence of globalization in the various school's collective consciousness. Such changes included information about new caucus, discussion, or prayer groups; immersion, mission, and study opportunities abroad; guest lectures and special worship experiences; not to mention an occasional cartoon, piece of poetry or art, and testimony. Entirely new bulletin boards devoted to globalization-related material appeared at several schools, and one seminary developed a regular, weekly, noon-time "Table Talk" for the discussion of globalization-related issues and experiences.

In terms of more formal faculty discourse, globalization was the topic of year-long faculty seminars at four project schools and was the theme of one or more faculty retreats at all but one or two others. Showing the "less than linear" pattern typical of faculty planning, a report from Wesley Seminary describes its year-long study focus in the following way:

> With the encouragement of our new Dean, the faculty study topic committee proposed concentrating our customary study time, prior to faculty business meetings, on globalization. The proposal envisioned each member of the faculty writing on the relationship between her and his own field and research and "globalization," with tentative plans to fashion a publishable volume from the contributions. This initial proposal encountered opposition since there was a lack of a shared understanding of globalization as well as a lack of clarity with respect to the intersection of various fields of study and the proposed topic. The proposal was recast, and the year was spent reading and discussing faculty papers assigned around four major ways to conceptualize "globalization:"

> evangelism, ecumenism, interfaith dialogue, and social justice. Attempts at summarization and evaluation of this process will be discussed at next fall's faculty retreat.

The importance of such study was underscored by a long-time observer of theological education who concluded that:

> If globalization is to become the revitalizing recovery and recasting of the catholicity of the church that could bring a new level of effectiveness and excellence to theological education . . . it will have to generate a more profound body of scholarship and more effective pedagogical methods than presently is the case.

In support of redirecting project faculty research toward advancing the "body of scholarship" related to globalization, the PIP/GTE provided modest "seed money" grants. The funding was especially oriented to encourage intentional cross-cultural, international travel--typically during sabbaticals--for new research and/or to develop greater facility with languages other than English. A complete list of project-related research would be as extensive and as varied as the list of new globalization related courses. Suffice it to note here that the research ranged from video tapes to collections of poetry; from "Mixed Pedagogies: A Critical Comparison of Academic and Experiential Learning" to "Developing a Curriculum for Globalization and Preaching" to "The Development of an Evangelical Alternative to Religious Pluralism;" from exploring partnership possibilities in Brazil to exploring partnership possibilities in the Ukraine; and from a survey of globalization resources available at other seminaries to a longitudinal survey of faculty and student attitudes toward globalization over the five years of the PIP/GTE at one seminary.

Scholarly discourse is one of the two foundations of theological education. The other is devotion to God, symbolically centered at most seminaries in their community worship. We have already noted one PIP/GTE president's perception of the project's impact on his school's worship and the broader impact of this on the school's ethos. No other project seminary, of which we are aware, has made such a dramatic claim for the project's effect on and through worship. Nevertheless, all of the schools as evidenced in their annual project reports and in our site visits used the opportunity of their community worship to share, celebrate, affirm, reflectively proclaim, biblically explore and, in many cases, bless and commission globalization related themes, experiences and groups. At a minimum this included using worship as a forum for returning immersion teams to bring their experience into the core of a school's community life and/or for being more intentional about using

international students and guests as worship leaders. One seminary designated a worship each month for a special focus on globalization and another project school thematically devoted a full year's worship to globalization. It is difficult to assess objectively the effect of worship on a community's life, but the following comment from a project steering committee provides another perspective on the potential:

> Worship has been enriched. This involves more than the adapting of imported rituals and insights from international and local immersions, but recognizing the ethical demands from those locales and how we are interdependent with these areas. Globalization in worship has been an exercise in unlearning the "us-and-them" mentality, and conversion to the "we" attitude. Worship has proven to be one of the places at [our seminary] where one can say things one might not yet be able to say in other parts of the seminary: its classrooms, its board rooms and its offices.

2. Practices and Policies

Changes in several arenas of institutional practice have already been discussed--e.g., worship, budget, the formal curriculum. In this section we turn to three others: student recruitment, sensitivity to the needs of international students, and hiring and promotion.

We have already noted that with increasingly diverse student populations, encouraging students to raise and address issues through their own contexts is perhaps the "easiest" and most natural path to incorporating multi-cultural perspectives into the everyday class room experience. Indeed, one PIP/GTE coordinator bluntly stated that the single most important factor driving the faculty at his school toward a heightened appreciation of the globalization project was the increasingly diverse groups of students the faculty had to engage every day. This trend, of course, predates PIP/GTE, and many of the PIP/GTE schools noted their diverse student bodies as a resource. Nevertheless, one consequence of the project was that every school became more intentional about enhancing this diversity through student recruitment. In most of the schools this change in recruitment practices remained informal--more a strategic awareness or sensitivity than a policy. Faculty at one of the project schools, for example, credit such strategic sensitivity as contributing to the hiring of an international as Dean of Students. But in at least one school, which had several board members within its various international immersion teams, student diversity was adopted as a formal goal as noted in a section titled "Movements Toward Change" in one of the school's annual PIP/GTE reports:

> **Trustee adoption of most (almost 2/3) of the recommendations of the Task Force on Underrepresented Constituencies**. During a time of uncertainty with respect to enrollment and fiscal constraint, the board has adopted recommendations calling for new initiatives with respect to groups underrepresented in the campus community. Although these board actions cannot be regarded as a direct result of the [PIP/GTE], they fit into a larger pattern of willingness to move forward into potentially difficult areas. The trust in God and openness to change indicated by these board actions offer hope to all of us concerned with institutional change and globalization in all of its dimensions.

