III

A CATALYST FOR CHANGE: The Intervention Model of the PIP/GTE

Models constitute the bridge between the theoretical and observational levels . . . .

Models can be seen as builders of discourse, as giving rise to large-scale interpretations of phenomena that so far lack a mapping . . . .

The greatest virtue of a model is that it enables us to be articulate when before we were tongue tied.

Ian T. Ramsey[1]

The purpose of the PIP/GTE was to test a specific intervention model for helping seminaries make the changes necessary for the global context to become integral to a school's educational program and ethos. Chapter II provided a concrete description of the changes realized by project schools--i.e., of how, in fact, the participating seminaries did change the way they teach during the project. In this chapter and the next we turn to the process of change, first describing the model of change used in the project and then turning to more generalized project learnings concerning bridges and barriers to change.

---

[1] *Models and Mystery* (London: Oxford University Press, 1964).

From the perspective of organizational change, two critical characteristics of a globalizing context are diversity and complexity.[2] It should not be surprising, therefore, that the catalytic interventions used in the PIP/GTE were diverse and complex. In particular, (1) the project's interventions were multi-layered, (2) each layer included multiple streams of diverse players and interventions, and (3) both the layers and the layers' diversity were intended to cumulatively build forward over the five years of the project. The specific purpose of this chapter is to map out this complexity, identifying each major set of components and their relationship to each other and to the flow of the whole. That is, our purpose here is to set forth the model of institutional change that the PIP/GTE set out to test. We begin by describing the model as intended, then turn to the sometimes pro-active and sometimes reactive changes in the design as the project unfolded.

A. Layers of Players and Strategic Processes: The Intention

The PIP/GTE was designed to interrelate four general layers of players. The most foundational layer consisted of those North American seminaries which, through their participation in the project, committed themselves to engage the possibility of change. The most central layer (central in a nodal and coordinative sense) was the project's national staff. The most strategically critical layer consisted of the innumerable international hosts of the international immersions. And a fourth layer consisted of a variety of local constituencies of the participating seminaries. In explicating the overall project design we look at it first from the perspective of the participating institutions and their related constituencies, and then from the perspective of the national staff and their coordination with the international immersion hosts.

1. The PIP/GTE from the Perspective of the Participating Schools

The funding proposal for the PIP/GTE called for the selection of nine seminaries to participate in the project. In early Spring, 1988, all accredited and associate member institutions of ATS received a copy of the project

[2]David Roozen, "Institutional Change and the Globalization of Theological Education." Pp 300-335 in Evans, Evans and Roozen, eds., *The Globalization of Theological Education.*

proposal and an invitation to apply.[3] A selection committee--composed of three seminary faculty or administrators on the Project Advisory Committee whose institutions were not applying, and the two project directors from Plowshares--was responsible for reviewing applications and making the final selection. Selection was to be based on the following factors:

- An institution's openness to change and responsiveness to globalization;
- An institution's ability to sustain a five-year commitment to the project;
- An institution's initial vision of the meaning of globalization for itself and its constituency;
- The diversity of selected institutions -- based on size, denominational background, ethos and geographic location;
- The representative nature of an institution in relation to its potential to influence theological schools or other constituencies concerned with theological education.

By participation in the project each school committed itself to, as one participant quipped, a rather extreme version of the contemporary twelve step movement. Although not exactly "steps," the project did require a school's involvement in the following twelve strategic processes and structures:

- Three international immersions led by Plowshares Institute;
- Joint preparation for and debriefing of international immersions with a school's project cluster partners;
- Selecting and providing release time for a faculty member to serve as project coordinator;
- Appointing a project steering committee, which the coordinator would chair;
- Initiation of an assessment and planning process for identifying and implementing changes related to globalization, a process to be assisted by a school's national project consultant;
- Designing and implementing a "local" immersion that would adapt the international immersion pedagogy to a North American context(s);
- Faculty and student research and scholarly reflection on globalization themes--supportable through seed money grants from the national project budget;

---

[3]Although the project was open to the application of non-seminary organizations related to theological education (e.g., a denominational agency or professional association) and several were approached about possible participation, none finally pursued application.

- Openness to work with "third world" immersion hosts on models of mutuality, including the possibility of "return immersions" in which third world theological educators might participate in North American immersions hosted by project schools;
- Open participation in the formative and summative, independent project evaluation;
- Direct financial support of $10,000 per year;[4]
- Annual reports to Plowshares;
- A final project report, including learnings about the globalization of theological education and bridges/barriers to institutional change, that would become a foundational resource for a school's sharing of its project experience with other church and educational constituencies.

The timing of these twelve steps across the five years of the project is schematically summarized from a school's perspective in Figure One.

As already noted the international immersions were the most strategically important project component. They were also, arguably, the most appealing feature to applying institutions. Of the three international immersions in which a school would participate, one would be in Africa, one in Asia, and one in Latin America. Each immersion would be a three-week experience, frequently split between two countries. A school would select an eight-member team to go on each immersion. Each team was to include faculty, administrators, trustees, students and representatives of other significant seminary constituencies (e.g., denomination or alumni/ae). Other suggested criteria for team selection included:

- Participants' ability to live, work, and learn in a supportive community, and openness to the goal of globalization;
- Participants' current or potential influence for effecting change in the seminary and the church, and in the case of faculty, in professional academic organizations;
- Racial and gender diversity;
- Student participants' leadership positions in the seminary and the potential for significant future leadership in the church, and enrollment at the seminary for at least one year following the immersion;
- Participants' lack of extensive experience in the host countries or comparable areas of the "third world."

[4]A subsidy item in the project funding grant assured that participation in the project would not be determined solely by an institution's financial resources.

FIGURE 1: PROPOSED PIP/GTE TIME LINE – *SCHOOL'S* PERSPECTIVE

YEAR ONE	YEAR TWO	YEAR THREE	YEAR FOUR	YEAR FIVE
Application			Plan mutuality with third world hosts	>>>>>>>>
Select Coordinator and Steering Committee	Begin implementing aspects of plan as situation dictates	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>	Consolidate efforts to implement planned changes
Research and scholarly reflection	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>
Pay annual project assessment	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>
	Preparation with clusters schools for first int'l immersion	Preparation with cluster schools for 2nd int'l immersion	Preparation with cluster schools for 3rd int'l immersion	
	First int'l immersion	Second int'l immersion	Third int'l immersion	
	Backhome debriefing and sharing of int'l immersion experience	Backhome debreifing and sharing of int'l immersion experience	Backhome debriefing and sharing of int'l immersion experience	
	Follow-through on individual, post-immersion convenants of application	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>
Select first int'l immersion team	Select second int'l immersion team	Select third int'l immersion team		
Prepare initial assessment & planning document; submit as annual report and for consultant's visit	Refine assessment & planning document; submit as annual report and for consultant's visit	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>	Prepare and disseminate final report, including learnings about bridges and barriers to change
	Begin planning local immersion	Conduct Local Immersion	Debriefing/sharing of local immersion experience	
Host consultant	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>
Host project evaluator		Host project evaluator		Host project evaluator

Explicit guidelines as to the relative distribution of faculty, administrators, trustees, etc., to be included in each team were not provided. Nevertheless, it was the project designers' clear expectation that the majority would be faculty; that presidents and deans would be priority administrators; and that the board chair and chairs of key board committees would be priority trustees. Implicit in such priorities in immersion team membership was the project designers' attempt to maximize the participation of persons in critical institutional decision-making positions and those who would be least transient in their institutional connection. Such priorities meant that rarely would more than one or two students or representatives of external constituencies be members of any one team from a given school.

Individual participation in an immersion involved agreement to the following commitments, the first three of which were called, in the language of the project, the covenants of preparation, participation and application:

- Intensive advance study of the economic, political, and religious life of the countries to be visited, and a one day orientation program led by the Plowshares staff;
- The immersion experience itself, with full participation under the leadership of the immersion's international hosts;
- "Back home" application of learnings, both as an individual and as a part of one's institutional team;
- Contribution of $500 toward the approximate $3,000 individual cost of the immersion.

During the three-week immersion experience, participants were to be exposed to the life of the Church and theological education in the host countries; be exposed to the "poor" and marginalized within the host countries; and be in dialogue with government, business, academic, grassroots, and opposition leaders who represented the strongest voices of various sides of a host country's central issues of religion and public life. Participants were also expected to involve themselves fully in the common community life of the immersion group, including daily worship and "debriefing" sessions, journal writing, sharing responsibility for community tasks (e.g., worship and discussion leadership, health and safety coordination, baggage handling, currency exchange, etc.), and living safely but modestly in the style of the international hosts. One of the explicit responsibilities of international hosts was designing several events to expose the immersion team to the vulnerability of the host's ministry.

