

LANCASTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PAYING ATTENTION: COMPARISON OF DESIRED CHARACTERISTICS  
OF MINISTERIAL LEADERSHIP IN THE UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY  
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE  
DOCTOR OF MINISTRY

BY  
KAY S. RADER

LANCASTER, PENNSYLVANIA  
MAY, 2012

Kay S. Rader

Paying Attention: Comparison of Desired Characteristics  
of Ministerial Leadership in the United Church of Christ

May, 2012

APPROVED BY:

Dr. Lee Barrett  
Project Supervisor

The Rev. Dr. Donald Freeman  
Reader

Dr. Anne Thayer  
Chair, Doctor of Ministry Committee

April 30, 2012

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	5
PROLOGUE	6
INTRODUCTION	9
The Research Topic	9
Methodological Approach	9
Key Concepts and Definitions	10
Significance of the Question for Ministry	17
CHAPTER 1: Presuppositions and Hypotheses Relevant to the Topic	23
CHAPTER 2: The Typology and Its Use	37
Development of the Method	37
Description of the Types	47
Units and Objects of Analysis	73
CHAPTER 3: The Results of Applying the Typology	76
Analysis of Local Guidelines	77
Analysis of National Guidelines	127
CHAPTER 4: Comparisons, Conclusions, and Recommendations	150
APPENDICES	161
APPENDIX A	161
<i>Lancaster Association In Care Manual</i>	
APPENDIX B	182
“Ministry Assessment Program”	

APPENDIX C	189
“Objectives of Clinical Pastoral Education”	
APPENDIX D	190
<i>Draft 3.1, Progress to Date, Materials Shared for Use and     Comment, May 2009, Ministry Issues Pronouncement;     Implementing the Pronouncement: “Ministry Issues: Forming     and Preparing Pastoral Leaders for God’s Church” (1-21).</i>	
APPENDIX E	211
“7 Types of Pastoral Leadership” Survey Form	
WORKS CITED AND SUPPLEMENTAL BIBLIOGRAPHY	214

**ABSTRACT**

Meeting leadership needs of the United Church of Christ, which includes finding the best ways to prepare new leaders for authorization, has been a lively conversation in the denomination in recent years. A decade of study led to a national Pronouncement on ministry issues in 2005 which suggested ways to move into the future while taking into account the remarkable diversity of faith communities within the denomination.

The broad range of ecclesiologies, with their corresponding theologies of ministry, has made the denominational conversation rich, but it has also made the task of coming to consensus on ministry issues challenging. In order to gain a better understanding of our practices in preparation for creating new guidelines for authorization, one directive of the Pronouncement was to “pay attention to our theologies of ministry in the UCC, especially ordained ministry.”

This project applies an ecclesiological typology to the descriptive language in current local and national denominational guidelines for identifying, preparing, and authorizing candidates for ministry, for the purpose of comparing the preferences which are revealed in them. Preferences are arrayed, and similarities and discrepancies between local and national materials are noted. In particular, this project observes whether or not the full range of ecclesiological diversity of the United Church of Christ is reflected in the guidelines for authorization, what differences exist between the sets of guidelines in this respect, and what the significance of those differences may be. The intent of this project is to contribute to the ongoing denominational conversation.

## PROLOGUE

A denominational directive has intrigued me since I first encountered it in several documents issued prior to General Synod 25, the nationwide meeting of the United Church of Christ in 2005. A study had been presented that year to all settings of the denomination as a formal step toward addressing the need for “well prepared and faithful ministerial leadership for God’s mission in the world both now and in the future.” In that study the statement was made that we need to **“pay attention to our theologies of ministry, especially ordained ministry”** (Local Church Ministries, *Ministry Issues* 11).

How we identify, prepare, and authorize ministerial leaders in our denomination is a topic which has held my interest for many years. At the time of General Synod 25, I was in the midst of a seven year tenure as chair of one of the local committees charged with authorizing ministry on behalf of the United Church of Christ (UCC). From that perspective I had noted that a range of understandings of ministerial leadership appeared to be operative in our local Association of churches, and among the members of our committee. In addition to our interactions with individual congregations with varying concepts of what a church is and does, we also related to the many candidates for ministerial authorization in our committee’s care, each with his or her own understandings of church and ministry. In my ten years as an ordained pastor I had served as mentor and advisor to several of these candidates during the process of discernment and preparation. During this time I also taught a course to first-year students at Lancaster Theological Seminary, helped lead several ministerial formation groups at the seminary, and co- led a peer support group for pastors in their first five years of ministry. Through these

encounters I was becoming aware of the wide range of ministerial leadership concepts existing among the various partners in the authorization process.

The differences that exist among local church settings were made even more evident to me as I made the transition in 2009 from serving a small town congregation with its more traditional understandings of being church to a small city congregation with a more progressive, emerging model. This expanded my vision of leadership characteristics which might be valued.

Participation in several General Synod gatherings during which the matter of authorizing ministry has been debated has deepened my desire to be part of the conversation. A key observation that has come to the forefront in these discussions is that, in order to truly be the incarnational body of Christ, we need to listen to voices from multiple perspectives on ministry. This is especially true in a denomination remarkable for both its diversity and its commitment to unity.

These experiences have made me increasingly curious about the following questions:

**Are we paying attention to our diverse theologies of ministry, especially in regard to ordained ministry, and how is that being done? Is the full range of ecclesiological diversity in our denomination reflected in the guidelines we follow for authorizing ordination?**

**What historical and contemporary ecclesiologies can be discerned in the language of the materials we use, and how do local and national guidelines compare in these matters?**

Other questions arise from and are supportive of these: What preferences are represented by the innate characteristics that seem to be considered desirable and looked for in prospective candidates? What is being nurtured in the discernment process? What characteristics are being selectively tested for or looked for in the reporting received from outside sources? What pastoral skills are deemed essential? Of the range of ecclesiologies that are represented in the guidelines,

do some appear to be given more weight than others? How adequately are the diverse understandings of ministry and church represented in these documents and procedures? And, since it is the role of a local Committee on the Ministry to authorize ministry on behalf of the whole denomination, what are the implications of such differences?

The challenge was how to study these characteristics in a systematic way. I first became intrigued with the possibility of using a typology for this purpose through a lecture given by Dr. Lee Barrett, Professor of Systematic Theology at Lancaster Theological Seminary, at an annual consultation of UCC judicatory committees in the mid-Atlantic region. In surveying other similarly designed typologies a possible method emerged. The development of that methodology is explained in more detail in Chapter 2, "Typology and Its Use."

Our local judicatory committee offered a possible setting for such research in that it has a high level of activity in authorizing ordained ministry, routinely working with five or more persons in the discernment process at any given time. This committee also maintains a set of written documents and guidelines that have been produced and authorized for its use in conjunction with denominational materials. I had lived with those materials a long time and knew them well.

The timing also seemed right for this kind of a study. The national church is currently engaged in producing draft documents recommending changes in the existing national guidelines for authorizing ministry. Several drafts in various forms have been circulated among all settings, and feedback has been encouraged, so an analysis of this kind could be a helpful contribution to the ongoing discussion.



## INTRODUCTION

### The Research Topic

The aim of this study is to discern preferences within the United Church of Christ concerning desirable characteristics of ministerial leadership through the use of a typology. The purpose for using the typology is to identify significant similarities or discrepancies between ministerial leadership preferences in locally and nationally produced guidelines for practices of finding, preparing, and authorizing candidates for ordained ministry in the United Church of Christ.

The larger question under which this particular research question falls is how the denomination's needs for "well prepared and faithful ministerial leadership for God's mission in the world both now and in the future" are being met in regard to the diversity of understandings of church and ministry (Local Church Ministries, *Ministry Issues* 1). This study addresses one of the named aspects of that wider conversation, a directive to "pay attention to our theologies of ministry, especially ordained ministry" (1).

### Methodological Approach

It is assumed that preferences in **characteristics of ministerial leadership**, and the particular **ecclesiologies** and corresponding **theologies of ministry** they indicate, are revealed in the descriptive language of **denominational guidelines**, both local and national. Under consideration are guidelines for receiving a candidate for **ordination** as a **Student In Care** (referred to in the national guidelines drafts as a **Member in Discernment**) of the local **Association**, the periodic assessment of that candidate for the renewing of status as a Student In

Care (referred in national drafts as **In Covenant of Discernment and Formation**), and the determining of readiness of a candidate for ordination.

Characteristics of ministerial leadership are more than mere preferences. Rather, arrayed through use of a typology, they reflect broad theological concepts of church and ministry. A **typology** is a set of ideal types for the purpose of identification and classification. In the context of this study, the use of a typology makes the ecclesiological patterns and theologies of ministry underlying the characteristics apparent.

### **Key Concepts and Definitions.**

The United Church of Christ affirms the concept of ministry in its broadest sense, aligning with virtually all confessional traditions (*Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry*, “Ministry,” paragraph 6) in the belief that “God calls the whole Church and every member to participate in and extend the ministry of Jesus Christ.” Furthermore, all are “authorized” for this ministry by baptism (United Church of Christ, *Constitution*, Article VI, paragraph 20). It is also affirmed that “God calls certain of its members to various forms of ministry in and on behalf of the church for which ecclesiastical authorization is required” (paragraph 21).

In this study, a **theology of ministry** refers to the concept of leadership that is informed by a particular **ecclesiology** or understanding of the nature and purpose of the Christian church. An ecclesiology is itself based upon a particular theology or understanding of the nature of God. The underlying theology of ministry of a believing community determines which qualities of its leaders, or **characteristics of ministerial leadership**, are valued or assumed to be necessary. This in turn informs how its leaders are to be identified, called forth, prepared, and authorized.

The objects of this study are denominational guidelines produced in both local and national settings. Local materials include **manuals and other documents** adopted through official action of the Lancaster Association, Penn Central Conference, for use in the process of authorizing ordained ministry. These materials were developed in response to a directive in the *UCC Manual on Ministry: Perspectives and Procedures for Ecclesiastical Authorization of Ministry* (produced in 1986 by the national church and updated in 2002), which states: “Each Association, guided by this *Manual*, establishes its own criteria and processes by which it examines and authorizes persons for ministry” (Local Church Ministries, *UCC Manual on Ministry* 6). The *Lancaster Association In Care Manual* which describes these criteria and processes was first offered in written form in 2000 and has been updated with supplemental material in subsequent years as needed. It is designed for use by candidates, churches, and Committee members in conjunction with the *UCC Manual on Ministry*. Committees on the Ministry may also rely on other sources of information in order to do the work of ecclesiastical authorization. The Lancaster Association considers evaluative information from outside sources, such as the results of required ministry assessment testing and supervisory reports from Clinical Pastoral Education. This material is described in detail in Chapter 3.

*Draft 3.1, Progress to Date, Materials Shared for Use and Comment, October 2008, Ministry Issues Pronouncement; Implementing the Pronouncement: “Ministry Issues: Forming and Preparing Pastoral Leaders for God’s Church”* is the national document under consideration in this study. It was produced by the **Ministry Issues Implementation Committee** in collaboration with the **Parish Life and Leadership Team, Local Church Ministries** of the United Church of Christ. While this document is not intended to replace the 2002 *UCC Manual on Ministry* at this time, it is intended to augment it. *Draft 3.1* is the most

recent working paper offering guidelines to “aid the United Church of Christ in finding, preparing and authorizing the leaders God is calling from and for it” (*Draft 3.1* 1), and it reflects the current state of the denominational conversation regarding authorization of ministry. The particular sections evaluated are the introductory portions and “Marks of Faithful and Effective Authorized Ministers.” Samplings of some additional sections which have not yet been completed are also included in the *Draft*.

*Draft 3.1* is an outcome of ongoing work by the national **Ministry Issues Implementation Committee**, based upon directives in the **Pronouncement** adopted by **General Synod 25** in 2005, *Ministry Issues: Forming and Preparing Pastoral Leaders for God’s Church* (which will be referred to hereafter as “Pronouncement on ministry issues”). A **Pronouncement** is a statement of Christian conviction on a matter of moral or social principle, one form of communicating formal motions for consideration by the denomination as a whole. A pronouncement is intended to be foundational theologically for other proposals for actions or resolutions – a contribution to the practical theology of the denomination. The UCC gathers biennially as **General Synod**, a representative body comprised of voting delegates, associate delegates, and visitors, to engage in such work of the whole. The Pronouncement on ministry issues was developed in response to voiced concerns from multiple settings that current ordination practices are not helpful to, and in some cases stand in the way of, the development and empowerment of potential leaders, especially from our non-Euro-American communities and from rural communities. The United Church of Christ has stated a position that if we are to fulfill God’s call to be the faithful missional church in the world we need leaders who can share with the whole church insights from all its communities (Local Church Ministries, *Ministry Issues* 2). Therefore, in order to be more respectful of our diversity and more faithful to our

founding ideals, covenantal polity, present identity, and future visioning, a study was undertaken to consider revision of our current practices of authorizing ministry.

One outcome of the discussion has been the development of a set of preliminary recommendations for changes in practice, including alternatives to the traditional college-and-seminary path to ordination. Another significant outcome has been feedback from participants who see the need for a more thorough consideration of the theologies of ministry behind what we do. These are related to our historic practices (of both dominant and lesser-known streams that have made up the UCC); our current understanding of the nature of church, mission, and leadership in a climate of changing ecclesiology in North America; our commitment to be a multiracial and multi-cultural church, committed to peace and justice, open and affirming and accessible to all; and our covenantal understanding of ourselves, in all our diversity, as the community of Christ. A more extensive description of the evolution of this conversation in recent years is included in Chapter 1 under “Presuppositions and Hypotheses Relevant to the Topic.”

Following adoption of the Pronouncement on ministry issues in 2005, a **Ministry Issues Implementation Committee** was formed. Sub-groups were convened to continue the discussion, with one of their ultimate tasks being the development of resources and tools. As drafts of materials were prepared and distributed, comment was invited from all settings, especially from Committees on the Ministry. The work of these task groups continues within the framework of the **Parish Life and Leadership Ministry Team** which facilitates policies and practices of ministry for the denomination. It is an arm of one of the instrumentalities of the national structure, **Local Church Ministries**, whose role it is to encourage and support local congregations in their work and mission.

One of the fields of inquiry for this study is the Lancaster Association Committee on Church and Ministry. An **Association** is that part of the United Church of Christ to which the function of recognizing, authorizing, and maintaining Ordained, Commissioned, and Licensed Ministry (collectively understood as “oversight of ministry”) is normatively delegated. The guiding of persons who are considering authorized ministries in their discernment process is also included in the oversight. An Association is made up of all members of congregations of a designated (usually geographic) area, and multiple Associations are organized into wider Conferences. In some circumstances, usually for geographic reasons, authorization is performed in the Conference setting. However, the standard practice is for oversight of ministry to be assigned to the local Association, where the responsibility is assumed by a **Committee on the Ministry**. This Committee, which does its work on behalf of the whole of the United Church of Christ, is made up of clergy and laypersons elected by the members of the Association. While the national guidelines standardize the term, such Committees sometimes identify themselves by other names. The Lancaster Association designates the authorizing body as “The Committee on Church and Ministry;” however, for the purposes of this study it will hereafter be referred to by the generic title, “Association Committee on the Ministry.”