The primary sources of both the intentional and unintentional diversification of PIP/GTE student populations--both during and immediately prior to the project--were Latino and Asian American ethnic groups, and international students from Asia, particularly Korea. We have already commented on how project schools came to value diversity as a positive resource. But the combination of (1) the increased diversity of student bodies and (2) critical reflection on the implications of multi-culturality engendered by the PIP/GTE, also heightened sensitivity in all of the schools to the unique needs and challenges of minority students who enter a majority culture. One consequence of this was that virtually every project school reviewed and changed the support systems it provided such students, particularly their international students. Reports such as the following, appearing in a section on "Activities Fostered by Participation in GTE," were typical:

> Development of a specific orientation program for international students at the beginning of the school year and monitoring of their integration into the school community during the course of the year.

Perhaps the most deeply felt if not the most visible and difficult challenge faced by both minority-culture students and the majority-culture institutions within which they were studying was that of language. Since, like most North American seminaries, all of the PIP/GTE schools had a long history of inclusion of international students in their campus programs, English proficiency was not a new problem. Rather, either the increased numbers of students challenged by English proficiency strained a school's traditional mechanisms for dealing with it, and/or changing institutional sensitivities heightened awareness that a school's traditional approaches were not adequate, or even appropriate. Every PIP/GTE school struggled with language. Five, however, made explicit programmatic changes. Four schools' developed on-campus programs to supplement an English language proficiency requirement for admission. Gordon-Conwell revised and expanded its "English as a Second Language" program. Wartburg and Dubuque developed a two-week, pre-fall

semester "writing module for international students." This program responded to suggestions made by students in the first year by expanding the program to include work on oral presentation, and activities to foster community-building and orient students to Dubuque. Weston developed a cooperative program with Episcopal Divinity School that provided writing workshops and tutoring for international students.

McCormick Seminary, in bold contrast, dropped its English language entrance requirement and developed a language "lab" program as an integral and necessary bridge in a curriculum in which a student can begin his or her degree work in a non-English language track. All students have to move to courses taught in English for the last year of course work. More than simply a language lab, the language program is at the heart of McCormick's effort to create a pervasively multi-cultural student environment. Not only does the "lab as bridge" allow for the complete mix of students from varied language backgrounds in "senior" year courses. But the lab itself is a place in which the vast majority of McCormick students engage each others' cultural differences--as users and/or tutors. We quote at length from a report by Rob Worley, director of the language program:

> The McCormick Theological Seminary language program is unique among theological seminaries because in addition to being a clear acknowledgment of changing social, cultural, linguistic, educational and religious contexts, it is a substantial response to them. The language program and the style of education which it evokes can provide a whole new capacity for the church to minister in American society--with greater understanding, a greater appreciation for differences, a greater capacity to communicate differences and a greater capacity to lead congregations and communities in an American society which needs and seeks persons who can help others relate with and understand the broader community of which we are all a part.
>
> In May, 1992, McCormick instituted a language policy which reflected the reality of our changing contexts and accepted the challenges that these changes must necessarily bring. Most significant about this policy, and perhaps the source of one of our greatest challenges, is the absence of a language requirement for admission. To address this challenge, the policy also called for the establishment of a language program which would support the language needs of the community. While English was recognized as the predominant language of the community, and the need for all students to be competent in English by their third year was made a condition of the policy, the same policy makes a more substantial claim, which is to recognize, to value, to proclaim ownership of all our languages, and to provide support for those who have specific needs in the

various languages we call ours....

> One of the lab's greatest values is its capacity to provoke and to sustain engaged and critical conversations between students about many aspects of McCormick, church or community life. Both tutors and their peers are nurtured--linguistically, culturally and academically through the richness of these encounters. They are, in fact, irreplaceable. In addition to the intense engagement between tutors and their peers, students are given additional opportunities for critical encounter through the program workshops.[9]

To become integral to the way a seminary teaches, globalization must become integral to the experiences of the seminary's faculty. There are two primary means to the latter, either provide new experiences for current faculty and/or hire new faculty who already have global experience. Giving disproportionate weight to faculty representation in the PIP/GTE's international immersions was, of course, a strategic recognition of the first approach. Judging not only from the impact of the project's immersions, but also from the fact that every project school has committed itself to continued ways of encouraging, if not supporting, global experiences for its faculty, intentional cross-cultural, international travel is also one of the most direct and effective ways of making globalization more integral to the experience of a school's faculty. Indeed, one project school offers faculty one semester credit toward sabbatical leave for participation in international immersions.