At the conclusion of each immersion participants would be asked to prepare individual "covenants of application," that is, statements of what each person intended to do back home by way of interpreting and otherwise acting

upon his or her immersion "learnings." In addition to participants' individual interests, there were project expectations that covenants of application would include how participants intended to: (1) share their experience broadly within their seminary community; and (2) work with their school's project steering committee on the selection, orientation and back home debriefing of future immersion teams, and on the project's institutional assessment and planning process--that is, to link with members of other immersion teams toward creating a "critical mass," and to link this critical mass to its institution's change-oriented planning process.

For each immersion experience a seminary team was to travel with the teams from two other project schools, forming an ecumenically diverse, three-school cluster. The ecumenical clustering was intended to add another stream of dialogue to the immersion experiences (in addition to the diversity which would be encountered in the host countries, and the diversity internal to any given school's team). Clustered teams were to share a common orientation to each immersion, and it was a project hope that additional cluster sharing would be initiated by the schools themselves.

If the international immersions can be thought of as the PIP/GTE's external engine of change, then one must think of each school's project steering committee as the anticipated internal engine of change. It was intended to serve as both the link between a school and the national staff, and, as just noted, the link among the critical mass of globalization advocates emerging within each school. According to project guidelines, the committee was to be composed of faculty, administrators, trustees, and students, and it had the following specific responsibilities (at a minimum, to coordinate, and more typically, to do):

- Interpret the project within the school, both initially and throughout the five years;
- Select immersion teams;
- Assist in the orientation of immersion participants and their back home debriefing;
- Coordinate the cycle of assessment, planning, and implementation;
- Plan and implement a school's local immersion;
- Host the national project consultant and independent evaluator during their site visits, and cluster partners and other project-related visitors to campus;
- Work with international immersion hosts on models of mutuality;
- Interpret the school's participation in the project to the national staff, most notably through the preparation of annual reports and the channeling of faculty requests for project research grants and student requests for cross-cultural experiences;

- Interpret the school's participation in the project to other external school constituencies, including the preparation of a "final" project report.

Those familiar with the committee process within most of theological education will appreciate the critical role that the chair of the steering committee (i.e., the school's project coordinator) had in the project implementation. They will also appreciate the time demands of this role. In anticipation of the latter, project guidelines required one fifth "release time" for project coordinators. In appreciation of the former, project guidelines underscored the importance of the choice of the project coordinator for "ensuring continuity and consistency" across the five years of the project.

The funding proposal's schedule of school reporting was extremely abbreviated, and its description of the anticipated school planning process was equally sketchy. The proposal stated: (1) that a school would prepare an initial statement of project goals during the first year; (2) that the steering committee would review this during the third year in preparation for a report due in the fourth year, the fourth year report also including a monitoring of emerging strategies and implemented changes; and (3) that at the conclusion of the project a school would prepare a report assessing accomplishments, including an analysis of factors most effective in bringing about change and most significant as barriers to change. During the first month of the project, conversations among the national project directors, independent evaluator, and planning consultants significantly elaborated this process.

The refined plan for assessment, planning, and reporting included a year-end annual report from each school that required, at minimum, an annual review and refinement of a school's assessment and planning. The process began with an initial, first year statement of change goals and possible strategies for attaining these goals, plus an assessment of resources available for accomplishing the goals (including existing globalization programming and supportive elements within a school's tradition) and of likely barriers which would have to be surmounted. The second, third, and fourth year reports were to be a monitoring and refinement of the first year statement, plus a list of the year's activities and accomplishments. The "final" report was to continue the monitoring and refinement process (i.e., goals and strategies for responding to globalization in the years after the project), and include (a) a summative discussion of activities and accomplishments, and (b) summative reflection on bridges and barriers to change. In comparison to the funding proposal's abbreviated statement on planning and reporting, it was hoped that the elaborated process would:

- Help keep the steering committee focused on the goal of institutional change, as opposed to the temptation to get sidetracked by the immediacy

and excitement of the international immersions;

- Provide for iterative cycles of assessment/reflection, planning and action that would afford natural entry points for the successive "waves" of persons added to a school's "critical mass;"
- Provide natural, annual points of entry for the national consultant;
- Increase accountability and especially the attention to task that accountability typically engenders;
- Provide regular and increasingly refined information for the independent evaluator and national project directors.

In addition to a general process of planning and implementation related to moving globalization from the periphery to the center of a seminary's formative ethos, participation in the PIP/GTE also required each institution to engage in one very specific planning and implementation effort. This was the development of a local immersion during the third year of the project. From the perspective of the overall project design the local immersion served three primary purposes. First, adhering to the theme of "thinking globally and acting locally," the local immersion was to involve a seminary in the "third world" at home. Second, having participating institutions take responsibility for their own local immersion provided a "practicum" in using the immersion pedagogy modeled in the international immersions. Third, the local immersion would add yet another "wave" of persons with immersion experience to the anticipated critical mass of globalization advocates within a given institution. Consistent with the design of the international immersions, the local immersion was to:

- Involve faculty, administrators, trustees, students, and other key seminary constituencies as participants;
- Place participants in an alternative and marginalized culture or cultures for two to three weeks;
- Involve dialogue with local government, academic, religious, and business leaders in the immersion settings, as well as in-depth engagement with those in local settings who are marginalized;
- Include a serious analysis of social, cultural, economic and, if applicable, interfaith issues that affect the structures of discrimination and poverty related to the visited settings;
- Be designed in partnership with representatives of the marginalized who would serve as hosts for the immersion;
- Explore the opportunities for continued "mutuality" between the seminary and host cultures;

- Require of participants both intense preparation and a post-immersion covenant of application, as well as a commitment to living safely but modestly, during the immersion, in the style of the local immersion hosts.

In support of the local immersions, the national project budget included seed money funding of up to $10,000 per institution for which participating schools could apply through their national project consultant. The national project grant also included an additional $10,000 per institution for seed money support of (1) faculty research and (2) cross-cultural experiences for students. In regard to the former, project designers were explicit in their hope that involvement in the PIP/GTE would provide the motivation, opportunity, and focus for scholarly research and writing, rather than a distraction from it. The latter was an acknowledgment that while student involvement in the formal components of the PIP/GTE would be limited--for the strategic reasons already noted--the pen-ultimate goal of the project was for seminaries to incorporate globalizing experiences as a part of a student's theological education.

Given the pilot nature of the PIP/GTE, dissemination of learnings to the broader community of theological educators in North America was, as would be expected, a critical concern within the project design. Primary responsibility for dissemination was assigned to the national staff and will be dealt with in the next section. But project designers also recognized the natural opportunities for dissemination provided by and within the participating schools, each of which would bring to the project a somewhat unique sphere of influence. Accordingly, the project design elevated several aspects of this natural opportunity to formal project expectations for the individual participant schools. The language of "influence," for example, permeates both the criteria used to select schools and the criteria suggested to schools for selecting immersion participants. These criteria also provide a clear sense of whom the project designers expected the schools to influence--most particularly denominational leaders, the professional guilds, and other seminaries with which a participant school had a structural connection. Further, and as previously noted, there was an explicit project expectation that a seminary's final project report would be shared with critical external constituencies within a school's sphere of influence.

2. The PIP/GTE from the Perspective of the National Staff

Three groups worked as national staff in support of the PIP/GTE--the national project co-directors from the Plowshares Institute,[5] a team of consultants, and the independent evaluator. We deal with each in turn.

National Project Directors: The PIP/GTE emerged, as noted in Chapter I, out of the convergence of several streams of heightened sensitivity to the challenges of globalization for theological education within North America. The most immediate of these influences on the birth of the PIP/GTE were (1) the advocacy of the Association of Theological School's Committee on Globalization, and (2) the Plowshares Institute's interest in experimenting with its international immersion pedagogy as a vehicle of institutional change. These factors merged in 1987 when, with the assistance of a planning grant from The J. Howard Pew Freedom Trust, the Plowshares Institute convened a project advisory committee of theological educators and of international and national consultants to shape a specific proposal for a major pilot project on the globalization of theological education. That proposal was submitted to the Pew Charitable Trusts in December, 1987. Funding for an initial three-year period was approved in March, 1988, with Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary serving as the project sponsor and Plowshares Institute as the project director.

The proposal specified several roles for the Plowshares Institute staff, co-directed by Alice and Robert Evans. In addition to overall project coordination and budget management, these included:

- Recruiting a pool of institutions interested in project participation, and then working with the selection committee to choose from among those institutions that formally applied for participation;
- Recruitment, training, and coordination of a national consulting team;
- Leading the project's international immersions and coordinating with international hosts in the immersions' development;
- Coordinating with the independent evaluator in regard to project evaluation and project dissemination;

---

[5]What we here call the national project co-directors were officially called, in the language of the project, co-coordinators. We use the director label here to avoid possible confusion in the reader's mind with the project coordinator within each school.

- Interpreting the project to broader church and theological education constituencies;
- Securing funding for the final two years of the project. (At the time of funding the initial three years of the project, The Pew Charitable Trusts expressed openness to receiving, at a later date, a continuation proposal for the final two years of the project.)

The project time line, from the perspective of the national project co-directors, is summarized in Figure Two.

