

“You Will Know Them by Their Fruits”

*A Report on the Evaluation of “Phase Three”
of the St. Andrew’s College Master of Divinity Program*

St. Andrew’s College Academic Committee
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
September 2010



**“You Will Know Them by Their Fruits”:
A Report on the Evaluation of “Phase Three”
of the St. Andrew’s College M.Div. Program**

CONTENTS

One-Page Report Summary3

Full Report:

A. Introduction and Method

1. Phase Three: What, Why, How? 4
2. Evaluation Tools6

B. Emerging Themes

1. Graduates are engaged in stable pastoral ministries.....8
2. Phase Three is an effective educational model.....9
3. The delivery of the program is generally successful.....9

C. What’s Next?

1. Curriculum11
2. Communications and Partnership11
3. Funding.....12

Conclusion13

Appendices:

Survey Questions (5 Surveys)14
Letter to Pastoral Charge Board Secretaries20

**“You Will Know Them by Their Fruits”:
A Report on the Evaluation of “Phase Three”
of the St. Andrew’s College M.Div. Program**

REPORT SUMMARY

Study Shows St. Andrew’s College Graduates are Doing Well in Ministry

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

September 2010

Graduates of St. Andrew’s College are engaged in stable pastoral ministries. So says a recent review of the St. Andrew’s College integrative internship/study program. The model, which intersperses a 16-month ½-time internship with 10-day college courses, saw its first graduates in 2004. By March 2010:

- 31 had completed the program
- 26 had been ordained
- 5 had been approved and expected to be ordained in 2010
- Of the 26 ordained:
 - 25 were still in active congregational ministry
 - 1 was retained on the ministry roll (raising young children)
 - 24 were settled in rural or small town pastoral charges
 - 21 were still on their settlement pastoral charges
 - 4 had moved once to a new pastoral charge
 - 3 of the 4 who had moved continue to serve rural or small town congregations; the 4th was serving a mid-sized prairie town
 - They had been settled at ordination in 7 Conferences across the United Church.

Comments from the ordinands’ settlement congregations affirm the effectiveness of their ministries. The graduates were variously described as: “a gem,” “our spiritual leader,” “completely dedicated to her faith and her congregation,” “a wonderful minister,” and “more than our minister ... our dear friend, without compromising all she offers as our spiritual guide.”

The program itself also received positive reviews from both graduates and those in congregational internship sites. The review team created a series of electronic surveys aimed at all participants in the program: graduates, faculty, internship supervisors, lay supervision team members, internship consultants, members of Conference-level committees, and members of congregations where graduates were settled as ordinands. Of the 67 survey respondents, 90% or more indicated “agreement” or “strong agreement” with the most of the program’s goals and outcomes. Further, 89% of graduate respondents “strongly agree” that they would recommend this program model to potential ministry students.

As the United Church reconsiders internship, St. Andrew’s College will continue to employ an integrated model of ministry practice and academic reflection. It will seek for ways to assist both students and church leaders and congregations in “catching the vision” of partnership in a faithful, integrated learning experience.

“You Will Know Them by Their Fruits”

A Report on the Evaluation of “Phase Three” of the St. Andrew’s College M.Div. Program

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
September 2010

“Every good tree bears good fruit,” says Matthew’s Jesus (Mt. 7:17). A good program of theological study should produce good leaders for the church and its gospel mission. In 2001 St. Andrew’s College embarked on a new curricular design for the internship and final year of the Master of Divinity program. This new educational model required approval from the national church, and deep cooperation among the church bodies – committees and congregations – that oversee and host internships in the prairie/Northwest region. It also called for new courses to be offered by St. Andrew’s College faculty, and it asked students to adapt to a new pattern for academic study, the practice of pastoral ministry, and the integration of both.

By 2010, 31 persons had completed the “new” program and graduated with M.Div. degrees. In 2009 College and church leaders agreed that it was time to evaluate the model. The Academic Committee of the college constituted a committee of five¹ to undertake the evaluation. This committee reported its findings to the College Academic Committee in May 2010.

Through three sections: Introduction and Method, Emerging Themes, and What’s Next? (plus two Appendices: Survey Questions, and Letter to Settlement Congregations), we invite you to taste and see what St. Andrew’s College discovered about the fruits of its educational endeavours.

A. INTRODUCTION AND METHOD

1. “Phase Three”: What, Why, How?

St. Andrew’s College became a pioneer in the internship process when it instituted a 10-month internship in 1976, to be integrated into the B.D. (now M.Div.) degree program between the second and third (final) year of study. At that time all other candidates for ordained ministry in the United Church of Canada completed “summer fields” between their first and second, and second and third academic years as their internship requirement.

