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Necessity drives innovation. As the needs of the Church continue to change, as new theological questions emerge in new contexts, and as pressures increase on traditional delivery systems that have developed over hundreds of years, theological education is in need of innovation.

However, in both theology and education, innovation comes slowly. Theology rightfully approaches innovation warily as it seeks to uphold historic orthodoxy. Education, especially higher education, develops within institutions that often progress slowly, deliberately, and methodically. Furthermore, as pressure for change builds, the question of who will drive innovation emerges. Which centers of activity might generate the most creative ideas?

In global business, the concept of “reverse innovation” indicates that some of the best ideas might flow in unexpected directions as new practices and models arise from emerging markets. In the same way, better solutions for the Church may come from those outside the historic centers of theological education. By challenging three assumptions that may limit innovation, this essay seeks to encourage those in “emerging markets” to think creatively in ways that may benefit the Church as a whole.

The Notion of Reverse Innovation

In their 2012 book, Reverse Innovation, Vijay Govindarajan and Chris Trimble maintain that for multinational corporations to succeed, they must move beyond the prevailing assumption that the best ideas are first developed in established markets and then exported to new ones. In reality, some of the best ideas will come via “reverse innovation,” whereby ideas first developed and adopted in emerging markets eventually gain traction in dominant regions to the benefit of all.
Reverse innovation challenges corporations by shifting the centers of control, pushing product development beyond proven ideas, and often going against conventional wisdom and best practices. However, as Govindarajan and Trimble point out, reverse innovation is not so much about the “best practice” as it is about the “next practice” that will lead to success (272).

Best practices in all fields are important, but targets are misaligned, then improving execution alone will not help to accomplish the true objectives. New circumstances may require new solutions. Reverse innovation acknowledges that new markets provide fertile grounds for creative thinking and problem-solving. The business world often adopts a “product out” mentality that simply looks for new markets for proven commodities. Products may be modified – often simplified – to meet lower price points, reflect regional tastes, and engage local supply chains. However, this approach builds on assumptions that do not always hold true, and may actually inhibit creativity and growth.

Challenging Three Assumptions

Govindarajan and Trimble expose assumptions and present case studies that provide interesting analogs for the world of theological education, where gaps in exported approaches to curriculum design, methodology, and content have been well-documented. Principles from reverse innovation may help to guide theological educators in pursuit of better solutions for preparing leaders for Kingdom work.

**Assumption One: Needs are universal.**

The assumption is that customers in poorer markets simply need cheaper versions of products that are popular in higher-end markets. It fails to account for the fact that new contexts have new and different needs, which may not be met by existing products and approaches.

Computer peripherals maker Logitech assumed that their market-leading computer accessories from the West would eventually succeed in China. They began by introducing cheaper versions of their products, assuming that as Chinese consumers became more affluent, they would “graduate” to Logitech’s higher-priced mainstream products.

However, Logitech soon learned that the Chinese company Rapoo surpassed them in the Chinese market not only because they made a cheaper mouse, but also because their product better met consumer needs. It turns out that Chinese consumers had special needs for mouse range, speed, and shielding due to context-specific issues such as high-density housing and popular use of the computer mouse to control internet-delivered television content. Rapoo thus created a better product because they did not assume that the Chinese market
would simply follow the Western one. While Logitech assumed that the Chinese market would one day “graduate” to their better products, Rapoo developed higher-end peripherals that met the particular needs of Chinese consumers.

Theological educators sometimes assume that training needs for Christian leaders are universal. While certain aspects of discipleship, spiritual nurture, and biblical understanding are indispensable for all followers of Christ, the formation of Christian leaders is not a homogenous process. Ministers require particular skill sets that address the needs of the Church as it responds to the unique cultural, societal, and theological needs of its context. Differing needs may require differing approaches to theological education in terms of curriculum design, content, or pedagogical models.

*Assumption Two: Progress develops iteratively from previous models.*

The assumption is that improvement begins with the existing product, which is then refined to increase market share. However, progress may require listening more carefully to the market and developing an entirely different approach in response to emerging needs.

As the second largest agricultural producer in the world, India was a natural market for John Deere tractors. Iterative design improvements upon previous models had enabled Deere to develop top products in the US. They followed this successful design model while developing a new tractor for India. They knew that Indian farmers had much smaller land plots than the large conglomerates in the US, so they created a smaller, cheaper version of their leading tractor. Yet, they gained negligible market share in India.

Meanwhile, the Indian tractor company Mahindra and Mahindra emerged as the dominant tractor maker in the country. Unlike Deere, which had built its tractor based on the previous year’s model, Mahindra began their design process by interviewing farmers. They discovered that Indian farmers used tractors in vastly different ways than American farmers. Indian farmers used their tractors not only to plow and harvest fields, but also as all-purpose vehicles for non-farm activities, such as transporting family and goods to town. Therefore, they had greater interest in fuel efficiency, issues related to use during rainy and dry seasons, ease of maintenance, and durability due to increased hours of usage.

Mahindra excelled because they did not use an inherited product as their starting point. They did not limit creativity to the existing product line. They did not assume that the Indian market would necessarily follow the Western one. They did not automatically build on previous practices. Instead, they first identified the needs of their clients and then built a product that met those particular needs. In doing
so, they have both penetrated the US market and become the number one tractor manufacturer worldwide, based on units sold. John Deere has subsequently revamped their joint venture in India, implementing practices learned from Mahindra.

Previous successes and best practices play an important role in theological education. However, a clean-slate approach may sometimes lead to innovations that better suit contextual needs. In the same way that Mahindra relied on teams to explore the needs of their market, theological educators need to listen closely to the differing and changing needs of the Church in diverse contexts, and remain open to fresh approaches. Discoveries may lead to new designs that depart from previous iterations, but also prove more effective in equipping leaders for ministry in new contexts.

*Assumption Three: Current institutional structures are necessary to accomplish objectives.*

Frameworks and infrastructures designed to support certain objectives can become entrenched, sometimes limiting the ability to meet new objectives. As a leading manufacturer of ultrasound technology, General Electric (GE) found it difficult to penetrate the market in China. Sales lagged in part because few hospitals and clinics had the required infrastructure for supporting technology designed for Western hospitals, let alone the resources to purchase such expensive machines.

Frustrated with slow sales, GE mobilized a team in 2002 to develop a new product that could meet the needs of Chinese healthcare providers and patients. GE discovered that they needed a product with a lower price point, as well as significant portability and efficiency. By 2010, they had developed a handheld ultrasound scanner that not only generated a seventy-fold increase in profit, but also became a standard instrument in global healthcare. The portable technology stretched beyond the obstetrician’s office, enabling use by paramedics, as well as in emergency and operating rooms.

If GE had limited itself to the prevailing assumption that ultrasound imaging required a large machine located in a specially designated space within the sterile environment of a healthcare facility, then the handheld scanner would not exist. Fortunately, GE’s creative response to the need for more affordable and accessible technology led not only to success in the Chinese market, but also to a better product that would be used throughout the world. Thinking outside the box opened powerful avenues for innovation and progress.

Traditional theological educational structures are based on monastic and
European university models. These structures are now facing challenges related to rising costs, decreased ability of students to commit to long-term residential studies, and increased demand for shorter program durations. In both the West and the Majority World, some seminaries have responded with new program offerings, utilizing technology or modular formats that move away from the traditional long-term residential model. As theological education explores new structures, new questions also arise, relating to spiritual formation, community-building, and the right amount of time needed to adequately prepare ministers. Further innovation addressing affordability and portability is needed.

Implications

The concept of reverse innovation will hopefully encourage theological educators to explore new ideas in response to new and changing needs, even if it means moving beyond or even against conventional approaches. As the Church has grown, new needs have also emerged. To meet these needs, some forms of innovation may build on existing practices by making modifications, incorporating regional insights, and employing local teachers. Other forms may require new models, new curricula, and new programs altogether. The pressures and needs remain, creating opportunities for innovative solutions in whichever direction they may flow.
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One day, the disciples found themselves in a situation that would be a nightmare for any president of a theological institution. They were challenged to provide food for thousands of hungry students! The disciples were troubled, knowing that vast resources would be required. However, Jesus urged them to first find out what was already available: “How many loaves do you have?...Go and see” (Mk. 6:38). This story, and particularly Jesus’ question, applies well to the financial sustainability of theological institutions.

In “Olive Oil, Theological Education, and Economics,” Larry Smith speaks of the differences between Western and Majority World contexts, and how they affect theological institutions. All institutions reflect the realities of the wider context in which they operate, and each context provides its own unique set of challenges and opportunities. In Majority World contexts, unstable political, economic, social, and sometimes religious realities make achieving sustainability an even greater challenge. Given this fact, Majority World schools may not, and perhaps should not, have identical tracks of development as Western schools. Contextual approaches are needed to equip institutions with deeper understandings of specific needs, appropriate approaches, and feasible sources of sustainability.

Smith proposes four considerations for leaders of theological institutions in the Majority World. Depending on the context and institution, these four issues may have varying degrees of relevance. Nevertheless, they are all important and encourage leaders toward “realism and credible planning.” As participants in the
Vital SustainAbility Initiative, a collaborative project helping schools to develop integrated and viable strategic plans in service of their mission, we at Ukrainian Evangelical Theological Seminary (UETS) have come to recognize the importance of realism. The first step toward credible planning and sustainability is to answer Jesus’ question: “How many loaves do you have?” It is possible for an institution to have something and not even realize it. A thorough analysis of available resources, faculty, facilities, expenses, and profit is therefore very important.

Jesus’ question motivates better stewardship by challenging us not only to identify resources, but also to value them. As a result of realistically analyzing our resources, we have become stricter in our enrollment policies. At UETS, no student covers 100% of the total cost of his or her education. UETS must therefore cover the deficit through a scholarship program. When the enrollment committee is not certain about a particular applicant, we must ask ourselves a very personal question: “Are we ready to pay for this student’s education?” We know what resources we have available to us, we value them, and we therefore want to use them wisely.

The disciples found five loaves and two fish. Knowing what we have helps our institution to better address its needs. Indeed, realism, credible planning, and good stewardship can really help an institution to fulfill its mission sustainably.
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Relevance and Faithfulness: Challenges in Contextualizing Theological Education

RUPEN DAS

The relevance of theological curricula to specific contexts has always been a challenge. In our pluralistic world where graduates minister in greatly varying contexts and cultures, theological education has to be both relevant and faithful. It is no longer enough to ensure that students have mastered core theological concepts and truths, learned biblical knowledge, and developed basic ministry skills. The impact of a theological institution is now measured by the effectiveness of its graduates in specific ministry contexts. Therefore, theological curricula have to be connected with graduates’ ministry contexts. This article explores historical models that have responded to needs within the Church and in society, and then asks how theological institutions today can be intentionally attuned to context. At the same time, concern for context must be balanced with the need to remain faithful to the Lord regardless of context.

Introduction

The issue of contextual relevance is not new to the Church or to theological education. As the Early Church moved from a predominantly Jewish setting in Palestine into the Roman world steeped in Greek philosophy and Caesar worship, staying faithful to Apostolic teachings amidst competing philosophies and allegiances was a significant challenge. The question was: how can one communicate the Gospel in contexts that are so different from the Jewish world in which the Apostles had known Christ?

This challenge was probably most clearly seen in the life of Polycarp, whose family had moved from Jerusalem after its fall in 70 AD and settled in the Roman province of Asia. It was here in the city of Ephesus that he was discipled as a young man by the Apostle John. Polycarp was later appointed by John himself as the Bishop of Smyrna, which is now Izmir.
What is so special about Polycarp is that he was one of the few Church Fathers who served as direct links between the Apostles who had known Jesus and heard His teachings firsthand, and the Early Church of the late 1st and early 2nd centuries. At a time when the young Church’s doctrines had not yet been crystallized through the various Councils and Creeds, the challenge for Polycarp was to ensure that the Apostolic teachings, which he had heard directly from John, remained unadulterated as they were passed on to the next generation.

This was no easy task. As Hellenism was on the rise and a Greek worldview dominated intellectual discourse, the Apostle John had contextualized the understanding of who Christ is by adopting the term Logos from Greek philosophy to explain how God is involved in the world and in human life. By observing John’s efforts at contextualization, Polycarp not only learned the doctrines defining this new faith, but also learned how to connect the reality of Christ whom he had come to know with the cultural and intellectual context in which he lived.