Local cross-cultural settings, learning new languages, and focused research, and conferences and/or training events also can provide paths to a deeper engagement with globalization issues. Using this broadened perspective on "globalization experience," two project schools formalized the value they place on such experience for faculty by making it an explicit criteria for tenure and promotion. Faculty at another project school can negotiate "release time" for extending their global experience.

The second primary way of building diversity and globalization experience within a school's faculty is through the institution's hiring practices. As one would expect over a five-year period, every PIP/GTE school had the opportunity to hire one or more new faculty. As one might also expect, candidates' experience with globalization and/or their potential for contributing to the diversity of the faculty were universal considerations. Global experience, expertise or embodiment was seldom the overriding criteria, but there are sufficient examples of it being a determinative factor in the actual

---

[9]Rob Worley, "Communicating Among Cultures." *Perspectives*, (Winter 1994), np.

choice of a candidate to suggest that it was given serious weight. We note but three examples from project schools' annual reports:

> There is no doubt that the hiring of [the school's new assistant professor of religion and society] was influenced by the fact that [the school] was involved in the globalization project.

> Because of the small size of [our school], there is now a critical mass of faculty who have experienced the immersions. At faculty meetings and in curriculum planning, the globalization of theological education is taken for granted. For example, [a professor of theology] was recently called to [our] faculty. A major criterion in choosing him was his experience in South Africa and his time of teaching in Mexico City. We would say his experience in globalization ranked in the first five selection considerations.

> The PIP/GTE has increased sensitivity to women's and racial minority issues on our campus. Although there is a long way to go here, we have hired our first black professor and have hired another [the school's second] woman professor.

To the best of our knowledge, consideration of a candidate's background in globalization remains an informal practice at all PIP/GTE schools. At the end of the project, however, one school was considering a recommendation from its PIP/GTE steering committee to formally extend its affirmative action faculty search procedures to "include candidates from the Two Thirds world."

In addition to faculty hiring there is concrete evidence that involvement in the PIP/GTE also affected the hiring of academic deans and school presidents. There was a change in academic dean at seven of the twelve PIP/GTE schools during the project. Five of these schools selected a member of the faculty for their new dean; two selected persons from outside the institution. Of the five internal selections, four had been serving on the school's PIP/GTE steering committee, three as chair (i.e., as their school's PIP/GTE project coordinator). Of the two external selections, one had been serving (and continued to serve) as one of the PIP/GTE national staff's theological reflectors; the second external selection was given general oversight responsibility for the development of his school's new urban research and training center.

Four of the PIP/GTE schools changed presidents during the project. In each case faculty and trustee comments to the evaluator were consistent in their assessment that support for the school's globalization efforts was a factor in the selection. In at least two of these cases, written statements from trustees who had been members of one of their school's international immersion teams drew a more direct connection between involvement in the PIP/GTE and the

selection of a new president. The following, for example, was prompted by a question about how globalization has "changed your work for the institution:"

> As a board member, it has been a reference point for development of a purpose statement and selection of a president.

In response to a question about what involvement in the PIP/GTE helped one's institution "do that it probably would not have done (or would have done much more slowly) if not involved in the project," a trustee at another school wrote:

> The PIP/GTE has helped the school to get its new president. By this I mean the Presidential Search Committee knew it was choosing a person whose vision was enlarged (attractively, we hope) by his own participation in an Immersion. I was on the Immersion and witnessed this conversion of the president-to-be. This is not to say that because of that conversion, he became our new president. But the conversion he experienced is now rippling through the seminary community and its policies.

3. Structural Changes

Under the rubric of structural changes, we turn to three final areas of institutional life affected by the PIP/GTE: (1) incorporation of globalization into a school's continuing "committee" structure; (2) the development of new centers, non-degree programs and departments; and (3) the development of new or deepened local and international, institutional relationships.

During the PIP/GTE every participating school was required to have a globalization project steering committee. As the project wound toward a conclusion, every school was faced with the issue of where, if at all, to formally lodge continued institutional responsibility for oversight of a school's globalization efforts. All did, but in a wide variety of ways. One of the schools involved in the Local-Global Connections continuation with Plowshares maintained their project steering committee basically as it had been during the PIP/GTE. Two of the other schools involved in Local-Global Connections re-constituted their former steering committees as sub-committees of their faculty academic programs committees, and a third merged its PIP/GTE steering committee with its committee for international students. Another of the Local-Global Connections schools disbanded its project steering committee, but transformed the committee's chair role into a permanent Faculty Coordinator of Globalization Emphases. The sixth Local-Global Connections school disbanded its steering committee in order to anchor a newly constituted

committee on globalization within a wider theological consortium of which it was a member.

At two schools responsibility for coordinating globalization efforts reverted to pre-existing structures--in one case a center for global mission and in the other the senior professor of world missions. Two additional schools lodged primary structural responsibility for globalization in a single professor--in one case a new faculty position created at the end of the project, and in the other case with a faculty member hired early in the project specifically for her expertise in world mission and cross-cultural methodology and who subsequently assumed responsibility as "Coordinator of Globalization of Theological Education."