By 1989, all UCC candidates were completing 8-month internships, somewhat on the model of St. Andrew’s, although only St. Andrew’s included extensive faculty involvement (chairing the evaluation meetings at the internship site, reading monthly journals and book reports) and concentrated over half of the final year’s academic study on a “Post Internship Learning Cooperative.” Meanwhile at St. Andrew’s College new concerns had emerged:

¹Committee members are named at conclusion of this report.

- The need to make training for ordination more accessible to persons whose ability to move for education and internship was limited (i.e., limit the number of household “moves” required for ordination education).
- The hope for a deeper and more consistent integration of ministry practice and academic work.
- The desire for students to have more time, including the full sweep of the church year (rather than just September to April) to learn and grow in supervised ministry.

Conversation and consultation began, and by 2001 the Committee on Ministry Vocations of the national church was ready to grant approval for St. Andrew’s to “pilot” a three-phase program:

- *Phase One (30 credits)* to be taken either on campus or off campus by distance education (through a series of introductory level regional cluster courses and internet courses) and/or transfer courses.
- *Phase Two (30 credits)* to be taken on campus. This phase focuses on pastoral studies and the Integration Seminar, which includes a social ministry field placement.
- *Phase Three (60 credits)* to include the 16-month half-time internship (normally September to December) and 30 credits of course work, of which 18 credits are 4 10-day Learning Circles.

The St. Andrew’s College internship continues to be directed and overseen by the Conference Committee on Internship and Educational Supervision, but as with previous St. Andrew’s models, there is also college input via a College Internship Coordinator, who sits on each of the three prairie/northwest Conference CIES bodies, and through regular contact with the student’s faculty advisor throughout the internship. The intern shares monthly journals and evaluation materials with the faculty advisor, who may write a brief report for the evaluation processes.

The entire St. Andrew’s M.Div. program was evaluated in a more general way as part of the processes of self-study for accreditation, most recently for the 2007 accreditation visit by the Association of Theological Schools (ATS). Both a graduate survey and a narrative evaluation took place then. However, the college and its partners recognized the need to review the internship portion of the program more intensively, since its innovative approach to internship once again places St. Andrew’s and its internship participants in a “pioneering” role.

The review committee recognized that would not be realistic to believe that it could isolate Phase Three completely from other aspects of the M.Div. program, but it attempted to **focus on the things that make Phase Three distinct, particularly *the interplay of theory and practice* as students undertake ministry roles and activities, and reflect on them in academic contexts.**

The committee determined that its task would be to show a clear set of goals and outcomes, relating to both the learning and the delivery of Phase Three, and demonstrate the extent to which these goals and outcomes are being fulfilled by the program.

2. Evaluation Tools

The committee created a list of graduates of the program, including their internship sites and their history of pastoral service. Three students between 2001 and 2010 entered Phase Three but did not complete the program; they were not included in the evaluation. At the time of the evaluation process there were six students currently on or about to begin internship; these, too, were not included in the evaluation.

The committee determined that the “stakeholders” in the Phase Three process could be divided into five groups (recognizing that some stakeholders belong to more than one group) The number in square brackets represents the number of persons the committee could identify and contact in each group:

- Graduates of the program [31]
- Learning Site Participants in the program (internship supervisors, Lay Supervision Teams [LSTs], internship consultants, non-supervising ministry personnel) [54]
- College Personnel (faculty, internship coordinator, pastor in residence) [7]
- Conference Committee members (Committees on Internship and Educational Supervision; Conference Education and Students Committees) [17]
- Members of Congregations who have received Phase Three graduates as ordained ministers. [26]

The committee prepared a set of statements for each group (Appendix I). These statements were drawn from several sources. First and most importantly, they reflect goals or outcomes the College has stated for the program. These appear in the “Outcomes Document” for the M.Div. program, particularly those that relate to praxis. Statements also came from other college documents relating to the program. In an effort to build on research already completed, the committee turned to surveys results reported in the ATS journal *Theological Education*.² Finally, statements were drawn from the various church constituencies involved in or affected by the program.

The committee used this data to build five on-line (electronic) surveys. Each survey consisted of sets of statements relating to the *students’ competencies*, and/or the *administration of the program*, and/or the *academic portion* of the program, depending on the stakeholders. The participant was asked to select one of five options in relation to each statement:

Strongly Agree/Agree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unable to Evaluate

There were also opportunities within each survey to provide narrative responses.