We have already presented a glimpse of the project's international immersions from the perspective of the participating schools. We here elaborate details specifically related to the national co-directors role as leaders of these immersions. Logistically, the project's international immersions presented a huge challenge. There were to be three a year (one for each cluster of three schools) in each of three years, with each immersion being three weeks in duration. Of the three annual international immersions one would be to Africa, one to Asia, and one to Latin America. Clusters would rotate through these three years such that over the three year period each cluster would have an immersion experience in each region. Each immersion would typically visit two countries in its respective region, at the invitation of one or more hosting persons or organizations within each country with which, in the majority of cases, Plowshares had an existing relationship. The invitations were to be secured by the national project co-directors, who would then design the immersion experience in each locale in partnership with the hosts.

Extensive discussions of the Plowshare's immersion pedagogy are readily available.[6] For present purposes, therefore, we note only two of its more salient features. First, using justice as a primary orienting filter for the experience places a premium on surfacing the social, cultural, and economic issues affecting the structures of poverty and discrimination. The importance of the cultural dimension of such an analysis--including the religious--is undergirded by the insights of Paulo Freire, among others, concerning the power of ideology. In order to focus assigned readings and site visits in each of the three international regions visited during the PIP/GTE immersions, a different theme was emphasized in each region--racism in South Africa, poverty in Latin America, and inter-faith issues in Asia.

---

[6]See, for example, Evans, Evans and Kennedy (eds.), *Pedagogies for the Non-Poor*; and Alice Frazer Evans and Robert A. Evans, "Globalization as Justice," pp 147-171 in Evans, Evans and Roozen (eds.), *The Globalization of Theological Education*.

FIGURE 2: PIP/GTE PROPOSED TIME LINE -- *NATIONAL CO-DIRECTOR'S* PERSPECTIVE

YEAR ONE	YEAR TWO	YEAR THREE	YEAR FOUR	YEAR FIVE
Recruit and select schools	Interpret project to external constituencies	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>	Coordinate dissemination of final project learnings with independent evaluator
Plan next year's int'l immersions	Plan next year's int'l immersions	Plan next year's int'l immersions		
	Provide orientation for current year immersion participants	Provide orientation for current year immersion participants	Provide orientation for current year immersion participants	
	Lead current year int'l immersions	Lead current year int'l immersions	Lead current year int'l immersions	
Recruit and orient consulting team	Debriefing, training and planning with consulting team	Debriefing, training and planning with consulting team-- including review of local immersion plans	Debriefing and planning with consulting team Consult on local immersions	Final debriefing with consulting team
	Consult on local immersions	>>>>>>>>		
Coordinate with independent evaluator and coordinator of consultations	Mutual debriefing/planning with independent valuator and coordinator of consultants	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>
General orientation of schools	"Crisis" intervention	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>
Initial review of schools' reports	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>	Review schools' final reports
Manage project finances	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>
Submit grant reports	Submit grant reports	Submit continuation funding proposal		

Second, and more importantly, a foundational assumption of the Plowshares pedagogy is that it is virtually impossible for the non-poor to significantly "educate" themselves--i.e., transcend the power of their controlling ideology--on issues of justice and reconciliation apart from a direct encounter with poor or otherwise marginalized people. Every Plowshares immersion, therefore, includes direct encounter with the poor and marginalized within the countries visited and with persons of vision committed to changing the status quo. Additionally, and in part because of the short-term nature of the immersion, this encounter is intended to be of such intensity that it demands response. That is, the experience is intended to generate sufficient motivational energy to carry-over well beyond the immersion experience. Since cognitive awareness seldom generates such motivational intensity in such a short duration, this further implies that the experience must engage the feeling level. This is in part the power of the personal encounter. But an affective trigger is further sought, within the Plowshares immersion pedagogy, by inviting participants to risk vulnerability through becoming dependent upon the care, skills, "modesty" of lifestyle, and grace of their "third world" hosts. Such vulnerability is perhaps at its most intense level during Plowshares' immersions when participants are invited, for example, through arrangement by the formal third world host organization to spend an evening alone or in pairs in the typically "shanty town" home of the poor. In summary, a significant intent of the immersion pedagogy is to create an experiential shock that challenges previous assumptions, reduces one's resistance to change, and requires the exploration of alternative patterns of living. In this sense, the immersions are better understood as efforts toward motivating conscientization, than as mere cognitive learning experiences.

Given the intensity of an immersion's schedule (a calliope of meetings, dialogue, and encounter strung together by exhausting travel in a "strange" land) and the immersion's pedagogy of structured vulnerability, the community of support provided by one's fellow travelers takes on critical importance. At a minimum it becomes one's major link to the familiar. More importantly, and especially when grounded in worship, it provides the sanctuary from which one can again venture forth into intense encounter, and in which one can begin to sort out (i.e., debrief) the feelings and thoughts engendered by the encounter. The general Plowshares' immersion design, therefore, calls for the daily opportunity for both group and individual worship and reflection. Journaling is strongly encouraged for personal reflection. In the interest of modeling mutuality, leadership of immersion group activities is shared.

As might be expected, a strong sense of community typically develops among immersion participants, and such an ethos is ripe with possibilities for breaking stereotypes and forming deep personal relationships. At the conclusion of an immersion experience the Plowshares' pedagogy coopts these

possibilities for the sake of accountability. As previously noted, immersion participants commit themselves to a covenant of post-immersion application of immersion learnings. This covenant is developed with a "covenant partner" chosen from within the immersion group, and a part of the covenanting process is the commitment for the partners to stay in touch for at least one year following the immersion for mutual support and accountability.

Using the Plowshares' immersion pedagogy within the PIP/GTE added two relatively unique dynamics to an immersion group's community life. First, not only did the group intentionally include persons from several diverse schools. It also intentionally included persons with different statuses within each school--faculty, administrators, trustees, etc. A PIP/GTE immersion group, therefore, included a structured encounter with diversity within its own community life. Second, a PIP/GTE immersion was not an end in itself. Rather, it was intended as an instrument of institutional change, and both the group reflection during the immersion and the covenants of application could be directed toward this end.

The Consultant Team: The rational for including a consultant component within the PIP/GTE design was grounded in: (1) the project's focus on institutional change, and (2) the pervasive opinion of the project advisory committee that the consistent presence of a skilled outside facilitator trained in approaches to institutional change would significantly enhance a participant school's efforts toward that change. Accordingly, the PIP/GTE funding proposal called for the selection and training of nine consultants, one to be assigned to each participating school.

Consultants were selected by the project directors in consultation with the project advisory committee. Selection criteria included: (1) commitment to and experience in the globalization process; (2) knowledge of theological education in North America; and (3) an ability to relate to institutions of divergent theological perspectives. Institutional change skills were not an explicit criteria. Such skills were to be a major focus of project consultants' training supplied by educational, management, and theoretical specialists in the field. Consultants were assigned to schools by the project directors in consultation with the respective consultants and schools.

The major roles of the consultants, as initially conceived, included assisting their assigned school with: (1) the development of a school's initial assessment and goals; (2) project and immersion orientation, and (3) planning, with a special focus on curriculum and policy design and implementation. In these roles the consultants were envisioned as providing both support and accountability. In addition to their specific contribution within the PIP/GTE, it was further anticipated that, in the long term, the trained consultants would

become resources to non-project schools interested in developing a greater responsiveness to globalization.

Consultants were expected to commit ten days per year to the project. This time would be divided between their assigned institution and training and coordination events with the consultant team. Although the funding proposal did not include a detailed breakdown of time usage, the initial, idealized, annual, working image included: (1) a three-day retreat with the entire national staff; (2) two, two-day site visits to a consultant's assigned institution, one prior to each year's international immersion to assist with orientation, and one following the immersion to assist with immersion debriefing and planning; and (3) three days "on-call" support for their institution and "at-home" preparation/administration.

Although not included in the initial design, a tenth person was added to the consultant team during the first month of the project to serve as coordinator of the team. This coordinator of consultants had direct responsibility, in consultation with the project directors, for the development, training, nurture, and management of the consulting team--responsibilities initially envisioned for the project directors.

Independent Evaluator: The funding proposal for the PIP/GTE called for an "independent" evaluator, to be hired through the project grant by Plowshares Institute if other funding could not be secured. Conversations among the Plowshares Institute, the Hartford Seminary Center for Social and Religious Research, and the Lilly Endowment produced that "other" funding as a grant from the Lilly Endowment to Hartford Seminary. As was true of the Pew project grant, the initial Lilly evaluation grant was for three years with an openness to consider a two-year continuation proposal. Although the evaluator would work in close cooperation with the PIP/GTE project directors, his direct accountability to Lilly helped legitimate his independence. This was further enhanced by the explicit understanding of cooperation between Pew and Lilly which, among other things, included Lilly's regular sharing with Pew of the evaluator's annual reports to Lilly.