The denominational term used to identify persons who are in the process of considering authorized ministry has recently been changed. Formerly referred to as a **Student in Care** of an Association, the **Member in Discernment** is one who, having been received into a relationship of care, counsel, and guidance with a local church and Association, is in the process of preparing for one of the denomination’s three authorized ministries. Application for this status is made on behalf of the candidate by his or her local congregation. When that status has been conferred by the Association, the candidate proceeds through a series of prescribed steps with the

Association's Committee on the Ministry. (Further details about this process are offered as the objects of analysis related to it are described.)

It should be noted here that, while the extensive process of discernment and preparation for ordained ministry is overseen by the Committee on the Ministry of the Association, a final decision on whether or not a candidate is deemed ready for ordination is in the hands of the Association as a whole. An official gathering, referred to as an Ecclesiastical Council, is convened for this purpose. The *Manual on Ministry* in its guidelines on ordination (Section 3) states that "each association must determine its policy regarding whether a person is a candidate approved for ordination pending an approved call upon the decision by the Association Committee on the Ministry or upon the decision by the Association Ecclesiastical Council" (10). In the case of the Lancaster Association, the decision is made by a vote of a quorum of delegates representing its 28 congregations. The body considers and acts upon recommendations of the Committee on the Ministry based on its experience with the candidate through the discernment process. The decision is also based upon the candidate's Ordination Paper and an opportunity for questioning of and discussion with the candidate by the assembled body. A positive vote by the body affirms that the candidate is ready for authorization; however, ordination may not take place until the candidate has received an "approved call to an ordained ministry position recognized by the Association" (10).

**Ordination in the United Church of Christ** is defined in the *Constitution* as "the rite whereby the United Church of Christ through an Association, in cooperation with the person and a Local Church of the United Church of Christ, recognizes and authorizes that member whom God has called to ordained ministry, and sets that person apart by prayer and the laying on of hands. By this rite ordained ministerial standing and status as an Ordained Ministerial Partner is

conferred and authorization given to perform the duties and exercise the prerogatives of ordained ministry in the United Church of Christ” (United Church of Christ, *Constitution*, Article VI, paragraph 22). The *Constitution* further defines: “An Ordained Minister of the United Church of Christ is one of its members who has been called by God and ordained to preach and teach the gospel, to administer the sacraments and rites of the Church, and to exercise pastoral care and leadership” (Article VI, paragraph 23).

While the work of Committees on the Ministry includes the authorization, support, and oversight of all three forms of authorized ministry in the UCC (Ordained, Licensed, and Commissioned), and the discernment process leading to them, the scope of this study is limited to procedures surrounding ordained ministry. Commissioning, while similar to ordination in the portability of its authorization from one setting of the church to another, is unique in that it authorizes a lay member for a specific church-related ministry. It is noted in the Pronouncement on ministry issues that, on theological grounds, Ordained and Licensed Ministries of the denomination are “identical in purpose” (Local Church Ministries, *Ministry Issues* 7). They differ, however, in that authorization for Licensed Ministry is not transferrable from one setting to another, yearly renewal of authorization is normative in current practice, and ministry is done under supervision. Also, licensing as it is currently practiced is a relatively recent means of authorizing ministry in the denomination, and the discussion surrounding it at this time is sufficiently complex to merit study on its own. Because of the longer history of both practice of and conversation about ordination within the UCC, I have chosen to focus my research on this form.

Ordination as practiced in the denomination is a synthesis of historic polities that include both “empowerment” and “embodiment” understandings. An empowerment view perceives



ordained ministry as grounded in the functions of the office, based primarily on specific needs of the church, and closely tied to a particular location. The embodiment model, based on a more sacramental and priestly view, centers on the gifts and “nature of the person” and his or her special calling (Zikmund, “Setting Apart” 83-84). These two understandings continue to play a role in the ongoing practices in the denomination, as will be noted. Ordination in the UCC is discussed further in Chapter 1, Presuppositions and Hypotheses Relevant to the Topic.

## **Significance of the Question for Ministry**

### ***The Implications of Covenantal Polity***

In the course of a conversation on theologies of ministry in the UCC, the word **covenant** is heard frequently because it is a concept fundamental to the life and ethos of the denomination. The organizational structure of the UCC is based on the understanding that “each expression of the church has responsibilities and rights in relation to the others, to the end that the whole church will seek God’s will and be faithful to God’s mission.” The implication of such a covenantal polity is that various settings of the church are to make decisions collaboratively, endeavoring to honor the perspectives of the other parts. Operative verbs include “listen...honor...carefully consider” as “the various expressions of the United Church of Christ seek to walk together in all God’s ways” (United Church of Christ, *Constitution*, Article III, paragraph 6).

Peter Schmiechen has noted the complexities of covenantal polity when “multiple definitions of the church are at work” in a denomination as diverse as the UCC. In addition to the four streams of the Congregational, Christian, Evangelical, and Reformed Churches which

have been assumed as a sort of “historical orthodoxy” for the UCC, it has been noted that the story of the denomination includes many racial and ethnic ecclesial communities, and thus it parallels the pluralism of American History (Zikmund, “Unity and Diversity” 1). There has also been a significant increase in the number of new ethnic congregations in the past decade. In his report to General Synod 24 in 2003, Josef Malayang, Executive Minister of Local Church Ministries at the time, shared the information that of the new and renewing UCC churches since 2001, thirty-two percent are Pacific Islander/Asian American, twenty-nine percent Euro-American, twenty-four percent African American, nine percent Hispanic, seven percent envisioned as intentionally multi-racial/multicultural, and twenty-nine percent open and affirming of persons of all sexual orientations (Malayang, “Address” 2).

The result is that a multitude of leadership understandings exist side by side. National arms of the denomination are not necessarily of the same mind as local congregations - and, by extension, Associations - which have developed from a variety of historical streams (Schmiechen 53). This circumstance continues to pose challenges to communication among the diverse settings of the church. Furthermore, we in the UCC have only recently attempted to broaden the conversation about our theological differences, even though many intra-denominational critiques (including the Pronouncement on ministry issues) have indicated that theology ought to be seen as a fundamental starting point. As we seek to address ministry issues, it is hoped that studies such as this one might advance the dialogue so essential in the UCC between local and national settings.

### *Usefulness for the Local Committee on the Ministry*

At the present time, the denomination is working toward changes in its processes as multiple paths to authorization for ministry are being envisioned. As the denomination continues

to diversify through the incorporation of new ethnic faith communities, alternative means of identifying, calling out, authorizing, and nurturing leadership are being recognized as part of an already historically varied mix. The work of Committees on the Ministry is becoming increasingly challenging as unfamiliar territory is entered. A more thorough understanding of the theological bases upon which local practices are founded could be a helpful starting point.

The clarifying of theological grounding for practices may provide information useful to the Lancaster Association Committee on the Ministry, especially as it considers modifying its current practices to respond to changing needs and increased diversity. In agreeing to consider drafts of national guidelines this Committee has indicated a willingness to take a closer look at its own practices, and indeed it has been engaged in that work for some time. Information gathered through this study may benefit the local Committee by shedding light on what is currently being prioritized, and it is hoped that this will provide the basis for conversation. New insights may suggest directions for further study.

Outcomes of this research may also offer the Lancaster Association (and other Committee on the Ministry as well) a more effective way to compare its leadership preferences and priorities with those of the wider setting. It may open the door for the local Committee to learn more about perspectives which are less familiar in its own context, yet are part of the collective experience of the United Church of Christ.

### ***Usefulness in the National Setting***

Former UCC General Minister and President John Thomas in his introductory remarks to *Multiple Paths to Ministry* by Barker and Martin affirms that there is a crisis in leadership that is far-reaching, and that while scarcity is the presenting problem, the issue is indeed theological.

Rather than a question of how to attract persons to and train them for ministry, what we face may

have more to do with how we understand of the nature of ministry itself (Thomas vii). But, as Norman Jackson has observed from his role as one who has been deeply engaged in the denominational discussion, there has been “a strange and noisy silence regarding the purposes of it all” (Jackson 3).

It has often been noted that, while there is agreement on the need to call forth and authorize persons for ministry, the denomination has never successfully addressed the tensions mentioned earlier that exist among concepts of ministry which were brought together in the merger through which the UCC was formed in 1957. To illustrate how these tensions play out, I note that the ordination vows (describing ministerial role) in the denomination’s *Book of Worship* are almost entirely functional in nature. This is typical of the empowerment model; that is, they describe the activity of the ordained as largely skill-based and able to be taught. On the other hand, while the standing of an ordained minister may be revoked by the Association for good cause, in effect rendering that person unable to be called to a ministry setting within the denomination, the person’s ordination is considered irrevocable, as is baptism (Zikmund, “Empowerment and Embodiment” 87). This is typical of an embodiment, or ontological, understanding of ordination. These tensions, and the resulting complexities of the process of call, are most keenly felt by Committees on the Ministry in the actual practice of authorization. They present a challenge to the Parish Life and Leadership Ministry Team as well as it seeks to provide guidance helpful in a wide variety of local settings. A closer look at how these tensions are manifested in various theologies of ministry may offer useful information for that ongoing work.

The Pronouncement on ministry issues called for action on several fronts, one of them (addressed in particular to Seminaries of the United Church of Christ) being “to engage with the

Council for Theological education *and other settings of the church* to articulate theological understandings of ministry” (Local Church Ministries, *Ministry Issues* 11). The need for theological understandings of ministry is also lifted up in the section devoted to implementation of the Pronouncement by local churches (11). It was in response to these proposals for action that the Parish Life and Leadership Ministry Team delegated one of its task groups to specifically take into consideration theologies of ministry in relation to implementation of this document. This study also attempts to respond to that concern.

### ***Facilitating the Covenantal Conversation Among Settings***

In a broader sense, this research responds to a desire that has been expressed within the denomination to strengthen contributions from all settings through clarification of perspectives on the authorization of ministry, particularly taking into account diverse theological stances. The information gathered may be helpful to the national church in its ongoing study of the nature of our denominational practice.

Drafts of the guidelines have been made available on the UCC website, [www.ucc.org](http://www.ucc.org), with the following invitation from the Ministry Issues Implementation Committee extended to all settings of the denomination: “We hope that you will read and use these materials as you participate in calling, preparing, and supporting leaders for the United Church of Christ. We invite you to let us know what works well, what needs more attention, what you suggest as improvements. . . . Build on your own experience as well as the materials offered here. Share your experiences and suggestions” (Local Church Ministries, *Draft 3.1* 4). Based upon the ongoing conversation this has fostered, the draft guidelines continue to be revised and improved. It is anticipated that insight into similarities and differences in leadership preferences of these

two settings, local and national, may enrich this discussion by offering another way to bring these settings into conversation with one another on the larger questions of this study. These are: How is the valuing of diversity in our denomination reflected in the guidelines we follow for authorizing ministry? Of the range of historical and contemporary ecclesiologies that are represented, do some appear to be given more weight than others? How do local and national guidelines compare? And, since it is the role of a local Committee on the Ministry to authorize ministry on behalf of the whole denomination, what are the implications of such differences?

## **CHAPTER 1: Presuppositions and Hypotheses Relevant to the Topic**

### ***Ordination***

The UCC is faithful to its Reformation heritage when in its founding documents it affirms that the church is a servant community, and all people of God are called and empowered for ministry. It is not surprising to find the concept clearly stated in the work of Martin Luther that all baptized are “consecrated” to a priestly role: “Every Christian has the power the pope, bishops, priests and monks have” (Pauck 112). And yet, while Luther believed in the absolute sufficiency of Christ’s work and that the priest’s role of sacramental action compromised the word and distorted the concept of God’s grace, he himself said that the church “must nevertheless have teachers and preachers who work with the Word” (Haendler 61). After 1524, as he began to envision a more comprehensive structure of the church, Luther acknowledged the need for a “setting apart” of some who were “charged with the administration of the Word of God and the sacraments, which is their work and office” (30-34). Thomas Tentler has observed that in the history of the church “institutions were reformed, but always, everywhere, a special class of clergy re-emerged” (243-244). (An exception to this in Quaker practice is noted.) In the absence of any concise explanation that universally applies to the practice, one must continue to ask the fundamental question: To what end do we “set apart?”

There are no unambiguous answers to that question, nor have there ever been. Even the early church inherited a mixture of traditions and practices based on such diverse influences as Scripture, first century Judaism, and secular customs (Zikmund, “Setting Apart” 1). Context has had a powerful effect on practice throughout the church’s history. For instance, some of the leadership roles reflected in the New Testament appear to have been strongly influenced by configurations of Greek and Roman secular society. In the second and third centuries, as the

richly diverse beliefs and practices of early generations of Jesus' followers came into conflict with one another, Christianity gradually moved toward standardization into an orthodox "apostolic faith." The threat of heresy and need to defend against it required the "setting apart" of a certain kind of leadership for guaranteeing adherence to "right" belief and practice (Ehrman 5).

***Evolution of the Priestly Role.*** Schillebeeckx has described the development of ministry in the church as "not so much . . . a historical shift from charisma to institution but a shift from the charisma of many to a specialized charisma of just a few . . . connected with a distinctive rite which bestowed the charisma" (121). Closely related to this shift in concept is the evolution that took place from bishop and presbyter to "priest." Bernier points out that prior to its adoption by the church, "priest" was a term used in reference to Jewish or pagan cultic roles, where priesthood was determined by heredity and not by special vocation. He notes that "no Christian is ever called priest in the New Testament" (43). The term was not used for ministerial leaders in the church until the 3<sup>rd</sup> century, and when its use began it corresponded to a renewed interest in and influence of the Old Testament in the writing of the Fathers.

The development of priestly terminology and an understanding of who deserved the title was probably the result of several factors. One influence may have been an early attempt to legitimate Christianity, newly separated from its parent Judaism, among other religions of the Near East which by and large had priestly classes. Also, it is likely that the surrounding Roman social structure of *ordos* or categories dividing society may have suggested a hierarchical structuring of the church. *Ordines*, modeled after Roman social orders, became the pattern for the emerging leadership *ordo* in the church (Osborne, *Ministry* 144). In Tertullian's writing in particular, *episkopi* and *presbyteri* parallel the political structure, and, as Osborne notes, *plebs*



found a parallel in the concept of the laity (142-143). As early as the second century a hierarchy of local church leaders was commonplace, and by the end of that century cultic vocabulary was in use and parallels to Old Testament priests were being drawn. Clement posed the analogy of church order and God's cosmic order as a theological justification; Ignatius of Antioch helped to firm up the role of bishop, as earlier prophetic and teaching roles were absorbed into the office (Bernier 78).