Each identified stakeholder received, by e-mail, an invitation with a pass code and a deadline for completing the survey on-line. (Each invitee could only complete the survey once.) For members of congregations who had received St. Andrew’s Phase Three graduates as ordained ministers, there was not available e-mail information, so the committee mailed a

² See in particular John Dreibelbis and David Gortner, “Beyond Wish Lists for Pastoral Leadership: Assessing Clergy Behavior and Congregational Outcomes to Guide Seminary Curriculum,” *Theological Education* 40 (2005 – Supplement), 25-49.

letter to each congregation with a request to participate (Appendix II). **A total of 135 individuals or congregations received an invitation to participate in the survey.**

The committee members could see who had completed the surveys, but the survey results remained anonymous within each survey group. Reminders were sent out twice to those who had not yet completed the survey: with one week remaining before the deadline, and with 36 hours remaining.

A total of 67 persons completed the survey. This represents 50% of those invited. There was numerically strong response to the survey invitation by graduates, learning site participants and College personnel. It was poor for Conference committee members and for the congregations being served by graduates, the latter of whom had to take the extra step of phoning or sending an e-mail to the committee in order to participate. Surveys were completed as follows:

- Graduates: 19 or 61%
- Learning Site Participants: 31 or 57%
- College Personnel: 7 or 100%
- Conference Committee members: 5 or 29%
- Ordinands' Congregations: 5 or 19%

The Learning Site cohort consisted of Supervisors (44%); LST Members (28%); Consultants (22%) and Non-Supervising Ministry Personnel (6%).

The survey program generated both numerical and percentage graphs for each multiple-choice item in each survey. Each group also had the opportunity to offer comments to supplement their multiple-choice responses to the survey. These generated numerous and occasionally lengthy narrative responses, particularly from graduates and learning site participants.

*"...Whatever comes up,
I always find an answer or way to manage...
my training in the St Andrew's program
has prepared me so well.."*

- Phase Three Graduate

*... "The fact that they were there
over the course of a church year,
and the seasons of
life and worship,
enabled all of us to grow."*

- Internship Site Participant

B. EMERGING THEMES

It is a challenging task to assess common themes that emerge from this study. It encompasses lay and ordered persons scattered across a wide geography. During the years 2002-2010 there were changes of structure and personnel in both church and academy. As in any educational setting some individuals were better suited and/or prepared than others to undertake a role in this program. One would need to conduct similar research with clergy who were trained by other methods to assess fully the merits of this curriculum. However, within the diversity of the groups involved and the quantity of survey data generated, we can make some common observations about “Phase Three.”

1. Graduates of “Phase Three” are engaged in stable pastoral ministries.

The Phase Three program produces ministry personnel who are engaged in stable ministries in many contexts, particularly in rural and small-town Prairie/Northwest congregations. Here is some information about those who completed Phase Three from 2004 to 2010, as of March 2010:

- 31 completed the program
- 26 had been ordained (as of March 2010)
- 5 had been approved and expected to be ordained in May/June 2010
- Of the 26 ordained:
 - 25 were still in active congregational ministry
 - 1 was retained on the ministry roll (raising young children)
 - 24 were settled in rural or small town pastoral charges
 - 21 were still on their settlement pastoral charges
 - 4 had moved once to a new pastoral charge
 - 3 of the 4 who had moved continue to serve rural or small town congregations; the 4th serves a mid-sized prairie regional town
 - They had been settled at ordination in the following Conferences: Alberta/North West; Saskatchewan; Manitoba and North Western Ontario; Manitou; All Native Circle; Hamilton; Montreal and Ottawa; and Maritime.
- All 5 who were approved for ordination in 2010 were invited to be employed as “candidate supply” at their internship site following the conclusion of their internships (4 chose to do so).

Comments from the ordinands’ settlement congregations affirm the stability and effectiveness of their ministries there. The Phase Three graduates are variously described as: “a gem,” “our spiritual leader,” “completely dedicated to her faith and her congregation,” “a wonderful minister,” and “more than our minister ... our dear friend, without compromising all she offers as our spiritual guide.” Furthermore, **80% of these settlement congregations indicated they *strongly agree* that they would be open to having another St. Andrew’s College graduate serve their congregations.**

2. Phase Three is an effective educational model for internship.

The statistical data indicated an extremely high level of support for Phase Three. In areas selected by ATS, the St. Andrew's faculty, and persons on Conference committees to represent competencies in ministry, there was consistent affirmation of the program. Within the multiple-choice format, the respondents indicated **90% or more "agreement" or "strong agreement" with the most of the program's goals and outcomes.**

The narrative comments echoed this affirmation: "I am immensely grateful for the integration of class/practical work," wrote one graduate. "I also appreciated the length and part-time nature of Phase Three, as it seemed to be a much gentler learning curve." "The integration of theory and practice was greatly facilitated by the fact that I was engaged with both simultaneously," said another. A learning site participant wrote: "The time of going back to the college and reflecting on their experience is invaluable, and increases their confidence level." Said another: "I think this program is a near perfect mix of academic rigour and practical training."