The national project evaluator had the following four objectives:

- To provide the national staff an on-going assessment of, including recommendations for changes in, national project interventions;
- To be a resource that individual participating schools could consult regarding their own project evaluation efforts;
- To coordinate project-wide efforts to identify "bridges and barriers to change;"

- To provide, at the conclusion of the project, a summative evaluation of goal attainment and a summative report concerning project learnings regarding bridges and barriers to change;
- To assist the national project directors in coordinating the theological reflector's participation in the project.

To facilitate the first objective and to provide the evaluator direct observation of national staff planning and debriefing, the evaluator was included as a regular participant in the project's annual, national staff retreat. Additionally, the evaluator met once or twice annually (plus several conference telephone calls) with the project co-directors and coordinator of consultants for the purposes of mutual debriefing, planning, and/or "crisis" intervention.

The initial national evaluation design included four additional formal means of data gathering. First, and as already noted, during the first month of the project an annual reporting procedure was developed for participating schools that sought to integrate planning, evaluation, and accountability concerns. Among other things this annual report was to include a school's self-assessment of its goal attainment and of bridges and barriers to change encountered and/or anticipated. Copies of the report were to be sent to both the national project directors and the independent evaluator. There was an explicit invitation to schools to attach a "private" supplement to the evaluator's copy, if the school so chose.

Second, every international immersion participant was given a "paper and pencil" questionnaire at the conclusion of the immersion (typically on the flight back to the United States) and asked to complete and return it to the evaluator either by mail or through the immersion leader. The questionnaire consisted of thirteen open-ended-response questions, the first seven dealing with the participant's individual immersion experience per se and the last six dealing with broader issues related to the participant's school's involvement in the PIP/GTE. Third, approximately one year after an immersion, participant's were sent a second questionnaire, accompanied by a copy of their initial immersion evaluation questionnaire responses and their post-immersion covenant. This questionnaire consisted of ten open-ended-response questions, including the following three specifically focused on overall project goals:

- What has your institution's involvement in the PIP/GTE helped the school do that it probably would not have done (or would have done more slowly) if not involved in the project? Why/how did involvement in PIP/GTE help?
- What has <u>not</u> happened that you or your school had hoped or expected (or where the movement has been much slower than hoped or expected)? Why do you think it has not happened or been slow in developing? What

would help, or would have helped, to make it happen or to speed things up?

- What fears or concerns do you have about your school's involvement with "globalization" in general? With its involvement in the PIP/GTE more specifically?

The remaining questions asked immersion participants for further reflection on their immersion experience and their covenants, and for their reflection "about what difference a 'global perspective' would make in the leadership of a typical pastor of a typical North American congregation."

Fourth, the evaluation design included three, two-day site visits to each participating school spread across the five years of the project. The first or "baseline" visit was to occur prior to a school's first international immersion. The second or "mid-point" visit anticipated visiting half of the schools after their second international immersion but before their local immersion, and visiting the other half of the school's after their local immersions. The third and final visit was anticipated after the completion of a school's final project report. Each visit was intended to include interviews with a school's project coordinator, president, academic dean, and either individual or group interviews with other faculty and administrators involved in the PIP/GTE, with faculty not involved in the PIP/GTE, with students, and if logistics permitted, trustees. The project time line, from the perspective of the independent evaluator, is summarized in Figure Three.

Given the PIP/GTE's explicit understanding of itself as a pilot project with strong commitments to disseminate learnings widely, and given the salience of theological reflection within the major consistency for this dissemination, in addition to the programmatic and organizational research and evaluation the evaluation grant also included funding for a theological reflector. This was to be a well known scholar with concerns for globalization who would be invited to read project reports and participate in project meetings, and ultimately, write a critical, theologically reflective study of the project.

B. Layers of Players and Strategic Processes: The Unfolding

A growing number of management consultants and academic theorists extol the virtue of flexibility for organizational success within the complexity

FIGURE 3: PIP/GTE PROPOSED TIME LINE -- *EVALUATOR'S* PERSPECTIVE (25 days per year)

YEAR ONE	YEAR TWO	YEAR THREE	YEAR FOUR	YEAR FIVE
Orientation with national project directors	Mutual debriefing/planning with national directors and coordinator of consultants	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>
Design evaluation	Analyze post-immersion evaluation questionnaire	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>	
		One year follow-up mail questionnaire to immersion participants re: institutional change	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>
Team building and orientation with national project directors and consulting team	Debriefing and planning with national project directors and consulting team	Debriefing and planning with national project directors and consulting team	Debriefing, planning and reflection with national directors and consulting team	Final debriefing and reflection with national directors and consulting team
Review schools' initial reports	Review schools' annual reports	>>>>>>>>	>>>>>>>>	Review schools' final reports
Begin baseline site visits to each school	Begin second round of site visits	Complete second round of site visits	Begin final round of site visits	Complete final round of site visits
Submit grant reports	Submit grant reports	Submit continuation funding proposal	Submit grant reports	Submit final reports
				Coordinate dissemination of learnings with national project directors

and rapid pace of change in a globalizing environment.[7] Perhaps including a formative component in the PIP/GTE's independent evaluator's role was one way the project designers anticipated this necessity. What is certain is that no one involved in the design of the project anticipated how quickly the PIP/GTE's capacity for flexibility would be called upon.

1. Suddenly There Were Twelve

The PIP/GTE proposal called for the selection of nine seminaries to participate in the project. In early Spring, 1988, all accredited and associate member institutions of ATS received a copy of the project proposal and an invitation to apply. Approximately sixty schools entered discussions with Plowshares about application. Twenty-four submitted complete applications. When the selection committee met in fall, 1988 to weigh the applications, the committee immediately confounded project planning **by selecting twelve schools**. The twelve, arranged by project cluster, include:

Cluster A:
Denver Conservative Baptist Seminary
University of Dubuque Theological Seminary
Wartburg Theological Seminary, Dubuque, IA
Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington D.C.

Cluster B:
Catholic Theological Union at Chicago
Chicago Theological Seminary
Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago
McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, IL

Cluster C:
Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South Hamilton, MA
Union Theological Seminary, New York, NY
United Theological College, Montreal, Quebec
Weston Jesuit School of Theology, Cambridge, MA

---

[7]See, for example: Tom Peters, *Thriving On Chaos: Handbook for a Management Revolution* (New York: Harper & Row, 1987); and Gareth Morgan, *Imaginization: The Art of Creative Management* (Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1993).

The selection committee conducted its deliberations in strict confidentiality. Consequently, the specific reasons and negotiations that informed its choices are known only to committee members. Nevertheless, it is known that three special arrangements helped stretch the resources of a nine-school-design to accommodate twelve schools, in effect creating the equivalency of nine and a half "full-participant" institutions.

Building on a long history of cooperation facilitated by their shared location in Hyde Park, Chicago, four schools applied to the project as a consortium, agreeing to participate as three full-participant equivalents and to pursue individual school goals as well as consortium goals. The four-school proposal was accepted as one of the project's three clusters. In terms of the availability of project resources, the "three full-participant equivalent" provision meant, among other things, that the four-school consortium would have twenty-four slots for each of the cluster's international immersions and work with a team of three project consultants. Faculty research, student programming, and local immersion seed money grants from the national project budget were not pro-rated, however, because each of the four schools agreed to pay a full-participant contribution for project participation.

Also building on a long history of cooperation, the two Dubuque seminaries applied to the project as a full-participant equivalent partnership in terms of drawing upon project resources and their financial contribution to the project. Among other things this meant that although each partner had individual school goals (in addition to several consortium goals), the two schools shared a project consultant, shared eight slots on international immersions, shared the independent evaluator's time, shared project seed funding, and conducted a cooperative local immersion.

Third, United Theological College, Montreal, is, by itself, extremely small. Indeed, the course of study for its M.Div degree is inextricably linked to the offerings of its two sister seminaries--The Montreal Diocesan Theological College and the Presbyterian College, and especially to the three seminaries' joint affiliation with the McGill University Faculty of Religious Studies.[8] With an intense interest in the PIP/GTE, but an inability to convince its partner schools to submit a joint application, United applied on its own with a clear acknowledgment that it would be difficult for it participate on a full-resource basis. United was accepted into the project on a half-participant equivalency, both in terms of draw upon project resources and financial contribution to the

[8]To oversimplify only slightly, United's students do the first two years of their M.Div course work in McGill's Faculty of Religious Studies M.A. program, and then do a third, "in-ministry" year at United which includes several courses shared by the three sister seminaries.

project with two exceptions. Because of it's unique status in the project as the only less than full-resource school in the project without a project-related consortium partner, it received the full resources of a project consultant and the independent evaluator.

Although participating in the project with some pro-rated reduction of available resources, all three less than full-participant schools entered into all components of the project. Additionally, they were held to the same expectations as full-resource schools in terms of: the nature of international immersion preparation, participation, and follow-up; the structure and function of a steering committee; designing and implementing a "local" immersion; planning, goal setting and reporting; encouraging related faculty research and student programming; participation in the project evaluation; and sharing project insights with related constituencies. They also had full access to the national project directors and communications.