Following the Edict of Milan and the end of persecution, bishops came to be accepted without question as leaders of the community. At the same time, their function began to extend into the civil sphere (Bernier 83). As this tended to emphasize the monarchical aspects of the hierarchy (101), *ordo* became the model of both public and church life (131). Imagery of high priest drawn from the Old Testament found a more established place in the church of the fourth through the sixth centuries as presbyters now assumed the role of assisting the bishop. Eventually, the beginning of the imperial church marked such growth in membership and congregations that a need for oversight of more than one church emerged, and with it an expanded role of bishop. As bishops gained a purview wider than a single community, the role of presbyter was elevated to liturgical leader of the congregation. The transformation from presbyter into "priest" signaled an increased distinction between clergy and laity and the development of a sacred class.

In discussing the "cultifying of Christianity," Bernier notes heresy as a significant contributing factor. The relationship between the concept of orthodoxy/heresy and the concept of purity/impurity may be noted in that both essentially involve the setting of clear boundaries around what is "holy." The concern is for maintaining the purity of the community. Heresy conflicts often had to do with sin and how to deal with it. Beginning in the fourth century, the

conflict between Pelagius and Augustine brought about Augustine's insistence on the concept that all are born to sin (assigning original sin to Adam) and that, contrary to the Pelagian view that human beings can choose righteousness, sinfulness is overcome only through grace. In reaction to Pelagius, Augustine developed his notions of absolute divine control, predestination, and "irresistible grace" (Manschreck 73). At the Council of Carthage in 418, the baptism of children was deemed necessary for the remission of original sin (74); the concept of "sacramental grace" was affirmed by the Synod of Orange in 529. Gregory I (590-604) "helped shape the medieval mind," according to Manschreck, by affirming that after baptism sin could be expiated through meritorious works, accompanied by penance (91). The boundaries had come to be clearly drawn, and the church had become the "vehicle of grace," insuring the holiness of the community through the sacraments.

The Arian controversy also played a part, which motivated the Council of Nicaea convened by Constantine in 325. In response to Arianism, the full humanity and full divinity of Christ and its necessity for human salvation was affirmed. Christ's union with humanity was understood to restore what had been lost in "The Fall" and to overcome the sufferings due to finitude. Union with the divine meant that resurrection wiped out death, the ultimate consequence of sin. As a result of this affirmation, the Eucharist became increasingly more cultic, with a corresponding cultic function of liturgical leadership (Cooke 541). Gradually, the early church's concept of Old Testament priesthood as being fulfilled in Christ gave way to the later church's concept of the Old Testament priestly model as "a prescription for church organization" (Bernier 68). By the time of Innocent III in the thirteenth century, the priesthood of Melchizedek was widely accepted as a model, and a "eucharistic church" based on the necessity of intermediaries had fully emerged (68).

We can observe purity boundaries being drawn here to maintain true doctrine and belief, and also right praxis, as reflected in statements and creeds and eventually in canon law and the ultimate authority of the pope. The development of the laity-clergy dichotomy was affected as the post-Constantinian church, now legitimated by society, faced the issue of increasing numbers (Faivre 217). Both the need for defense against heresy and the need for internal homogeneity within clear boundaries were issues in the struggle to define “the people of God” (Congar 67).

All the while, the church continued to experience an issue that had existed from its beginnings: the difficulty of keeping “a clear vision of the uniqueness of Christianity as well as its bond with Israel” (91). The assimilation of Old Testament typology into church practice represented a response to the need for new identity that included heritage from both the Old and New Covenants. It also appears that the redemptive work of Christ being viewed through the lens of the Old Testament eventually affected notions of sacrifice, theories of papal authority, and the priestly role in the sacraments, which led to an emphasis on the cultic. As a result, by the sixth century the priestly role had evolved from unifier of the community to “dispenser of graces” and the Eucharist had come to be understood as the “source of saving grace” (91). The use of vestments and the practice of celibacy served to further separate clergy from laity.

By this time sacerdotalism was firmly in place. Clergy had become the “priests of the New Israel,” a concept initiated centuries earlier, as reflected in Chrysostom’s treatise on the priesthood. The role of presbyters had been fully transformed into the role of priest, and bishops became priests with the power to ordain other priests (92). Another major change was in the act of ordination, which had gone from ordination to leadership of a particular community, based on the assumption that one was not a priest without a function in a particular setting, to ordination as a ritual that involved an absolute and ontological transformation of a person into priest for all

time and in all places (92). This “indelible quality,” solidified through Augustine’s conflict with the Donatists, came to be understood as a permanent “mark” of belonging to Christ, even if that character were to remain “unfruitful” in the person’s life. The significance of this was the shift to ordination as essentially the giving of special powers to the ordained (Bernier 299, f. 9).

With increasing emphasis on cult, priests moved from a functional to a sacramental role, consecrated to a sacred ministry as “sacramental practitioners” who presided over communion. Regulations that governed them were chiefly modeled on Old Testament rules regarding priests, who were regarded as representing a “higher” form of holiness than that required in the Old Testament (Congar 102-103). By the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the ordination ritual clearly signified an act whereby one receives “the power to offer mass and forgive sins” (129). In the emerging of a whole new class of theologians, scholastic theology in particular had a significant influence during the Middle Ages in constructing a theology of the priesthood “after the fact” - that is, formulated in a way consistent with existing practice and tradition. At the same time, canon law was coming into its own, assuring conformity in liturgy and solidifying ritual actions (133). Laity came to rely more on priests whom they perceived to be the necessary mediators between God and humankind, the ones deemed able to “get people to heaven” (130).

Gradually the concept of an ontological difference between clergy and laity came to be accepted. The focus shifted in the Middle Ages to the presbyterate as the highest order, and a transition was made from the former *presbytos* to the almost exclusively liturgical and cultic role of *priest*. From that point on, “the power to celebrate the eucharist and the power to forgive sins controlled the meaning of holy order and gave the rationale why the priest, and he alone, should be considered the highest stage in this *ordo*” (Osborne, *Ministry* 573).

This describes the process by which the practice of ordination came to be defined in priestly terms, although other models of ministry continued to be carried along as undercurrents from the earliest understandings of ordination. For instance, the magisterial role (interpreter of authoritative teaching), which in the early church resided in the office of bishop, was restored as a primary pastoral responsibility in the Protestant Reformation. Although ordination had come to be focused on the priestly role and imbued with ontological meaning, functional understandings were not entirely lost.

*Changing Paradigms.* In the Protestant Reformation previous key clerical claims were reexamined, especially the concept of the sacraments as the primary ecclesial means of grace and the dominant role of priest as its mediator. For reformer Martin Luther (1483-1546), this raised questions about the freedom of God and sufficiency of Christ's work as revealed in the word (Osborne, *Ministry* 398). The reshaped vision of the church described in the writings of Luther and John Calvin (1509-1564) had a profound effect on understandings of the roles of both ordained clergy and the laity. With the word of God taking center stage, the church and its leaders came to be seen as the primary vehicles through which the word would be rightly taught, preached, heard, and experienced, and the sacraments rightly administered. But the role of the laity also received new emphasis. Just as the office of teacher or magister was reasserted as a primary role of the ordained, so was the activity of the laity in ecclesial ministry. The concept of the "priesthood of all believers" included lay and clergy alike; the distinction was that some are called to ordained ministry. Luther and Calvin differed in their understanding of how that distinction manifested itself, a matter addressed in more detail under the description of historical foundations of the Rabbinic/Magisterial model. In fact, the first six of the models described in the typology were influenced by Reformation changes as well.

As I ponder ecclesiastical authority and church leadership for the twenty-first century, I wonder what has been left behind and what has carried over into present practice. I find the observation of Hendrick Kraemer in 1958 still relevant in a post-modern world. He posits that an emphasis on rites and cultic practices as the only essential acts of the church still has effect and “has contributed enormously to the feeling among the laity of being objects and not subjects in the Church” (125). It is Kraemer’s opinion that the narrowness of this view has tended to divide clergy from laity. In this he finds agreement with Ronald Osborne and Alexandre Faivre, as well as many other contemporary authors I have encountered who describe changing paradigms in the church and its leadership needs. They agree on the need to sort out and clarify the theologies underlying current practices.

Tentler has posed provocative questions: What are the roles of our ecclesiastically authorized leaders in regard to the basic Christian mandate for reconciliation with God, with one another, and with all of creation? How do we relate today to our ancient roots? Tentler makes the observation that in the history of the church since the time of Thomas Aquinas, “institutions were reformed, but always, everywhere, a special class of clergy re-emerged” (243-244). In the absence of any concise explanation, one has to continue to ask the fundamental question: To what end do we “set apart?”

Context continues to influence practical change. There is consensus among scholars of American religion that demographic shifts and other cultural transformations have created the need for new paradigms of Christian leadership. Today new models of church leadership are emerging to adapt to a changing context. Within the UCC, the Pronouncement on ministry issues was the result of a decade-long discussion on the diverse leadership needs of the church in the twenty-first century and how to address them. In adopting this, the denomination joins many

others in recognizing the need to respond to the well-documented leadership crisis affecting the mainline. How to identify, call out, prepare, authorize, and nurture such leaders, and why, is an ongoing discussion among virtually all denominations (Barker xi). Much of the current conversation has been centered on how leaders are prepared, which would seem to emphasize a more functional (empowerment) view of ministry. But conversations such as those surrounding the Pronouncement on ministry issues continue to speak in ontological (embodiment) terms as well – of “consecration,” and the call to “represent,” for instance (Thomas, “Something More” 1). It is noteworthy that both functional and ontological understandings of ordination have been evident in some form from the first century of the church onward.

### ***Current State of the Conversation in the United Church of Christ***

The current conversation in the denomination is the result of years of study, culminating in the Pronouncement, *Ministry Issues: Forming and Preparing Pastoral Leaders for God’s Church*, adopted by UCC General Synod in 2005. The Pronouncement was in response to voices being heard from outside the “center” testifying that current ordination practices in the United Church of Christ are not helpful to - and in some cases stand in the way of - the calling of potential leaders from all communities represented in the denomination. The document also points out that any revision to current practices would require a thorough consideration of our present understanding of the nature of church, ministry, and leadership; both historic and current practices of authorization for ministry in the denomination, including the “hidden histories”; the theology behind our stated commitment to become a “multiracial and multi-cultural church, open and affirming, and accessible to all”; insights offered through postmodern perspectives; and our

covenantal understanding of ourselves fundamentally, in all our diversity, as the community of Christ (Local Church Ministries, *Ministry Issues* 1).

Responding to concerns raised in the past decade, the UCC Office for Church Life and Leadership began reconsidering how we authorize ministry. Long a part of the United Church of Christ, American Indian and African American communities were the first to say that they have not been well-served by the ordination procedure instituted at the formation of the denomination in 1957. With a broadening of the diversity of the denomination in recent decades, newer voices from other non-European ethnic and racial communities have affirmed that traditional Euro-American modes of identifying and preparing ministers are not serving the needs of all faith communities represented in the United Church of Christ (Whitman 2). In 1995 a consultation convened to gather perspectives yielded a wide range of concerns (Office for Church Life and Leadership, “Ordained and Licensed Ministries” 1). The initial consultation was followed by the convening of six additional gatherings aimed at bringing issues into greater focus.

In particular, it was noted that traditional seminary education does not adequately prepare candidates for service in some ethnic communities where a person is considered “learned” not by attaining a degree but by being raised up by the community and trained by its elders. While there appears to be denomination-wide consensus on the principle of an educated and learned clergy (New 33), the issue is that “education” is being narrowly defined according to the dominant culture. Current guidelines for authorization requiring a Master of Divinity degree functionally exclude some groups from calling leaders out of their own communities. Norman Jackson has pointed out that persons affected include those whose training and ordination took place outside the United States, such as in American Samoa. Current practice also tends to exclude persons whose cultural community envisions a different orientation to ministry



formation. Jackson offers his own experience as a Native American as an example. He found on leaving seminary that his education all but disqualified him to serve a congregation on an Indian reservation, for that education had required him to set aside his own culture, spirituality, style of learning, and liturgics. “In short,” Jackson says, “those [a traditional path] excludes tend to be from other than the dominant culture, to be people of color, and from the non-western world” (Jackson 7).

The traditional path to authorization in the UCC usually follows, after the attaining of a bachelor’s degree, a prescribed course of study in an accredited seminary toward a master of divinity degree. Many communities have pointed out that they would be better served by culturally-specific training generally unavailable in our seminaries. Attending seminary can itself be an oppressive experience for some. Jackson, based on his own experience in the Native American community and conversations with graduates, shares: “To study at a UCC recognized seminary, if you are from other than the dominant culture, means for the most part that you must set aside, while in seminary, your own culture and identity, and take on Euro-American epistemology, understanding of biblical and . . . textual authority, spirituality, liturgics, and style of learning.” Seminary education may require such a candidate to “demonstrate skill in a culture in which he or she will never minister” (8-9).

Concerns are not limited to ethnic minority communities. Small churches, often located in isolated rural areas, are increasingly unable to find adequately trained ministerial leadership. In 2000, about 660 UCC congregations with an average size of 122 found themselves in a situation of inadequate leadership (Office for Church Life and Leadership, “State of Ministry in the UCC” 2). An alternative is the engagement of a licensed pastor; however, guidelines for licensing and the availability of regional programs vary greatly from conference to conference.

In addition, because a seminary degree is currently the “icon,” and regional lay training is deemed inferior by many, a class system has developed between ordained and licensed ministry, a hierarchy which has no theological basis (3). There is an understandable sense of urgency to clarify the nature of authorized ministry in the UCC and to address all that is exclusionary and oppressive in our current practices (Office for Church Life and Leadership, “Ministry Issues Update” 6).

In response to these concerns, General Synod 22 in 1999 urged all settings of the church to engage in a comprehensive study of our denominational practices. The issue was to be addressed on several fronts including theological reflection, study of our polity, the consideration of multiple paths of preparation, and the nurture and support of persons in that process. In March of 2002, the Parish Life and Leadership and Local Church Ministries instrumentalities began to convene a series of nation-wide gatherings. The first meeting included fifty-five members directly affected by the need for adequately prepared leadership. According to Eileen Norrington, Ministerial Authorization Coordinator of the Parish Life and Leadership Team of Local Church Ministries at the time, all faith communities represented in the denomination were included (Norrington). Clergy and lay leaders from urban, suburban, and rural settings participated (Lang). At the final consultation a steering committee was selected to oversee the entire project with a goal of preparing a proposal for action in the form of a Pronouncement to be presented to General Synod 25 in 2005. It would contain, as all Pronouncements do, a statement of Christian conviction based on biblical, theological, and ethical principles. It would also include a plan for any constitutional changes, and a vision for ways to engage the entire denomination in conversation on ministry issues facing the UCC. A final draft was shared with

all settings in September of 2004, and the Pronouncement on ministry issues was officially adopted in 2005.