This proved critical when he was confronted with the heretic Marcion, who in his own contextualization efforts, had tried to separate the Church from its Jewish roots and in the process, redefined who Jesus and God were. In order to deal with the heresy, Polycarp sifted through the arguments from the Greek culture and philosophy that had undergirded Marcion’s heresy, identifying those that did not align with the Truth he had learned in order to ensure that the Early Church remained rooted in the teachings of Jesus and the Apostles.

This is the challenge that all theologians and missiologists face: how can one take Truth learned in one context and make it relevant in another? Princeton theologian Daniel Migliore writes, “Confession of Jesus Christ takes place in particular historical and cultural contexts...Our response to the questions of who we say Jesus Christ is and how he helps us is shaped in important ways by the particular context in which these questions arise” (2004, 205). For theological educators, the challenge is even more complex: how does one teach students the skills to take the Christ they know in their context and enable people in a different historical and cultural context to encounter Jesus Christ? This is exactly what the Apostle John had to do – to take the Christ he had come to know in a Jewish Palestinian context and teach Polycarp how to proclaim Christ in an intellectually Greek and politically Roman context. In a sense, the Apostle John’s effectiveness in discipling and training Polycarp can be assessed by how successfully Polycarp had handled the Marcionite heresy.

Assessing the impact of theological education has always been a challenge. This article will address how a seminary might connect theological education with the ministry contexts of its graduates in order to equip effective Christian leaders. In a pluralistic world with greatly varying contexts and cultures, theological education
has to be both relevant and faithful. It is no longer enough to ensure that students have mastered core theological concepts and truths, learned biblical knowledge, and developed basic ministry skills. The impact of a theological institution must now be measured by the effectiveness of its graduates in specific ministry contexts. Therefore, theological curricula have to be connected with the contexts of graduates. This article will lay some foundations by: 1) looking at how different models of theological education have evolved over time to respond to needs within the Church and society, and 2) exploring how a theological institution might intentionally connect its teaching with the ministry contexts of its graduates.

Pastor and theologian Eugene Peterson states that all ministries are rooted in particular geographic locations. He writes, “Now is the time to rediscover the meaning of the local, and in terms of church, the parish. All churches are local. All pastoral work takes place geographically” (Peterson 1994, 129). If this is true, then do our graduates have the ability and tools necessary for understanding their local contexts?

Models of Theological Education

There is no one model of theological education. Jesus mentored the Twelve by focusing on the development of their character, faith, and ministry skills. He also provided extended teaching, as in the Sermon on the Mount and the Upper Room Discourse. The Apostle Paul mentored key people as they traveled with him. He taught them faith through his life experiences, and theology and pastoral practice through his letters and teaching. His students learned about contextualization as they observed his ministry to the Gentiles. The Apostle Peter taught the believers in exile how to defend their faith against false teachers.

Since the time of the Early Church to the present, theological education has always considered: 1) the needs of the Church in a particular context, as well as 2) the influence of the local culture. There are three commonly accepted models of theological education. David Kelsey of Yale Divinity School was the first to compare the classical and vocational approaches (1993, 27). Robert Banks (1999) then added a’s missional approach and Brian Edgar (2005) a confessional model. Later, Darren Cronshaw (2012) added the contextual and spiritual models.

The classical model, sometimes referred to as the “Athenian model,” understands theological education as Christian character formation or paideia. Paideia is derived from classical Greek pedagogy, literally means childrearing or education, and signifies a process of molding character. The objective is to produce well-rounded and fully educated citizens (Tarnas, 1993, 29-30). Drawing from the philosophical foundations of Platonism, paideia does not start with individual persons and their potential, but rather the concept of the ideal person. The
goal of education is to educate and mold human beings into the likeness of the “ideal man,” who represents human nature in its truest form. Greek and Roman philosophers, artists, sculptors, educators, and poets all drew their inspiration from the concept of the ideal man. The goal of classical education is therefore the transformation of the individual.

The Early Church adopted and then adapted this model. Some of the Church Fathers saw the Christian faith as a form of paideia, believing that one's character had to be formed as one grows in faith. By the medieval and monastic period, this model had become the dominant educational philosophy. Paideia also influenced Basil of Caesarea's monastic rules (Jaeger 1961, 90). The objective was to help individuals develop a holistic vision of the totality of life. Rather than just knowing about God, the focus was on knowing God intimately.

Brian Edgar at Asbury Theological Seminary writes of theological education “It is not about theology, that is, the formal study of the knowledge of God, but it is more about what Kelsey calls theologia, that is gaining the wisdom of God” (2005, 210). The emphasis is on holiness and the transformation of the individual. Edgar states that in this model of theological education, holiness, and moral and spiritual transformation are central.

The vocational model, referred to as the “Berlin model” and rooted in the Enlightenment, views theological education as preparation for a professional Christian vocation. Therefore, theological education had to be situated within the context of a university as an academic discipline. The German term wissenschaft means an area of study or science that requires systematic research. The idea of wissenschaft as a model for seminaries comes from Friedrich Schleiermacher's pioneering work at Humboldt University in Berlin. The moral and personal formation of individuals through the study of authoritative texts assumed lesser importance (and became a secondary objective) than the training of students in rigorous inquiry that facilitated movement from theory to praxis.

Schleiermacher's goal was to design a curriculum that would train professional ministers for the State Church in Germany, as a way of defending theology's status as a valid academic discipline. He built on the fourfold structure of the traditional theological curriculum used to train pastors and teachers during the Reformation period. This curriculum consisted of Biblical Studies, Church History, Dogmatic or Systematic Theology, and Practical Theology. Schleiermacher adapted it to a modern university context, insisting that the university had a mandate to train clergymen because their training was no different from that of practitioners of medicine or law. In all three disciplines, training follows a progression from theory to professional practice (Schleiermacher and Tice 2011, 137). This vocational model of study was adopted at the risk of losing the emphasis of paideia on
personal, moral, and spiritual formation.

Schleiermacher's model is still very much the framework used in most theological training today, though the specific content of the four areas of study may have changed. Theological schools continue to recognize that both knowledge and skills are needed for pastoral ministry. Many Evangelical seminaries incorporate elements from both the classical and vocational models in their curricula. They focus on character and worldview formation, as well as on the “professional skills” required to serve in Christian ministry, though the emphasis is more on theory and knowledge.

The final commonly accepted model, the missional model, was developed by Robert Banks of Macquarie University in Sydney and is referred to as the “Jerusalem model.” The missional model sees mission as encompassing all aspects of life: family, friendships, work, and community life. For Banks, missional education is “undertaken with a view to what God is doing in the world, considered from a global perspective” (1999, 142). Therefore, theological education is not an independent discipline, but is seen as a part of effective mission. The objective is to be involved in the missio Dei, the mission of God. According to Banks, the best theological education and spiritual formation involves field-based training, stretches students to practice what they are studying, encompasses all of life, and addresses evangelistic opportunities.

Additional understandings of theological education had been added to these three models. Brian Edgar of Asbury Theological Seminary proposes a fourth approach, called the confessional model. Referred to as the “Geneva model,” Edgar’s approach emphasizes knowing God through the means of grace and the traditions of a particular faith community, and especially through the creed and confession of that community. This involves “formation... through in-formation about the tradition and en-culturation with it” (Edgar 2005, 213). This is done through teaching about the founders, heroes, struggles, strengths, and traditions that are both distinctive of and formative for that community. Examples of schools following this approach include denominational seminaries and the training institutions of specific mission agencies.

### Figure 1. Four Models of Theological Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classical</th>
<th>Confessional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athens academy</td>
<td>Geneva seminary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL transform the individual</td>
<td>GOAL knowing God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theologia</td>
<td>doxology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missiology</td>
<td>scientia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem community</td>
<td>Berlin university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL convert the world</td>
<td>GOAL strengthen the church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Classical**
- **GOAL:** Transform the individual
- **Institution:** Athens Academy
- **Goal Areas:** Theologia, Missiology

**Confessional**
- **GOAL:** Knowing God
- **Institution:** Geneva Seminary
- **Goal Areas:** Doxology, Scientia

**Missional**
- **GOAL:** Convert the world
- **Institution:** Jerusalem Community
- **Goal Areas:** Theologia, Missiology

**Vocational**
- **GOAL:** Strengthen the church
- **Institution:** Berlin University
- **Goal Areas:** Scientia, Doxology

Cronshaw (2012), Mission Researcher at the Baptist Union of Victoria in Australia, adds two further models. The first is the **contextual model**, referred to as the “Auburn model.” According to Cronshaw, theology and mission need to be expressed in specific contexts, such as his local neighborhood of Auburn (Franke, 2005, 90). Thus, theological training involves understanding local contexts and learning how to build community (*koinonia*). It is the community that lives out the Gospel, a process through which boundaries dissolve. Together, Christians experience community and demonstrate the love of God so that others may belong and one day believe (Murray, 2005).

The final model that Cronshaw adds is the **spiritual model**, also known as the “New Delhi model.” This approach takes into consideration a multicultural and pluralistic world. Cronshaw writes:

A New Delhi context for missional spirituality is the ashram. As the balance of global power and Christian influence is shifting to the global South, Kraig Klaudt artfully suggests that certain Indian ashrams feature helpful characteristics that theological education can adopt. These ashrams are located “in the world” without fences; are open to all; offer community living that is engaged in service; emphasize simple living and spiritual maturity more than publishing; provide a holistic curriculum of intellectual, spiritual, political, aesthetic and relational development; and create time and space for spirituality and self-awareness. Locating theological education and missional spirituality in New Delhi reminds me to engage with the worldviews of my neighbours and to welcome the alternative model of the ashram (2012, 12).

---

**Figure 2. Six Models of Theological Education and Missional Spirituality**

Each of these models understands its role in theological formation differently and, as a result, defines effectiveness differently. While certain elements of each model can be transferred across cultures and contexts, each represents a response to specific needs in the Church and in society.

These six models also highlight the variety of theological education that is available today for laity, ministers, other Christian leaders, and scholars. Each type of training has different goals and requires a different curriculum. Theological institutions need to be clear about what they hope to accomplish, as this would determine the model of theological training they should use.

Connecting Curriculum to Context

Different models of theological education arose in response to the specific needs of the Church at certain moments in history and in particular locations. How might a theological institution today intentionally connect with its own context? How might theological educators connect their curricula with the ministry contexts of their students?

There are two models of organizational theory that institutions use to assess their effectiveness. One is a systems theory of organizations. According to this theory, an organization has a structure, clearly defined roles, processes and procedures, a product (in this case, a curriculum), and so on. The more clearly defined these elements are, the more effective the organization will be. Therefore, the quality of the institution is measured by its systems, procedures, and resources in the form of curriculum, faculty, facilities, library, and so on. One hears terms like ISO 9000. Accreditation reviews are often based on this theory of organizations. While context is sometimes acknowledged, a systems theory of organizations is mostly internally focused.

Others see organizations as living systems, or organisms. They move away from a mechanistic model of institutions to a biological one. Organizations are open systems. They have a structure, but they survive and are able to thrive only if they are able to adapt to changes in their environment. The open systems approach requires organizational structures, systems, and procedures to be flexible, responsive, and adaptive. Such organizations are sensitive to context and are externally focused. Both internally and externally focused understandings of organizations are needed to ensure the quality and effectiveness of a theological institution.

Within the larger framework of the ministries of the Church and the missio Dei, theological institutions exist not only to produce graduates, but also to meet needs in churches, on the mission field, and in Christian organizations to
further the purposes of God. They do this through their graduates. Therefore, the effectiveness of a theological institution is assessed not by the number of graduates it produces or the personal quality of these graduates, but rather by the ability of graduates to meet the needs of churches, mission agencies, and the communities they serve. Are our theological curricula relevant to the ministry contexts of our graduates?

Consider the “Program Logic” figure below, which illustrates the various interconnected steps in the process effecting positive change. Teaching is an activity that should result in learning. Whether learning has taken place is assessed through exams, research and reflection papers, case studies, simulations, field practice, and a variety of other evaluative measures. However, there is a difference between assessing an activity and assessing the result of that activity. Our objective is not to report on how many have attended a particular training activity, but rather to identify what has changed as a result of the activity. Most seminaries understand this well and are able to assess whether learning has taken place. However, our work does not stop at determining whether learning has taken place. We must also ask what graduates have done with what they have learned.