One of the major challenges facing the selection committee was maximizing diversity in terms of the chosen schools' existing approach to globalization, denominational background, geographic location, and size. Again, we cannot comment on the sense of constraint felt by the committee in attempting to attain such diversity. We can assess, however, the diversity they achieved. Tables One and Two present an overview of relevant information, showing not only the diversity among PIP/GTE schools, but also how the profile of project schools compares to the overall profile of ATS member institutions. Table One presents several school characteristics available in the *Fact Book on Theological Education.* As evident in the table, there is considerable geographic spread among PIP/GTE schools. However, in comparison to the overall profile of ATS schools the Chicago and Dubuque consortia weigh the PIP/GTE toward the Great Lakes and Plains regions at the expense of the South and West. Size of place was not a selection criterion. There is research, however, that suggests that seminaries located in major cities are more engaged in globalization issues than seminaries located in less densely populated areas.[9] In this regard it is interesting to note that all of the PIP/GTE schools are located in the central city of major metropolitan areas, except the two Dubuque schools, and even the two Dubuque schools are located in the central city of their small metropolitan area.[10]

Table 1 also shows some spread in the size (as measured by FTE

---

[9]David Weyrick, *A Hermeneutic Phenomenological Investigation of the Concept of "Globalization" within the North American Theological Education Context* (Dissertation, University of Akron, 1992).

[10]At the beginning of the project Gordon-Conwell had two campuses, one in a northern suburb of Boston and the other in Boston.

enrollment) and in the denominational relationship of PIP/GTE schools. In comparison to the overall ATS membership, however, the profile of PIP/GTE schools is decidedly skewed toward larger enrollment institutions and those formally related to oldline Protestant denominations. Particularly noticeable in terms of the former is the absence of PIP/GTE schools with enrollments in the 50 - 150 range, the modal range for the overall ATS profile. We do not know why this is the case. However, prior research has indicated that the lack of resources (time and money) is a major barrier to seminary involvement with globalization issues,[11] and it is at least plausible to think that the availability of resources (perhaps most importantly time) is positively related to size. The same prior research also indicates that Roman Catholic seminaries and seminaries formally related to evangelical denominations are less likely than other ATS member seminaries to emphasize globalization, which may explain, in part, the skewed denominational relationship profile of PIP/GTE schools.

Table 2 contains data from the 1989 ATS Task Force Survey of Institutional Response to Global Theological Education. Seventy-six percent of ATS seminaries responded to the survey, including eleven of the twelve PIP/GTE schools, which at the time of the survey had just been accepted in the project. The table shows some spread among PIP/GTE schools in "the meaning of globalization most in keeping with the institution's *fundamental commitments.*" However, especially in comparison to the overall profile of ATS seminaries, the PIP/GTE school profile is decidedly skewed toward what in short hand might be called the social justice orientation. Perhaps more interesting, a comparison of questions 3a and 3b in the table indicates that: (1) there is a pronounced gap for PIP/GTE schools between "the meaning of globalization most in keeping with the institution's *fundamental commitments*" and "the meaning of globalization *most actually implemented* in the school's program and ethos;" but, (2) almost no such gap in the overall ATS profile. As a result, in terms of "the meaning of globalization *most actually implemented* in a school's program and ethos" the PIP/GTE and overall ATS profiles were quite similar at the beginning of the project.

The table also shows, as one might expect, that PIP/GTE schools were much more likely than the overall ATS profile to indicate that globalization was a "very important" emphasis on campus. Perhaps the only real surprise in the answers to this question is that two PIP/GTE schools responded toward the lower end of the importance scale.

---

[11]David A. Roozen, "If Our Words Could Make It So," and "ATS Task Force Survey of Institutional Response to Global Theological Education," *Theological Education* XXX (Autumn, 1993), pp 29-53.

TABLE 1: PIP/GTE AND ATS SCHOOLS: FACT BOOK DATA COMPARISONS[12]

	ATS	GTE
Region:		
Canada	12%	8%
North East	6	17
Middle East	19	17
Great Lakes	20	33
Plains	9	17
South East	16	0
South West & Mountain	6	8
Far West	10	0
Enrollment (FTE):		
Under 50	6%	8%
50 - 150	41	0
151 - 300	27	42
301 - 500	13	33
500 +	9	17
Denominational Relationship:		
Oldline Independent	8%	8%
Oldline Denominational	38	58
Roman Catholic	26	16
Evangelical Denominational	21	8
Evangelical Independent	7	8
University Related:		
Yes	9%	16%
No	91	83
Highest Degree:		
BD/M.Div	33%	17%
Th.M/STM	11	8
D.Min	31	50
Th.D/Ph.D	25	12

[12]Based on data reported in, *Fact Book On Theological Education: 1987-88*. The ATS column includes all ATS member institutions, including the 12 PIP/GTE schools.

TABLE 2: PIP/GTE AND ATS SCHOOLS: SURVEY DATA COMPARISONS[13]

Of the following four meanings of globalization, which one *is most in keeping with your institution's fundamental commitments*?

	ATS	GTE
A. The church's universal mission to evangelize the world ...	51%	18%
B. Ecumenical global cooperation ...	21	18
C. Christianity's dialogue with other religions ...	5	0
D. The church's mission to the world to address ... the poor, hungry, homeless and the politically and economically powerless.	23	64

Of the following four meanings of globalization, which one is *most actually implemented in your school's program and ethos?*

A. The church's universal mission to evangelize the world ...	42%	27%
B. Ecumenical global cooperation ...	27	45
C. Christianity's dialogue with other religions ...	7	0
D. The church's mission to the world to address ... the poor, hungry, homeless and the politically and economically powerless.	24	27

Overall, what degree of importance does the issue of globalization receive on your campus?

1. Very Important	26%	60%
2.	37	20
3. Important	32	10
4.	5	10
5. Not Important	0	0

[13]David A. Roozen, "If Our Words Could Make It So," and "ATS Task Force Survey of Institutional Response to Global Theological Education," *Theological Education* XXX (Autumn, 1993), pp 29-53. ATS column N = 155 schools. GTE column N = 11 schools.

2. Clustering: Three Different Structures

As previously noted, the original project design called for three, three-school clusters, the three schools in a cluster traveling on and sharing a common preparation for the project's international immersions. In addition to simplifying immersion logistics, the purpose of clustering was to ecumenically group theologically diverse schools and thereby add yet another stream of dialogue across diversity to the immersion experience. It was also a project hope that cluster sharing beyond the international immersions would be initiated by the schools themselves.

We have already seen that the selection of twelve project schools forced four-school clusters.[14] The previously presented listing of schools by cluster also shows that there is at least some theological diversity within each cluster. Cluster C (Gordon-Conwell, Union, United and Weston) is arguably the most theologically diverse, and it is certainly the most diverse in terms of denominational representation. The internal diversity of several of the larger schools in the Chicago cluster helps broaden the otherwise moderate to liberal overall lean of these four schools. And although lacking a Roman Catholic member, Cluster A (Dubuque, Denver Conservative Baptist, Wartburg and Wesley) includes a good mix of conservative, moderate, and liberal Protestantism.

Following the original project design, each cluster shared three international immersions, one to Asia, one to Africa, and one to South America. Cluster A traveled in May or June--following each school's spring term. Cluster B traveled during July or August. Cluster C traveled in January--intended to coincide with either a January short term, or an extended break between fall and spring terms. All immersions were three weeks in duration. Specific countries visited on the immersions include:

Cluster A:
1989: Zimbabwe and South Africa
1990: Peru and Cuba
1991: Philippines, Hong Kong and China

Cluster B:
1989: Philippines, Taiwan and Hong Kong
1990: Zimbabwe and South Africa
1991: Brazil

[14]Budgetary considerations precluded the alternative of creating a fourth, three-school cluster which would have required adding an additional set of international immersions.

Cluster C:
1990: India
1991: Brazil
1992: Zimbabwe and South Africa.

Eleven of the twelve PIP/GTE schools were able to work comfortably within the above cluster-immersion time frame. The one exception was Weston. Summer travel worked best for the self-contained Chicago cluster, and neither the late spring travel time for Cluster A nor the January travel time for Cluster C fit well with Weston's academic calendar. With no good time alternative, Weston was placed in the Cluster C for geographic reasons. With January courses and a relatively small faculty, most of whom had order as well as seminary responsibilities (a problem unanticipated at the time of application), Weston found it impossible to put together a full eight-person team to participate in it's cluster's immersions. Indeed, it was unable to send anyone on the first January immersion. To help mitigate its January conflict, one to three Weston persons traveled with another clusters' immersions. One project benefit of this unanticipated necessity was that it added a Catholic presence to Cluster A's immersions. Scheduling conflicts, however, remained pervasive for Weston throughout the project, and in the end only fourteen persons from the school participated in the project's international immersions, and these persons were spread across six different immersions. A few other schools fell a person or two short of their allotted international immersions places, but none to the extent of Weston.