Since 2007, a Ministry Issues Implementation Committee has been developing and sharing drafts of materials in various stages of development, under the heading “Progress to Date . . . Implementing the Pronouncement: “Ministry Issues: Forming and Preparing Pastoral Leaders for God’s Church.” Still in process, for instance, are materials for assessment for Commissioned Ministry, resources for meeting the needs of persons with disabilities, and suggestions for the organizational aspects of Committees on the Ministry (*Draft 3.1 3*). The current *Draft 3.1* began to be circulated in 2009. Persons serving on local Committees on the Ministry and in other settings of the denomination have been encouraged to use the guidelines in their respective work, then respond to the Implementation Committee on what seems helpful, what is problematic, and what additional information would be useful (5). Also in 2009, changes required in the ministry provisions of the *Constitution and Bylaws* of the United Church of Christ were presented to and approved by General Synod 27. Those changes then proceeded through the process of being ratified by at least two-thirds of the individual Conferences of the United Church of Christ, as is required. A letter to all the Conferences from the Ministry Issues Implementation Committee in November of 2009 explains that, while the specific changes are in terminology, the emphasis is on the various settings of the Church engaging as covenant partners in the process of discernment and accountability.

“Marks of Faithful and Effective Authorized Ministers of the United Church of Christ,” a key component of the recent guidelines, have been offered for testing in the settings of the church, not only for ordination but “to guide the movements related to authorizing ministers for the Church, from the beginnings of a possible call through one’s ‘retirement’” (*Draft 3.1 6*). The

intention of the Implementation Committee is to further revise and refine the materials as feedback is received.

When considering a path into the future, it is wise to be mindful of the contextual hermeneutic which underlies both the Pronouncement on ministry issues and our denominational identity. Expressed in our founding documents, including the “Basis for Union” and our *Constitution*, is the acknowledgment of a responsibility to interpret the faith for our own place and time, and a conviction that we are never limited to past interpretations. New ways are constantly being revealed, and interpretation is taking place in diverse communities throughout the UCC. Perhaps one of the greatest contributions that this denomination can make to the ecumenical conversation about church leadership in a changing world is this experience of diversity.

## CHAPTER 2: The Typology and Its Use

### Development of the Method

The method chosen for identifying and classifying what is being valued in decision-making processes surrounding ministerial formation is a **typology** of leadership characteristics, developed from a survey of similar typologies. Considered in this survey were types described in the writings of Lesslie Newbigin (1953); H. Richard Niebuhr and Daniel D. Williams (1956); Avery Dulles (1978 and 1987); Schuller, Strommen, and Brekke (1980); Francis Schussler Fiorenza (1988); Peter Schmiechen (1996); Clyde Steckel (2002); and Hough and Cobb (1985), whose analysis is based in part on the unpublished work of Ronald Osborn (1982); and Osborn's expanded typology (1991). The method is also grounded in my own research on ecclesiologies and theologies of ministry evident in the United Church of Christ which I had completed as an independent study in Theology and Ethics in 2006 under the direction of Lee Barrett, Professor of Theology at Lancaster Theological Seminary (Rader).

My interest in the usefulness of a typology for the study of practices of authorization for ordained ministry in the denomination began with lectures by Lee Barrett at Lancaster Theological Seminary on the subject of ecclesiologies and leadership. The lectures were given at Consultations on Church and Ministry for members of UCC Committees on the Ministry in the Mid-Atlantic region. Barrett had approached the topic with a brief historical survey of the range of understandings of why we set people apart for leadership in the church. In addition to that survey, an overview of concepts of call was offered, based in part on those identified by H. Richard Niebuhr. This still leaves a problem for those who authorize ministry, Barrett pointed out, because a number of things are left unspecified concerning what particular gifts and skills

will be deemed necessary for leadership. He suggested that a starting point for discussion might be the use of a typology of leadership characteristics linked to discrete ecclesiological understandings, each type answering in its own way the question, “What, exactly, is church leadership?” Seven leadership models were offered: Priestly, Shamanistic, Rabbinic, Evangelistic/Charismatic, Facilitatory/Administrative, Mediatorial/Educative, and Social Prophet/Activist. The work of Hough and Cobb and Frances Schussler Fiorenza (among others) was acknowledged as the basis for the typology presented.

In the course of discussions on the nature of ministry a long tradition of typologies, drawn from historical study and having implications for ministerial leadership, have been advanced. Hough and Cobb have pointed out that such paradigms “arose in relation to certain theological concepts of the church and ministry resident in the Christian tradition” (5). O’Meara notes that leadership models also arose in response to changing cultural landscapes, for the church exists in real life, “on that edge where revelation meets civilization” (1). While typologies vary in the particular purpose for which they were designed, they have been established as useful research tools for differentiating fundamental assumptions about what it means to be “church” (Schmiechen 32).

Although in the course of history some types receded in importance and others came into dominance, it has been noted that a range of ecclesiologies is still present in denominational discourse and in actual practices of authorization (Hough and Cobb 47-48). O’Meara affirms the value of a historically grounded understanding, noting that the church draws on forms both old and new as it adapts to its current context (1). As Hough and Cobb point out, the church is “a community that lives through and from shared memories” and must discern what it means in each new setting “to live from those memories” (47). New ecclesiologies are not simply

conscripted from the past. Rather, each is a unique expression of what faithfulness means in a new context, “in light of what it has meant in the past” (48).

The typologies I surveyed had been created for a variety of purposes. I found that those which proved most helpful to me were either related to the discussion about changes in theological education or the process of call. This is not surprising, since these are both areas where theory is put into actual practice. The work of Committees on the Ministry is closely related to both.

Each of the typologies surveyed identifies a series of dominant traditions and organizing principles that have defined the church at particular times. Rather than offering any details about the desired characteristics of leaders, the types described by Avery Dulles in his *Models of the Church* (1978 and 1987) focus on main trends in Western theological thought. Dulles’ approach is clearly theological and his stated purpose is to facilitate ecumenical dialogue by offering a means to broaden perspectives. He invites the reader to consider strengths and weaknesses of each model he offers. Although Dulles writes from his experience as a Roman Catholic, and does offer a thorough defense of the institutional perspective in the final chapter of the expanded edition (1987), that model is not given more weight than the others. I judged that his five part typology – church as Institution, Mystical Communion, Sacrament, Herald, and Servant – could be expanded for my purposes. Dulles also includes in his later edition a description of church as “Community of Disciples” as an attempt to “build bridges to the other models” (206). Indeed, Dulles notes that he has chosen to concentrate on certain models (representing “the leading theological schools” of his time) without attempting to be all-inclusive (32).

I found one of the most helpful contributions of Dulles is his discussion of the difficulty of employing analytical language in describing ecclesiology. He suggests the use of “images” to

describe types (which he refers to as “models” or “paradigms”) in order to speak through analogies that “point to the reality of the church” (Schmiechen 33). He defines image as that which “can be readily imagined” - metaphors for experiences of what the church is and does. Types can only be a suggestion or an approximation of what is, for the nature of church is a subjective reality (Dulles 23). We are familiar with categorizing our natural world by external criteria or “visible elements,” Dulles points out, but “at the heart of the Church one finds mystery,” the presence of God who calls it into being (17). This is its innermost reality and the common factor among all manifestations of the church. The utilization of metaphor was evident to some degree in all typologies I surveyed, and I have adopted such language in my own by employing terms such as “rabbinical,” “priestly,” and “mystic.” Related to this matter, I note that credit was given in a number of works surveyed to the foundational observations of Paul Minear on the nature of the church, *Images of the Church in the New Testament* (e.g. Dulles 19). It was also commonly observed that in times of change such images or types or models will shift, some losing widespread acceptance as new ones are being formed.

Of the work surveyed, the typology of Lesslie Newbigin in *The Household of God* (1953) was the smallest, even though its intended scope is all of Western Christianity. Newbigin’s scheme consisted of only three types, based on Roman Catholic, Protestant (Lutheran/Calvinist), and Pentecostal (Anabaptist) traditions. The author early on points out the use of a typology to better understand how ecclesiological traditions can complement, rather than compete, with one another. Like Dulles, the ecumenical debate of Newbigin’s time is central to his purposes.

In *The Ministry in Historical Perspectives* (1956), Niebuhr and Williams address ministerial leadership itself, their primary interest being the concerns of theological education. While their extensive analysis begins with ministry in the early church, the portion most helpful



to me was the historical background for the types prevalent in America from its founding through the first half of the twentieth century. In broad terms, a typology covering preaching, priestly, and teaching offices is suggested; even so, their analysis of later forms of ministry expands to include pastoral care, involvement in social reform, and other aspects that represent “the full dimensions of the Christian community” (x). The typology becomes increasingly complicated as the diversity of later Protestant ministry in America is addressed and the analysis is divided according to the segments of society that are ministered to (e.g. urban, rural, immigrant, institutional).

Schuller, Strommen, and Brekke, editors of *Ministry in America* (1980), have made a significant contribution to the discussion by compiling analyses of survey research data on denominational practices concerning ordained ministry in the United States and Canada in the 1970's, including the United Church of Christ. This volume is the outcome of the “Readiness for Ministry Project,” funded by the Lilly Endowment and accomplished under the direction of the Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, by and for those involved in theological education. Introductory essays on the basic issues involved in defining ministry, and the nature of the research data offered, suggest an emphasis on goals and outcomes. In approaching this material I paid heed to the caution expressed by Dulles that there is something more about the church than what can be contained in objective analysis. Even so, Daniel Aleshire's “Eleven Major Areas of Ministry” (23-53) and Merton Strommen's “Models of Ministry” (54-89) were particularly useful in clarifying my own typology.

Since my aim was to be inclusive of all ecclesiologies represented in the United Church of Christ, the studies which proved to be most valuable were those particularly focused on traditions which have been dominant in the United States. Peter Schmiechen was most helpful in

this regard. In his work *Christ the Reconciler* (1996), Schmiechen offers an analysis and critique of the work of Dallas and Newbigin. Like Dallas and Newbigin, Schmiechen's perspective is an ecumenical one aimed toward reconciliation and dialogue. Like theirs, Schmiechen's focus is on understandings of the church itself rather than specifically on its leadership, although some insightful observations on leadership characteristics are included from time to time in his discussion. As he points out, in contrast to Dallas and Newbigin, his typology is distinctively representative of "real communities . . . embodied in the major traditions in the American experience" (36). Schmiechen describes his eight part typology as an expansion of the three types of Newbigin (37). And as does Dulles, Schmiechen reflects on the dynamics between traditions. I determined that, for my purposes of observing leadership characteristics, several of Schmiechen's types could be consolidated. Of special interest to me are his comments, as a member of the UCC, on particular issues of the denomination relating to its remarkable diversity.

In *Christian Identity and Theological Education*, Joseph Hough and John Cobb state that their purpose is to bridge the gap between the content of theological education and the practice of ministry. In order to address this, the authors identify dominant ministerial types emerging from particular shared expectations, not only of the church but of society (5). Again, attention has been given to socio-historical location in this analysis, emphasizing for me its importance. Their types - Master (authoritative teacher); Revivalist and Pulpiteer; Builder; Pastoral Director; and Manager and Therapist - and their suggestions for leadership preparation, provided useful guidelines for the types I eventually chose as my own. One difference to note is that Hough and Cobb do not include a type that describes spiritual or charismatic leadership. The essay of Frances Schussler Fiorenza offered some insights into that model of ministry.

Hough and Cobb led me to the work of Ronald Osborn, *Creative Disarray* (1991), which I found to be most useful. In the process of addressing the need for changes in theological education and preparation of church leaders, Osborn offers a thorough description of the unique development of ecclesiology in Protestant America, a context in which the Enlightenment heritage took on a particularly individualistic character. Reflecting on the diversity of models in the American context, Osborn points out concepts which are associated with each (viii). Osborn also affirms what others have noted before him, that no model is complete in itself nor should any model be entirely rejected (x). I found that the typology he employs, which is subdivided according to how the types are represented in the 18th, 19th, and 20th centuries, could be simplified for my purposes.

Osborn's particular concern is providing greater clarity concerning expectations related to ministry. He is particularly sympathetic to pastors and congregations engaged in the process of call, who struggle with differing concepts of what a minister is and does (5). In this, Osborn is perhaps the observer who comes closest to my own interests and experiences, for he points to the need to clarify unspoken assumptions about ministry. Because of this lack of clarity, self-identity is complex for ministers. An important observation Osborn makes is that "today's minister is tangled in a thorn-thicket of expectations derived from at least half a dozen forms of ministry out of the American past and almost as many more from the current scene. In such a context, how can we speak of a concept of ministry? Confusion prevails in the mind of the minister, the congregation, the theological seminary, denominational officials, and the secular community" (9-10). Osborn's observations confirmed for me the need for further study.

In the material surveyed I found affirmation for a historical approach to identifying the full range of ecclesiologies and concepts of ministry needed for my study. In addition to the

above mentioned sources, a number of observers from within the denomination have offered insights into the particular ecclesiologies and leadership needs of the UCC. Among these are: a 1996 PRISM article by Rollin Russell on “Standards for Ministry in a Covenantal Church;” two 2002 lectures by John Thomas, “Something More: Authorized to Represent,” and “Pontiff, Prophet, Poet: What Kind of Leaders Will We Require?;” Clyde Steckel’s 1996 essay, “Authorizing Ministry in the United Church of Christ: Slouching Toward Order;” and a 2001 PRISM article by Donald Freeman, “Five Important Characteristics of Ministry: Owned, Recognized, Empowered, Authorized, Accountable.” I also found that the unpublished typology of Donald Freeman, “Models of Pastoral Leadership,” designed for use by local congregations in the search and call process, affirmed the types I had outlined. I found it possible for my purposes to consolidate several of Freeman’s ten types.

These systems of classification, envisioned from a variety of perspectives and ranging in number of types from three to as many as twelve, were the building blocks for the seven-part typology employed in this study. As many have noted, the UCC is unique among denominations in that it includes among its diverse streams of tradition most of the major ecclesiologies of Protestantism in America. A typology broad enough to assess preferred ministerial leadership characteristics in any given setting of the denomination needs to reflect that pluralism.

### ***Usefulness and Limitations of the Method***

It is assumed that the characteristics which tend to be valued and deemed essential are determined by understandings of what the church is and does. Therefore, the organizing principle of this typology is ecclesiological. It is also acknowledged that, since no single type can offer a complete image of what the church is and does, a typology is just a tool for gaining

some insight. In reality, individual members, congregations, local judicatories, and denominations may adhere to several concepts of church simultaneously, even if some of these concepts are held in tension with one another (Osborn 4). As Dulles also points out, the use of types or models may be useful in offering a new perspective on practices, but models are necessarily “partial and functional,” inadequate to fully describe something which has dimensions beyond that which can be quantified or described in concrete terms. No model in itself offers a complete image of what the church is, and models are only intended to illumine some observable aspects of church (Dulles 28).