At yet another school the PIP/GTE steering committee officially disbanded but continued indirectly as all members of the steering committee came to constitute the school's new curriculum committee. At the final school, Catholic Theological Union, globalization is such a pervasive part of the institution's complex structure that it is difficult to pin-point a single coordinative/initiative structure. Immediately prior to the project the school's Committee on World Mission arguably served as this structure. It was an interdisciplinary, faculty committee with representation from each department and program at the school. During the second year of the project many of the members of this committee were reorganized into a new department of Cross-Cultural Ministries. By the end of the project, CTU was not only one of the three sponsoring institutions of the new Chicago Center for Global Ministries and host institution for the Center-related and newly created D.Min concentration in cross-cultural ministries, but CTU had also created a new interdepartmental, World Mission Forum. That Forum serves many of the same functions as the original Committee on World Mission, and developed and supervises CTU's new World Mission Program. As described in the CTU catalogue:

> The World Mission Program at Catholic Theological Union has been developed to allow students to choose a mission focus in any of the various degree programs offered by the school, as well as to meet the needs of furloughed and returned missionaries who come to the school for one or more terms of continuing education. It also challenges all theological education at CTU with the reality of cultural and religious pluralism in the global church.
>
> It is with this purpose that CTU has shaped its World Mission Program. It has organized biblical, historical, systematic and ethical courses with mission as their focus and/or content. It has created a specialized intensive course to help people prepare for cross-cultural ministry and a Mission/Ministry/Spirituality Integrating Seminar to aid returned missionaries to process both their experience abroad and their re-entry.

> It has sought out pastoral placements most suitable for reflection on the church's mission.
>
> The World Mission Program is supervised and developed by the interdepartmental World Mission Forum... All degree programs provide for a concentration in mission.

CTU certainly created the most complex array of new program structures related to globalization during the PIP/GTE. It was not, however, the only school to do so. We have already noted, for example: the development of new degree concentrations and language programs at several schools; United, Montreal's new post M.Div, Ministry in a Global Context Diploma; and the University of Dubuque's proposal to the Pew Partnership for Civic Change program. The PIP/GTE was also a direct catalyst for Union's initiative in the development of a new, local community empowerment organization, Harlem Initiatives Together. As described in the 1993-95 Union catalogue:

> HIT is a multidenominational, multicultural, multiracial organization of empowerment, rooted in local congregations and community groups and committed to the training and development of a new generation of nonpartisan leaders in Harlem. The mission of Harlem Initiatives Together is to create a powerful vehicle in Harlem that is capable of negotiating with the government and private sector, holding them accountable, and cooperating with them on strategies to improve the quality of life for Harlem residents. Union is a member institution in HIT. This provides an opportunity for students to get involved in the wider community north of Union.

The idea for HIT emerged as Union's PIP/GTE local immersion committee worked to reestablish Union's historical ties to the Harlem area and continues as the primary site used in Union's new course, Ministry in New York City. Weston Seminary, likewise, used its PIP/GTE local immersion to create, and continues to use in its course offerings, an institutional relationship with Jesuit Refugee Services.

The Chicago cluster of PIP/GTE schools applied to the project as a cluster to deepen and formalize their cooperative work in areas related to globalization. The joint CTU-LSTC-McCormick D.Min, including a concentration in cross-cultural ministries, is one product of this cooperative effort. Overarching this is another, The Chicago Center for Global Ministries. As described in a report from one of the sponsoring schools:

> In 1993, the Catholic Theological Union, LSTC and McCormick Theological Seminary formed the Chicago Center for Global Ministries,

> an ecumenical agency that coordinates the resources for cross-cultural ministries and world mission of the three seminaries.
>
> This Center, which builds on the accomplishments of the former LSTC Center for Global Mission, ensures that a coordinated series of courses in cross-cultural studies, world mission, ecumenism, and globalization is offered each year in Hyde Park. It also fosters the professional development of the persons teaching in these areas, as well as increased sensitivity among all the members of the faculty. The Center assists faculty in designing research projects and serves as a resource to internal committees and supporting denominations in matters of globalization.

The Center also has become the coordinating body for the Association of Chicago Theological School's annual, spring World Mission Institute. Institute themes in the last several years include: Asian Communities and the American Church; Spirit as Power: Mission in South Africa and in Black America; the 500 Year Struggle of Native People in the Americas; Christian-Muslim Relations--Toward a Just World Order; Many Faith Traditions: Toward a Global Ethic; and Reconciliation as a Missiological Challenge in 1995.

Wartburg and Dubuque also entered the PIP/GTE as an ecumenical cluster, and we have already noted several ways they deepened their programmatic partnership related to globalization--e.g., several new courses, immersion opportunities, and a new writing program for international students. Wartburg's new curriculum, however, prompted reassessment of one former area of cooperation. Prior to the new curriculum the two schools' biblical departments offered a fully integrated set of courses for meeting course requirements in Bible. The unique time-sequences in Wartburg's new M.Div curriculum, particularly in the first year, unfortunately precludes this. United also entered the PIP/GTE with the hope of heightening cooperation related to globalization among its ecumenical partners in Montreal--Diocesan College, The Presbyterian College, and the McGill Faculty of Religious Studies--and we have also already noted the successes it had in this regard.