With the exception of Weston, schools within a cluster shared their international immersion experiences. The extent of other kinds of intra-cluster sharing varied considerably. The four schools in the Chicago cluster, as already noted, entered the project as a consortium, with consortium as well as individual school goals. Relatedly, there was a regularly meeting steering committee for the consortium in addition to the steering committees of the individual schools. The four schools' international immersion teams shared preparation for and debriefing of their immersion experiences. The four schools also conducted a cluster-wide local immersion, shared several special, short-term project events, and three of the four consortium schools created a joint Center for World Mission and a cooperative D.Min track in cross-cultural ministries.

At the other extreme of cooperative structure, the geographic distances separating Cluster A schools mitigated against any cluster sharing other than on immersions. Indeed, even immersion orientation sessions were conducted separately, except for the close cooperation of the two Dubuque schools and a cluster-wide orientation the day immediately prior to an immersion's U.S. departure.

The extent of interaction among Cluster C schools fell in between that of the other two clusters, although closer to that of Cluster A. The geographic distance between Cluster C schools made it possible to attend joint meetings

without the cost of air travel,[15] and indeed the cluster met together in the Boston area for joint orientations to their second and third international immersions. Following the first immersion, United invited the other schools in the cluster to Montreal to debrief the immersion experience, discuss the schools' different approaches to globalization, and explore the possibility of other cluster events. The meeting never materialized, nor others like it. As an alternative, disciplinary related groups of cluster faculty met in conjunction with professional meetings (e.g., the annual meetings of the American Academy of Religion and Society for Biblical Literature). The cluster also began discussion of a joint local immersion. Again the joint effort never moved beyond the discussion stage, although students from all cluster schools were invited to participate in each other's individual local immersions. In only one case was the invitation acted upon.

3. The International Immersions: Fine Tuning a Proven Design

The Plowshares Institute had been leading international immersions for more than a decade prior to the PIP/GTE and brought to the project an immersion design and network of international contacts honed by that experience. It is not surprising, therefore, that the project's international immersions unfolded, in most respects, according to plan. All nine immersions took place at the originally planned times; all went to the originally planned regions of the world; and the respective school teams were weighted toward faculty, followed by administrators, trustees, students, and representatives of a school's church constituencies. Not everything related to immersion travel, however, followed the plan. There was one last-minute change in destination, and one travel-related accident unprecedented in Plowshares' experience. The latter was a serious bus accident during Cluster C's first immersion (India, 1990). The last minute change in destination involved Cluster B's first immersion (Asia, 1989). This summer immersion was scheduled to include China. However, the student-led, pro-democracy protests in China, culminating at Tiananmin square in spring, 1989, all but closed the country to serious exchange programs. Discussions and negotiations among the cluster schools, Plowshares, and international immersion hosts explored several alternatives, including canceling the immersion altogether. It was decided to proceed with originally planned dates, spend more time than originally planned in the Philippines, and substitute a visit to Taiwan for the originally planned trip to the Peoples Republic of China.

Such unanticipated complications related to travel notwithstanding, there were relatively few changes in the general structure of the immersion experience itself during the course of the project. The changes that were made, nevertheless, were especially significant to the project schools because they

[15]Driving time between Montreal and Boston is approximately seven hours and about four hours between New York and Boston.

were based on feedback from the first round of project immersions and therefore both increased the schools' trust in the openness of the national staff and helped adjust the general-church-audience immersion design of Plowshares' previous seminars to the more specifically targeted audience of seminary teams.

The first round immersions followed the originally proposed structure. Second and third round immersions incorporated three sets of changes. One set of changes involved the addition of a cluster's voice to the planning of its international immersion. The specific itinerary and schedule of first round immersions were planned by Plowshares staff and their extensive network of international hosts. Feedback from first round immersion participants suggested it would be helpful for future immersion teams to have some input into the planning process. The suggestion flowed from three more specific concerns. First, while the travel schedule of all Plowshares' immersions borders on the exhausting, many first round project immersion participants found it distractingly so. In particular they found it often detracted from a participant's ability to fully absorb new experiences and/or from the immersion group's reflective time. Second, while Plowshares' immersion hosts typically included some theological and denominational diversity, several first round participants noted a "liberal to liberationist," Protestant bias that they would like broadened to include a greater representation of Roman Catholic and evangelical Protestant contacts. Third, many of the project schools had their own contacts in the countries to be visited, and both as a means to helping schools strengthen their existing bridges to third world countries and as a means of broadening theological/denominational representation among hosts, several first round immersion participants suggested that future immersions provide opportunities for participants to visit existing school contacts.

Although a planning triolog among Plowshares staff, international hosts, and the four school teams for any given immersion complicated the process, three general steps were incorporated in second and third round immersions to help address the suggestions and concerns articulated by first round participants. First, immersion teams were invited to share specific itinerary suggestions with Plowshares, Plowshares in turn sharing these with the lead host in each country to be visited. For example, meetings with both Evangelical and Roman Catholic seminaries and church agencies in several visited countries were extended through the use of contacts provided by cluster schools. Second, whenever possible, a lead host from at least one of the countries to be visited met with representatives of that immersion's participant team prior to the immersion. Typically such a meeting was piggy-backed on an already scheduled trip of a lead host to North America to attend the annual meetings of the AAR/SBL or other international meetings. Third, second and third round immersions included one or two days with no prescribed agenda, such that individual participants or self-selected sub-groups could pursue their own interests and contacts.

Another set of changes to the structure of second and third round international immersions involved the traveling groups' communal debriefing, reflection and worship life while on the immersion. Plowshares leadership of

first round immersions included not only coordinating the action and the travel/accommodations components of an immersion, but also coordinating the immersion groups' communal life. Several first round participants suggested that this was too much for one person to handle effectively, and that such overload contributed to the sacrifice of communal time to the press of other things and/or to Plowshares' proactive tendencies in regard to leading group debriefing and reflection sessions. In response to these concerns, second and third round immersions incorporated a team of immersion leaders, this team typically pairing Plowshares staff with one or more of the project's team of national consultants, the latter taking primary responsibility for structuring the immersion group's communal life. An immersion steering committee comprised of representatives from each school participating in the immersion, an international host, and immersion leaders was also created to provide regular feedback from the group during an immersion.

A final set of changes to the immersion structure concerned group preparation and orientation. Several first round participants expressed concern that their preparation had been long on theological and social/cultural/economic/political background for the countries to be visited, but short both on how to adapt to a new cultural setting in general and on providing a personal/experiential feel for the countries, groups, and individuals to be visited. Several first round participants also expressed concern that not enough time was given at the beginning of an immersion for the kind of "community building" needed to integrate four disparate school teams. In response, several relatively minor changes were made to the formal structure of preparation and orientation. Materials prepared by prior immersion teams (reports, slide shows, video tapes, "survival guides" for those about to be immersed, etc), for example, were added to the reading list or orientation sessions for subsequent teams. Reading lists also were revised to include suggestions of prior participants, particularly in regard to substituting articles for entire books and increasing the diversity of material. Additionally, and as noted above, representatives of immersion teams were invited to meet with lead hosts prior to an immersion. Finally, more extensive community building activities were built into the beginning of each immersion trip.

4. Project Steering Committees: Variations on Intended Themes

The PIP/GTE was about helping seminaries change themselves, and the primary structure to coordinate responsibility for a school's project-related change efforts was its steering committee. As already noted, this responsibility was bi-directional, linking a school outward with national project catalysts and inward as a school's own internal catalyst--encouraging, directing, and linking the anticipated critical mass of commitment and ideas that the project would stimulate within a school's own resources. The committee was one of the two most important structural components in the PIP/GTE design, and the committee's chair (i.e., a school's project coordinator) had the single most important school role in the project design.

An overview of tasks and guidelines for the steering committee, as envisioned at the project's inception, already has been presented. The extent to, manner, and timeliness with which steering committee's actually accomplished or embodied these, however, varied considerably. All steering committees included multi-disciplinary faculty, administrative (typically the academic dean) and student representation, and several included at least one trustee and/or representative from an external seminary constituency. The size and stability of the committee, however, varied from school to school.

One school had a two-person coordinator team (consisting of the academic dean and a senior faculty member); the rest had single coordinators. Of the eleven schools with a single coordinator, two of the original coordinators were deans and nine were faculty. Of the nine faculty members all but two were tenured, all but one was full-time, and although only four taught in the areas of missiology or world religions, all had international experience. Given the project proposal's explicit concern that a school's choice of coordinator was important for "ensuring continuity and consistency across the five years of the project," it is important to note that there was a formal change in coordinator at five of the twelve schools during the project--in two cases because of extended sabbaticals, in two cases because the coordinator left the institution, and in the final case because the original coordinator needed to focus his time elsewhere. In each case the original coordinator was replaced with a person already serving on the steering committee. In addition to these formal changes there were also several instances in which a semester-long coordinator's sabbatical temporary passed the responsibility for the steering committee to another member of the committee.