Each of the described types originally developed in relation to the challenges of a particular historical social context, and any type holds the potential for being reinterpreted for the church of another place and time (Hough and Cobb 5). What such a typology may be able to reveal are inclinations toward particular operative understandings of what the church is and does. It is assumed that by studying documents used by those who make or guide decisions toward ministry authorization it is possible to reveal the valuing of particular kinds of ministerial leadership characteristics. These preferences in turn imply ecclesiologies that underlie practice.

The use of a typology to analyze and array church-related documents is not without precedent. In 1998, Aart van den Berg, an economist and theologian in the relatively new field of “economic theology,” used such an approach with theological documents on the economy. His stated goal was to “generate further critical reflection upon them, in order to clarify the current discussion between theologians and economists . . .” (6). Van den Berg compares theological concepts and conceptual frameworks that have been converted into guidelines (165), broadly based on four different ways of thinking and speaking about God: God the creator, the God of justice, the God of liberation, and the God of love. Van den Berg has based his analysis

on weighted word frequency counts. Our methods differ in that my study is based on phrases in the guidelines and my own interpretation of how they are descriptive of expectations related to the various ecclesiologies.

It is my assumption that manuals and guidelines adopted through official action by the Association and the denomination for use in the process of authorizing ministry are theological documents. I share with Van den Berg a desire to “improve the quality of future texts” (Ulshoefer 430) through further discussion. One criticism of Van den Berg’s work is that more information on the contexts in which these documents were developed would be helpful. I have kept that in mind.

#### ***My Relationship to the Settings, and Related Experience.***

In the course of serving on the Lancaster Association Committee on the Ministry, I have had considerable first-hand experience with the denominational processes of authorization. This Committee is made up of twelve voting members and is staffed in an advisory role by an Associate Minister of Penn Central Conference. The length of tenure for members of the Committee ranges from the newly-elected to more than five years’ experience. Most of the members have been serving for more than one year since four persons are elected to the committee annually by the Association to serve three-year terms. Due to the amount of training needed for the accomplishing of this work, length of experience on the Committee is highly valued, and members willing to serve for a second term are encouraged to do so. My length of service was unusually long because I was originally appointed to fill an unexpired term, then was elected to two consecutive terms of my own. By the time my terms ended in April of 2009, I had served nearly nine years, for seven of those in the position of Chair or Co-chair.

Conference staff persons have noted that, in terms of the amount of work of oversight it is called to do, this is quite an active Committee. Proximity to Lancaster Theological Seminary accounts in part for the high number of Members in Discernment or persons in various stages of application for that status who are in relationship with the Association at any given time.

In regard to the wider church setting, I have been actively engaged in the denomination's conversation on ministry issues in Association and Conference discussions and as a Synod delegate. As part of the preparatory work for this study, I completed a historical survey encompassing the broad range of ecclesiologies represented in the denomination, including both functional views of ministry leadership and countervailing ontological understandings such as the Mercersburg high church movement of the mid-nineteenth century. Also helpful in preparing for this work was a study I completed on the history of the Pronouncement on ministry issues and the process and documents that led to it. To get a sense of the current state of this discussion I have surveyed the conversation among leaders within the denomination as well as observations of several persons outside it.

### **Description of the Types**

The majority of currently operative ecclesiologies in the denomination are outgrowths of Reformation thought. Therefore, the reshaped visions of church held by Luther and Calvin are treated in more detail since their concepts are most influential in the first six types described. Phyllis Tickle notes that post-Christendom understandings of church emerging in the twenty-first century, representing a difference between what she refers to as "inherited church and emerging church" (136), are not dependent on ideas solidified in the centuries following the Reformation. The answers to fundamental questions of authority, human worth and responsibility, and

spirituality are no longer being grounded in *sola scriptura, scriptura sola*. This difference and its contextual foundations will be addressed in connection with the seventh type, the “Midwife Model.”

**1. The Rabbinic/Magisterial Model describes the minister as theologian and interpreter of authoritative teaching. The leader is one who can teach how to interpret rightly, or do the interpreting for the community. What is valued most highly are innate gifts and learned skills for preaching, teaching, and interpreting the Word and other authoritative documents (such as creeds, confessions, and theological classics).**

**Ecclesiology.** The church is “gathered and formed by the Word of God” and its essence is proclamation - receiving the Word and passing it on (Dulles 76). What is valued most highly in ministerial leadership in this model is expertise as theologian and exegete. One who is able to teach members of the faith community how to interpret scripture, or do the interpreting for them, is desired. The pastor is preacher and proclaimer of the Word. When the gospel is rightly preached, the church becomes a “lens” through which the grace of God is perceived and appropriated; therefore, education in and knowledge of scripture is essential.

**Historical Foundations.** In the early church the role of theologian and interpreter of authoritative teaching lodged in the office of bishops, who collectively constituted the “magisterium” of the church. In the medieval church this function was in the hands of the “Masters” or educated teachers, while the sacraments were entrusted to local pastors and only bishops confirmed. The Protestant Reformation elevated the role of local pastor to include the teaching office. For the origins of this understanding of ministerial leadership we can look to Martin Luther and John Calvin. It may be noted that the contributions of both Luther and Calvin



are not limited to the Rabbinic/Magisterial model of leadership alone. They also apply in the first six of the types, all of which have roots in the Reformation.

For Luther, the fundamental human predicament is unbelief and a lack of trust in God, which results in bondage of the will. In his view, the penitential system of the medieval church perpetuated the error of this lack of trust. While in the teachings of the late medieval church grace was still understood as essential and unmerited, and the preaching of the word was highly valued as a main vehicle through which God touches the human condition, the church represented by the *ordo* of the priesthood had increasingly come to be seen as a necessary vehicle of grace. Particularly offensive to Luther was what he perceived as a focus on the self's abilities in the church's teachings that humans needed to cooperate with grace, or justification through meritorious works. He challenged Scholastic theology's teachings about the relationship between grace and the forgiveness of sin, in order to emphasize what God in Christ has done as an unmerited gift. Luther affirmed the completely satisfactory value and absolute sufficiency of Christ's life and death, revealed in the Word. Therefore, "teachers and preachers who work with the Word" are deemed essential to the church, and Luther's directive is to "call from among ourselves and elect those we find qualified, whom God has enlightened with intelligence, endowed with gifts . . ." (Haendler 61).

Luther believed that the concept of ontological change in ordination signified a devaluation of baptismal grace, for all Christians are called to priestly service (that is, to intercede for others). Luther wrote in 1520, "All Christians are truly of the spiritual estate (*stand*), with no difference among them but that of office (*amt*)" (30). The main distinction of ministerial office is simply that some are called out from the people, by the consent of the community, to do the "work" of preaching and teaching (39-42). Later on, although this is never

fully explained in his writing, Luther appears to imply that there is a “certain something” that distinguishes those called to pastoral office, and these innate gifts can be discerned by the whole congregation. In the *Smalcald Articles* he writes, “The office does not confer the essence and authority that everyone has; instead, that must be there first, from birth, and must make him fit to exercise the office.” And he also states, “One must have bishops, pastors, and preachers . . . for the crowd itself cannot do such things for themselves” (90). Still, Luther appears to have held in high regard the theological insights of the laity, never deviating from his firm position on the priesthood of all believers. He remains certain that the acknowledgment of forgiveness of sins is the duty of all Christians on behalf of one another (87). This creates an unresolved tension as to whether theological authority lies in the congregation or in the ordained ministerial leadership, although Luther’s writing of the catechisms is an indication of his emphasis on sound teaching and his belief that specific direction was needed. Perhaps it was because justification by grace represented such a significant doctrinal change that Luther believed careful teaching of the Word was essential.

The Word takes center stage for John Calvin also. Calvin affirmed that the church is where the Word of God is rightly taught and preached and heard, and the sacraments (the acting out of the Word) properly administered. Since sanctification involves the deriving of principles for right living from scripture, preaching must be sound. Calvin’s ecclesiology has strongly influenced Congregationalism, the German Reformed tradition, and the Evangelical Synod - all historical streams of the United Church of Christ.

A significant difference between Luther and Calvin is their interpretation of the “priesthood of all believers” and the way in which grace is bestowed. For Luther, the flow of sanctifying grace is a direct one from God to all the baptized. In Calvin’s view also, forgiveness

is a perpetual activity, a “constant grace” within the gathered community. But God confers grace upon the society of believers in a sense through the church, which is directed by ministers who rightly preach the Gospel and administer the sacraments. In Calvin’s words, the “mission of reconciliation has been entrusted to the ministers of the church and . . . by it they are repeatedly to exhort the people to be reconciled to God in Christ’s name” (McNeil 1035). The church abides as long as the ministry of word and sacrament abides, and a “well-ordered” community is a mark of the “true” church (1031). For Calvin there must to be agreement on “necessary doctrine,” or the key articles of religion, such as the institution of the sacraments and Christ alone as head of the church. There was room, however, for discussion and disagreement on lesser issues.

In Calvin’s ecclesiology, the minister was seen as a “tool” used by God to do God’s proclaiming and teaching work and to interpret God’s will. Ministers are “delegates” to the people to declare “[God’s] will to us by mouth” (1053). There is the sense in Calvin’s writing of equality and mutual growth among all members, and therefore it is a function of the whole to determine who among them are deemed suitable, worthy, and “adequate and fit to bear the burden.” Characteristics of the candidate should include evidence of “sound doctrine and holy life,” and no indication of any faults which would “disgrace the ministry” (1063). Thus, ministerial leaders are “created” through public testimony and decision, by orderly vote of the people. That all the people are engaged in this orderly calling of ordained leaders is a given, and Calvin goes further than Luther in describing the organizational structure, discipline, and oversight through which this is properly accomplished.

Besides possessing certain inherent characteristics, it is also important that those chosen “be instructed in skills necessary for the discharge of their office” (1063). Calvin emphasizes

that leaders are to be well-prepared. And yet there is also a sense that a “secret” call is involved, one which does not have the church as a witness; God chooses ministers and entrusts the office to them, “confer[ing] the grace to carry it out” (1055). It is not, ultimately, a “decision by men,” but by “the mouth and manifest oracle of the Lord himself” (1064). God calls, and it is the role of the church community to recognize and affirm that call. It appears that, for Calvin, ordination is not just a sign of commending the ordinand to the people and installing the candidate in a position. “Visible graces of the Spirit” are actually conferred in the blessing and consecrating laying on of hands in ordination (1067). It may be noted that both Luther and Calvin acknowledge ontological as well as functional aspects in the calling forth of ministerial leaders.

**2. The Community Builder Model describes the minister primarily as the central figure and facilitator of the covenant community, God’s own people. The leader functions as a guide in embodying the Christian life of faith as a witness to the world, through evidence of wisdom, personal piety, and exemplary behavior. Qualities valued are a sense of call to and loyalty to the community, commitment to the living out of covenantal relationship, and pastoral “shepherding” gifts that lend themselves to the stability and well-being of the whole.**

**Ecclesiology.** The church understands itself, first and foremost, as a community with both horizontal and vertical dimensions: that is, it involves the living out of binding relationships among human beings, and between human beings and God (Dulles 49). The minister’s role of “clerical public guardianship” extends beyond the congregation, for the church is viewed as a stabilizing factor in the wider community. (Scott, *Pastors and Providence* xiii).

**Historical Foundations.** A post-Reformation example of this model in practice is Congregationalism of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Its resonances with Calvin are evident in its concern for the preservation of social order of the community and the valuing of institutional stability. In New England of the 1600's and 1700's, ministry was understood as a public office that helped preserve the social order as a manifestation of the Puritan vision of a "godly commonwealth" (Zikmund, *The Living Theological Heritage* 5: 370), growing toward the "final perfection of the Kingdom" (Dulles 89). An ordained leadership position was not conferred but rather "created" from within an individual church as a call to preach and teach. In the United Church of Christ, this model is referred to as an example of "empowerment:" a calling forth based on need in the church for specific services of leadership. Ministerial status is conferred on behalf of and related to a particular community. Although prestige went with the role in both church and community, the status of the pastor did not differ ontologically from that of the rest of the congregation. "Calling" referred to all vocations and professions and directed all of life. Within the structure of the church there was neither formal episcopal nor informal occupational hierarchy. Still, the "sacred calling" was considered distinctive. There was a sense that "divine agency was at work" in providing leadership for the church (Scott, *From Office to Profession* 6). The distinctiveness of the Community Builder model is that the leadership role extends beyond the church itself and into the community. Scott describes the clerical role as "profoundly conservative" in the sense of valuing the preservation of public order, institutional continuity, stability, and social harmony (8). Exemplary character, personal piety, freedom from worldly vices, and spirituality distinguished ministerial candidates from their peers (7).

While the Community Builder may no longer be a familiar model in suburban mainline congregations, pastors in rural and small town settings testify that the concept still exists of

minister as primarily a social and public figure – for instance, offering prayer at civic events or sitting on the boards of philanthropic organizations. The “community guardianship” aspect of ministry may also be noted in some ethnic communities.

**3. The Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model is distinguished by the importance accorded to an experience of conversion or other profound or mystical religious experience, often as the result of interaction with a charismatic figure. Desired leadership qualities include evidence of an internal spirituality, a sense of divine calling, and self-direction or spiritual direction. What is valued is dynamic and persuasive witnessing and preaching of the gospel that can effect a change of heart. Leaders also guide discipline in the sense of empowering persons to live a new life, manifested inwardly in practices of personal piety and outwardly in acts of service.**

**Ecclesiology.** This model resonates with Luther’s fundamental belief in the utter human need for God’s grace. The church is a community of sinners in constant need of redemption; and yet it is also a witnessing community, responsive to the Holy Spirit which constantly acts from within to transform it (Hough and Cobb 68). Emotive preaching, prayer, and the power to persuade or otherwise engender spiritual growth in individual lives are the most valued characteristics of leadership in this model. Interestingly, the institutional church may be secondary or not necessary at all to its realization.

**Historical Foundations.** In the first three decades of the nineteenth century a fundamental shift took place in the nature of churches in this country. The freedom of religion that manifested itself in a separation of church and state had also promoted religious pluralism. As a result of this new diversity, the sacred office as it had been known in New England congregationalism lost its public character. Churches were “transformed from parish-oriented

organizations, with some local authority, to voluntary organizations,” and “membership in these organizations was based on the consent of the individual believer” (Hough and Cobb 9).

Because a personal decision for faith had risen to such importance, the ability to persuade came to be highly valued. The revivalism that had begun on the American frontier, in which preaching was considered the primary gift, eventually spread throughout the country as the Great Awakening.

Charismatic gifts have been associated with the German Pietists, who reacted to the formalism and intellectual emphasis of the Age of Reason with a return to personal faith experiences. Pietism is characterized by a sense of human guilt, the need for forgiveness, and a personal “sense of the living presence of Christ within,” experiences which are expressed outwardly in acts of devotion (Manschreck 255). German Pietism is associated with both the Evangelical Synod and the Reformed Church, two of the United Church of Christ’s historic streams. Historically, “low-church” movements such as the Ursinus movement also represent this model. The term “low-church” refers to worship that is liturgically pulpit-centered, typically with the omission of spoken congregational responses and prayers (Shetler 38).