Within the 17 ministry competency items there were only 5 items in which, in *any* cohort, less than 90% of the respondents "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that the program met its goals. Of these, only one represented less than 80% agreement: 74% of graduates agreed or strongly agreed with the item: "At the conclusion of Phase Three I demonstrated competence in ministry with children/youth." The learning site and settlement congregation cohorts, however, indicated more than 90% agreement with this statement. It will be addressed below in the "What's Next?" section.

The process of self-discovery and learning the tasks and habits of effective ministry is time-consuming, disruptive, and occasionally heartbreaking, for both the learner and those facilitating the learning. The Phase Three program does not eliminate the need for hard work and self-examination on the part of all those involved. However, most of the participants agree overwhelmingly that the program and its students do meet the rigorous competency outcomes the Academic Committee has set for it, and the graduates appreciate the experience (at least in retrospect!). It is noteworthy that **89% of graduate respondents strongly agree that they would recommend the Phase Three program model to potential ministry students.**

3. The delivery of the Phase Three program is generally successful.

While a highly integrated program may be educationally desirable, it can be challenging to deliver. The need to inhabit "two worlds" – the academy and the congregation – along with the other "worlds" of a student's life (family, friends, other commitments) creates a complex environment for both students and those engaged in the process with them. However, **the graduates indicated 90% or more agreement with 69% (18 of 26) of the goal statements related to program delivery and learning circles** (required courses in Phase Three). These included statements about college courses and faculty and peer mentoring, but also about some of the most stressful aspects of ministry preparation: transitions, time management, finances, support, and evaluation. "Through the learning circles I felt affirmed, challenged, and nurtured," wrote one graduate. "I appreciated having learning circles and using an integrated learning experience as opposed to having to return for a final year in

school,” wrote another, who added, “This truly helped me to prepare for study leave and continuing education now that I’m in ministry.”

Of the areas of less than 90% agreement, there were two below 80%: (1) the intern’s “match” with her/his learning site (79% agreement); and (2) the statement that the program: “facilitated mutual learning between the college and congregations of the United Church” (74% agreement). Learning site matches are the work of Conference committees, with limited input from the College. They are also highly complicated, and need to factor in geography, the congregation’s needs, and the supervisor’s skills as well as the intern’s learning needs. It is probably quite acceptable that nearly 80% of interns believed they had a *good* match.

The question of mutual learning between college and congregation is interesting because St. Andrew’s is the only ordination training college in the United Church that even imagines such a link in its curricular life, and it is a challenging one to forge. Comments indicated that graduates felt they balanced college/congregational demands adequately – albeit with difficulty. One noted: “After doing the Phase Three program with supposed half-time work, half-time study, I discovered that full-time work was a breeze. I guess I had been doing full-time study and full-time work instead!” Comments from learning sites were more divided about the value of college requirements. Some treasured the opportunity of “learning along with the intern as they did their studies.” Others felt the study requirements disrupted the pastoral relationship of the intern with the congregation(s) and wider community.

This concern fits with the areas of disagreement expressed by learning sites and conference committees. **Conference committee members and learning site participants indicated 90% or more agreement on half the items relating to program delivery. All the items ranked below 80% related to roles and communications**, the lowest of which was the respondents’ clarity about the role of the college internship coordinator – ranked “strongly agree” by all the conference committee members, but at 57% agreement by learning site participants. Learning site participants ranked their understanding of the role of the faculty advisor in the internship at 67%. Further, in the narrative comments, two learning site participants felt that the Lay Supervision Team was not well prepared, one stated that the Consultant’s role was unclear, and several said in various ways that the model was “difficult to navigate.”

Role confusion fits with the question of mutual learning and communication between internship site and college, and also suggests some consideration of the role of church committees, particularly the CIES in facilitating these relationships. These questions will be addressed further in “What’s Next?” below.

The other critique that emerged in the narrative comments was a repeated concern in the church constituency (learning sites and Conference committees) that interns are under-funded. While internship funding has been through the United Church’s history the purview of the national church, the St. Andrew’s model has elements that complicate the issue. We will therefore turn to it as well in the “What’s Next?” section.

C. WHAT'S NEXT?

As this evaluation process unfolded, the national United Church was in the throes of rethinking its internship program. Church leaders have stated that the denomination is unable to continue to fund internships from national church budgets. New models are emerging and will be employed. Thus, even with a largely affirmative review, Phase Three cannot remain the same. Whatever happens next must strive to retain the many aspects of Phase Three that have produced competent ministers and for which the College received positive feedback. It should also strive to work on those areas where support for the existing program was less than full.