In contrast to the many schools that entered the PIP/GTE with the explicit anticipation of deepening ecumenical relationships with sister seminaries, Denver and Weston were among those that did not. Nevertheless, in both cases new partnerships were established with non-project seminaries that the respective school's point to as one of the most significant effects of the project for them. At Denver Seminary the immediate catalyst for a continuing relationship with Iliff School of Theology was Denver's invitation to Iliff to jointly develop and participate in Denver's project-related local immersion. We have already noted Weston's co-development with the Episcopal Divinity School of a writing program for international students. Weston also established

an ongoing relationship with EDS's Anglicanism, Globalization and Ecumenism program and jointly developed with Boston College a series of faculty events planned for the two years immediately after the PIP/GTE, "to cooperate on an ongoing basis with Boston College in the area of globalization as part of our [Weston's] enhanced relationship with B.C." Also building on the rich array of theological schools located in the Boston area, Gordon-Conwell reinvigorated its discussions with the School of Theology at Boston University toward a joint Th.D. in Missiology.

Although "Think Globally, Act Locally," was an important orienting phrase within the PIP/GTE, there was a hope both within the national staff and among several of the project schools that the project would also stimulate the establishment of new, international seminary partnerships. As we elaborate in a following section, this unfortunately was one dimension of the project that evolved slowly. Indeed, although the project's international immersions and other faculty travel produced much informal conversation among international seminaries, and although project-encouraged faculty experimentation with developing a school's own international immersions often led to the intensification of existing international partnerships, only one school had formally established a new international partnership by the conclusion of the project and only two other schools reported concrete plans to do so.

D. From The Periphery To The Core

All of the schools accepted into the PIP/GTE knew they had committed themselves to trying to change the way they taught, and all brought a variety of concrete institutional resources related to globalization to build upon in engaging this challenge--e.g., historical theological commitments, faculty experience, diverse student bodies, existing course offerings, international institutional partnerships. But all of the project schools also entered the project acknowledging that, in spite of often extensive global resources, globalization still tended to be a peripheral concern in the formation of the majority of their students. They all acknowledged that the real challenge of the project was to change the way they teach *so as to bring globalization into the center of their educational enterprise.* Thus far we have addressed the issue of change through the variety of ways seminaries can--and PIP/GTE schools did--change the way they teach in response to a deepened appreciation of the implications of globalization for theological education. In this section we turn to a brief assessment of the second half of the "real challenge"--namely, whether the variety of changes initiated at any given project school brought globalization

into the core of their educational structure and ethos?

In making such an assessment we fully appreciate the difficulty of discerning the actual core educational structure, much less ethos, at many theological institutions and the inherent subjectivity and/or ambiguity of many of our judgments and criteria. Beyond begging the reader's tolerance of this in advance, we allow ourselves two simplifying, methodological "presumptions." First, we divide the PIP/GTE schools loosely into two categories, (a) those with a relatively integrated core structure and ethos and (b) those with highly segmented cores. As we elaborate in Chapter IV, integrated and segmented institutions have different capacities for and processes of transformative change. Second, with one exception we intentionally opt for relatively vague characterizations of change--such as "toward" and "presence"--rather than for artificially precise measurement. The exception is for those three schools for which we believe it is accurate to say that during the project globalization became foundational within the schools' relatively integrated cores.

Our two methodological considerations allow us to locate all twelve PIP/GTE schools within five broad categories of globalization's movement from the periphery toward the core of their educational enterprises. For each school we also provide a brief description of why we categorized it as we did.

- **Globalization Became Foundational within a Relatively Integrated Core:**

  Wartburg Theological Seminary: The M.Div is the foundation of Wartburg's formal and informal curricula, with all of the school's faculty teaching and two-thirds of the school's students enrolled in it. Making globalization one of the foundational themes in a new mission statement and then using the new mission statement as a guide for dramatically redesigning its M.Div, therefore, both in-and-of-itself and for what it symbolizes about other changes initiated by Wartburg during the project, leads us to place the school at the top of the list in this category.

  United Theological College, Montreal: Both the school principal's strong commitments and the school's location in bi-lingual Montreal provided for an ethos strongly pre-disposed toward globalization prior to entering the project. Nevertheless, the extent to which its formal curriculum offerings are integrated with those of its partner seminaries in the Montreal Joint Board for Theological Education required that they become partners in globalization before United could fully move globalization into the core of its program. Achievement of this partnership, including a change in M.Div requirements and a new post-M.Div, Ministry in a Global Context Diploma, is perhaps most visibly symbolized in the schools' joint participation in the Local-Global Connections continuation project.

Denver Seminary: Denver's multiple M.Div and M.A. specialty areas notwithstanding, its faculty is relatively homogeneous theologically and organizationally cohesive. The hiring of a consultant to work with each faculty member toward the globalization of individual courses resulted in the most pervasive course review of any project school, with the possible exception of Wartburg. Both the adoption of a cross-cultural immersion requirement in its M.Div and creation of a new faculty position, Director of Globalization, further moved globalization toward the core of Dever's program. That formal curriculum revision remains at the discussion stage suggests that Denver currently straddles the boundary between this and the next change category. However, two ethos factors tilt toward our "foundational" recognition. First is the addition of an explicit focus on racial and economic diversity within the seminary's largest single program--counseling. Second, the school's explicit movement to tie its past and future together under the rubric of globalization--the former including initial commitments to foreign missions and the addition of commitments to evangelical social witness early in its history.