Figure 3. Program Logic
Theological institutions must begin with an assessment and understanding of their own context and of the contexts in which their graduates will minister. Activities such as teaching, training, and mentoring must then be designed according to this understanding with the inputs (or resources) available to the seminary. The activities will result in certain changes (outputs) for individual students that will help them to minister effectively in a church, on a mission field, or through a Christian organization.

The effectiveness of the graduate and the resulting changes that occur in the church, mission field, or organization are the outcomes. (Note that this is different from what we often refer to as educational outcomes). The seminary needs to define what is meant by the “effectiveness of graduates” (at the outcome level) and identify the indicators to be used.

Finally, the local church or the community of believers will influence the surrounding community and the resulting transformation is referred to as the impact. Of course, the local church is only one of the contributors to social change, since social impact can never be attributed completely to any single institution.

As we can see, there are several cause-and-effect-relationships from activities all the way to impact. We need to be aware of the factors that can affect and disrupt this cause-and-effect change process at various points. These external and internal factors are known as risks, and should be identified and addressed.

We can discern several implications from the change process that has been outlined:

1. The focus of the theological institution needs to be on the outcome level and not just on the output. The graduates and their training are only a means to the greater end of serving the Church and participating in the mission of God.

2. A theological institution’s effectiveness is measured by the effectiveness of its graduates in their particular ministry contexts.

3. In order for graduates to be effective, seminaries need to understand their students’ contexts and design curricula accordingly.

How can we connect the ministry contexts of our graduates with our curricula?

After assessing the contexts carefully, we need to engage in two administrative processes in order to ensure the effectiveness of our institution. The first ensures feedback collection at various points in the change process. The second ensures that decisions are made based on the feedback and information that have been gathered.
1. **Feedback Collection:** An educational institution needs to have feedback mechanisms to assess the progress and quality of its programs. Exams, for example, assess the progress of students. Student course evaluations provide some information about the effectiveness of faculty. Monthly financial reports provide snapshots of the institution’s financial status. Similarly, we also need ways to collect feedback at the activity, output, and outcome levels to identify and assess the progress and changes taking place. While most institutions have internal feedback mechanisms, very few have mechanisms for obtaining feedback from external contexts on a regular basis.

2. **Decision Making:** Good decisions are made on the basis of accurate information and feedback from various sources. Unfortunately, available information is not always used. For example, during a curriculum revision process, do we look at the student and faculty course evaluations? Do we gather feedback from graduates, and from the churches or organizations they are serving? Feedback from assessments, student and faculty evaluations, and student performance need to be directed toward the specific educational administrators who make the decisions regarding curriculum redesign or course revision. Too often, evaluations are done, but the information is never used to make educational programs more relevant.

A seminary’s feedback mechanism could look like the following:

![Image with a flowchart showing the relationship between activity, output, outcome, and impact.](image)

**Figure 4. Organizational Assessments and Feedback Loops**
Consider these key points about feedback mechanisms:

- As each activity or course is conducted and then completed, its effectiveness needs to be assessed. This can be done through faculty course assessments, student assessments of the curriculum, and student evaluations of the faculty.

- The seminary's main purpose is to train and equip leaders. Most seminaries have already established graduate profiles or graduation requirements for every program. Throughout their tenure at a seminary, students are continually assessed to determine whether they are fulfilling graduation requirements. This is done through tests, exams, assignments, projects, case studies, and so on. The changes in the student's knowledge, attitudes, and skills are what we are assessing.

- At the same time, a seminary's mission should never stop at equipping leaders. Leaders are equipped in order to serve. A seminary's ultimate mission is to serve the Church and the organizations obeying the Great Commission and the Great Commandment. Therefore, we must also measure the outcome of our work by assessing whether churches and mission organizations are being served by our graduates. This kind of assessment can only be done by working closely with the churches and communities where graduates are serving. The seminary needs to define what it means by “effectiveness.”

At the outcome level, collecting periodic feedback from the ministry contexts of graduates would provide a wealth of information for curriculum redesign or course revision. Feedback from graduates, churches, key Christian leaders, and communities could provide information for improving three vital components of theological education:

A) **Theology:** These would include the Creeds, Systematic or Biblical Theology, Historical Theology, and Christian Ethics. While all theological concepts are important for any theological education, are certain theological concepts problematic in particular contexts? Students need to not only know what these may be, but also understand how to address them. How is God perceived and understood in a particular context or culture? What are the biblical perspectives on the issues of poverty and social justice, gender, race, human trafficking, immigrants, female genital mutilation, and so on? What are the specific social and ethical issues in a particular context that need to be addressed from within a Christian ethical framework? How is respect shown and thus, how is God worshiped in a specific culture and context?
B) Practical or Pastoral Theology: Do graduates know how to address the specific issues faced by individuals and families? There are cultural variations on issues such as childrearing and child discipline, marital relationships and divorce, interactions with in-laws in extended families, gender roles, selection of marriage partners, etc. Recent converts may face issues such as persecution, baptism, being cut off from their families and communities, polygamy, and so on.

C) Missiology: What are effective missional strategies and practices for a particular context? What contextual bridges can be made to the gospel? What are potential barriers or risks?

Connecting curricula to ministry contexts increases the probability of effectiveness in the ministries of graduates. Attending to each step in the “program logic” – overseeing the activity of theological training, confirming that the output fits graduate profiles, and assessing the outcome of graduates’ effectiveness in ministry – ensures that theological education can have a positive impact in diverse contexts.

Conclusion

If all ministries, as Eugene Peterson says, are geographical – located within space and time in a specific cultural, political, and historical reality – then do theological institutions understand the realities and contexts of their graduates, and prepare them accordingly? Do we intentionally connect our curricula to their contexts?

In the life of Polycarp, there is evident another quality that the Apostle John had nurtured in his disciple – that of faithfulness amidst challenging and threatening contexts.

Polycarp understood the importance of contextualization as he observed the ministry of the Apostle John and was able to effectively safeguard the faith bycountering the heresies of Marcion. However, when confronted with the Caesar worship of the Roman Empire, there was no option other than to remain faithful without compromise. Polycarp was martyred because he would not proclaim that Caesar was lord. As he faced execution by burning, he declared, “86 years have I have served him, and he has done me no wrong. How can I blaspheme my King and my Savior?” Polycarp is a model of both relevance and faithfulness.

Knowing how and when to be relevant, and when to remain steadfast and unchanging requires wisdom and discernment as we work to contextualize theological education to better serve the Church and transform communities for the glory of God.
References


---

**Rupen Das**

Rupen Das is with Canadian Baptist Ministries on secondment to the European Baptist Federation. He is also Research Professor of Social Justice, Compassion and Development with Tyndale University College and Seminary in Toronto, as well as on the faculty of the International Baptist Theological Study Center in Amsterdam. He has wide global experience in relief and development, educational administration, and theological education, and brings this mix of practice and academia to his writing, research and teaching.
This article describes our attempt to use an abbreviated version of action research in an integrated learning module of the Theology Program at the Arab Baptist Theological Seminary in Beirut, Lebanon. Practical theological and theological educators can make effective use of this social scientific method within the context of the theological school. Among the benefits of action research are the development of reflective practitioners, the encouragement interactive reflection and learning, and facilitation of contextualization in theological research.

Introduction

As she completes her final year of theological studies, Miriam looks forward to ministry through the church in her minority community. She sees herself working toward reconciliation between Christians and the majority sociocultural and religious group in her country. The challenges are enormous. How does one overcome deep-seated racism, rooted in centuries of oppression, conflict, and division, in order to restore relationships and reconcile communities divided along lines of socio-religious identity?

For social and religious workers trying to effect change in society, “real-world” problems require integrative, multi-disciplinary approaches. Even deciding how to begin raises complex questions. During the process of researching and planning for social action, the original situation observed may undergo change, along with the researcher herself, so that the initial observations no longer apply. Research for social change is too complex for a linear methodology. Traditional research approaches, I suspect, contribute to the problem of fragmentation among theological disciplines and between “theology” and “practice” in life and ministry.

---

1 For security reasons, the student’s name has been changed.
In this article, I offer a reflection on my experience using action research as a learning task in an integrative learning module for students at the Arab Baptist Theological Seminary (ABTS). In order to help our students to develop research skills that are actually useful for the kinds of problems they will face after graduation, the ABTS curriculum experiments with several non-traditional approaches to research. We have found action research methodology very well-suited to the kinds of theological reflection and community reconciliation work that we hope will characterize our alumni as they serve their contexts through the Church. While this article is not meant to halt the use of traditional research methodologies, I hope it might advance a broader understanding of the use of social scientific research methodology in theological education. For this effort, I am building on the work of many others who have discussed the relationship between practical theology and action research (see Cameron, Bhatti, and Duce 2010; Frazier 2006; Dokecki, Newbrough, and O’Gorman 2001; Graham 2013; Harder 2007; Swinton and Mowat 2006).

What is Action Research?

A number of practical theologians and theological educators recognize the value of action research as a social scientific method for practical theology. In what follows, rather than describe the theoretical components of action research, I will let a student’s project illustrate the process while including relevant discussions of action research principles.

Miriam came to faith in an Arabic-speaking Lebanese church through a neighborhood outreach program. In recent years, she began leading a small group serving newly displaced refugees who had moved to the town where her church is located. These outsiders differed from the established church community economically, culturally, and religiously. The members of her Arab church community were becoming minorities in their town for the first time they could remember. Through the refugee and development ministry of the church, and some Bible study small groups, a number of the refugees came to believe in Jesus as the Messiah. While the church was cautiously glad, many people were uncomfortable with any kind of reconciliation that would involve integrating the two groups of believers. Their differences seemed overwhelming to most and...
integration was opposed by a vocal contingent. Miriam decided that she wanted to research how to reconcile these two groups.

Rather than starting with a theoretical study of reconciliation, Miriam began with observation and informal interviews. Through the interview process, she identified people who seemed willing to work toward resolving the growing tension between the two groups. At the same time, she was also taking classes focusing on the understanding of the Church as a restored and restoring community. This understanding was explored as part of an integrative module taught by a team of faculty that considered biblical-theological, historical-theological, socio-cultural, and ministerial perspectives. Through these multidisciplinary lenses, Miriam analyzed the situation and began to develop an action plan that included a task that would be doable within a short time frame: holding a focus group meeting with interested members from both groups.

Action research can be defined as “a flexible research methodology uniquely suited to researching and supporting change. It integrates social research with exploratory action to promote development” (Given and Somekh 2008, 4). Action research developed as a unique approach particularly suited to situations in which the researcher is both an observer and a stakeholder in the outcome. It is especially concerned with social action intended to develop or repair intergroup relationships (Lewin 1946, 136). While various approaches exist within the field of action research, they share an emphasis on the formative role of both researchers and participants, who in traditional approaches are often merely “objects” of research. In action research, the researcher participates with the researched to set the research question (Harder 2007, 136).

Over Christmas break, Miriam had an opportunity to hold two focus group sessions, out of which emerged some very interesting themes. Through her prodding questions, the focus groups began to identify distinct themes in the various perspectives, questions, and concerns of both groups: How will integrating with “them” change us? Does reconciliation require integration? What if the refugee community returns “home” only to have their new cultural-religious identity be rejected by the dominant majority there? Good questions were being generated beyond the ones she had in mind at first.

Action research methodology recognizes that when observing and researching a person or a group of people, the specific situation being observed will change through the research process itself. In addition, action research acknowledges that the researcher both conceptualizes and participates in the process of social action. Finally, rather than attempting to develop a control by which to compare results, action research values the particularity of the insights emerging from subjective communities (Todhunter 2001).
After the initial focus group meeting, Miriam wrote an evaluation reflecting on both the content generated by the participants and their interactions with one another. Out of this evaluation, she discerned several new issues for further study involving ecclesiology, identity formation, and missiology. These were not where her study on reconciliation had begun, but they have now been revealed through the action research process. Even the situation itself was changing as participants from the initial focus group connected and continued the discussion outside of her official meetings. New plans for potential actions began to emerge in light of all these changes.

By design, action research brings multidisciplinary perspectives to bear on a specific social issue. Rather than ending with a set of propositions for what “ought to be,” the action research project develops as a spiral of observation, reflection, planning and taking action, and evaluation leading to new observations as the cycle repeats. New questions develop out of the direct input of participants in the study. Thus, action research empowers individual participants and communities as co-researchers, who are not merely objects of study (Todhunter 2001). In the Middle East and North Africa, where many of our graduates serve, this kind of community engagement and empowerment is greatly needed.