St. Andrew's, in anticipation of internship changes, has proposed a "Pilot" model for ministry training that differs only slightly from the current Phase Three. While this document cannot rehearse that proposal in its entirety, we will allude to it as we consider what happens next in relation to Phase Three.

1. What's Next? – Curriculum

Phase Three's curricular outcomes were so strongly affirmed in this study that **the College will continue to employ an integrated model of ministry practice and academic reflection.** This strong commitment has given impetus to the College's proposal to pilot a "residency program" much like internship, but lasting a full two years and engaging the ministry "resident" at the level of a ½-time to ¾-time Presbytery appointment. Further aspects of this proposal will be discussed below, but in terms of curriculum, its aims around vocational preparation will remain the same. The content of the curriculum will continue to address the outcomes stated in the survey questions, although these are open to revision as College faculty and the Academic Committee continue to assess student performance and the church's needs in an ongoing evaluation cycle.

Having lacked a tenure-track faculty member in pastoral studies throughout most of Phase Three's existence, it is not surprising that the one area where graduates experienced a gap was in preparation for ministry with children and youth. In 2009 the College hired a tenure-track faculty member in pastoral studies, who specializes in Worship and in Christian Education (for all ages, including children and youth). While this faculty position will assist in addressing that concern, the College will also need to continue to be vigilant in the area of education for ministry with children and youth, within the context of preparing candidates for comprehensive parish ministries with persons of all ages.

The College's participation in the Saskatoon Theological Union continues to offer curricular possibilities. Deeper cooperation at the level of ministry practice may further enhance the Phase Three program in future.

2. What's Next? – Communications and Partnership

The survey items that generated the least "agreement" and the most critical comments related to the challenges created by the delivery of the integrated program. While the College may harbour a vision of deeply integrated learning and an exciting partnership between the academy and the congregation, it is clear that not all the actors have caught or subscribed to that vision. **Since the college remains committed to the integrative model, it will need**

also to commit itself to several tasks: (1) communicating better the program's goals; (2) making sure that College roles are clear to both students and learning site participants; (3) keeping channels of communication and support open between College and learning sites; and (4) helping to foster a sense of partnership with learning site participants.

We need to note that during the course of Phase Three to date, the College has had three different Internship Coordinators. The most recent has been the Rev. Alison West, whose work is praised in the narrative comments sections of the survey. She set a high standard for ongoing communication among all the partners in the St. Andrew's College internship program. Because the St. Andrew's program differs from the (soon to be changed) national internship program, a good relationship between the College and the Conference CIES committees is crucial, and Rev. West forged those bonds. **Although she is now retiring from the Internship Coordinator position, the College is committed to maintaining the level of interaction and support that Rev. West established.**

Beyond that pivotal role, **the College may consider other ways to assist congregations in "catching the vision" of partnership in a faithful, integrated learning experience.** While some respondents relished the opportunity to be engaged in the interns' study process ("This was refreshing for my ministry as well," one commented), some others saw the intern's time away simply as "absence" from the necessary work of the pastoral charge. The process of ministry education should be mutually enriching for all the participants. Geographical and financial restrictions limit some of the possibilities, but it is important that congregations recognize their potential for teaching and learning about ministry and common life in the Gospel. **As the College moves into what may be the piloting of a new version of Phase Three, it is imperative that all those involved are both *informed and committed to the task*:** students, faculty, Academic Committee, supervisors, Lay Supervision Teams, consultants, and members of whatever presbytery/Conference bodies are responsible for ministry training. The quest for partnership must continue for Phase Three to succeed in future.

3. What's Next? – Funding

Church financial resources are precious gifts that are both easy and difficult to share. All the causes are worthy, but the funds are increasingly limited. In Phase Three, St. Andrew's College interns are funded at the same level as national interns, but over a 16-month rather than an 8-month period. This has created advantage for some, and difficulty for others, depending on their life circumstances. The provision of housing has been a particularly challenging concern for some learning sites. To further complicate matters, all interns (national and St. Andrew's) receive less remuneration than Designated Lay Ministers (DLMs) who are in training, as the latter are presbytery appointments and participate in the pension and benefits plans of the United Church. This creates the inequitable situation where DLMs are paid more than ordination interns, although they usually have committed less money and time to their theological education.

St. Andrew's interns are able to access the College's fairly well-endowed student bursary program to supplement their internship remuneration. However, if/when the national church ceases to fund internships, there will need to be another way to pay for the program. **The proposal to pilot a "residency" program is intended to provide funding for**

integrated practice and study by making the “residents” presbytery appointments, who will then participate in the church’s benefit plans.

This is not an entirely satisfying solution, as there are some congregations who cannot afford a ½-time presbytery appointment and have counted on the internship program to provide them with ministry personnel – in exchange for which they have become excellent and deeply committed internship learning sites for the church. We hope that there may be some provision in the national church’s new funding models to offer subsidies to these faithful “educator congregations.”