Project guidelines asked for one-fifth release time for the project coordinator. This guideline was formally and fully followed at only three of the twelve project schools. At several of the "non-compliant" schools the absence of formal release time did not have a noticeable effect, primarily because the coordinator seemed, for the most part, to comfortably incorporate steering committee responsibilities into other and related administrative duties (e.g., one of the faculty coordinators was also director of his school's world mission center). However, at four institutions it was clear that time pressures in other academic and administrative areas detracted from a coordinator's attention to the PIP/GTE.

The amount of time a school's steering committee gave to the project and, relatedly, the range of things a committee did, also varied considerably from school to school. At the minimalist end of the spectrum, a few committees tended only to meet when there was a national project deadline (e.g., selecting an immersion team, submitting an annual report, meeting with a national staff representative); committee attendance was typically sporadic; and the meetings frequently took the form of the committee "blessing" something the coordinator had already done. At the activist end of the spectrum a few committees met at least monthly; attendance was consistently high; and there was extensive discussion of project-related business. These committees were extremely proactive both in regard to working with the international immersion teams and keeping the project visible to the entire seminary community. It was not

atypical, for example, for such committees to: (1) convene weekly study sessions and prayer meetings with an immersion team prior to an immersion, including members from prior immersions in the preparation; (2) hold commissioning services for immersion teams; (3) provide a support network for the families of participants who were away on an immersion; and (4) design immersion debriefings and celebrations/reunions that brought together all immersion participants. It was also not atypical of such proactive committees to make regular reports, often calling for some formal action (e.g., approval of a globalization mission statement) at faculty meetings and retreats; to create faculty or seminary-wide forums or seminars for the presentation and discussion of faculty or visiting scholars' research on globalization issues; and to regularly focus seminary worship on globalization themes. As might be expected, most project steering committees operated at a level somewhere between these two extremes.

As the project moved into its final two years, it became increasingly evident that one of the most important tasks of the steering committee was connecting its project-specific planning to its institution's broader planning and decision-making process. As might be expected, the mechanisms of this connection varied considerably from school to school, and one of the most important sources of variation was the size of the institution. Smaller schools, in general, tend to have less complicated formal decision-making structures (e.g., fewer layers of committees), augmented by greater personal overlaps in key roles in the formal structure, and fewer issues competing for the institution's decision-making time. The potential advantages of such formal and informal structures were clearly evident in the smaller PIP/GTE schools. To cite just two examples: First, given a fixed number of international immersion slots per school, small schools had a higher percentage of their faculty, key administrators, and trustees participate in the project's international immersions (and relatedly, involved in the preparation, debriefing and team building related to the immersions). Second, although most project seminary academic deans and presidents participated in international immersions, and although all project steering committees included the academic dean, at the smaller schools the president also tended to be an active member of the steering committee.

As the project progressed, it also became evident that better mechanisms were needed for sharing across all the schools. Not only were the schools facing common situations, but each was doing so creatively out of the rich and varied background of experience it brought to the project. Consequently, there was a constant stream of ideas, insights, and material from which all could benefit. In the original design the mechanisms of such possible sharing were limited to within clusters, plus the accumulated wisdom of those on the national staff who had contact with all the participant schools (specifically, the project directors and evaluator). To help stimulate the project-wide sharing of information a quarterly newsletter was established during the second year, primarily devoted to articles submitted by the schools. Also during the second year one of the school presidents took it upon himself to work with the national project directors in convening an annual meeting of project-school presidents. Toward the same end of sharing common project concerns and wisdom, but

unfortunately not until the last year of the project, a two-day conference of project coordinators was held, which included one joint session with the project-school presidents. As will be elaborated in the next two chapters both the presidents group and the project-wide meeting of coordinators proved to be especially important additions to the original project design.

5. National Consulting Team: Taking One's Own Advice

We have already noted three changes made early in the project to the consulting component of the project--the addition of a coordinator of consultants, consultants' participation as co-leaders with Plowshares staff of second and third round international immersions, and multi-school assignments of coordinators necessitated by having twelve seminaries involved in the project. The latter was a relatively straightforward matter of, in two cases, one consultant working with two different schools. The Chicago cluster arrangement, however, was a bit more unique. Three of the original nine members of the consulting team were women, and building on a shared interest in feminist approaches to leadership, they expressed a desire to work together as a consultant team to one of the clusters. The Chicago Cluster provided a natural opportunity for this, and it was negotiated for the three women consultants to work as a team with this cluster. Two of the team each acted as primary contact with one of the schools, the third team member acted as primary contact to the other two schools, and the team shared involvement with the cluster's overall consortium steering committee.

The coordinator of consultants position was established to serve as: (1) a singular and independent channel of communication between the consultants and national project directors; (2) the coordinator of consultant training and debriefing (including planning for the national staff retreats); and (3) "troubleshooter" when there was an unanticipated consultant-related issue. This not only added special expertise to the national staff and helped communication with and among the consulting team, but also helped the national project directors focus their time on other necessary tasks. All three functions of the coordinator of consultants required close involvement with the national project directors and the independent project evaluator (particularly given the evaluator's formative role). As a result and as previously noted, the coordinator of consultants, national project directors, and project evaluator began to meet regularly--typically twice a year in person and several times a year via conference telephone call-- to assess and adapt the flow of the project, plan national staff retreats, and confer on situations that demanded special national staff interventions.

It was a project hope that consultants would serve through the entire project; a hope almost realized. Only two members of the original consultant team did not complete the project, both resigning when the responsibilities of new jobs precluded continued involvement. One resignation came late in the project and the consultant's relationship with the affected school was picked up by one of the national project directors. The other resignation involved one of

the Chicago Cluster team of consultants and occurred in the second year of the project. A faculty member who was serving as project coordinator at one of the Chicago cluster schools agreed also to serve as part of the Chicago team of consultants--picking up the role of primary contact for a school other than her own.

Including the coordinator of consultants and the Chicago addition, eleven persons served on the national consulting team during the project. Of these all but one had held or during the project were holding tenured, seminary faculty positions; seven had been or were academic deans; three had been or were seminary presidents; one had been a parish pastor, bishop and seminary faculty member and became during the project a national church executive for international mission; two were directors of globalization programs at non-PIP/GTE seminaries; and all had long histories of involvement with globalization issues. Theologically and denominationally the overall consultants' profile matched the overall profile of participant schools very closely.

The consultants had three general tasks related to their schools: (1) as interpreter of the project to their schools; (2) as mediator between their school and the project directors and other national staff; and (3) as a resource person to their school's project steering committee. The first two generally proceeded as planned throughout the project, although there were occasional tendencies, especially during the first two years of the project, for either the national project directors or for the schools to preempt the consultants interpreting/mediating roles by communicating directly with each other.[16] The "resourcing" role worked relatively well at the general level of encouragement and review, but often proved problematic at the point of meeting highly specific school needs that were either beyond the expertise of a school's consultant or would have demanded considerably more of the consultant's time than allocated in the project design. In response to such needs for highly focused consultation on specific programmatic issues, changes were made in a continuation-funding grant that allowed the national staff to arrange specialized, supplementary consulting support to particular schools.

6. Local Immersions: Encountering the Global at Home

The importance of the local immersion for helping project schools experiment with the immersion model of transformative pedagogy, for allowing additional persons at any given school to participate in a project related

[16]Given close personal relationships between the national project directors and several of the deans and/or presidents in the participant schools, there was occasionally a similar problem involving the circumvention of a school's project coordinator role as mediator between a school and the national project staff.

immersion, and for building relationships with North American hosts that could develop into ongoing partnerships was recognized by project designers right from the start. Nevertheless, little was said about the specifics during the first two years of the project, except: (1) that each seminary would develop and implement a local immersion during the third project year (i.e., between a school's second and third international immersions); (2) that the local immersion should generally follow the international immersion pedagogy; and (3) that project schools could apply to the national project for $10,000 seed-money grants toward the local immersion's design and implementation.

Toward the end of the second year of the project, however, the prospect of doing local immersions in the third year of the project caught the full attention of both the national staff and the schools' steering committees. One immediate response was a change in the local immersion time line. Another response was the development of a set of local immersion "guidelines." There was near unanimous agreement that it was unrealistic (and in most cases impossible) to expect project schools to design and implement local immersions during the third year, especially since this year also included a school's third international immersion. Consequently, the local immersion was moved to the fourth year (i.e., after a school's third and final international immersion).

