

INTRODUCTION

As we joined in worship, the sounds of Calcutta's streets drifted noisily through open windows to mingle with the quiet prayers of those who had gathered. Against the far wall, surrounded by her beloved Missionaries of Charity, sat Mother Teresa--a woman whose very name has become synonymous with Christian compassion and service. The India Immersion Team, of which I was privileged to be a part, had seen firsthand some of the remarkable ministries to which these dedicated missionaries had given their lives. It was not until we worshiped together, however, that I came to appreciate fully the profoundly spiritual base of their joyful service. "Our work," as Mother Teresa has said, "is only the expression of the love we have for God. In the slums we are the light of God's kindness to the poor."

Mother Teresa's life and work, like those of many who preceded her stand as eloquent reminders of the urgency of reaching out (sometimes across traditional boundaries) to a broken world. Such reminders, I am convinced, are especially needed within the theological seminaries of North America. In an age of privatization and institutional insularity, it seems especially important that we learn how to move beyond our relatively isolated, homogeneous, and parochial structures in order to engage the global realities beyond our gates. If we are to be faithful to the commission which Christ gave us, we must discover how to build bridges more effectively to distant shores and how to join hands with unfamiliar partners. Insularity, by its very nature, seems to be inimical to the Gospel. Perhaps what we need is something similar to the Apostle Peter's vision in Acts 10--the sort of paradigm shift which enabled the early Christian communities to recognize that the Good News which they proclaimed was intended to bless people of every nation, race, gender, and class. For me, such a shift became more clearly visible in India. Since I returned home,

the experience has continued to transform the ways in which I think, teach, and live

My experience is not unique. During the past decade, an interest in globalization has been growing within many of the member institutions of the Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada. A number of articles on the subject appeared in Theological Education, and a special committee has been established to help give impetus and direction to this increasingly important area. Furthermore, during the past five years twelve of our schools have been involved in the Pilot Immersion Project for the Globalization of Theological Education. Participation in the project has begun to reshape both individuals and institutions. While it is still too early for a full assessment, the Pilot Immersion Project may represent one of those rare moments in theological education when fundamental change actually takes place.

Garth M. Rosell¹

Several points in Rosell's reflection on his experience in The Pilot Immersion Project for the Globalization of Theological Education in North America (PIP/GTE) provide a helpful introduction to the project and to this report. First, PIP/GTE's starting point was the confession that within a globalizing world context the parochialism of much of North American theological education is inimical to the Gospel. Second, the project involved twelve schools for five years. Third, the project's major pedagogical premise was that serious engagement with "others" through immersion in their life world can be a powerful catalyst for change. Fourth, although individual change was important, it was only a first step toward the project's more fundamental goal of institutional change. Such institutional change was to be realized when a critical mass of individuals emerged within each institution. Transformed and bonded through common immersions, these individuals would collectively spearhead an ever intensifying institutional change process. Fifth, the project succeeded! That is, to varying degrees in the majority of participating schools the project was, in fact, one of those rare moments when fundamental change took place. All twelve schools changed in ways that

¹"Forward." Pp XIV-XV in Evans, Evans and Roozen (eds.), *The Globalization of Theological Education* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1993). Rosell is professor of church history and former dean at Gordon-Conwell Seminary, one of the PIP/GTE schools. He served on the advisory committee for the development of the PIP/GTE proposal, and as project consultant to United Theological College and Weston Jesuit School of Theology.

they, themselves, felt were significant.

Finally, Rosell reminds us that the PIP/GTE was part of a broader movement of increasing awareness of globalization issues and experimentation with globalization programs within North American theological education. Indeed, the PIP/GTE was itself intended as an experiment--a pilot project--within and on behalf of these broader currents and would not have been possible without them. *With gratitude for and in mutuality with this broader ethos of concern and creativity, the authors intend the current report to provide as full an account and assessment of the PIP/GTE as is possible one year after the project's formal conclusion.*

Two decisions made at the beginning of the PIP/GTE underscore the seriousness with which the project pursued its public role as "pilot." First, one of the criteria for measuring the project's effectiveness was, to use the exact language of the proposal, "the identification of bridges and barriers to such change, the results of which will be made available to the broader community of theological education." Second, the project sought funding from a foundation not involved in the action component of the experiment for a part-time, independent evaluator for the full duration of the project. In addition to providing ongoing, formative evaluation across the five years of the project, this person was also responsible for a final assessment, with particular attention to learnings about bridges and barriers to change. The Lilly Endowment, Inc. graciously accepted and funded a proposal from David A. Roozen, Director of Hartford Seminary's Center for Social Religious Research to serve in this role. He is the primary author of this report, and all final judgments about the nature and extent of change and about bridges and barriers to change contained in the report are his.

Robert A. Evans and Alice Frazer Evans, Co-directors of the Plowshares Institute, served as co-directors of the PIP/GTE itself and as co-authors of this report. In every sense of the phrase, they and their Plowshares' associates were the driving force of the project. Plowshares' leadership of the action component of the PIP/GTE was supported by generous funding from The J. Howard Pew Freedom Trust.