4. WHAT’S NEXT? – Further Research and Reporting

A study of this kind invites further research both into possibilities and effectiveness in ministry leadership, and into action/reflection learning models in other disciplines. We hope to share our findings with the Association of Theological Schools as well as with church constituencies within the United Church and beyond, as denominations seek for ways to train their leaders.

The commitment of St. Andrew’s Phase Three graduates to rural ministry is also worthy of further investigation. The Centre for Rural Community Leadership and Ministry (CiRCLe-M) of the Saskatoon Theological Union, might explore further the ways in which such integrated training supports and nurtures rural communities.

CONCLUSION:

The first calendar of the Presbyterian Theological College, Saskatoon, in 1914 (which became St. Andrew’s College in 1924) stated the College’s aim: “to challenge young men for the Christian ministry and to train a native clergy for Presbyterianism.” Ninety-six years later there have been many changes in the nature and contexts of Christian ministry, but the core impetus remains at St. Andrew’s: to prepare persons, in partnership with others, for Christian leadership in the prairie/northwest region. Phase Three of the Master of Divinity program is a model that helps the College to live out its mission in collaboration with educators of all kinds across this vast landscape.

“A good tree cannot bear bad fruit,” says Jesus (Mt. 7: 18). Together with its partners, and by the grace of God, the St. Andrew’s College community prays that it might continue to offer good fruit to the United Church of Canada and this good garden of Earth it strives to serve.

The Phase Three Review Committee:

Barbara Zimmerman – Committee Chair; Rep. to Academic Committee from ANW Conference

Sandra Beardsall – Professor of Church History and Ecumenics, St. Andrew’s College

Greg Parker – Graduate of Phase Three, ordained ministry in MNWO and ANW Conferences

Peggy Proctor – Assistant Academic Coordinator of Clinical Education in the School of Physical Therapy (U of S); Academic Committee member-at-large

Earl Reaburn – ANW Conference Personnel Minister

Review Report Appendix I: Questions for Phase III Evaluation Surveys

Outline:

I. For students/graduates of St. Andrew's M.Div. program

- A. Ministry Competencies**
- B. Program Delivery**
- C. Learning Circles**

II. For Learning Site Participants in the Phase III/Internship process (Supervisors, LST members, Non-supervising Ministry personnel, Consultants)

- A. Ministry Competencies**
- B. Internship Processes**

III. For St. Andrew's College Personnel (Faculty, Internship Coordinator, Pastor in Residence)

- A. Outcomes**
- B. Program Delivery**

IV. For persons in congregations whose ministry personnel include graduates of St. Andrew's College (2004 and later):

- A. Ministry Competencies**

V. For Conference Committee personnel connected to St. Andrew's College Phase III

- (CIES, Presbytery E&S)**
- A. Internship Processes**

I. For students/graduates of St. Andrew's M.Div. program:

A. Ministry Competencies:

Please respond to the following questions as they apply to you *at the conclusion of Phase III*, using the following scale:

Strongly Agree/Agree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unable to Evaluate

1. I was able to make scripture relevant for individuals and the community.
2. I was able to speak about faith in ways that were clear and understandable.
3. I was able to reflect critically on myself in ministry and in the world.
4. I was able to express my faith through action.
5. I demonstrated competence in the following ministry practices and habits:
 - a) Presiding at worship
 - b) Preaching
 - c) Conducting Funerals, Weddings, and other pastoral liturgies
 - d) Pastoral Care – visiting, counselling
 - e) Group Facilitation
 - f) Ministry with children/youth
 - g) Congregational administration
 - h) Assisting congregation members to grow in faith and discipleship
 - i) Community presence and witness
 - j) Diplomacy
 - k) Patience
 - l) Flexibility
 - m) Conflict Management
 - n) Time Management

B. Program Delivery:

Strongly Agree/Agree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unable to Evaluate

In my experience, the Phase III program:

1. Offered opportunities for effective interaction for me with College faculty
2. Encouraged upper-year students to mentor and relate to other students
3. Encouraged the interns to support and mentor one another
4. Facilitated mutual learning between the college and congregations of the United Church
5. Helped me to learn to manage time effectively
6. Helped me to develop patterns of study and reflection in the midst of ministry practice.
7. Provided a good transition for me from academic work to congregational ministry work
8. Offered appropriate feedback for my learning experiences.
9. Offered adequate opportunities for me to develop the skills and competencies I needed to do effective ministry.
10. Helped me to discern by own strengths and weaknesses
11. Helped to clarify the role of an ordained minister in the United Church of Canada
12. Enabled me to do my internship in a geographical location that was appropriate for me
13. Matched me well with my learning site
14. Operated with a clear outline of the financial and personal costs of undertaking the internship, including:
 - a) Travel and accommodation during Learning Circles
 - b) Accommodation on the internship site
 - c) Other expenses of living and studying
15. Provided adequate support to meet any unexpected challenges (e.g., problematic supervision, change in Learning Site)
16. Offered useful formal evaluation reports and meetings for assessment of my preparation for ministry
17. Is a model I would recommend to potential ministry students.