The need for specific local immersion guidelines also became clear as soon as steering committees began seriously to consider how they might structure their local experience. In some cases this desire for greater clarity came from steering committees who sought assistance in both stimulating and focusing their thinking. In other cases, the desire for greater clarity came from national staff who were encountering a "creativity" among steering committees that seemingly overreached the boundaries of what an immersion experience might be. In response, a six-page local immersion guideline document was developed in consultation with a broad range of experts in urban and rural theological education. With the exception of the duration of the experience, the local immersion guidelines basically translated the structure and assumptions of the project's international immersion for a North American context that included hosts with whom a seminary might develop on-going relationships. Key among these were that:

- The experience should focus on the experience and issues of marginal and economically disadvantaged constituencies/communities, and the life of the church within these communities;
- The experience should be planned by hosts in the local communities;
- Participants should enter as fully as possible into the world of their hosts, including becoming dependent upon one's hosts for maintenance, security, and education;
- Participants should be in dialogue with government, business, academic, grassroots, and oppositional leaders who represent the strongest voices on various sides of central issues;
- Participants should agree to covenants of preparation, participation/ reflection, and response similar to those of the international immersions;

- Project schools should feel free to join with other project schools in sharing a local immersion experience; and
- The local immersion should be ten days to two weeks in duration.

The guidelines were provided as "guidelines," rather than rigid mandates. Nevertheless, schools were informed that proposals for national project seed-money grants for the local immersions (for which every school anticipated applying) would be reviewed from the perspective of the guidelines and that therefore exceptions to the guidelines "should be noted and explanations provided." Five schools received national project funding for and conducted North American immersions that closely followed the structure of the project's international immersions. Six schools received national project funding for and conducted "exceptional" local immersions that included significant departures from project guidelines. The twelfth school received approval for its local immersion design, but had to postpone it until after the project's formal completion. In most instances a school selectively, although not exclusively, recruited local immersion participants from among faculty, administrators, trustees, and students who were unable to participate in its international immersions. In a few cases, however, an intentional balance between yet-to-be and previously immersed participants was sought.

The five schools whose local immersions closely followed the structure of the project's international immersions included:[17]

- Denver Conservative Baptist: Conducted in cooperation with the non-PIP/GTE, Illiff School of Theology, also located in Denver. Fourteen days in duration; twenty-two participants; time split between the rural communities surrounding Burlington, Colorado and six neighborhoods in Denver representing different mixes of ethnic, economically disadvantaged, and minority populations.
- University of Dubuque and Wartburg Theological Seminaries: Ten days in duration; thirteen participants; time split between several rural and Native American communities in Iowa and Nebraska.
- United Theological College: Two phases. The first phase was eight days in duration; had eighteen participants including representatives from United's sister seminaries in the Montreal Joint Board of Theological Colleges and the McGill University Faculty of Religious Studies; lived with Cree and Inuit families in the Great Whale River region of Northern Quebec; and focused on the implications of a projected hydro dam on the environment and for the displacement of the Crees and Inuits. The second phase was a workshop on poverty and the multi-cultural reality in Montreal and involved twenty people.
- Wesley Theological Seminary: Ten days in duration; thirty participants including nearly the entire faculty, the president, dean, two trustees and

[17]More extensive descriptions of all local immersions are available from the respective schools.

several students; time spit between the Appalachian coal mining area around Charleston, West Virginia and the inner city of Washington, D.C.

The six schools whose local immersions included departures from project guidelines included:

- The four schools in the Chicago Cluster: A cooperative venture that involved twenty-eight participants from the four schools in community ministry and social service projects serving marginalized constituencies in Chicago. Hosts from the various projects served as mentors to the immersion participants. Participants worked in their assigned project for one or two days for each of nine months, in addition to meeting regularly with their mentor. Four participant reflection groups were also formed which met for three hours each month for group reflection and discussions with guest community leaders.[18]
- Weston Jesuit School of Theology: Initial faculty/student site visits and other kinds of orientation to Boston Archdiocese programs for new immigrant and refuge populations, followed by supervised student placements in several of the programs and seminary group discussion/reflection meetings.
- Union Theological Seminary, New York. Two separate local immersion experiences. One involved ten seminary persons living for eight days as a common community, and "experiencing" the issues of health, housing and homelessness in the Harlem, Washington Heights and Morningside areas of Manhattan. The second involved a hundred persons for three days, beginning on campus with worship, concluding on campus with a celebrative meal and debriefing, and spending the intervening time dialogically engaging a variety of justice issues through visits to eight community agencies and organizations in the seminary's neighborhood.

7. Theological Reflectors: Plan B

The original research and evaluation grant proposal called for commissioning a "respected senior scholar" to spend approximately a fourth-time per year across the five years of the PIP/GTE placing a critical analysis of the project in its broader historical and theological context. During the first year of the project this was significantly changed. The initial notion of a single person gave way to a team of three. The revision was driven by two factors, including: (1) the difficulty of finding a senior scholar able to invest a fourth time over five years; and (2) the difficulty finding a single person with high

[18]For an extended discussion of the Chicago cluster's local immersion see, Susan B. Thistlewaite and George F. Cairns (eds.), *Beyond Theological Tourism: Mentoring as a Grassroots Approach to Theological Education* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1994).

visibility and direct ties to the diverse constituencies represented in the project. The team approach reduced the time demands on any one person and provided a greater inclusion of diverse perspectives. The initially recruited team included Walter Brueggemann, Professor of Old Testament, Columbia Seminary; Mortimer Arias, retired Methodist Bishop of Bolivia, past president of the Seminario Biblico, Costa Rica and, during the first several years of the project, part-time professor of missiology, Iliff Seminary; and M. Shawn Copeland, Assistant Professor of Theology and Black Studies at Yale Divinity School.

Brueggemann's election as President of the Society of Biblical Literature shortly after he accepted membership on the PIP/GTE's team of theological reflectors prompted a further modification to the team. Lacking the time to participate in the project on a regular basis, Brueggemann agreed to be available upon special request and to work as an advisor to the national project directors, especially in regard to the project's evolving relationship with the SBL and the project's relationships in China. In his place, M. Douglas Meeks accepted appointment to the team. Meeks was Professor of Theology at Eden Theological Seminary at the time of his appointment to the team, and shortly thereafter accepted the position of academic dean at Wesley Theological Seminary--one of the PIP/GTE schools--from which he maintained his role on the theological reflector team.

The active team of theological reflectors participated in the final three national staff retreats and the coordinators debriefing conference at the conclusion of the project; two of the three shared leadership with Plowshares staff on international immersions; and all published a variety of articles informed by their participation in the project.

8. National Project Dissemination

As a part of their acceptance into the PIP/GTE all participating schools agreed to share their advocacy for the globalization of theological education and their project learnings with other church and educational agencies and institutions within their immediate sphere of influence. In varying ways and to varying extents all project schools have done this. Several publications by project participants, for example, have already been noted, as has United Seminary's strong engagement of its sister seminaries in the Montreal Joint Board of Theological Colleges and the McGill University Faculty of Religious Studies, and Weston's new partnership with the Boston archdiocese. A multitude of other presentations to denominational boards, local congregations, professional academic associations, and seminary faculties could be elaborated.

Advocacy and dissemination of learnings were also strong commitments of the national staff, although a specific plan for acting on these commitments only emerged as the project unfolded. In the end the plan included four major initiatives coordinated by the national project directors and project evaluator. One of these is this report, which is being distributed at project expense to all ATS seminaries. A second is a book frequently noted in the report, and

including contributions from thirty-one project participants: Evans, Evans and Roozen (eds.), *The Globalization of Theological Education.* This book was premiered at the third major national project dissemination initiative, the November, 1993 national conference, "The Local/Global Connection: Cross-Cultural Theological Education." The conference was held in Chevy Chase, Maryland, immediately preceding the AAR/SBL annual meetings in downtown Washington D.C., and included three plenaries, plus a closing worship; fifteen workshops; four case study sessions; a special discussion session on library resources for globalization; and display tables for schools to share resources. All PIP/GTE schools had materials on display, and a majority of the conference's plenary speakers and workshop leaders were PIP/GTE participants. One hundred, twenty-two persons attended the conference, representing sixty-three seminaries.

The fourth major vehicle of national project advocacy and sharing was the formal relationship that the project, through Plowshares Institute, developed with the Society of Biblical Literature. In a 1993 letter to PIP/GTE participants, David J. Lull, executive director of the SBL, described this relationship in the following way:

> As evidence of the impact of GTE on the community of biblical scholars, conversations with Bob Evans led me to propose a new lecture series at the SBL annual meeting on the Bible in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Generous support from the Plowshares Institute for the first three lectures brought Bishop K.H. Ting in 1990, Itumeleng Mosala in 1991, and Elsa Tamez in 1992 to the SBL annual meeting. This year we are pleased to have Dr. John Pobee give the lecture in this series. In addition we have established an on-going working group under the same name, which has brought together an impressive list of scholars who are opening the discourse of biblical scholarship to the work of biblical interpretation in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Our discourse, and we hope our teaching and scholarship, is being enriched by including these new voices.
>
> Independently, but encouraged by such projects as these, the SBL held its 1992 international meeting in Australia, marking the first step toward enhancing communication with biblical scholars in the Pacific Rim. Discussions are underway toward holding an international SBL meeting in South Africa in 1996. And I hope similar conferences will be held before the end of this century in Latin America and in China. These conferences will surely help open up exchanges across cultures that will further enrich discourse about the Bible everywhere.