The pietistic heritage continues to manifest itself in current practice in the denomination. Mystic and charismatic aspects of leadership are particularly valued in some of the Native American and African American worshiping traditions. Perhaps a contemporary form of the charismatic model may be found in the concept of church as a relational community of individual “seekers,” each one a “pilgrim” on a spiritual quest (Schmiechen 49). It is typical of this model that the community is not defined by legalism or doctrine or tradition but is primarily Spirit-led, with an emphasis on individual and personal pilgrimage toward truth. This

distinguishes pietistic models from those which are centered on community formation, such as the Midwife Model to be described later.

It should be noted that the Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model could manifest itself in quite different forms – for instance, as quiet contemplative companionship such as in spiritual direction, or as dynamic preaching and evangelistic witnessing at revivals. Since both emphasize personal practices of piety and change of heart, they share many of the same desired leadership characteristics and therefore are combined in one model.

**4. The Priestly/Sacramental Model is characterized by the sacraments being central to the believing community and the focal point of its activity. The community finds its unity in the presence of Christ through sacramental worship, catechism, and tradition. The characteristics most valued in ordained leadership are liturgical gifts and skills that guide the community in its worship life of prayer, confession, and praise, in response to what God has done. Also valued is an ecumenical vision of the wider church as a manifestation of unity in Christ.**

**Ecclesiology.** The church is understood as “the visible manifestation of the grace of Christ in human community” (Dulles 89), and a witness to and embodiment of the unity beyond human division which God creates in Christ (Schmiechen 45). It is an extension of the Incarnation continuing in time, the parts organically connected to one another and held together by word and creed and ritual. The church’s activity revolves around its sacramental and worship life, through which the community experiences its unity with Christ and with one another. Baptism is key as the entry into one organic extended whole, the Body of Christ. There is a strong sense in this model of a direct line of continuity with liturgical tradition. Leadership is



endorsed and imbued with power by the institution, “entrusted with sacred authority” (39). In this view, ministerial call is from Christ, through the church, and the ordained leader fulfills a symbolically representative role as the presence of Christ. The call (described by H. Richard Niebuhr as an inner or “secret call”) is recognized as such by the congregation, which is the body of Christ (Local Church Ministries, *Ministry Issues* 5).

**Historical Foundations.** In the United Church of Christ, this model of leadership is usually described as “embodiment;” that is, authorization has more to do with the nature of the person than the function of office. Certain persons upon whom unique gifts for ministry have been bestowed are called out on the basis of that recognition by the community. This “high church” theological perspective is most clearly expressed in the mid-nineteenth century Mercersburg movement of the German Reformed tradition. The high church movement, which focused on altar and congregational participation in the liturgy, is connected with Phillip Schaff and John Williamson Nevin who both served on the faculty of the German Reformed seminary at Mercersburg, Pennsylvania. Nevin and Schaff crafted a theological response to the revivalism of the Great Awakening and what they perceived as “the general malaise of American Protestantism . . . unchurchly, unhistorical, and unsacramental . . . and responsible for growing sectarianism” (Yrigoyen and Bricker 5). The movement was an attempt to shift attention away from revivalistic individualism and focus instead on a broader perspective on the church as an organic community. Schaff, a German historian, was particularly concerned about rekindling a sense of the continuity of the church and its apostolic nature. Central in importance were the sacraments, the incarnate Word, and the church’s embodiment of it.

In this type, ministry and laity are understood as inseparably connected, each an “essential constituent of the whole, complete organism” (Gerhart 521). While not of a

hierarchical order, at least a functional difference is acknowledged between laypersons and office-bearers. The Spirit bestows different gifts, fitting persons for different vocations; therefore, within the “organism” or body each has his or her own place. Offices of the church are different in that they “represent the authority of the church” (514-15). Ordained ministry is considered integral to its organization, since clergy stand between Christ and the church, mediating Christ’s service. Therefore, it is an office that exists in some sense by “supernatural warrant” (529). On the question of succession, apostolic continuity exists not through direct line but through unbroken continuity of the whole church with the church throughout time (530).

**5. The Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model makes the establishing, maintaining, and administration of churches as social institutions the primary concern. The existence of the church in the world is crucial as the place of nurture and empowerment of the members for outreach. What is valued is facilitative leadership: the pastor is considered the “Chief Executive Officer,” motivator, counselor, and solver of problems for a particular “pool” of clients. Valued leadership traits include measurable skills that are most useful in maximizing the effectiveness of the organization. These include skills in pastoral care, planning and management strategies, and administration.**

**Ecclesiology.** The institution of the church is seen primarily as a human social system, although it is distinctive from all other institutions in its God-given purpose of mutual caring and extending that caring outside itself. How it orders its life to that end is of prime importance (Hough and Cobb 52). Because of the challenges of a pluralistic, mobile society, preparation must be intentional in order to do the church’s work effectively. Goals and visioning, planning and problem-solving, as well as providing intentional systems of care for the care-givers, are

essential activities. This model may also manifest itself as a concern for the maintaining of the church in its wider setting as a denomination, as the same strategizing, goal setting, and organization of the system are prioritized. While similar in some ways to the Community Builder Model with its interest in preservation of a social system, the Reflective Practitioner Model focuses primarily on effectiveness of the church itself as a functioning institution rather than preservation of wider public order.

**Historical Foundations.** In the period leading up to 1850, another fundamental change in the ministry as a social institution in America took place through a process of professionalization (Scott, *From Office to Profession* xi). The term “professionalization” refers here to the mastery of a set of skills necessary for an administrative role, skills which are measurable. Influenced by the development of professionalized officer training in Germany and the profession of engineering which came to prominence during the Industrial Revolution, other occupations soon followed suit. Fundamental to this concept was the assumption that any field of endeavor could be based in theory and described in terms of a body of knowledge, which in turn could be empirically observed and analyzed (Hough and Cobb 13). The ordained ministry was not exempted from this trend toward measurable skills. Schleiermacher’s professional model for ministry was soon adopted by Andover, Harvard, and Yale divinity schools. In this model, readiness for ministry can be determined objectively in terms of the successful mastery of the particular skill set and techniques needed to fulfill the functional role of pastor, such as preaching or administrative tasks. Osborn notes, for instance, that with the rise of the secular role of certified counselor trained in psychology and psychotherapy, counseling skills in ministry began to be valued and thus taught as part of ministerial preparation. The same was true for managerial skills (Osborn 151).

Evidence of this model at work has been noted in the marked tendency in recent decades for church leaders to think programmatically, emphasizing goal setting and strategic planning following a business model (Hadaway 24).

**6. The Social Activist model is characterized by its most fundamental concept, that the church exists to fulfill God's mission. The view is global, centered on acts of love and justice, especially in solidarity with the oppressed and those on the margins. Authority is based in the acts of Jesus and the gospel mandate to promote justice, mercy, and love. Valued gifts of leadership are prophetic; that is, those which enable the re-imagining of the church for mission and the empowering of the people of God for service in a changing world.**

**Ecclesiology.** The church is a servant community shaped by being sent forth by God and rooted in God's purposes to restore and heal creation (Guder 5). In fact, it is mission itself that is the church's only reason for being, and the world is its proper venue. The church has a dialogic relationship with the world, with the ultimate goal being justice and reconciliation, or "the overcoming of the various alienations that vex humanity today" (Dulles 96). Distinguished from the more personal needs emphasized in the Mystical or Spiritual/Charismatic Model, in the Social Activist Model the church must be ready and willing to "empty itself" of power in order to accept its servant calling and go where it is needed. Therefore, concerns of denominational or institutional or even societal stability are always secondary to the gospel mandate to promote justice. Ordination, while authorized by the institutional church, may very well involve a calling outside the institutional church, or perhaps even the deconstruction and reinventing of institutional structures (Mead 5).

**Historical Foundations.** The Evangelical Synod, Congregationalist, Christian, and Reformed streams of the UCC were all traditionally social-action minded, as is the current denomination resulting from their merger. In recent years a reorientation in the overall understanding of “mission” has had an effect on ecclesiology. While Western evangelism can be credited with successfully spreading Christianity around the world, the cultural assumptions in which that gospel message was packaged have come under scrutiny as other voices have been heard. It has been observed that the church in the West has tended to make institutional extension and survival its priority. Guder notes that when the church is thought of as a dispenser of religious services, its mission focuses on the nurture of its members who are its “customers” and “consumers” (5). Observations offered from a third-world perspective have brought about a reorientation of thinking about mission. As a result, the traditional Euro-American church has been gradually awakening to the insights of our non-Western brothers and sisters in mission-based churches so characteristic of other parts of the world. What was once seen by the West as the church on the periphery has come to be valued as dynamic and transformational, making the West itself a mission field ripe for fresh readings of the gospel. This re-evaluation of the nature of mission, in a setting of increasing pluralism, continues to be influential in the development of the Social Activist model. In this model there is no distinction between mission as evangelism and mission as social justice. The goal is holistic, seeking “to embody signs of God’s liberating word in very concrete situations in which people suffer in our world” (Wood 130).

The national setting of the United Church of Christ serves as an example of this model at work, for the denomination continues to define itself as prophetic and justice-oriented, declaring that “the church exists for mission” (Malayang 1). Roger Shinn notes that the UCC “may be the foremost American denomination in articulating support for progressive social policies” (185); a

review of General Synod Pronouncements and resolutions over the years confirms our prioritizing of issues of race, poverty, peace, and human rights.

**7. The Midwife Model describes the minister as a person who values diversity, and is knowledgeable about the many forms of Christianity (and other religions as well), with an appreciation for all. A leader in the Midwife Model is a nurturer of the creative gifts and impulses of the participants, one who has a high tolerance for “chaos,” and who can maintain the flow in a flexible and unpredictable environment. Therefore, leaders are those with imaginative and facilitative personalities. Valued most highly in leadership skills are the ability to nurture ongoing spiritual growth, and the ability to help persons both discover their unique gifts and add their particular assets into the life of the community in practice. Since faith is transmitted primarily through interpersonal relationships, a primary role of pastor is to be a catalyst for building community. It is important that leaders are sensitive to community dynamics so that they are able to discern the system and “reset” it when necessary, but also able to discern when to “get out of the way” rather than being overly directive.**

**Ecclesiology.** The church is an incarnational community, a “vessel of transformation” whose purpose is to engage in disciple-forming mission, which is a communal process (Pagett 106). Opportunities for community formation are valued over formal membership; the concept of membership may be quite flexible, in fact, as participants come and go. The purpose of the church is not to provide solace or satisfaction or to offer a variety of programs. Rather, it exists to provide an atmosphere for sharing diverse beliefs and experiences that “provoke” participants out of perceptual patterns in order to see things in new ways (Hadaway 133). A common

metaphor for what goes on in community is a “journey of discipleship,” and it is the journey itself that is deemed most important.

The community may often be characterized by dissonance and change; therefore, institutional stability is not a priority. Emphasis is on cultivating an environment for experiential worship and creative expressions of faith, rather than on maintaining a standard worship format in a certain kind of building or facility. Secular settings are as good as traditional space, because worship is participatory and sacred space is created by the acts and intent of the people gathered in it. Resources do not necessarily need to be of a technically sophisticated nature, but an openness to the use of any tools or technology that fit the creative purposes of the community at the time is characteristic.

The sharing of diverse beliefs and experiences is valued, as is a setting in which persons can feel safe to share their questions, weaknesses, doubts, and fears. There is no “target audience” or age group; rather, persons from any background may be drawn together by a desire for creative exploration of their faith and spirituality, and a wish to make a difference in the world.

**Historical Foundations.** The historical setting for this model, in broadest terms, is post-Christendom. Pastoral paradigms shaped by the worldview of Christendom have emphasized central, authoritative, even hierarchical leadership, with power based in the institution and in the role of “clergy.” Those roles tended to be clear and predictable (Mead 32).

The first six types described – Rabbinic/Magisterial, Community Builder, Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic, Priestly/Sacramental, Reflective Practitioner/Administrator, and Social Activist – have in common that they are in some sense post-Reformation paradigms. That is, each of these types has developed out of notions of what the church is and does that are in some

way a response to the great social transformations surrounding the Reformation as a “hinge time.” A fundamental change from what had gone before the Reformation was in regard to authority. The response of Protestantism was to shift from the authority of the Pope and church councils to the authority of scripture and biblical exegetes. But Protestantism both expressed and reflected many changes that were also cultural, including the rise of capitalism, the development of a middle class, and the advent of the political nation-state. The emergence of Protestantism is also closely tied to the Enlightenment, rationalism, and empiricism. A major contributory factor was the invention of the printing press which not only made scripture available to nearly everyone, but also allowed for the sharing of ideas on a much wider scale (Tickle 50-54).

Phyllis Tickle theorizes that about every five hundred years or so, “the church cleans out its attic and has a rummage sale,” noting that earlier periods of transition occurred in the first century with the birth of Christianity and its codification of belief, ritual, and values, the sixth century with the fall of Rome and rise of monasticism, and the eleventh century surrounding the Great Schism between Constantinople and Rome and the consolidation of institutional power (16). The Great Reformation of the sixteenth century had been the most recent of these major cultural transformations until the dramatic cultural changes we are currently experiencing, many of which had already begun to occur during the twentieth century. The name given this current period of transition is “The Great Emergence.” Like the profound paradigm shifts that have come before it, The Great Emergence is affecting all aspects of culture – economic, social, and political. While Tickle’s main focus is religion in North America, she points out that the implications are worldwide and are not limited to Christianity.

Changes noted in the cultural climate around us include an increasing questioning of capitalism, erosion of a middle class, movement away from the nuclear family as the



foundational unit of society, a change from a cash-based to an information-based economic system, and the shift from nation-state to globalization. Other significant factors are the new communication technologies: the internet, World Wide Web, and social media, as well as the speed with which new technologies are constantly being introduced and assimilated into culture.

While the empirical perspective assumed some “absolutes” that could be discerned, post-modern thought is marked by uncertainty, especially about any basis for claiming “truth,” since all knowing is contextual and therefore the interpretation of truth is relative to the perceiver. The biblical implications of literary deconstruction are obvious, if writing “has no meaning outside the circumstances and disposition of the reader” (79).

Changes in the concept and composition of community have also been occurring over many decades. The demographic shift from rural to urban living with its characteristic of constant contact has created a different level of social interaction. Physical proximity also brings with it diversity in conversations, since different kinds of questions are likely to arise from multiple perspectives coming together. As mobility has increased and family ties to particular places (and particular churches) have eroded, old denominational divisions are melting away (133). At the same time, Tickle notes, a “subjective proximity” is arising in our culture. From the 1990’s on, the media age has made it possible for a multitude of ideas to fly freely and unrestricted in a shared and public way (her image is of bees around an upturned beehive), and without the filtering or “vetting” that had existed in earlier times. This haphazard blending leads to what Tickle calls a “ubiquitous theology” (133). Also, with the decline in loyalty to any particular institutional belief system, a non-doctrinal spirituality has been emerging. The “I’m spiritual but not religious” mantra that is often heard is one of the outcomes of a rejection of any centralized uniformity of belief.