C. Learning Circles:

Please reflect on the learning circles as you experienced them, using the following scale:

Strongly Agree/Agree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unable to Evaluate

1. *Learning Circle One: Skills and Identity in Ministry* – helped me, early in the internship, to confirm my vocation and to reflect on my identity in ministry and the practice of ministry.
2. *Learning Circle Two: The United Church of Canada – History, Theology and Polity* – helped me to deepen my understanding of the denomination and integrate that learning into the practice of ministry.
3. *Learning Circle Three: Cross-Cultural Experience* – helped me to integrate learning about another culture and persons who are marginalized in society with my learning about myself in ministry.
4. *Learning Circle Four: Who am I in Pastoral Ministry?* – helped me, near the end of my internship, to confirm my skills for ministry and reflect on my identity as a pastoral minister.
5. The learning circles helped to model good peer support practices in ministry
6. The timing of the learning circles was appropriate for my learning and my internship work.
7. I looked forward to attending learning circles.

II. For Learning Site Participants in the Phase III/Internship process (Supervisors, LST members, Non-supervising Ministry personnel, Consultants):

A. Ministry Competencies

Please respond to the following questions as they relate to St. Andrew's College interns *at the conclusion of their internships*. Since we are attempting to evaluate the program, not specific interns, if you worked with more than one intern, please respond with a choice that represents the "average" of your experience. There will be an opportunity for written comment at the end of this section. Please use the following scale:

Strongly Agree/Agree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unable to Evaluate

1. They made scripture relevant for individuals and the community.
2. They spoke about faith in ways that were clear and understandable.
3. They were able to reflect critically on themselves in ministry and in the world.
4. They expressed their faith through action.
5. They demonstrated competence in the following ministry practices and habits:
 - a) Presiding at worship
 - b) Preaching
 - c) Conducting funerals, weddings and other pastoral worship services
 - d) Pastoral Care – visiting, counselling
 - e) Group Facilitation
 - f) Ministry with children/youth
 - g) Congregational administration
 - h) Assisting congregation members to grow in faith and discipleship
 - i) Community presence and witness
 - j) Diplomacy
 - k) Patience
 - l) Flexibility
 - m) Conflict Management
 - n) Time Management

B. Internship Processes:

Please respond to the following questions as they relate to the St. Andrew’s College internship program since 2004 (16 month internships only), using the following scale:

Strongly Agree/Agree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unable to Evaluate

1. The sixteen-month half-time internship allowed this pastoral charge to receive ministry that otherwise it could not have afforded financially to receive.
2. The opportunity to offer an educational experience to a person preparing for ordained ministry was an important factor in this pastoral charge’s decision to seek an intern.
3. The congregation was adequately prepared to receive and support the intern.
4. The intern’s relationship with the College during the internship encourages the integration of academic learning and learning about the practice of ministry.
5. The program facilitates good communication between the college and church constituencies.
6. The program facilitates mutual learning between the college and congregations of the United Church.
7. The role of the St. Andrew’s College internship coordinator in the internship process was clear to me.
8. The role of the intern’s faculty advisor in the internship process was clear to me.
9. The evaluation reports were useful for providing information helpful to the assessment of the intern’s preparation for ministry.
10. I would be open to working with a St. Andrew’s College intern again in the future.

Narrative:

Some rewards of having an intern on this pastoral charge were: _____

Other comments about the process of internship _____

III. For St. Andrew’s College Personnel (Faculty, Internship Coordinator, Pastor in Residence):

A. Outcomes:

In my experience, graduates of the Phase III program demonstrate the following competencies (based on Curriculum Outcomes document):

Strongly Agree/Agree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unable to Evaluate

1. Ability to articulate the relevance of scripture for individuals and the community of faith today.
2. Ability to apply key theological concepts of the Christian faith in relevant ways in ministry settings.
3. Ability to appropriate and interpret critically the history of Christianity for contemporary church and ministry.
4. Ability to analyze critically current moral problems and ethical stances and their relationship to ministry.
5. Ability to reflect critically on themselves in ministry and in the world.
6. Ability to engage in and reflect upon actual ministry situations
7. Integration of ministry practices and pastoral theology studies with the rest of the theological program.