Our Experience: The Theory and Its Curricular Implications at ABTS

The description I provided above of my student’s project developed from a learning task for one of our integrative learning modules at ABTS. Our curriculum is driven by the seminary’s vision to see God glorified, people reconciled, and communities restored through the Church in the Arab world4. This vision is based on a holistic understanding of salvation that sees a restored humanity, reconciled to God and to each other, called to be restored community that participates with God in a ministry of reconciliation not only with “each other,” but also with “the other.”

In light of our vision, the purpose of our seven-week integrative learning module is to equip our students to empower and nurture churches as communities of reconciliation and effective agents of God’s peace in the world. Through biblical-theological, historical-theological, socio-cultural, and practical-ministerial lenses, students explore the saving work of God that enables a community of peace and the reconciling work of God through this community in the world. The final project for this module is integrative. Analyses from all four theological disciplines are to be integrated by students – this integration is one of the primary criteria by which professors assess students.

Action research is especially conducive to such integration. Although seven weeks is a short time for an action research project, the objective is for students to learn the method of action research and gain some experience through an abbreviated process consisting of two research cycles. Through this abbreviated process, students gain practice that can prepare them for using action research in life and ministry.

The project itself begins on the first day of the integrative module, when students begin conceptualizing the first round of their research. All of our students have previous ministry experience in the Middle East and North Africa, and all of our students are human. Thus, there is no shortage of problems and situations of brokenness for them to consider researching. At this early stage, our students often need a lot of guidance and coaching to find a focus and develop a research plan.

After submitting a report of one cycle of observation, reflection, and action planning, students will attempt to implement one step in their initial action plan. After completing this first step, they will write a brief report describing the action taken, evaluating the effect (or non-effect), and documenting any new or unanswered questions that may have arisen during the process. As they engage in this field work, students continue learning through the multiple theological lenses introduced in the module. Therefore, their understanding of the issues at stake will develop both in and out of the classroom. Students often find that their initial understanding of the problem has changed drastically through both the coursework and fieldwork.

For the final portion of their project, students will submit a portfolio containing the observations, actions reports, and evaluations from their two action research cycles. This portfolio is assessed according to the learning that takes place between the first round and the second, with specific focus on theological integration. The module professors collaborate to set the assessment criteria, assuring that each theological discipline is fairly represented.

Because the entire project is completed over a relatively short period of time, we recognize that it is not a full-scale action research project. Nevertheless, the project does offer our students an introduction to the action research method. Many students have commented that it took them a couple weeks to understand the process. By the end, however, it made more sense to them than traditional research papers assigned in other courses. By going through a second round of reflection and research that challenged what they had originally believed to be the “perfect” action plan, the students gained valuable insights into the complex nature of planning meaningful social action.
Why Use Action Research in Theological Studies?

There are a number of reasons for using action research for integrative and socially engaged theology. As we considered alternative research methods, several advantages of action research stood out in light of our educational outcomes at ABTS.

First, action research develops reflective practitioners (Sagor 2000; Zwodiak Myers 2009). This is the kind of researcher that we are trying to cultivate at ABTS. Swinton and Mowat explain that action research promotes “movement from practice [action] to theory, to critical reflection on practice, to revised forms of practice developed in light of this spiraling process” (2006, loc. 4679). This movement is fundamental to reflective practice, where theory and practice are develop together and inform one another (see Schön 1983; Moon 1999). Action research trains reflective practitioners by promoting reflection on practices and making explicit the tacit knowledge of practitioners (Given and Somekh 2008, 6).

Second, action research encourages integrative reflection and learning. The ABTS curriculum is designed to promote integration among the traditional theological disciplines5. To this day, theological education often segregates the disciplines. Despite numerous critiques of this fragmentation, theological curricula continue to support such fragmentation through learning tasks that isolate the traditional theological disciplines from actual practice. Integration of biblical studies, historical theology, contextual realities, and pastoral practice can happen when students are encouraged to address specific church or community issues from multiple perspectives. Because our mission is to prepare students for ministering to the Arab world through churches, we value educational approaches that encourage multidisciplinary research and theory-practice integration.

Finally, action research facilitates contextualization of theological research. The 1990 ICETE Manifesto insists that theological education address the needs of its specific context6. The method of action research requires researchers to engage with specific contexts as participants, and not merely as absent observers. It challenges theological students to listen to the questions that arise from their contexts, and to develop and revise their research according to those questions, instead of relying solely on biblical, historical, or theoretical perspectives. It is through this kind of contextualization that theological education can have real significance in given contexts.

---

5 For a more detailed description of ABTS’s curricular design, see Perry Shaw, Transforming Theological Education (Carlisle: Langham, 2014), 4.
Despite the overall success of our experience in guiding projects that involve action research, I have two critical concerns that present challenges to using action research in theological education in general and in the Arab world in particular.

In critiquing social scientific models of action research, Swinton and Mowat point out that “the focus of action tends to be on generating solutions to particular problems” (2006, loc. 4687). Problem-solving is the fundamental telos of action research. While practical theology does share with social science a commitment to context, its fundamental purpose is not merely pragmatic. Rather, its telos lies in enabling the people of God “to remain faithful to God and to participate fully in God’s continuing mission to the world” Swinton and Mowat 2006, loc 4711) Its mission is to glorify God and not just to fix problems. It is important to keep this difference in mind when introducing theology students to action research. Particularly in the regions and contexts where my students live and serve, it is quite common to feel hopeless and doubtful about true change. The “promise” of a new methodology can lead to disappointment if change is slow or non-existent. By keeping the telos of theological action research in mind, we remember that the ultimate assessment criterion is faithfulness to God’s mission in the world.

My second critique is of particular concern in Islamic contexts, but may have more general implications. Action research emerged in the context of broader developments in educational theory, including Paulo Friere’s liberation pedagogy and Donald Schön’s reflective practice (Given and Somekh 2008, 6). These developments have in common a grounding in the values and knowledge of the participant community. That is, they test and adapt theory based on the practices of the participant community, rather than prioritizing theory developed “from above” by the academy. This attention to practice conflicts with the epistemological assumptions of dominant approaches to Islamic education7. These approaches hold significant influence in Arab cultural contexts. This conflict has driven an ongoing debate in professional education in the Arab world about the viability of reflective practice in Arab culture8. While this debate exposes

---

certain imprecise constructs of “Arab culture,” it does also illustrate some of the socio-religious obstacles to implementing action research. Whether new critical-contextual approaches to action research are needed in Arab contexts may be an issue for further exploration.

Conclusion

In this article, I reflected on an experience of implementing an abbreviated version of the action research method in an Arab theological educational program. In our limited experience with training students in the theory and practice of action research, we have identified many advantages. Action research is the kind of tool that can help a Middle Eastern woman like Miriam to conceptualize how theology can make a difference in her community. Action research can help her to plan and experiment with actions designed to promote change in her community toward reconciliation between Christian minorities and dominant groups. In settings like the Middle East and North Africa, action research can be a powerful tool for promoting the kind of theological integration that leads to social change.

References


Caleb Hutcherson

Caleb Hutcherson (ThM, Dallas Theological Seminary) serves at the Arab Baptist Theological Seminary (Beirut, Lebanon) in various academic and administrative roles. He is currently enrolled in PhD studies at the International Baptist Theological Study Centre in Amsterdam. His research deals with theological reflection and contextual theological education.
A Tectonic Shift: The Rapid Rise of PhD Programs at Evangelical Theological Schools in the Majority World
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In recent years, the number of evangelical theological schools in the Majority World conferring the PhD has grown considerably. This article shares results from a survey of twenty-three schools conducted as part of the Doctoral Initiative sponsored by the International Council for Evangelical Theological Education. The results show a steep increase in program offerings and enrollment that will greatly affect faculty development in the Majority World in the coming decade. Implications for both Majority World and Western institutions are also discussed.

Introduction

In the last fifteen years, the landscape of doctoral programs that prepare Majority World theological educators has shifted dramatically.¹ As the Church has grown, so also have the seminaries and Bible schools tasked with training pastors and leaders for Christian service. Over time, the number of schools has increased, the level of instruction has advanced, and new PhD programs have developed. As recently as fifteen years ago, faculty members seeking doctoral degrees had to

¹ In this article, “Majority World” refers to nations located outside the “West.” Historic terms such as “Third World” or “Developing World” often carry a pejorative connotation. Directional terms such as “West” and “Global South” are more neutral, but have their limitations, as the regions discussed do not fall neatly within geographical lines. For example, Latin America is clearly in the Western hemisphere, but is not generally considered as “the West.” On the other hand, Australia is in the Southern hemisphere, but is more often associated with the resources and power found in Europe and North America. Majority World is a positive term that reflects the global population distribution in general and the concentration of Christians in particular, as the majority of Christians worldwide now live in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and Eastern Europe.
enroll at Western institutions, which often required five to seven years of full-time residential study and entailed moving entire families to a new country. After completing their degrees, scholars and family members who returned home would often face cultural readjustment challenges.

Driven by the need for more faculty members, the desire to make the doctorate degree more accessible, and the opportunity to develop more contextually engaged theological reflections, nearly two dozen self-identified Evangelical theological schools located in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and Eastern Europe have established doctoral programs. Twenty of those schools have offered doctoral programs since 2004. The number of students enrolled in these two dozen programs has quickly eclipsed the total number of all international students in North American Evangelical PhD programs currently accredited by the Association of Theological Schools (ATS). This rapid and significant shift in enrollment represents an inflection point in the history of Evangelical theological education.

This article shares the results of a survey conducted among twenty-three theological schools located in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and Eastern Europe. The survey findings reflect the current state of these newly developed doctoral programs and indicate a continued trajectory that will have a significant impact on future generations of Church leaders. The findings raise important questions, with both positive and challenging implications for these growing doctoral programs and for the development of theological educators in the Majority World.

The Focus of the Survey

The first of its kind to focus on Majority World theological institutions, the survey was conducted from July to September 2015 at twenty-three schools identified through their connection to the International Council for Evangelical Theological Education (ICETE). Therefore, the schools share a broadly Evangelical theological identity. Other doctoral programs exist in the Majority World, offered by schools that may align with historic Protestant denominations associated with the World Council of Churches, national universities, or Catholic universities. In many instances, faculty at Evangelical schools may have received training at those institutions as well. Programs with an express purpose to train Majority World leaders and that do not require full-time residency, but are located in the West (e.g. Oxford Centre for Mission Studies), were also excluded. The survey thus focuses exclusively on schools that, by confession and geographic location, fit the focus of the ICETE Doctoral Initiative.

Finally, the survey is limited to research doctorates (PhD or ThD) and do not include professional doctorates like the Doctor of Ministry (DMin) or Doctor of Missiology (DMiss) degrees. While valuable to the Church, these degrees have a different
purpose and design than the PhD. In this article, the terms doctoral education, doctoral programs, and doctorates will only refer to the research doctorate degree.

A future update on this work could create an opportunity for longitudinal analysis related to completion rates and enrollment trends of both Western and Majority World programs. Further research might include student experience during and after the doctoral program, and include more demographic information, such as students’ ages, backgrounds, and vocational goals. Over time, following up with graduates to learn about their employment and writing contributions would be beneficial. Similar studies on the doctoral programs of other ecclesial communities would also be valuable.

Members of the ICETE Doctoral Committee regard as credible the doctoral programs at the twenty-three schools studied. They are offered by legitimate institutions and most often involve faculty members known to the ICETE community. Inclusion, however, does not indicate an endorsement and the survey was not designed to evaluate particular programs. The list is not exhaustive, as new programs have been developed since the survey was conducted and a program that should have been included was inadvertently omitted. The list thus provides a representative snapshot in time of a growing group of doctoral programs.

Conducting the Survey

A preliminary survey of seventeen schools took place in 2012 and was followed in 2015 by a more comprehensive survey commissioned by the ICETE Doctoral Steering Committee. By 2015, the Committee had identified twenty-three schools offering more than 60 doctoral degree programs combined. All twenty-three schools responded to the survey by providing data on their doctoral programs (see Appendix 1 for the full list).

In each case, the President (Principal) of the school received an introductory email with a link to an online survey. Either the President or a designee would complete the questionnaire. The survey allowed participants to answer both multiple choice and open-ended questions related to each distinct area of study. Responses were then compiled and analyzed to illustrate the current state of doctoral offerings at these schools. Where appropriate, comparisons have been made with additional information from the 2012 survey and other data.