- **Globalization Made a Strong Movement Toward the Center of an Integrated Core**

Chicago Theological Seminary: A combination of faculty turnover and the strong fiscal pressures faced by the school resulted in a faculty that is much more organizationally cohesive than at the start of the project and universally committed to globalization--the latter to the point where the school's project steering committee's claim that the faculty takes globalization for granted rings true. Nevertheless, it remains to be seen whether or not the faculty can translate its investment in globalization into a formal curriculum that is convincingly urgent to the school's various constituencies and/or into more limited projects that can leverage external funding.

- **Globalization Established as a Strong Presence within a Segmented Core**

Wesley Theological Seminary: The inclusion of a required cross-cultural experience in several of its D.Min tracks and as an integral part of the integrating three-year Practice in Ministry and Mission sequence in its M.Div, plus the Biblical Department's globalization of all its course offerings has brought globalization solidly into the core of Wesley's curriculum. However, Wesley has the most theologically diverse faculty of any project school. In such a mileu globalization is interpreted and expressed in and through multiple and complex definitions and concrete

experiences--a situation not without tension. Nevertheless, Wesley is and has committed itself to be a learning laboratory for living in a new global context of diversity.

Catholic Theological Union: A union of over 20 religious orders, most with an international presence, CTU has always had a strong global dimension within its community. At the beginning of the PIP/GTE this global dimension was formalized in the curriculum in a variety of courses and special opportunities scattered throughout the school's departments and coordinated by the Committee on World Mission. During the project many of the members of this committee were reorganized into a new department of Cross-Cultural Ministries. By the end of the project, CTU was not only a co-sponsor of the new Chicago Center for Global Ministries and host institution for the Center related and newly created D.Min concentration in cross-cultural ministries, it had also created a new interdepartmental, World Mission Forum that developed and supervises CTU's new World Mission Program. This program offers concentrations in mission within every degree program, and is charged with the responsibility for challenging all theological education at CTU with the reality of cultural and religious pluralism in the global church.

McCormick Theological Seminary: The creation and programatic centrality of its unique language lab program to help McCormick's culturally diverse student body learn together brought the school's strong appreciation for cultural diversity into the center of the school's curriculum. The school's joint sponsorship of the Chicago Center for Global Ministries symbolically expresses its commitment to and deepened its access to resources for both global and cross-cultural programming. It remains to be seen, however, whether or not McCormick faculty with special interests in international and global justice issues can leverage the school's growing commitments in these areas into the core of McCormick's own curriculum.

- **Globalization Made a Definitive First Step into a Segmented Core**

Weston Jesuit School of Theology: Weston entered the PIP/GTE with a rich international heritage. The hiring of a faculty member with special expertise in cross-cultural theology, addition of a perspectival requirement in globalization, establishment of a faculty coordinator of globalization, development of strong ties to Boston area immigrant Catholic agencies, and increased receptivity to international students during the project all represent a new centrality of globalization in Weston's core curriculum. However, this has not as yet pervaded all departments; the school came late in the project to a renewed appreciation of its intrinsic global network

as a Jesuit institution; some debate continues as to the possibility that Weston's unique calling is to develop an American theology.

University of Dubuque Theological Seminary: A flurry of project-related initiatives including the adoption of a cross-cultural immersion requirement in the seminary's M.Div, establishment of a faculty Coordinator of Globalization Emphases, the hiring of a part-time coordinator for international students, and creation of several new courses all have served to introduce globalization into Dubuque's core curriculum and ethos. However, globalization remains a contested issue within a self-described "compartmentalized faculty," and an on-going series of, in some cases tragic, faculty and administrative losses through illness and death has slowed momentum toward a projected evaluation of the school's entire formal curriculum.

Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago: The creation of the integrative Unity and Diversity course and its location as the introductory course for all first year students each September brings globalization into the core of LSTC's formal curriculum. The school's participation in the founding of the Chicago Center for Global Ministries and in the Center's many programs, however, may prove to be the key to sustaining and deepening LSTC's long history of engageing global issues. The Center provides a focused vehicle for (a) the expression of existing faculty commitments and expertise, and (b) further faculty development in globalization. The Center fucntions in a way that fits with the departmental and programmatic segmentation typical of a school LSTC's size.

Union Theological Seminary: For a school of its size Union offers an extra-ordinarily wide range of specializations, particularly at the Ph.D. level. Relatedly, a highly segmented faculty and student structure and ethos have evolved--even within the liberal to liberationist tilt of the school's ethos which provides a generalized receptivity to many of globalization's major thrusts. The strong encouragement of first year students to take the Ministry in New York City course represents an initial foray of globalization into the formal curriculum core of at least Union's M.Div program. An on-going, seminary-wide, January, urban mini-immersion, the founding of Harlem Initiatives Together, and a renewal of the school's worship life have brought globalization into the core of the school's community life. It remains to be seen, however, how pervasively globalization will penetrate Union's advanced degree programs.