The report progresses through five chapters. The first chapter notes several streams of concern about globalization that served as background for the project, then elaborates the goals and assumptions that guided the project. Chapter II represents what we expect will be the heart of the report for most readers. It presents how the project schools actually changed the way they teach. The reader will note by the extended length of the chapter that we have gone to particular lengths to present a comprehensive and substantive discussion of the range of ways in which the project schools sought to institutionally embody their engagement with globalization. We do so not primarily to document the "success" of the process--although we do believe the

overall project proved to be exemplary. Rather we do so as a way of calling attention to (1) the vast array of concrete resources related to globalization now available in the project schools and which can serve as models for other schools, and (2) the broad scope of areas that can contribute to moving globalization from the periphery to the core of an institution's teaching.

Chapter III turns attention from the fruits to the process of change. It presents the PIP/GTE's model of change, both as proposed and as actually unfolded. Chapter IV continues discussion of the dynamics of change, presenting project learnings about bridges and barriers to change. The chapter includes both an evaluation of specific PIP/GTE interventions and an analysis of factors within the participating schools that facilitated or hindered their ability to change. The final chapter is more reflective, elaborating our thoughts about the broader implications of the project for theological education.

The PIP/GTE was an immense undertaking, directly involving over a five-year period faculty, administrators, trustees, and students from the twelve participating schools; the hosts and dialogue partners from nine international and eight "local" immersions; eleven project consultants; four theological reflectors; program officers from two foundations; the entire staff of Plowshares Institute; and significant resources of the Hartford Seminary Center for Social and Religious Research. It is awkward and humbling to be thrust into the position of attempting to summarize reflectively and interpret their--and our--experience. We extend our gratitude and appreciation to all of the project's participants, most importantly for their willingness to risk change, and secondly for their openness to us and others with their insight, wisdom, and critique. Whether through formal reports, questionnaires and interviews, or spontaneous and informal exchanges, virtually everyone involved in the project has contributed critical reflection.

Three groups, however, deserve special acknowledgment and thanks. First and foremost, our thanks to the twelve participating schools and most particularly each school's steering committee and steering committee coordinator. Chapter IV comments on the key role of steering committee coordinators as agents of change. Let us further note here the coordinators' equally critical role as dialogue partners with us in reflecting upon what happened and why. Our special thanks also to the project's consulting team and team of theological reflectors, who, in addition to their contracted responsibilities with the project, met with us at least once a year for five years in three-day retreats to reflect on the project. Project schools, steering committee coordinators, and a school's current contact person for his or her school's globalization efforts are listed below, as are project consultants and theological reflectors. We commend each of them to you as articulate and experienced bearers of the project's wisdom.

Finally, for their own amazing persistence, patience, and steadfastness in

working with three at times perplexing and at times perplexed purveyors of change, our deepest thanks to Maralyn R. Lipner, program support, Plowshares Institute; Hugh C. McLean, financial administrator, Plowshares Institute, and Mary Jane Ross, administrative assistant, Hartford Seminary Center for Social and Religious Research.

**Cluster
School**

* *Steering Committee Coordinator*
Current Contact

Cluster A:

Denver Seminary

* *Timothy P. Weber*

* *Kermit A. Ecklebarger*

Current Contact: Malcolm Newton

University of Dubuque Theological Seminary

* *David Scotchmer (died February 25, 1995)*

Current Contact: Lyle D. VanderBroek

Wartburg Theological Seminary

* *Wi Jo Kang*

Current Contact: James Nieman

Wesley Theological Seminary

* *David Hopkins*

* *Douglas Strong*

Current Contact: V. Sue Zabel

Cluster B:

Catholic Theological Union

* *John Kaserow*

* *Robert Schreiter*

Current Contact: John Kaserow

Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago

* *Yoshiro Ishida*

Current Contact: Richard Bliese

Chicago Theological Seminary

* *Susan Thistlethwaite*

* *Graydon F. Snyder*

Current Contact: Susan Thistlethwaite

McCormick Theological Seminary

* *Heidi Hadsell*

Current Contact: Hearn Chun

Cluster C:*Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary** *Gary Bekker*

Current Contact: Kenneth L. Swetland

*Union Theological Seminary (New York)** *Larry Rasmussen** *Janet Walton*

Current Contact: Larry Rasmussen

*United Theological College (Montreal)** *Pierre Goldberger*

Current Contact: Pierre Goldberger

*Weston Jesuit School of Theology** *Edward M. O'Flaherty, S.J.** *Brian O. McDermott, S.J.** *Walter J. Smith, S.J.*

Current Contact: Margaret Eletta Guilder, O.S.F.

Project Consultants:

Erskine Clarke

Toinette M. Eugene

Heidi Hadsell

Maryann Hedaa

Will L. Herzfeld

Paul G. Hiebert

Joseph Hough

William Bean Kennedy (Coordinator)

Eleanor Scott Meyers

Garth M. Rosell

Arthur Van Seters

Theological Reflectors:

Mortimer Arias

M. Shawn Copeland

Douglas Meeks

Walter Brueggemann