The Context of the Survey

In 2010, ICETE convened the Doctoral Consultation, a three-year project addressing the emerging Majority World doctoral programs. Schools, accreditation groups, and support agencies convened in Beirut (2010), Bangalore (2011), and Nairobi
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(2012). The Consultation sought to define excellence and identify best practices in doctoral education. The Beirut Benchmarks (2010) outline six qualities of doctoral graduates. These include a comprehensive understanding of the field of study, faithful exercise of crucial skills, research that represents serious inquiry with integrity, a creative and original contribution worthy of publication, contextual relevance that is biblically informed and critically engaged, teaching strengths, and missional impact. The subsequent meetings in Bangalore and Nairobi sought to operationalize the Benchmarks. A Doctoral Steering Committee was established to continue working with the schools and oversee the publication of “best practices” in doctoral education (Shaw 2015).

The emergence of Evangelical doctoral programs in the Majority World has occurred at a time of reflection on and change in doctoral-level education, as evidenced broadly by the work of the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (CID) in the US and of the Bologna Process in Europe. Changes in doctoral education, described as in a “state of flux,” bring great excitement, as well as concern and frustration, over the degree (Aitchison and Pare 2012, 12). Rather than producing dissertations, schools, according to the CID, should emphasize the “formation of scholars” and develop doctoral programs that have a “fitness of purpose” in order to produce more holistic outcomes (Walker 2008, Nerad and Hegglund 2008).

Questions about the doctoral process have also emerged, including those related to the purpose of the degree, program design, collaboration, and the formation of doctoral students who will serve as teaching faculty and as researchers (Ehrenberg, Kuh et al. 2009, Baud and Lee 2009). Pressures related to program duration, completion rates and duration, delivery modes, and finances add further contour to the landscape in which these new programs have emerged.

Findings of the Survey

The survey sought self-reported data on the current state of Evangelical doctoral education in the Majority World, including figures related to enrollments, graduations, disciplines and areas of study, and resources available to support the programs. It did not attempt to provide an assessment of the quality of the programs.

Steep and Steady Growth in the New PhD Programs and Program Offerings

The first Evangelical Majority World doctoral programs were established in the late 1990s by the South Asia Institute for Advanced Christian Studies (SAIACS) and Nigerian Baptist Theological Seminary, which were both offering PhDs by 2000. Since that time, more than twenty schools have started PhD programs (Figure 1). Among the twenty-three schools surveyed, three programs are located in Latin America, ten in Africa, nine in Asia, and one in Eastern Europe. Additional programs
have emerged since the survey was conducted from July to September 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Schools Adding a PhD Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996-2000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2005</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2010</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to new schools offering doctorate programs, those with existing programs have expanded the number of program offerings at the PhD level (Figure 2). At the time of the ICETE meeting in Bangalore, India (2011), seventeen schools were hosting thirty-six PhD programs. By 2015, the number of schools had increased from seventeen to twenty-three, but the number of doctoral programs offered had increased by more than 80%, from thirty-six to sixty-six programs. Ten schools had only one PhD program, but five schools were offering a PhD in five or more areas. For example, at the Asia Graduate School of Theology in the Philippines, students may pursue a PhD in six distinct areas: Biblical Studies, Theology and Church History, Holistic Child development, Peace Studies, Intercultural Studies, and Transformative Learning. In this study, AGST represents one school with six programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase in PhD Offerings</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools with PhD Programs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Program Offerings</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant Enrollment Increase**

The aggregate enrollment in Majority World programs has become significant. By 2012, more than 400 students had enrolled in these doctoral programs. Over the next three years, the number of enrolled students would increase by 50%, bringing the total number of enrolled students to more than 700 (Figure 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PhD Students in MW-Based Programs</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More than half of the surveyed schools have relatively small PhD programs with fewer than twenty-five students enrolled. Seven schools have ten or fewer doctoral students. However, nine of the programs have twenty-five or more students, and the four largest programs each have more than fifty. The nine “large” programs account for 72% of the total enrollment. The four largest programs are at Nigerian Baptist Theological Seminary (NBTS), South African Theological Seminary (SATS), Programa Doctoral en Teología (PRODOLA), and Torch Trinity, and account for 45% of the total enrollment.

**Points of Comparison**

For these Majority World schools, the last decade represents a time of rapid expansion of PhD offerings and increased enrollment in doctoral programs. As a point of comparison, the Association for Theological Schools (ATS) accredits forty-seven institutions that offer a PhD in the United States and Canada. These include Evangelical, mainline Protestant, and Catholic schools. In the 2014-2015 academic year, total enrollment of visa students in all ATS-accredited PhD programs was at 638. This figure represents all international students from both the West (Europe, Australia, etc.) and the Majority World. Furthermore, PhD enrollment at ATS-accredited schools has declined by more than 20% since the earliest data available in 2003 (Association of Theological Schools, Head Count Enrollment by Race or Ethnic Group, Degree, and Gender: All Member Schools).

While a number of factors affect enrollment rates in doctoral programs at North American theological institutions, these numbers do not reflect broader trends in higher education. In 2015, the total number of international students enrolled in PhD programs of all kinds in North America had increased by more than 15% over the previous ten years (Open Doors Data International Students: Academic Level). Therefore, declines in PhD enrollment at North American theological schools cannot be attributed merely to tighter visa controls after 9/11 or to the 2008 economic downturn. Rather, PhD enrollments of international students at North American theological schools have declined during a period of general increase in PhD enrollments of international students across all fields of study. At the same time, enrollments in new PhD programs at Evangelical schools in the Majority World were markedly increasing.

A more direct comparison of enrollment could be made with the fourteen ATS-accredited PhD programs at North American schools that self-identify as Evangelical (see Appendix 2 for the list). In 2012, the total number of “non-Korean” international students enrolled in the doctoral programs at these fourteen

---

2 Evangelical students study in PhD programs at other schools, but these fourteen schools align theologically with the Majority World schools.
schools totaled 189.\textsuperscript{3} Even if those numbers run counter to current trends of decline and hold steady, the number of Majority World PhD students enrolled in programs at Majority World Evangelical institutions is now multiple times the number of comparative students enrolled in PhD programs at North American Evangelical schools (see Figure 4).

More Majority World Evangelical students are earning PhDs and they are doing so increasingly at schools in their home contexts. By 2015, the number of students enrolled in doctoral programs at Evangelical institutions in the Majority World had eclipsed the total number of international students pursuing PhDs at all theological schools in North America. In addition, the number enrolled in these new programs was significantly higher than that of comparative students at expressly Evangelical schools in North America and perhaps worldwide.\textsuperscript{4} It is clear that the centers of faculty training for Evangelical theological schools in the Majority World have shifted away from the West.

\textsuperscript{3} Demographic information of students can be difficult to obtain due to privacy laws and differences in recordkeeping. Therefore finding a precise number of Majority World students can be difficult. At the time of the initial survey, schools supplied the number of international students (excluding Korean students) enrolled in the PhD program. Korean numbers were treated separately as they are often large and differed from the 2013 comparison.

\textsuperscript{4} Enrollment numbers at other Western institutions in the UK, Western Europe, Australia, etc. have not been collected. Most of the theological schools in these regions belong to larger universities and do not always embrace the same confessional institutional identities as their counterparts in North America and the Majority World. Therefore, it is likely that the number of students from the Majority earning a PhD at Evangelical schools within their home contexts is already larger than the total number of Majority World students earning their degrees at Evangelical schools in all of the West.
Graduates

While the total number of enrolled PhD students at Majority World Evangelical schools remains quite large, the number of graduates remains relatively small. As of 2015, the twenty-three schools had only produced 262 PhD graduates. 70% of these schools have ten or fewer graduates, including seven schools that had yet to celebrate a doctoral commencement. In fact, two schools (NBTS and SATS) account for 60% of all PhD graduates. Only NBTS has more than fifty graduates (see Appendix 1 for a listing of graduate numbers at each school).
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The relative newness of most of these programs largely accounts for the low number of graduates. Thirty of the PhD offerings did not even exist in 2012. Six schools had only begun their doctoral programs in the three years prior to the survey, which is not enough time to produce the first group of graduates. The graduate numbers will undoubtedly increase as enough time passes for students to complete their programs. Between 2012 and 2015, the original 17 schools saw their PhD graduate numbers increase by 53%. Over the next five years, assuming adequate completion rates, hundreds of teachers holding PhDs earned in the Majority World will join faculty and Church leadership ranks.
Characteristics of the Schools and Their Programs

The survey data indicate that schools have developed programs with a variety of program designs, study areas, and levels of resourcing.

Program Design

Doctoral program design varies greatly across Western contexts. In the US, PhD programs often include multiple years of coursework, comprehensive examinations, and the oral defense of a dissertation. In Europe, the thesis is often the only requirement, with attendance of lectures or seminars left to the discretion of students and their supervisors. European programs therefore focus on original research, rather than on coursework (Nerad and Heggelund 2008, 313).

Among the Majority World schools surveyed, only two (less than 10%) follow the “dissertation only” model. The vast majority require students to complete some amount of coursework, though the number of hours varies from program to program. Several of the schools refer to their program design as a “hybrid” of the US and European models.

Fewer than half (48%) of the surveyed schools have designed their programs as full-time residential degrees. Approximately one-third have modular formats, and two schools conduct their programs completely via distance learning. The formats vary, but the more common design includes a more traditional, residential, classroom-oriented approach.

Degree Programs and Areas of Study

Evangelical schools in the Majority World offer PhD programs with more than a dozen areas of study (Figure 6). Most students are pursuing degrees in the core fields of Biblical Studies and Theology. Students can also earn degrees in other fields common in the West, such as Counseling, Education, and Intercultural Studies. In addition, 10% of enrolled students are pursuing degrees in integrated fields, such as Peace Studies, Theology and Development, and Christian Studies. Two of the larger programs at PRODOLA and SATS are more difficult to define by discipline as students can pursue nearly any topic with an approved supervisor. The breadth of program offerings means that in the coming years, teaching faculty across a variety of disciplines will have earned their degrees from schools in the Majority World.

---

5 Both PRODOLA and SATS have unique distance education models that allow students to pursue their degrees off-site. Both have very little infrastructure and rely primarily on supervisors from other institutions who agree to work with their enrolled students. These programs provide the credentials and framework for the student and mentor to complete the dissertation. In the survey, both schools indicated only one program offered, but their students write dissertations that reflect a variety of disciplines that would be reported as separate programs by other schools.
Teaching and Supervising Faculty

The twenty-three schools reported a large number of residential faculty members actively teaching in their PhD programs. The total number of 233 does not include visiting faculty, outside supervisors, or external examiners. Student-to-faculty ratios vary greatly among institutions and across various areas of study. For example, in fields such as Counseling, Ethics, and Translation Studies, the student-to-faculty ratio is greater than 7:1, while in fields such as Biblical Studies, Theology, Church History, and some of the integrated fields, the ratio is less than 2:1. Given the low ratios in so many key areas, most faculty members focus their attention at the Master’s, Bachelor’s, and certificate levels.

Although the number of residential faculty members is large, few among the 233 have experience as primary dissertation supervisors. Some of the doctoral programs are so new that faculty have yet to develop supervisory experience; therefore, outside supervisors are needed. Other schools, such as AGST, PRODOLA, and SATS, rely on experienced faculty from other institutions by design. The large faculty numbers reported by the schools indicate a desire to involve residential faculty to a larger extent in their doctoral programs. Training and experience remain two of the greatest needs. In some disciplines, very few faculty members exist in comparison to growing student enrollments. Schools may have a particular need for targeted additions to their faculties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Study</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>PhD Students</th>
<th>PhD Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biblical Studies</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church History/ Historical Theology</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missions/ICS</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Fields</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Fields</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified (PRODOLA, SATS)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6
Library Resources

In the survey, schools also reported on their library holdings. Of the twenty-three schools, only six have libraries with 50,000 or more volumes. Only one school, SAIACS, has a library with more than 100,000 volumes. About half of the schools (11) have between 25,000 and 50,000 books. Three reported less than 25,000. Another three (programs at PRODOLA and the Asia Graduate School of Theology) are consortium-based, do not have campuses, and therefore rely on outside libraries for student use.

All of the schools surveyed reported some level of access to electronic resources. However, the level of resourcing varied considerably. Thirteen schools have access to the ATLA database. Eleven reported access to EBSCO. However, only seven schools have access to both. Other electronic resources included online journals, specific database and bibliographic resources, and additional electronic access through partnerships with other schools and libraries.