- **Globalization Reinforced Existing Emphases within a Segmented Core**

  Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary: Gordon-Conwell entered the PIP/GTE with a strong program in world missions centered at the school's main campus in South Hamilton, and a model, urban-ethnic program, the Center for Urban Ministerial Education (CUME), located at the school's branch campus in Boston. Among the school's primary goals for the project was the strengthening of these two programs and especially the development of greater connections between them. During the project Gordon-Conwell hired a new distinguished professor of world mission, and faculty and trustee interviews credit participation in the PIP/GTE for positively influencing several board decisions related to reshaping the institution. Other effects of the project generally remain at the level of individual faculty initiative, although there is general agreement that the school's participation in the project heightened its appreciation for the Christological center of its theology and contributed to a greater sensitivity to the needs of its non-Anglo students.

E. Continuing Challenges

Reflecting the PIP/GTE schools' positive evaluation of their experience during the project, there was extensive agreement across project schools during the evaluator's final site visits that, "they would do it again if they knew then (when they originally applied) what they know now." At nine of the twelve schools this was a clear and enthusiastic consensus among faculty and administrators. At two other schools the appreciation for the project was tempered somewhat by the question as to whether or not there may have been another approach that better fit their unique circumstances. At the twelfth school the president, dean and several faculty remained enthusiastic about the project, but we doubt they could win a faculty vote to "do it again." The schools' positive feelings about the project notwithstanding, there was equal acknowledgement that much remained to be done and that not everything the schools' project steering committees had set forth as objectives at the beginning of the project had been accomplished. Seven continuing challenges received sufficient mention across project schools to call special note to them here.

1. Contextualization. The first we have already alluded to in our "Note On Pedagogy." Whatever else globalization might imply for theological education, contextualization is foundational. Many, if not most, project faculty were at least familiar, if not comfortable, with the contextual challenge in their scholarship. But project experiences and experimentation forced the question

from the additional perspective of contextualization's implications for teaching and learning, and indeed the further faculties got into the project, the more urgently they felt this pedagogical question. Strong hints emerged that any definitive answer would have to include healthy doses of social analysis and experiential and multi-disciplinary approaches. But for the most part these remained challenges, and there was a broad-based consensus that issues of pedagogy remain one of the most pressing areas of concern toward the furtherance of the globalization of theological education in North America.

2. Theological Issues. Second, and we hope not surprising for a project in theological education, the challenge of contextualization sharpened the articulation of several persistently difficult theological issues and brought them to the center of faculty discourse. Most of the schools entered the project with some, in a few cases extensive, facility in contextual theology. But the project strongly pushed this in three directions. First was a heightened concern with unity that transcends the particular, or in the question of one faculty member, "Is there a unity to the gospel in the midst of human diversity, i.e., what is the nature of catholicity?" Second, particularly within those schools most engaged by the interfaith encounters facilitated by the project, there was a decided increase in the discussion of Christology. As one immersion team member asked, "Who is the cosmic Christ who is manifested in the multiplicity of forms of contextuality?" Third, and building on contextualization's pull toward the experiential, the project precipitated a heightened concern with "practical" and "local" theologies. As one faculty member put it, "How do we reformulate theology from the questions of people in the pews (or not in the pews if they feel unwelcome there)?"

The ecumenical sharing among project schools, from often dramatically different theological traditions, also highlighted questions about the unity of the gospel. This cut across Don Browning's well know, four-fold categorization of different meanings brought to globalization within theological education--evangelism, ecumenism, interfaith dialogue, and social justice (to oversimplify Browning's more nuanced conceptualization of the categories). We have already noted the Christological challenge of interfaith encounter. But more deeply felt in the lived experience of most of the project schools was the search for reconciliation between evangelistic and social justice commitments. The project's encounter with local and global economic marginality also prompted several schools to begin more intense reflection on a theology of development, including one faculty member's earnest suggestion that it was about time "we began to critique our own institutional and ideological loyalties." As was true for issues of pedagogy, definitive resolution of all these theological issues remains illusive, but as one faculty member put it, "the important thing is that we changed the nature of the questions we're discussing."

3. Curriculum Review. Undoubtedly related to the pedagogical and theological questions that all project schools continue to pursue, curriculum review was a third area in need of continued work highlighted by many project schools. Five years may seem like a long time for sustained, priority attention to any institutional issue. Within the experience of the PIP/GTE, however, it was hardly enough time to build momentum for, much less implement a thorough curriculum review--even for those half dozen project schools which chose to move in this direction. Only Wartburg completed the task and then moved on to radically redesign its M.Div program, and even Wartburg did not begin implementation of this new design until the year following the project's formal conclusion. Of the five other project schools which envisioned doing a comprehensive review of curricula through the lens of globalization, only two had actually started the process by the end of the project, two others were poised to begin such a review in the year immediately following the project, and the fifth had not yet formalized faculty commitment to the process. If there is a positive side to the protracted length of time it has taken these five schools to move to a comprehensive curriculum review, it is that the additional time has allowed all five to experiment selectively with new and revised courses and new degree requirements.