The general movement in religion has been from doctrinal to experiential, a common metaphor being a mutual journey of spiritual exploration with fellow sojourners, often wounded ones. The size of the community is in flux as well, since the optimum size for this kind of relational journeying is the small group. As technology has enabled religious experience to move into secular and electronic space, practices have become “more interiorized” (106). Individual imagination is highly valued and nurtured. Music has tended to become more personal and participatory, especially with the introduction of the iPod. At the same time, the internet and cyberspace enable the connection of “each of us with all the rest of us.” Immediacy of connection on a global level brings with it an awareness of pain and an urgency about dealing with it, as well as the need to explore theological questions on a deeper level.

There are other factors as well. As one example Tickle cites the Korean and Vietnam Wars and the 1965 Services Act that resulted in a new influx of Asian influences, particularly Buddhism with its holistic incorporation of body, mind, and spirit and emphasis on subjective experience. As she notes, “the journey of the spirit did not require the baggage of religion to be a worthy and rewarding trek” (97). Many aspects of Buddhism, a non-theistic belief system, were readily assimilated into existing religious practices. Even the use of drugs has been a factor in raising questions about the nature of what is real and what is consciousness.

The Reformation concept of *sola scriptura* has long been under assault, beginning with the use of biblical texts to argue both for and against slavery. The need for reconfiguration of scripture as authority has continued to be voiced in discussions related to such social issues as the family, the role of women, divorce, and most recently, homosexuality (101). Tickle points out that when a profound change in culture is occurring, it is typical that generally accepted principles of morality from the past will be in flux. Examples can be seen in the controversies

surrounding Terry Schiavo, Dr. Jack Kevorkian, and the Roe versus Wade case. Technological advances in medicine have brought with them difficult beginning- and end-of-life issues.

Such profound cultural transformation into a post-modern, post-denominational, post-Enlightenment, post-rational world also signals a significant movement away from organized religion as it has existed in the past. As previous notions of what the church is and does are in flux, so is the role and authority of its leaders (93).

### *A Note on the Additional Model*

Originally, I had considered my typology complete with the first six models. But several years after my original work on this study began I was called to a setting quite different from the one I had been serving. This new setting was a congregation which had been described to me by denominational officials as a church “restart,” a congregation which had emerged from the dissolution of an older, dying one, but with very little similarity to it. The congregation’s story is that through the creation of a “living will” which included clear markers for assessing continued viability, it became evident to the members that the hundred-year-old church had reached the end of its life. The decision was made to sell the building, disperse property and remaining assets in a meaningful way, and assist members in finding new church homes. The process of disbanding had nearly been accomplished when a small group of members decided that they wanted to continue as a church somehow, but to continue in an intentionally very different way. And so they “re-invented” what it means to be church. Other than the fact that most of them already knew one another, everything about this re-start was brand new – structure, leadership style, decision-making processes, worship, meeting place, even their vote to be “Open and Affirming”

(a designation in the UCC of congregations who are fully inclusive of and welcoming to all people regardless of sexual orientation).

As I looked at the models I had been working with thus far, and at the same time struggled each day to live out my pastoral role in an environment that was quite new to me, I noted that none of the models described what I sensed was needed of a pastor in this setting. As I surveyed the literature on this new way of being church, some clarity began to emerge from the fog. When the Rev. Steve Sterner, then head of UCC Local Church Ministries, sent out his annual letter comparing “established” and “emerging” church characteristics, I saw in it the basis for a congregational discussion: If we are not fitting into any of the familiar molds, then what are we? The outcome of that conversation was the realization that we definitely leaned toward the “emerging” model of church Sterner had described. Now we had something to go on.

I also recalled from Lee Barrett’s most recent lecture on the subject that he had expanded his original typology to include an additional model, which he called “Mediatorial/Educative,” describing it as a recent phenomenon, a post-modern version of church leadership. His description of what church is and does in this model seemed to apply to my new setting: a church typified by the radical pluralism of its congregants, quite often people originally from churches representing more traditional ecclesiologies who now find themselves together in one congregation. Barrett had noted that a key value in this model is “learning to play together without hurting one another,” and one task of the pastor is to mediate radical difference, preventing “ideological civil war.” The leader’s role is also to expose the congregation to multiple forms of Christianity, nurturing an appreciation for all, and promoting “cross-fertilization.” His description of this model resonated, more than any of the previous models had, with how my congregation was “being church.”

Ongoing reading and consulting, in addition to participant-observation of the values being revealed in the kind of choices we were making as we went about being a church, helped me create the seventh model, which I determined would be best labeled “Midwife.” One of my colleagues in ministry, the Rev. Dr. Marsha Woodard, had coined the label to describe her own work with peer groups at Palmer University, and this had been the basis for her doctoral thesis. Modeling her Midwife Leadership Style (MLS) after the traditional role of a midwife in the birthing process, Woodard gives her description of the style as follows:

- a relational model of leadership that values each person
  - one in which the leader has a personal and intimate relationship with God
  - one in which the leader sees and understands her or himself to be a co-laborer with God
  - one in which the leader lives in the creative tension between structure and tradition, freedom and creativity
  - one that values a process of human transformation that allows each individual to develop in his or her own way
  - one that understands that persons grow at different rates and in different ways
  - one that transcends traditional expectations
  - one that is inclusive of a variety of ideas
  - one that does not encourage replicas of the leader.
- [A person or persons] using the Midwife Leadership Style (MLS) will be:
- intentional in maintaining an intimate relationship with God
  - more frequently described as ‘both/and’ thinkers than as ‘either/or’ thinkers
  - aware of their own limitation[s] and will know when to ask for help or to utilize the skills and gifts of others
  - seen as one who walks alongside of, encourages and helps others get to where they are going
  - a learner who continually is reading in a variety of areas in order to provide a unique experience for each person
  - seen as one who seeks open-ended outcomes
  - expecting each person . . . to have their own ‘birth,’ ‘miscarriage,’ or ‘abortion’
  - clear about their role and not inclined to do for the other what the other can or should do [for his or her] . . . self (Woodard 25-27).

In surveying related literature I have noted that the same or similar leadership style descriptions appear in the writing of participants in and observers of the changing face of the church as it emerges from Christendom. Loren Mead had written in 1991 that “we are being called to be midwives for a new church . . .” (5). Doug Pagett refers to a leader in this model as

“curator” (101); Kurt Hadaway names the leader as “provocateur” (117); the label used by Standish is “conduit” (144), and McFayden describes such leaders as “seekers” (101). This model also resonates with the “servant leader” in the writings of Kent Keith and others based on the work of Robert K. Greenleaf (Keith 9-10). Piazza and Trimble of the Center for Progressive Renewal contrast typical leadership models of the past, valued as “the experts” in one fashion or another, to effective leaders for a changing context, whom they describe as “the networkers, the collaborators, the facilitators, the lifelong learners” (140).

The Midwife Model is distinctive from the other six types in the following ways. While the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model** assumes a body of authoritative teaching that is to be passed on, such as creeds, confessions, and theologies, the Midwife Model considers all doctrines open for fresh interpretation. Leadership in the former is hierarchical, based on an assumption that the leader has acquired formal knowledge and skill that prioritizes his or her interpretations over those of non-clerical participants. In the Midwife Model the contextual nature of all interpretations is assumed and so interpretation from a wide range of perspectives is valued. The Rabbinic/Magisterial Model places a high value on acquired knowledge and the cognitive domain. Reliance is on an educational model of faith formation, suggesting a distinction between mind and body. The Midwife tends to place equal value in the experiential and the mystical, and assumes a holistic relationship between body, mind, and spirit. Community in the Rabbinic/Magisterial Model tends to be well-ordered, while in the Midwife Model there is a high tolerance for chaos, since the interactive journey toward discipleship is unpredictable in nature.

Although the well-being of the community is of concern in both the **Community Builder** and Midwife Models, and a binding relationship between God and covenant partners is nurtured in both, the nature of community is understood differently. In the Community Builder Model

stability and the preservation of social order is prioritized, while the Midwife Model's focus on transformational change is more likely to involve intentional disruptions of institutional continuity and "harmony."

The **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic** and Midwife Models also share some aims. These include an emphasis on transformation or "change of heart," the valuing of an experience of God over learning "about" God, the modeling of spiritual practices that effect spiritual growth, a responsiveness to the movement of the Spirit, and an emphasis on the witnessing community in a variety of contexts rather than the maintenance of the institution. However, focus on the charismatic leadership of one person or looking to leaders to have "the answers" is not characteristic of the Midwife Model, although that may be true in the Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model. Diana Butler Bass describes a different kind of charisma, more typical of the Midwife, which is ". . . shared or dispersed throughout congregational systems and creates grassroots commitment" (307). Midwife leaders would prefer to bring many views into conversation rather than be persuaders of a particular point of view, and a variety of religious experiences would be valued. Also, communal as well as personal formation is emphasized in the Midwife Model.

The **Priestly/Sacramental Model** places high value on tradition and continuity with the church through the ages. A sense of organic connectedness of the whole church in all its diverse settings would also be valued in the Midwife Model, but along with receptiveness to ancient liturgies and traditional interpretations would be openness to a wide variety of innovative interpretations, especially in regard to atonement and soteriology. In contrast to concern for sacraments being rightly administered, many ways to celebrate communion might be explored in the Midwife Model. Leadership authority in the Priestly/Sacramental Model comes from the

“center;” ordained leaders are considered to be imbued with power by the institution, “entrusted with sacred authority.” In the Midwife Model, “church” is not so much an institution as a self-organizing system of relationships, complex and interactive. Rather than a leader entrusted with sacred authority, what holds it together is the cohesiveness of the interactive community itself as a conducive center for all to connect with God, each other, and the world.

In the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**, priority is given to maintaining the institution and preserving its social system. In the Midwife Model, the church is understood as a social system as well, but its boundaries are highly permeable. Preservation of that system is not a goal; transformation is. Facilitative leadership is valued in both, but a leader in the Midwife Model is not viewed as the “fixer of problems.” Emphasis in the Midwife Model is on adaptive change from within the community as part of the journey of becoming, rather than on problem-solving. To that end, emphasis is placed in the Midwife Model on building on identified strengths of all the participants and what is going well. The mastery of measurable skill sets would be useful in the Midwife Model to some extent, but not for the primary purpose of meeting the needs of parishioners by providing programs or services, or for maintaining administrative stability. Rather, the skills most desirable in the Midwife Model would be those of facilitation, collaboration, and networking.

In both the **Social Activist** and Midwife models the church is understood as existing to fulfill God’s mission, and the view is global. A common aim is to empower participants for service in a changing and pluralistic world, and both models are grounded in a belief that the church must be ready to empty itself of power in order to accept its servant calling. Both would critique the tendency of other models to make institutional stability a priority, or to even to be fixed in location. The primary difference may be that in the Midwife Model mission has a



broader meaning. Engagement in God's mission in the world is seen as disciple-forming through shared experience and shared trajectory, and personal and group transformation within the faith community itself would carry as much weight as systemic or societal transformation.

### **Units and Objects of Analysis**

Units of analysis for this study are the following documents which contain denominational guidelines, both local and national, for authorizing ordained ministry. Descriptive language in the documents is arrayed through the use of the typology for the purpose of revealing broad theological concepts of church and ministry.

#### ***Objects of Analysis: Local Guidelines***

The following documents of the Lancaster Association are studied in the course of this inquiry. *The Lancaster Association Committee on Ministry In Care Manual* was developed in August of 2000. It is intended to be used in conjunction with the United Church of Christ *Manual on Ministry*, a general resource for procedures of ministry authorization in the denomination. Because the actual responsibility for ministerial authorization is in the hands of the local Association, it is recommended by the national setting that each Association put into writing its particular requirements and procedures. Not all Associations have done so, but Lancaster is one that has developed its own manual for use by candidates, pastors, and churches. This manual includes a description of the process by which a decision is made to receive a candidate in Care of (a Member in Discernment of) the Association, guidelines for the ongoing In Care process, criteria for yearly renewal of In Care status, and description of the process by

which readiness for ordination is to be determined. In addition to the local *Manual*, the following documents are in use.

The “**Ministry Assessment Program (MAP)**” document describes the battery of assessment tests and surveys that are required by the Lancaster Association to be administered to all candidates as part of the In Care (Member in Discernment) process. This testing is administered by the Samaritan Counseling Center, a regional organization chosen for this purpose by the Associations of Penn Central Conference in consultation with Conference staff. The document is provided to the Associations by the Samaritan Counseling Center.

“**Objectives of Clinical Pastoral Education**” is a document provided to the Associations of Penn Central Conference by the Conference office. It outlines in general terms the Clinical Pastoral Education (CPE) accredited program. It is a requirement of the Lancaster Association that its candidates for ordination successfully complete one unit of CPE prior to authorization.

***Object of Analysis: National Guidelines***

As stated earlier, the national document under consideration in this study was produced by the **Ministry Issues Implementation Committee** in collaboration with the **Parish Life and Leadership Team, Local Church Ministries**. *Draft 3.1, Progress to Date, Materials Shared for Use and Comment, October 2008, Ministry Issues Pronouncement; Implementing the Pronouncement: “Ministry Issues: Forming and Preparing Pastoral Leaders for God’s Church”* is the most recent working paper that has been shared with all settings of the denomination. It is intended to augment the 2002 *UCC Manual on Ministry*.

The particular portion of the materials evaluated in this study includes the introductory letter and comments, and the “Marks of Faithful and Effective Authorized Ministers.” These “Marks” are intended to be used “developmentally,” that is, throughout the process of ministerial formation. The “Marks” are also suggested for use in the oversight of persons already authorized for ministry, as part of ongoing support and encouragement for continued growth (Local Church Ministries, *Draft 3.1* 14).

*Draft 3.1* includes additional materials in various stages of development, such as sample pages of some of the resources which are still in progress. It is the intention of the Implementation Committee to add to future drafts as feedback is received and the guidelines are completed and refined. Because this material is not yet complete, it has not been reviewed as part of this study.

### **CHAPTER 3: The Results of Applying the Typology**

Questions put to the data through the use of the typology are: What preferences are represented by the innate characteristics that seem to be considered desirable and looked for in prospective candidates? What is being nurtured in the discernment process? What characteristics are being selectively tested for or looked for in the reporting received from outside sources? What pastoral skills are considered essential? What understandings of church are being affirmed - not only in what is specifically required of the candidate but also in what is being modeled by the Committee in the interaction with the candidate?

Answers to these questions are then evaluated in light of the larger questions of this study: How is the valuing of diversity in our denomination reflected in the guidelines we follow for authorizing ministry? Of the range of historical and contemporary ecclesiologies that are represented, do some appear to be given more weight than others? How do local and national guidelines compare? And, since it is the role of a local Committee on the Ministry to authorize ministry on behalf of the whole denomination, what are the implications of such differences?