Approximately half of the schools (11) publish their own academic journals. Eight produce issues twice a year. The others publish less frequently.

Partnerships

Every school in the survey is in some form of partnership with Western institutions or faculty members (Figure 7). Two schools are involved in informal arrangements with Western faculty members. Several of the schools have formal Memoranda of Understanding with Western schools. The most common partnerships involve outside faculty teaching and supervising doctoral students. Other partnerships involve study trips for students to access larger library holdings for their research. Five of the schools receive accreditation through or conduct a joint program with another school.
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Partnerships thus enable schools to augment their resources for their doctoral programs. Although these partnerships represent important connections between Western and Majority World programs, schools reported a wide variety of partners, including other schools in the Majority World.

**Implications**

Much like how the centers of Christianity have shifted from the West (see Robert 2000, Jenkins 2002, Sanneh 2009, Sunquist 2015), doctoral training for Evangelical students from the Majority World has also shifted dramatically to the East and South. Trends of rising student enrollments, new PhD programs, and expanded program offerings indicate that an increasing number of pastors, missionaries, and Christian workers will be trained by professors who have earned their degrees at institutions within their own cultural contexts.

**Positive Implications for the Schools**

The increasing availability of quality doctoral education has several positive implications for the Church. First, Majority World programs directly address issues of achievability related to time, travel, and study expenses (Cunningham 2007, Starcher and Stick 2003). Residential PhD studies in the West come with considerable costs, including tuition and school fees, higher costs of living, and international travel. Furthermore, institutions must release developing faculty members for extended periods when they study and hope they will return after their degrees. The impact of cultural transitions (upon leaving and returning) takes a toll on both scholars and family members who travel abroad. Majority World programs alleviate many of these pressures as they are less expensive, are often located within a student’s regional or cultural context, and may provide students with opportunities to continue their teaching and ministry while studying.

In addition to logistical and economic advantages, Majority World programs provide increased opportunities for contextual theological engagement. Meaningful engagement requires more than geographic proximity. Higgs states that for a program to be African, it must do more than take place on African soil; rather, an African program “directs its attention to issues, concerns and theoretical or conceptual underpinnings of African culture” (Higgs 2008, 448). Similarly, Caldwell adds that Asian programs involve more than the physical location and ethnic makeup of faculty; instead, they must address Asian issues and engage Asian pedagogies (2010, 32). The survey did not assess the degree to which such engagement occurs. However, the schools surveyed share both an implicit and explicit value in helping doctoral students to address important issues within their contexts. An in-depth study of three schools demonstrates that faculty and students perceive that such engagement is happening (Hunter 2014).
These new programs also have an opportunity to address several needs related to doctoral education, as described in the literature. The broader push for socially relevant dissertations (Nerad and Heggelund 2008) mirrors the desire for research that serves the Church (Poerwowidagdo 2003, Starcher and Stick 2003). Both the Beirut Benchmarks (2010) and the Best Practices in Doctoral Education (Shaw 2015) stress the importance of addressing contextually relevant issues. New programs can attend to issues such as preparing educators for careers in teaching (not just equipping graduates with research skills) and for roles in administrative leadership (Starcher and Stick 2005, Walker 2008, Danby and Lee 2012). Furthermore, contextually engaged research further advances theological development in the Majority World Church (Hunter 2014, 165-171).

The dramatic shift in the enrollment of Majority World Evangelical PhD students demonstrates the perceived viability of Majority World programs that helps to counter what Caldwell has referred to as “subtle colonialism,” which presumes that all good training must be done in the West” (2010, 33). However, this may not yet be fully evident as some in Majority World programs may experience a sense of inferiority toward those in larger and more established Western programs (Hunter 2014, 121). Yet, as more faculty members hold degrees from Majority World institutions, students will recognize more and more the viability, importance, and value of these programs.

**Challenging Implications for the Schools**

The rapid growth of viable doctoral programs outside the West has many positive implications for theological education and for the Church. However, some questions and challenges have also emerged.

First, enrollment has greatly outpaced graduation rates. While the newness of the programs contributes to this discrepancy, concerns for completion rates exist nonetheless. Researchers have identified the overall time students spend working toward PhDs globally and the challenges related to completion rates (Ehrenberg, Kuh, and Cornell Higher Education Research Institute 2009). In South Africa, less than 10% of doctoral students graduate within five years (Nerad and Heggelund 2008). According to a report by the Auburn Center, theological schools in the US follow a similar pattern, with the average completion time for a PhD being seven years (Bleier and Wheeler 2010). Distance programs that enroll students who continue to teach and serve in ministry during their studies often take much longer to complete. Time will tell how many of the more than 700 currently enrolled Majority World Evangelical doctoral students will complete their degrees.

A second concern relates to issues of accreditation and academic rigor. Some Evangelical regional accrediting bodies have not yet developed accreditation
standards for PhD programs. In some cases, schools have received accreditation from the state by meeting government academic standards. In other cases, programs cannot receive accreditation until they have existed for a certain number of years and produced a minimum number of graduates. In addition to such systemic challenges, questions of academic standards arise. Enrollment has outpaced the development of faculty and library resources, raising concerns over academic viability. Further questions arise from a perceived dichotomy between contextual engagement and academic excellence (Hunter 2014, 172). The ICETE Doctoral Initiative began in part to support schools in developing academic and contextual credibility. Resources such as Best Practices in Doctoral Education (Shaw 2015) can help schools to pursue excellence in all areas.

Third, the need for trained faculty who can supervise dissertations presents a particular challenge. Despite reporting a large number of residential faculty members engaged in their PhD programs, seventeen schools also reported a need to use outside supervisors for doctoral dissertations. Time will hopefully address this challenge as residential faculty gain experience. However, it will be important for schools to intentionally support faculty members in cultivating supervisory skills and experience.

A fourth area of concern is the lack of library resources available for doctoral research. The survey revealed that most schools have a relatively low number of library holdings as compared to their Western counterparts. Determining the suitability of a collection for doctoral research would require in-depth research at each institution. However, it is clear that financial constraints limit the growth of libraries even as schools increase their doctoral program offerings. Most schools also remain under-resourced in their access to electronic databases and online journals. Issues related to consistent internet access and bandwidth pose additional challenges.

Partnerships represent one solution for addressing students’ need for greater access to resources. Through nearby universities or study trips abroad, students can supplement their access to library resources as institutions continue to upgrade their holdings. Nevertheless, the need remains for more contextually focused, locally generated resources. As schools continue to create cultures of research and to generate theological reflection, they will also help to build (slowly) this needed portion of the collection.

Finally, the rapid development and expansion of PhD programs raise the question of sustainability. Will schools be able to find sufficient qualified applicants to maintain current enrollment levels or begin new programs? If applicants exist, are there enough faculty positions for graduates to fill at theological schools in their regions? While comprehensive data may not exist, school leaders believe that
institutions in the Majority World have a great need for faculty and scholars trained at the doctoral level. The maturation of master’s-level programs and the push for increased credentials among faculty members teaching at all levels would indicate that the overall need for doctoral graduates remains, even as local needs may vary.

In addition, many schools rely on scholarship support for students at all levels. PhD studies are particularly cost-intensive because of the need for small student-to-faculty ratios in doctoral seminars, as well as for one-on-one supervision and mentoring during the dissertation process. Therefore, finding enough funding to support growing PhD programs will be critical. Before launching additional programs, schools should consider carefully the needed areas of study, and the required human and library resources. Schools should also consider program formats that will best serve student and faculty needs in their regions at this time.

Opportunities for the Future of Doctoral Programs

In this “time of flux” for both broader doctoral education and theological education, Evangelical seminaries in the Majority World have an opportunity to try new ideas, experiment with different program formats, and develop models that best serve their unique contexts. Integrated programs such as Theology and Development represent one such response to a significant contextual need. Although they face challenges in developing credibility, young programs can be more innovative in their responses to a changing environment because they are less encumbered by institutional and historical structures.

Findings from the survey may have direct implications for Western schools as well. The rise of Majority World doctoral programs has coincided with declining numbers of international students in ATS-accredited Evangelical PhD programs in North America. The correlation between the shifting enrollments suggests that some students who would have entered North American programs have instead enrolled at schools in their home contexts. Trends indicate that this may continue at even higher rates over time. However, through new partnerships, multiple institutions may now play a role in the formation of doctoral students. Western schools are no longer the only option for PhD students and may need to consider new ways of contributing to the development of faculty members at Evangelical theological schools in the Majority World.

Finally, newly developed doctoral programs can emphasize the value of contextual engagement in the formation of doctoral students by further developing residential faculty who can bring intracultural critique to their supervision of doctoral students. Increased opportunities for writing, publication, access to regional theological journals, and the development of new resources will also serve students and promote deeper theological reflection.
Conclusion

The data from the 2015 survey of twenty-three Evangelical schools in the Majority World indicate that a significant shift has already occurred in enrollment patterns for doctoral education. If most of the enrolled doctoral students graduate and obtain teaching positions at theological institutions in their home contexts, then these new PhD programs will greatly influence theological training for future generations of Christian leaders across the Majority World. At the same time, rapid growth also places a strain on the faculty, library, and scholarship resources needed to sustain doctoral programs, requiring new partnerships and creative strategies. As programs develop and expand, they will not only contribute to the formation of future faculty members, but also shape emerging models of doctoral education at theological schools. The shifts documented above have happened quickly and the trajectories would indicate that the landscape has changed, perhaps permanently.

Appendix 1

Participants in the 2015 Doctoral Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
<th>Current Enrollment</th>
<th>Total Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa International University</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akrofi-Christaller Institute of Mission,</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology, and Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Graduate School of Theology – Alliance</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Graduate School of Theology –</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangui Evangelical School of Theology</td>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Tucker School of Divinity and</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China Graduate School of Theology</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Participants in the 2015 Doctoral Survey (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
<th>Current Enrollment</th>
<th>Total Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Theological Fellowship</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculté de Théologie Evangélique, Université Shalom de Bunia</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Leadership University</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instituto Teológico FIET</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jos ECWA Theological Seminary (JETS)</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigerian Baptist Theological Seminary</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan African Theological Seminary</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programa Doctoral en Teología – PRODOLA</td>
<td>Latin America Consortium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Higginbottom Institute of Agriculture, Technology, and Sciences – Centre for Advanced Christian Studies</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminario Teológico Centroamericano</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African Theological Seminary</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia Institute of Advanced Christian Studies</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theological College of Northern Nigeria</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Participants in the 2015 Doctoral Survey (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
<th>Current Enrollment</th>
<th>Total Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Torch Trinity Graduate University</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Theological College, Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Biblical Seminary</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 2

#### Enrollment Data from ATS-Accredited PhD Programs at Evangelical Schools in North America (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
<th>Enrollment*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asbury Theological Seminary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemblies of God Theological Seminary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin Theological Seminary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Theological Seminary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuller Theological Seminary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regent University Divinity School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot Theological Seminary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Evangelical Divinity School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Theological Seminary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest Baptist Theological Seminary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Baptist Theological Seminary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Enrollment of non-Korean International Students.
** An unofficial number or approximation, as official numbers were not provided.
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In January 2016, Dr. Ted W. Ward entered eternal rest. He is internationally recognized for his enduring contribution to educational studies and Christian education as Professor of Education at Michigan State University, and as Professor of Christian Education and the founder of research doctoral programs in Education and Intercultural Studies at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. During his 30-year tenure at Michigan State University, Ted, as his students called him, was “often accused (justly) of running a seminary on campus because of the Christian students he attracted, and his ongoing insistence that Christians must think theologically about educational questions.”

He supervised over 200 doctoral dissertations and his students serve in theological education globally.

In the following short essays, the authors reflect personally on the ways in which Ted Ward has influenced their lives, ministries, and practice of theological education.

Tributes:

• A Legacy that Speaks Today – Victor Cole
• An Indelible Mark – Adrian Ban
• The Gift of Listening – Rose and Bulus Galadima
• A Friend with a Global Perspective – Suraja Ramanan
• Forming the Practice of Theological Education – Yau Man Siew

African cultures value the lasting memories of those who have passed on as evidenced by John Mbiti’s famous documentation of the African philosophy of “the living dead,” which immortalizes the legacy of ancestors. The writer of the Letter to the Hebrews provides a striking analogy that enriches this traditional African concept. Like righteous Abel, who “still speaks, even though he is dead,” the departed heroes of the Christian faith also “speak” for they constitute a “great cloud of witnesses,” urging on those who are still running this pilgrim race (Heb. 11:4, 12:1 NIV).