4. Cross-Cultural Requirement. The next three areas frequently noted by participating schools as continuing challenges all are in one sense or another support functions. Every school that added an alternative culture requirement (e.g., immersion experiences or cross-cultural exposure) to one of its degree programs, for example, indicated that it now faced the challenge not only of establishing concrete policies and procedures for meeting the requirement, but also of either finding at least a few "low cost" options for fulfilling the requirement and/or of developing external sources of funding to subsidize the student's cost of the requirement.

5. Recruitment Strategies. As we have already noted, every participating school changed its recruitment strategies to enhance the diversity of its student body, including strategies for increasing the number of international students to the extent funding and other support systems permitted. It was only toward the end of the project, however, that several schools realized that a similar concern about diversity also needed to be applied to the composition of their boards of trustees. The cultural diversification of faculty was also an on-going issue for most schools, although the weight of the issue tended to shift positively during the project from that of commitment to implementation. Several faculty members noted that the recruitment of international faculty for permanent positions was particularly challenging.

6. Institutional Partnerships. The development of formal institutional partnerships with seminaries and other church and educational agencies outside of North America arguably as much a teaching and learning function as it is a support function. Nevertheless, there was broad agreement among project schools that such partnerships were (1) critical to globalization efforts--both as a resource and for purposes of accountability, and (2) frustratingly slow in their development. We have already noted that the project's international immersions and other faculty travel produced much informal conversation with international seminaries. Every project school also hosted a variety of international guests and visiting faculty during the project. However the lack of development of international partnerships was the greatest disappointment to the PIP/GTE national project directors. Only one school had formally established a new international partnership by the conclusion of the project and only two other schools reported concrete plans to do so. The resource-intense nature of developing and maintaining such partnerships is, of course, a strong constraining factor. Relatedly, several project schools that intensified their efforts to establish such relationships during the Local-Global Connections continuation report that the project helped them realize that intense relationships with a few strategically chosen institutions outside the North American context is preferable to a broader, less intentional set of partnerships.

7. Implications for Congregations. The first paragraph in the PIP/GTE's initial grant proposal contains the following lines, "The purpose of the Pilot Immersion Project is test a specific [intervention] model:

> with the goal of making the institutional changes necessary for seminary graduates to function faithfully in the Church's ministry in a global context.... The goal is to shape the vocation of ministers with a realistic global awareness by reorienting the basic structures and processes of education employed in theological schools.

This wording was an intentional reminder that theological education is not an end in itself, and that the project's goal of changing the way a seminary teaches, therefore, was only instrumental. The ultimate goal was, and remains, "for seminary graduates to function faithfully in the Church's ministry in a global context." Given this ultimate goal and the fact that the dominant career trajectory of students in the vast majority of project schools is into parish ministries, the national staff was frequently disappointed early in the project by the lack of discussion among immersion teams and within project steering committees of the implications of globalization for local, North American congregations. This disappointment was furthered by the relatively rapid withering of the only school effort at the beginning of the project to develop a

cooperative globalization project with local parishes. But as suggested in the above comments regarding pedagogy, a heightened sensitivity to the experiential/local/practical grounding of globalized theological education evolved during the project. This was accompanied at the majority of project schools by increasing concern with the parish as context for ministry. Efforts like Union Seminary's Harlem Initiatives Together, Dubuque Seminary's Project People Link, and Weston's work with Boston area immigrant communities certainly reflect this concern. Nevertheless, the following comments from the final project reports of two other project schools suggest that while relationships with local parishes were receiving increased attention, they remain a continuing challenge:

> The primary goal currently under discussion . . . focuses on re-creating the field education requirement into a "congregation-based education" curriculum. This new initiative represents a contextually based program that forms partnerships with teaching settings (e.g., congregations and community ministries) focused on discipleship. Globalization dimensions of this initiative include the contextual emphasis, the empowerment of students and local ministry settings in covenant with the seminary, attention to the social reality of ministry, including an acknowledgement of peripheral voices, developing tools of critical analysis in support of change and taking seriously the implications of culture, race, gender and class for ministry.

> [We would hope to] create a curriculum within a less traditional educational process that is more contextually and experientially based. Such a move will require much closer working ties to the local church and specific mission contexts which become the "class room." It will also require consideration of other models for doing theological education (TEE for example). Social analysis will be an integral part of such an approach as will alternative models of pastoral leadership, church styles and community building.

Seminaries can change the way they teach and learn in ways that move globalization from the periphery toward the core of their preparation of women and men for ministries of witness and service in an increasingly interdependent world community. In this chapter we have drawn on the five-year experience of the PIP/GTE to document how twelve seminaries have, in fact, done this. Among their impressive accomplishments we place special importance on (1) the schools' heightened awareness and sharpened articulation of the continuing challenges they face in making a global perspective integral to their educational and formative purposes, and (2) the schools' deepened commitment to and resources for engaging these challenges. This is not to minimize the breadth

and depth of changes these institutions have already made within their formal and informal curricula. Indeed, while our extended discussion of the changes is motivated by our belief that they are exemplary, we recognize, as do all the project schools, that these changes are not a conclusion. They are a new beginning toward a future whose real test is the impact the seminaries' graduates will have on their congregations, denominations and communities.