Other comments _____

B. Program Delivery:

In my experience, the Phase III program:

Strongly Agree/Agree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unable to Evaluate

1. Enhances the learning community at the college
2. Offers opportunities for effective interaction between faculty and students.
3. Encourages upper-year students to mentor and relate to other students
4. Encourages the intern cohort to support and mentor one another
5. Facilitates good communication between the college and church constituencies
6. Facilitates mutual learning between the college and congregations of the United Church
7. Offers evaluation reports that are useful for providing information for the assessment of the intern's preparation for ministry.
8. Creates "ministry ready" candidates for ordination.
9. Offers me sufficient opportunity for academic/intellectual engagement with the Phase III students.
10. Offers me sufficient opportunity for pastoral/personal interaction with the Phase III students.

Other comments _____

IV. For persons in congregations whose ministry personnel include graduates of St. Andrew's College (2004 and later):

A. Ministry Competencies

Please respond to the following questions as they relate to clergy who have served your congregation/pastoral charge as *graduates of the St. Andrew's College M.Div. program*. If you have worked with more than one graduate, please respond with a choice that represents the "average" of your experience, using the following scale:

Strongly Agree/Agree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unable to Evaluate

1. They make scripture relevant for individuals and the community.
2. They speak about faith in ways that are clear and understandable.
3. They are able to reflect critically on themselves in ministry and in the world.
4. They express their faith through action.
5. They demonstrate competence in the following ministry practices and habits:
 - a) Presiding at worship
 - b) Preaching
 - c) Conducting Funerals, Weddings, and other pastoral worship services
 - e) Pastoral Care – visiting, counselling
 - f) Group Facilitation
 - g) Ministry with children/youth
 - h) Congregational administration
 - i) Assisting and encouraging congregation members to grow in faith and discipleship
 - j) Community presence and witness
 - k) Planning and visioning leadership with the congregation
 - j) Diplomacy
 - k) Patience
 - l) Flexibility
 - m) Conflict Management
 - n) Time Management

6. In future, should this congregation require another ministry person, I would be open to having another St. Andrew's College graduate serve this congregation.

Other Comments _____

V. For Conference Committee personnel connected to St. Andrew's College Phase III (CIES, Presbytery E&S):

A. Internship Processes:

Please respond to the following questions as they relate to the St. Andrew's College internship program since 2004 (16 month internships only), using the following scale:

Strongly Agree/Agree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unable to Evaluate

1. The sixteen-month half-time internship allows pastoral charges to receive ministry and offer an educational opportunity that otherwise would not be able to do so.
2. The intern's relationship with the College during the internship encourages the integration of academic learning and learning about the practice of ministry.
3. The program facilitates good communication between the college and church constituencies.
4. The program facilitates mutual learning between the college and congregations of the United Church.
5. The financial aspects and responsibilities of the 16-month half-time internship are clear to me, especially as they relate to:
 - a) The national church/congregational funding of the internship
 - b) Accommodation on the internship site
 - c) The intern's access to the College Bursary Fund
6. The processes and accountabilities of the program are clear and transparent.
7. The role of the St. Andrew's College internship coordinator in the internship process was clear to me.
8. The role of the intern's faculty advisor in the internship process was clear to me.
9. The program produces "ministry ready" candidates for ordination in the United Church.

Other comments about the internship process _____

**APPENDIX II: LETTER TO BOARD SECRETARIES
OF SETTLEMENT CONGREGATIONS**

March 1, 2010

Greetings from St. Andrew's College!

The College has always valued its partnership with the congregations for whom it prepares ministers and other leaders. Now we would like your assistance in a review of our program.

In 2004 the first graduates of our newly revised Master of Divinity program were ordained in the United Church of Canada. Since then, your pastoral charge has received at least one of our graduates through settlement or call.

We have created a **short on-line survey** (5-10 minutes) for pastoral charges who have settled St. Andrew's graduates since 2004, and **we hope that you or someone from your charge will complete it**. The survey will help us gauge whether the College's program is effective in preparing competent and faithful ministers for United Church congregations.

Access to the survey is through an e-mail that will be sent to the person who will fill out the survey. Since we are not sure who that might be in your charge, we ask that you or the designated person kindly contact us, so that we may add you to the e-mail invitation list.

Please send the name and e-mail address to Prof. Sandra Beardsall:

sandra.beardsall@usask.ca

or call her at: 1-877-644-8970

no later than March 26, 2010.

That person will then receive an e-mail invitation, with a link to the on-line survey and a special "code word" to allow that person access to the survey.

Thank you so much for your willingness to help us offer a strong and relevant education for faith and ministry!

Sincerely,

(Rev.) Barbara Zimmerman
Chair, Phase III Review Committee