Africa, with its diversity and rich cultures, has benefitted a great deal through the labors of Western missionaries and educators, especially in the 19th and 20th centuries. We still have lasting memories of the explorer and medical missionary, David Livingstone, and of pioneering anthropologists such as Geoffrey Parrinder and Edwin W. Smith, who have left behind numerous writings on Africa and her peoples. Their work has shaped prominent African thinkers from key centers of higher learning throughout the continent.

Another group has left their mark in a different way. Although professors like Ted Ward traveled to Africa from time to time as consultants to build up African educators and to visit their protégés on the field, they largely operated from key centers of higher learning in the West, where they developed new generation of mentor-educators for the Evangelical movement in the Majority World in the latter half of the 20th century.

**A Cascading Legacy:** Ted Ward’s legacy on the African continent will continue to “speak” for a long, long time. His impact could be categorized into two broad areas. First, he ventured into East, Central, and West Africa as an educational consultant, introducing the value of not only formal, but also nonformal education for addressing Africa’s unique challenges. Second, he directly mentored key African leaders and Western missionaries, who would serve in vital educator roles across Africa, for four decades at Michigan State University (MSU) and Trinity Evangelical Divinity School (TEDS). While writing this piece, I counted offhandedly, with the assistance of a colleague, well over three dozen key educators across Africa who were Ted’s direct mentees. Over the years, these educators have in turn impacted numerous other educators, who may be considered as Ted’s indirect mentees. As can be seen, Ted’s influence has multiplied exponentially.
It is therefore quite fitting that in 2004, the leadership of the Nairobi Evangelical Graduate School of Theology (NEGST) invited Ted back for what would be his valedictory lectures on theological education in Africa. On that visit, Ted, like an African patriarch, reconnected with a number of his direct mentees, whom he referred to on that occasion as “my children” (although he had been fond of referring to each of them during their time at MSU and TEDS as “my African brother/sister”). To his delight, he also met a core group of educators who have been built up through the service and ministry of his direct mentees. These younger leaders he described on that occasion as “my grandchildren.” These designations are especially poignant in the African context, where the honor of a traditional African patriarch is tied to the number of surviving children, grandchildren, and even great-grandchildren. By the mercies of God, Ted lived to see his intellectual and spiritual descendants during that last visit to Africa, and he returned home with deep satisfaction.

**The Power of Story:** Ted, in typical African pedagogical fashion, loved to employ vivid anecdotes from personal experience in his teaching. One such story was from a much earlier visit to a rural part of Central Africa, where he had spoken on theological education. Ted noticed that whenever he used the term “seminary” during his presentation, the translator would go on in what seemed to be circumlocution. At the end of the presentation, Ted asked his translator about the word for “seminary” in the local language. The translator chuckled, saying, “You don’t want to know, or do you?” That response only stirred Ted’s curiosity further. Finally, Ted was told that in the local context, the elders referred to “seminary” as “the place where little boys go to get big heads”!

In Africa, Ted’s memory lives on among his African “children,” “grandchildren,” and future “great-grandchildren.” Memories of Ted’s personal touch and concern for his mentees, his deep listening abilities, his teachings and transformative pedagogical style, and of course his many formal writings, as well as his many off-the-cuff nuggets of wisdom scribbled on scrap paper, remain and “still speak.”
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My first encounter with Dr. Ward was in 1995 at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School in Deerfield, IL. I had been accepted into the doctoral program in Educational Studies and Dr. Ward was a major reason why I decided on this program. I first heard about Ted from Dr. Jim Pluddeman, my academic adviser at Wheaton College (IL). Dr. Pluddeman would constantly give credit to Dr. Ward for certain educational ideas and concepts in the classroom. I was already very pleased with my experience at Wheaton College and began to wonder about this Dr. Ward who had left such a positive and lasting impression on one of his former Ph.D. students at Michigan State University.

**Learning from Jesus as Teacher:** Fast forward to September 1995 to find me now sitting in my first class with Dr. Ward, learning about how high conformity limits discovery learning. From the very first class, it was clear to me how deeply Dr Ward was immersed in the Scriptures and how much he admired Jesus' teachings. He often pointed to how Jesus’ greatness could be seen in his teachings, as well as in his style of teaching. Jesus moved around a lot, and taught in diverse settings on various occasions while eating, walking, sitting down, traveling by boat, and so on. Parables, metaphors, similes and other literary devices were often employed to help his audiences learn. He often communicated complex truths using simple imagery. He used metaphors to draw people into a discovery process, and invite thinking and learning. Dr. Ward helped me understand the great value and power of nonformal education, and offered me a fresh and biblical perspective on Christian education that has had an impact on my own philosophy of ministry ever since.

Later, when I was preparing for my dissertation and Dr. Ward had graciously agreed to be my first reader, I began to see and understand that asking good questions can lead to new findings and perspectives. It was then that I realized what had made Dr. Ward such an outstanding teacher – it was not only his deep desire to follow Jesus, but also his willingness to be challenged by Jesus’ teaching and to ask how they apply in day-to-day life situations. Dr. Ward believed in first observing with his mouth closed before asking questions. In other words, he taught us to control our biases in order to see and hear what is actually going on in the Scriptures or around us. Then, we may look for patterns – things that are happening, not necessarily by chance. By keeping track of our observations, we
may then discover possible meanings and identify plausible relationships. Finally we are to reexamine our observations so that our conclusions can be as objective and clear as possible. This was a discipline that I was personally lacking at the time. Dr. Ward helped me to learn and apply these steps in my work.

**Clear Focus:** During my final year in the PhD program, when the process of dissertation writing could be very hard at times, Dr. Ward would constantly remind me of yet another important concept: “zoom in and zoom out.” I still remember his words: “Adrian, do not forget to zoom in to make sure the necessary details are all in, but then you need to zoom out to make sure you are staying on the main course and to keep moving forward.” I knew what he was talking about. As a Program Fellow, I have seen many ABD (All But Dissertation) Ph.D. students who are so concerned with zooming in that they forget to zoom out and see the big picture. Others fail to zoom in enough on the important details in their work.

I love and cherish Dr. Ward for who he was as a follower of Christ called to be an educator whose life and work have inspired so many others. For the way he instilled in me the desire to be the person God has called me to be, I will be ever grateful.
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**Adrian Ban**

Adrian Ban, Ph.D. (2001) is a writer and speaker who serves as the President of Integra Romania, a not-for-profit organization focused on both formal and nonformal training. He resides in Oradea, Romania, where he and his wife Ema (M.A. in Bioethics from TIU in 1998) are deeply involved in the ministry of the Emanuel Baptist Church of Oradea. Adrian and Ema are blessed with three sons: Andy, Eduard, and Thomas.
The Gift of Listening

ROSE AND BULUS GALADIMA
NIGERIA

We praise God for the life of Ted Ward. We first met him in the early 1990s when Bulus was studying at TEDS. We reconnected a decade later when Rose came back to earn her PhD at TEDS. We consider ourselves Ted’s “academic grandchildren.” We were both students of Victor Cole at Jos ECWA Evangelical Theological Seminary in Nigeria a decade earlier in 1980s. Victor Cole was one of Ted’s doctoral students at Michigan State.

We have many fond memories of Ted. We remember him as a very friendly, hospitable, compassionate, honest, and direct master teacher, master storyteller, and faithful servant of Christ, among other things.

A Master Teacher and Profound Thinker: Rose remembers him coming to one of her classes as a guest lecturer for several weeks. His vast knowledge and experience in the field of education were both instructive and inspiring. We are sure that many can testify of Ted’s love for students. He and Margaret invited us to their home for lunch just to get to know us better. Their hospitality meant a lot to us as international students far away from our homes.

An Attentive Listener and Skillful Storyteller: Ted had a great influence on the founding of Almanah Rescue Mission, the ministry we started to serve widows and orphans in Nigeria. When we first told him about our ministry plan, he told us a story about one of his many travel experiences. He shared about a people group his party had visited in South America. They had asked the chief, a WWII veteran, what was the greatest need of his people. Ted said the chief stared for a long time at the old, worn army boots on his feet and told them the greatest need of his people was learning how to fix shoes. Ted then observed that the chief had been the only one wearing shoes.

This poignant story helped us in the founding of Almanah. We realized how easy it can be to focus on our own needs, rather than that of the people we are trying to serve. Leaders must take care to keep the right needs at the forefront of their mission. From Ted, we learned the great value of listening to the people we are serving. We began our work in 1995 and today, it is still going strong under the leadership of very compassionate Nigerians, thanks to Ted’s early influence.

When we heard that Ted was sick, we called him and asked if we could visit him.
He and Margaret welcomed us warmly, as is characteristic of them. We were both surprised by how weak he was and moved that he still made time to meet with us. We were eager to leave to allow him time to rest, but he took time to ask about our ministry and rejoiced with us in what God was doing. Even at one of his weakest moments, he taught us about Christian graciousness and deep faith in God.

Ted was very compassionate, and loved the poor and marginalized. He took seriously Jesus’ exhortation in John 9:4, “As long as it is day, we must do the work of him who sent me. Night is coming, when no one can work” (NIV). And now, Ted has completed his work and entered his rest with his Savior.

Rose and Bulus Galadima

Rose and Bulus Galadima have ministered together in Nigeria and in the US. Rose earned her PhD in Educational Studies from Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. She is the founder of Almanah Rescue Mission, a ministry to widows in Nigeria. She taught at Jos ECWA Theological Seminary in Nigeria for over 20 years and served in denominational leadership. She is currently engaged with Respond International, a ministry to help Boko Haram refugees.

Bulus earned his PhD in Historical Theology from Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. He served on the faculty at Jos ECWA Theological Seminary for two 20 years, including two terms as Vice Chancellor. He cofounded More than a Mile Deep, an indigenous African Theological Education program committed to train Christian leaders in Africa. He served as the Vice Chairman for ACTEA (Association of Christian Theological Education in Africa). He also serves on the doctoral committee of ICETE (International Council of Evangelical Theological Education). He now serves as the Dean of the Cooke School of Intercultural Studies at Biola University in California.
“Ho, Ho, Ho! You must be wishing that you could be back home in Singapore,” said a smiling Ted Ward to me on a cold winter morning in Deerfield, Illinois. He was holding a mug with steaming brewed coffee in one hand and a briefcase in the other. He was walking toward his office on the campus of Trinity Evangelical Divinity School (TEDS). I counted it a privilege to walk alongside the Director of the Educational Studies Department. Dr. Ward was instrumental in guiding me during my studies and especially during difficult times of dissertation writing from 1989 to 93.

An Encouraging Mentor: Professor Ted Ward was indeed a teacher and friend to many students. He was also a mentor to many young leaders coming from North and South America, Africa, and Asia to pursue their degrees in higher education.

In September 1989, I received my acceptance into the Educational Studies doctoral program with great excitement over the opportunity to learn from this man of God. Dr. Ward’s passion for teaching can be seen in his many creative approaches to the teaching-learning process. He had a brilliant mind. “You need to read widely,” was Dr. Ward’s exhortation to me. He constantly challenged us to probe ever more deeply into our fields of study through research and writing.

For my dissertation, Dr. Ward encouraged me to bring relevance to my research by interviewing Christian converts from the Majority World now living in Chicago. During a class on research methods, he encouraged me by announcing that my research on the experience and conversion of Muslims was especially important during that moment of the Gulf War.

A Lasting Friendship: As I reflect on my professor and friend, I am convinced that Dr. Ward was a tower of strength to students from various continents. Dr. Ward (which is how I usually address him, as an Asian cultural expression of respect) was hospitable in many ways. Together with my colleagues, I was invited to Dr. and Mrs. Ward’s lovely and cozy home for lunch after the Day of Prayer, and for refreshments during our school vacation.

In 1994, my heart was warmed upon receiving news that Dr. Ward with his wife Margaret would visit Singapore. I had returned home and commenced work as faculty at a theological college. Several of my colleagues were excited and wanted
to meet him.

In 2000, when I was on the mission field teaching at Nairobi Evangelical Graduate School of Theology (now Africa International University), Dr. Ward arrived with Mrs. Ward and a team of educators to facilitate at a conference with the faculty and alumni. In addition, several TEDS alumni were present for a special tea fellowship at the home of the principal, Dr. David Kasali (also a TEDS graduate).

A Transcultural Model: My deepest memory of Dr. Ward’s teaching and writing comes from his book, Values Begin at Home. For years, I have made reference to the “Hand” model in the classroom and during presentations at conferences. His model has inspired many trainers of teachers to aim for and focus on holistic education. This vital model also encourages leaders and educators to develop our own creative models from our different cultural contexts.

Our memories of Ted Ward as a person, teacher, and friend will remain close to our hearts. He was God’s servant who drew no “lines” between men and women, age groups, or nationalities. To God be the glory.


Suraja Raman

Suraja Raman graduated from Trinity Evangelical Divinity School in 1993 with a PhD in Educational Studies. During her time there, Ted Ward was the Director of the Department and was also her dissertation director and first reader. Upon returning home to Singapore, she resumed her responsibilities as a faculty for theological schools in Singapore and later served as a missionary at Africa International University, in Kenya from 1997-2008. She continues to teach, write, and conduct training for church leaders in Southeast Asia and around the world.
As a teacher, Ted Ward valued and practiced holistic inquiry into truth, learning in community, and responsible service (not just knowledge for knowledge’s sake). He was one of the chief influences on my life.

A Different View of Education: I will not forget my first seminar as a new doctoral student with Ted. My notion of a teacher was that of a “sage” and I thought of a good student as one who passively receives wisdom. When I saw other seminar participants engaging passionately with the material and with each other, I quickly realized that I was experiencing a totally new model of learning. I thought, “I’d better say something or Ted will wonder why he accepted me into the doctoral program.” I blurted out something and Ted immediately responded with care. He then commended me for my contribution. I felt as though Ted was holding my hand, allaying my fears and inviting me to contribute to the marketplace of ideas. That day, I found my voice!²

Teaching is enabling others to discover truth for themselves. A teacher guides toward resources and facilitates the birth of ideas. In Ted’s seminars, we would read texts in advance and come prepared to engage. Working in small groups, we would critique and debate ideas. It was not uncommon for the class to develop new paradigms and models.

Ted was a prolific author and he required us to be familiar with precedent literature in the field. However, for Ted, knowledge is found not only in textbooks, but also in life experiences. He often encouraged “reflective praxis” (an action-reflection feedback loop), and believed that examined experience leads to wisdom. Many in the doctoral program had significant years in ministry and Ted encouraged maintaining a dialectic between what we read and our life experiences.

² David Tracy (1987) notes that theological education involves “genuine conversation” with “hard rules” that include speaking and defending one’s ideas, endurance of necessary conflict, and changing one’s mind if persuaded by evidence. Susan Simoniatis (2002) asks students, “Are your commitments based on unreflective choices?”
Ted developed the “rail fence” model while at Michigan State University. In this model, knowledge and experience form the top and bottom rails of the fence. From his research on effective professional development, he found that the best programs were those that integrated learning (knowledge) with the actual life situations of learners. We recognized this model in Ted’s seminars.

Most adults are “self-motivated” learners. They seek immediate application and prefer “transformational learning” in contrast to the “informational learning” of younger learners.3 Ted often reminded us that learners’ questions and contexts are a window to their needs.

Once I met a missionary on furlough in Chicago after several years in an African country. When he found out that I was studying with Ted, he touched my shoulder many times (as though I was a precious commodity). He told me that Ted was one of the most amazing teachers he had ever met. He described a conference in Africa where, before saying anything, Ted had asked the missionaries what issues and challenges they were facing. After hearing them out, he gave his presentation. The missionary told me he had never met a teacher who was so courageous.

**Education in Community:** Another critical value evident in Ted’s pedagogy is “community.” Trinitarian theology and the Church as Body of Christ are critical foundations in Ted’s educational philosophy. For Ted, education cannot take place without a good relationship between instructor and learners. We used first names with him and other professors in the doctoral program. He reminded us that we were colleagues in learning and ministry.

Ted and Margaret invited the doctoral students to their home at the beginning of the semester. Every faculty member in the program would be there (with spouses if married). Ted reiterated the values of the program and we would get to know each other over dessert and coffee. Friendships with our professors and colleagues persisted long after we graduated.

Ted cared for us. We were treated as his brothers and sisters, and he would do whatever he could to help us succeed. I will not forget a time when I was stuck in my data analysis for my doctoral thesis and could not proceed. I called Ted and asked if I could consult with him at his home. When I arrived, he had a cup of coffee for me, and he spent about an hour reviewing and clarifying my issues, with suggestions for a way forward. I told him later, “Ted, coming to see you is like visiting the doctor’s office. Even though I still have my problem, I am already feeling much better.” He laughed.

---

3 Sharan Merriam et al., Learning in Adulthood (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006), 130.
As a learning community, we at Trinity engaged in collaborative learning. Ted expected us to help one another. He encouraged major joint projects, and we regularly shared resources and ideas. Ted criticized Christian higher education for its solitary nature – students would often study and research on their own. However, ministry is most often a team effort. Ted warned that if we had not learned collaborative work, it could lead to disastrous results in life and ministry.

One important room in the doctoral wing at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School was the “doctoral reading room” set aside for our doctoral student community. We often ate lunch together and continued our seminar discussions there, sharing ideas for research projects and socializing.

**Integrated Learning Pursuits:** The third value I learned from Ted is the integration of theology and social science in a holistic search for truth. Ted famously said that oftentimes, “Christian education is neither.” It is not “Christian” when teachers unwittingly embrace practices that may be antithetical to biblical principles of teaching; it is not “educational” because many teachers are ignorant of sound educational theory.

One of Ted’s favorite passages is Psalm 19, which speaks of God’s self-revelation in the Word and in the world. With his conviction that “all truth is part of God’s truth,” Ted modeled a holistic search for truth. He rejected a “sacred-secular” division in the academy and encouraged us to find links between internal (disciplinary) and external (broader) truths, which both belong to God.

> Given that all truth is God’s truth, there needs to be as great a concern in “rightly dividing the general revelation” as in “rightly dividing the Word.” The world is much more truth-oriented toward the things [of general revelation] with which we are most casual, and so we often violate “their truth” while promoting “our truth.” We don’t get growth and honor God by mishandling the truth that he has revealed. We can’t manipulate, suppress or be casual about truth in either domain.4

Ted would often begin a seminar with a meditation on Scripture – reflecting not as a Bible scholar, but as an educator and social scientist. If we were discussing educational philosophy, he would inquire into Christ’s model of teaching and the theology of the human person. If we were learning about leadership, he would look at the biblical principles governing leadership. If discussing human growth and development, Ted would bring insights from developmental psychology, but he would also offer a theological critique. Ted brought ethnographic research into

---

our doctoral program, fully convinced that pastors, educators and missionaries needed those tools to exegete culture.

Conclusion

I like to think that I am carrying on Ted’s legacy – his values and practices – in my own teaching. He taught me to always remember that students are people made in the image of God and are to be respected for their rationality, creativity, and rich life experiences. Teaching is to enable learners to develop their own framework of intellectual commitments, so they can judge among competing truth claims. Ted also taught me that each class is a community of learners in Christ. Genuine care and trust are foundational to education. A learning community emphasizes collaborative, not competitive, learning. Last but not least, Ted taught me that education is a holistic process of seeking God’s truth in both his Word and his world. Ted, you not only showed us how and why we teach; you also showed us how we should live. I will endeavor to pass on your legacy to my students. I really miss you.
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ELIE HADDAD  
*Arab Baptist Theological Seminary (Beirut, Lebanon)*

I have been serving for more than a decade as the President of a theological school in the Majority World: Arab Baptist Theological Seminary in Beirut, Lebanon. Questions of contextual relevance have been at the forefront of our thinking for many years. As our context changes rapidly, we have been able to respond through innovative ways of delivering integrated and holistic theological education. However, many related questions linger in my mind: How much of this innovation is influenced by the structure and maturity of our leadership? Is it realistic to expect that governance can move beyond mere fiduciary administration? Is there a modified governance model that would be more effective in our culture?

Jason Ferenczi does a brilliant job answering these and many more questions. With his vast experience serving theological schools around the globe through the Cornerstone Foundation and Overseas Council, Ferenczi is well-suited for exploring the influence of governance structures on the renewal of theological education in the Majority World. Ferenczi begins by providing a comprehensive survey of the literature on leadership in theological schools, as well as on nonprofit and educational governance. He then discusses his detailed qualitative research among four diverse theological schools in the Majority World and proposes insightful recommendations for effective governance.

Busy seminary leaders find it hard to spend time reviewing extensive bodies of literature on topics such as governance. I highly appreciate the way Ferenczi
distills the main concepts of key books for our benefit and how he builds a bridge from leadership to governance. As Ferenczi reflects on the literature, he concludes that “[i]ncreasingly, literature on nonprofit and educational governance has suggested the importance of governing boards moving beyond the fiduciary role to engage in strategic and generative thought” (89). However, Ferenczi notices that the literature has not paid much attention to the governance of theological schools. This makes his research all the more crucial.

After reviewing the literature, Ferenczi discusses his research on governance and leadership at four institutions in Asia, the Caribbean, Eurasia, and South America. He dedicates more than one third of his book to addressing his first research question: What characteristics contribute to the effectiveness of theological school governance? Ferenczi organizes his findings into six categories that also highlight key recommendations for schools in various contexts. They deserve a brief mention:

1) **A Community of Trust:** “Trust was the first and perhaps the primary building block of governance effectiveness in the schools studied” (109). Communities of trust share two key characteristics. First, they demonstrate respect for those in various positions of authority: the board, president, management team, faculty, and staff. Second, they share a “fabric of trust that transcended the power or authority of any one position” (102).

2) **Alignment:** Alongside trust, there has to be alignment of the parts in any system. Alignment relies on trust. It refers to “the congruity of the administrative actions of the various units of the educational institution” (111). This alignment includes shared values, and a shared commitment to the vision and mission of the school.

3) **Strong, Empowering Leadership:** Ferenczi’s research reveals that effective governance requires a certain kind of leadership. Leaders need to be strong and know “where the community need[s] to go,” as well as empowering and able to recognize that they cannot “drive the community there by fiat alone” (137).

4) **Shared Commitment to Transformative Education:** Although Ferenczi’s research does not focus on curriculum or educational approaches, “questions about governance effectiveness in each case led to discussions of curriculum and educational programs” (159). Effective schools increasingly understand their role as missional, prophetic, and transformative.
5) **Reflective Responsiveness**: Ferenczi defines reflective responsiveness as “an awareness of and curiosity about both the immediate and broader context in which the school operates, as well as the broader context of the Christian church as it relates to non-Christian society” (140). Institutional and governance effectiveness are key to schools’ ability to see, interpret, and relate to the surrounding society.

6) **Planning for the Future, Including Succession**: This may not be the most important characteristic, but Ferenczi notes that “awkward and unplanned transitions were the single greatest threat to the presence of the other characteristics mentioned above” (161). Although a strong and empowering president is key to governance effectiveness, it is the responsibility of the board to consider what happens in the absence of such a leader. Complacency in this area is very risky.

Next, Ferenczi asks: *How does the cultural setting of theological schools relate to characteristics that contribute to governance effectiveness?* Ferenczi found little evidence of the need for specific cultural forms of governance. Nevertheless, there is a “need for all governance structures to be responsive to their context” (184). Effective schools must adopt “a more fluid approach to governance” that takes cultural patterns into account.

Finally, Ferenczi asks: *How do governing boards employ insights from internal and external relationships to enhance governance effectiveness?* This question was designed to investigate whether boards were involved in two activities that contribute to governance effectiveness: boundary spanning and generative thought. Ferenczi’s data reveals that these activities were practiced meaningfully by management teams, staff, and faculty, but rarely by school boards. This finding led Ferenczi to construct a governance theory that he calls a concert of governance in order to encourage “the expansion of the understanding of governance” beyond the traditional understanding (188). The board remains as “the critical final authority in the governance process, yet the overall work of governance stretches beyond the boardroom and into the fabric of the institution as a whole, drawing on the insights, talents, and abilities of the [President], the Management, staff, and faculty, as well as the board” (189). Ferenczi discusses some implications of this theory, but defers to those in the position to test the validity and utility of this theory.

A number of years ago, our school partially implemented John Carver’s Policy Governance model, which considerably improved our governance function. However, as the book points out, this model has its obvious limitations. Ferenczi offers us a new framework that can help us move beyond the traditional...
understanding of governance. My hope is that we will be able to experiment with this framework at ABTS in the near future, and that we will be able to validate the findings and governance theory presented by Ferenczi for cultural applicability in our context.
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