The local guidelines are divided into three phases of the process toward ordination, a progression in discrete “stages:” Initial Assessment, Ongoing Assessment, and Assessment for Authorization. Appropriate sections from the multiple documents in use by the Lancaster Association are addressed as they correspond to each of the above phases.

The national guidelines, in particular the “Marks,” are to be applied throughout the process toward authorization, and indeed beyond it. The national guidelines are contained in one document.

## Analysis of Local Guidelines

### INITIAL ASSESSMENT

#### Document: *Lancaster Association In Care Manual*

The *In Care Manual* of the Lancaster Association is found in APPENDIX A. Originally produced in August of 2000, this *Manual* is made available to each candidate, local pastor, and congregation as they enter into the process. At this time, the language in the Manual has not been changed to reflect the shift from “Student in Care” to “Member in Discernment” in national guidelines, hence the continuing use of the former terminology. It should be noted that, at the present time, the “Marks of Readiness” from the latest draft of the national guidelines are also provided to those entering the process of discernment. According to the current chairperson of the Committee, these “Marks” are to be used in addition to the local *Manual* by the members of the Committee on the Ministry, the Member in Discernment, his or her local church pastor, and any advisors and church committees that relate to the member during the discernment process. The Committee is currently studying sections of *Draft 3.1* of the national guidelines, discussing how each would impact current practices and require changes in the existing Lancaster Association Manual. A sub-committee has been formed to work on rewriting the local manual.

The process of receiving a candidate In Care of the Association is outlined in the first section of the *Manual*. Pages 2 through 5 describe how decisions are to be made whether or not to receive a person In Care, including what those who authorize ministry on behalf of the denomination should be looking for in potential candidates for ordination.

The **“INTRODUCTION”** on page 2 is concerned primarily with establishing a covenantal relationship (line 8) among all parties in this process. It lists the relationships that are expected to be created and nurtured between the candidate and the local church, the Association Committee on the Ministry, the In Care Advisor, and the seminary. The candidate is expected to be an active partner in this covenant. This is a characteristic concern of the **Community Builder Model**, emphasizing as it does the role of leader as facilitator of the covenant community.

Aspects of the **Midwife Model** may also be noted. For instance, the language describes the discernment process as a “journey of preparation” (line 17) facilitated by multiple persons engaged in that journey together for the purpose of providing “counsel, support, and assistance,” presumably to one another (line 16). In the sections that follow those relationships are described in detail. As described in the Introduction, there is an implication of collegiality; no one person or entity appears to be assigned a dominant role.

Encouragement of a candidate to “apply for in care status no later than the beginning of the first year of seminary” (lines 19-20) implies the need for a significant length of time for the building of an interpersonal relationship.

**“1. RELATIONSHIP WITH THE LOCAL CHURCH PASTOR.”** This section emphasizes two areas which are both representative of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. First, the process toward In Care status must begin in a congregation of the United Church of Christ, through conversation with a UCC pastor. Denominational manuals are to be followed and the denominational process toward ordination needs to be clearly understood (lines 33-34). A concern for continuity with UCC practices and

the maintaining of denominational loyalty can be construed as an extension of this model's interest in institutional maintenance.

Skill development, which is also valued in the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**, is evidenced here. Under the local pastor's guidance, the candidate is to be involved "in as many local church activities as possible during the in care period," (lines 37-38) by participating in "the leadership of sacraments and rites" (line 40) and by serving as "preacher, liturgist, teacher, youth advisor, parish visitor, holder of office, etc." (line 42), all of which would involve the development of certain skills. A candidate's experience in the role of "preacher, liturgist, teacher" resonates with the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model's** emphasis on proclamation, valuing ministerial skills of theologian and interpreter of the Word and other authoritative documents.

Encouraging this level of participation would nurture deeper relationship between the candidate and other members of the congregation, characteristic of the **Midwife Model**. This emphasis is further noted in the requirement that the candidate be "an active member of the local church for about a year" (lines 28-29). Although the reason for the time requirement is left unexplained, it may be assumed that a congregation and its pastor cannot engage with one of its members in such a process without getting to know the person well. (The role of the local pastor and congregation is not only significant at the beginning of the journey, but continues to be deemed important as the process of discernment goes on.)

Two other types are also indicated in this section. The **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model**, which emphasizes an internal spirituality, sense of divine calling, inner reflection and responsiveness to the Holy Spirit, is in evidence in what is being looked for in a candidate. The process begins with recognition of the member's own "sense of calling" (line 27), described by

H. Richard Niebuhr as the “inner call.” Discernment and clarification of that sense of call takes place between the member and his or her pastor, as “[t]ogether they . . . pray for God’s guidance through the power of the Holy Spirit” (lines 29-30).

Concern for the proper administration of the sacraments resonates with an emphasis of the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**. The *Manual* states: “A student may not serve as the celebrant in Holy Communion, Baptism, or in weddings,” but may be invited “to participate in the leadership of the sacraments and rites aforementioned” by the pastor (lines 38-40). The implication is that such learning is necessary, and participation needs to be supervised by someone entrusted with authority to ensure that appropriate liturgical practices are followed.

**“2. RELATIONSHIP WITH LOCAL CHURCH CONSISTORY/COUNCIL.”** This section, which begins on page 3, is itself divided into three parts. These address, first, the candidate’s responsibilities in regard to an initial interview with the governing body of the local congregation or a committee established by it; second, information about the candidate to be furnished by the pastor; and third, instructions to the congregation regarding a psychological assessment of the candidate.

Overall, the section resonates with the **Priestly/Sacramental Model** in its emphasis on the necessity for a candidate’s matriculation through proper channels in the organizational structure of the local church, as endorsement is initially conferred by the “Consistory/Council” on behalf of the congregation. That it is the congregation to which the recognition of a call is entrusted is itself a characteristic of a Congregational version of the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**, in which the congregation is the basic unit of the church. (It is noted that Episcopal Priestly/Sacramental Models would be very different.) The local church is expected to look for



evidence that the candidate has not only the maturity but also “the gifts . . . needed for ordained ministry” (lines 28-29).

This section makes clear that the lines of church authority are to be respected, in continuity with the tradition of the church; the Consistory/Council is the entity through which authority is passed on as it “creates its own In Care Committee or assigns the responsibility to an already existing committee” (lines 5-6). The local church is expected to explain the process it has followed and to transmit the results as part of its recommendation of the candidate to the Association (lines 41-42). The stated concern for the candidate’s “understanding of ordained ministry” and “the requirements and process of preparation for ordination” (lines 30-31) also indicate a desire for continuity with tradition.

There is evidence of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model** in the denominational concerns expressed. For a second time the requirement is stated that under ordinary circumstances, before applying to the Consistory/Council for in care status, “the candidate must be a member of a local UCC church for one year” (page 3, lines 3-4). This is affirmed later on in the section APPLICATION FOR IN CARE STATUS to be filled out by the pastor where “[v]erification and length of membership in this congregation and in all UCC congregations to date” (lines 39-40) is specified. The repetition suggests a valuing of a candidate’s knowledge of and experience in the United Church of Christ, resonating with the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model’s** concern for denominational stability.

The requirement that the candidate provide to the governing board or its committee a “Professional resume (listing work, education, civic, church and other experiences with dates” (lines 21-22) is another indication of emphasis on skills attained through experience. The request for descriptive information from the pastor about the candidate indicates valuing of

particular attributes and skills for leadership, such as “Psychological stability (capacity to establish and maintain harmonious interpersonal relationships with others, to cope well with stressful situations, and to exercise adequate emotional control)” (page 4, lines 7-9), and “Sensitivity to and awareness of needs and motives of others (capacity to care about and consider the feelings of others, and to attempt to understand why people behave as they do)” (lines 11-13). Emphasized is an aptitude for the development of particular professional skills for the maintaining of church as a social institution in which the pastor functions as motivator, counselor, and solver of problems. Note also the description, “Ability to . . . deal effectively and creatively with problems” in lines 15-17. Another indication of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model** is an emphasis on the “Ability to assume . . . and to fulfill responsibilities” (lines 15 and 17).

Several desired attributes may also be indicative of the **Midwife Model**: for instance, the valuing of resourcefulness and creative approaches (lines 15-16), as well as wholeness - “Physical health” (line 18), “Breadth of interest (evidence of varied interests, hobbies, leisure activities and creative pursuits)” (lines 19-20), and “Awareness of her/his own physical, emotional, and spiritual needs” (line 22).

Whether the preference is more indicative of one model or the other (**Midwife or Reflective Practitioner/Administrator**) would be revealed in the degree to which institutional stability is the desired goal, and in how directive a role a ministerial leader should take. The preference is not clear in this section, although there does appear to be more emphasis on a certain professionalism, which suggests the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator model**. The attribute of “Leadership ability (capacity and confidence to lead effectively)” (line 10) may also be an indication that a more “hands on” approach is envisioned.

**The Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model** appears to carry some weight in this section, as evidenced in what is to be discussed when the local church In Care Committee meets with the member – specifically, how the experience of participation in the local church has “contributed to the candidate’s sense of call” (lines 26-27). The member is also directed to submit a statement about his or her “General faith pilgrimage,” to include “Christian experience, insights and encounters which have shaped the candidate’s faith . . .” (lines 13-15). This statement is also to address his or her “call to ministry,” which should reflect on “personal faith and life that leads to the feeling that he/she is being called to ministry in the Church of Jesus Christ” (lines 16-18). The request for assessment by the local church pastor of the candidate’s “confidence” in leadership (line 10), as well as “Ability to share his/her spiritual journey” (line 21) suggest a valuing of qualities of inner spirituality and persuasive witnessing. This may also be indicated in the desired ability to “clearly express self both orally and in writing” (page 4, lines 5-6). It is noted that the pastor is also requested to comment on the candidate’s “Awareness of his/her own . . . spiritual needs” (line 22).

**The Rabbinic/Magisterial Model** is also well-represented in this section. Since the candidate is directed to submit the bulk of this information in writing, it can be assumed that he or she is expected to be verbally articulate and that clarity is a desired trait. This is stated specifically in the request for comment from the pastor on “Communication skills” (lines 5-6). (It is noted that verbal clarity would be a trait valued in the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model** and perhaps the other models as well, as a generally desired attribute of leadership.) There is evidence that academic ability is being valued here, since a candidate is required to provide “Academic transcripts from college and any graduate work, including seminary” and to describe “Current education plans, if appropriate” (page 3, lines 19-

20). The local pastor is also asked to comment on “Academic potential (intellectual alertness, curiosity, and ability; openness of mind” (page 4, lines 3-4). The candidate is expected to be able to reflect theologically on his or her call to ministry (page 3, lines 16-17).

The **Community Builder Model** is represented briefly in this section in the concern expressed for the building of covenantal relationships between the church, pastor, and the candidate (page 3, line 43 and following), encouraging the support of all parties involved.

There is only the briefest indication of any preference for characteristics of the **Social Activist Model**. A candidate’s “concern for social issues” is mentioned only once, under information requested from the pastor (page 4, lines 13-14).

**“3. RELATIONSHIP WITH THE IN CARE SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE LANCASTER ASSOCIATION COMMITTEE ON CHURCH AND MINISTRY,”** the section found on pages 4 and 5, describes the basis upon which the decision is made by the Association Committee to grant In Care status. Noted in the opening sentences are words describing an initial interview with the Sub-Committee: “The candidate is accompanied [to the interview] by her/his pastor and one or more members of the local church’s In Care Committee. The interview is a dialogue between the candidate and the In Care Sub-Committee in which local church representatives are free to participate” (page 4, lines 40-43). Such a strong affirmation of the covenantal relationship between a local church and the Association of which it is part is indicative once again of the **Community Builder Model**.

On page 4, lines 38-43 describe a chain of transmission of authority in regard to recognition of call that suggests the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**. The local church In Care Committee conveys the outcome of its initial discernment process with the candidate to the Association’s In Care Sub-Committee, which is assigned the first step in the assessment task for

the Committee on the Ministry. All materials that have been gathered by the local church are funneled through and evaluated by this Sub-Committee (line 39), whose task it will be to discern on behalf of the Association (and ultimately the denomination) if “this is a person with gifts for ordained ministry” (page 5, line 11). It is noted that, in saying “no” to an applicant, the Sub-Committee acts on behalf of “the whole church” (line 28).

That the Sub-Committee also must discern if this is a person with “an authentic call to ministry” (line 12) could suggest either the **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic** or the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**, depending upon the meaning of “authentic call” in this context. It is not clear if this is referring to an inner or outward/providential call; or perhaps it refers to both. That emphasis is placed on the Sub-Committee’s discernment through “prayer” (line 27) resonates with the **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model**.

Other models are indicated as well. That a recommendation may be made, if deemed necessary, for the candidate to engage in “further . . . study” (line 19) resonates with the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**. That a recommendation could be made for “further . . . counseling” (line 19) in order to “address the identified deficiencies” in a candidate (line 23) is indicative of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**.

Reference is made in both the second and third sections of the Manual to “the psychological assessment which is required of all candidates who have applied for in care status” (page 4, lines 25-26). This will be considered at the end of the “initial assessment” process of the local Association. Reference is also made in this third section to “Annual Reviews of In Care Standing,” a topic addressed more appropriately under “Ongoing Assessment.”

**“4. RELATIONSHIP TO THE IN CARE ADVISOR,”** the section located on pages 6 and 7, describes the assigning of an Advisor to a candidate when he or she is granted In Care (Member in Discernment) status. Since this relationship is intended to continue throughout the entire process, and its descriptive elements are mainly related to ongoing assessment, this portion of the Manual will be evaluated under that heading, for the most part. There are a few elements which have bearing on the initial assessment phase, however, and these are addressed here. The statements that an Advisor “counsels the candidate in the fulfillment of all requirements and standards as far as preparation for ordained ministry is concerned” (page 6, lines 21-23), and will be “very familiar with the in care process outlined in the MANUAL ON MINISTRY . . . and further spelled out in this manual” (lines 28-30) indicate an emphasis on proper denominational procedure. Concern for denominational order and stability is indicative of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**.

The Advisor is also directed to “inform the In Care Sub-Committee if the candidate is not receiving appropriate mailings from the Association, Conference, and wider church” (lines 35-37), suggesting concerns for building strong ties with the denomination and attention to covenant-keeping. This is an indication that both the candidate and the Advisor are expected to be active partners in the covenant, a characteristic concern of the **Community Builder Model**. Another indication may be the description of the Advisor as “a role model for the candidate” (line 20), since in this model the leader is expected to serve as a guide through his or her own exemplary behavior. That the advisor “is usually an ordained minister” (line 24) may also indicate the Advisor serves as role model.

Another directive is that the Advisor be assigned “without delay” (lines 19-20), so that he or she may be “available and ready to respond to questions and concerns” (line 21), and become

“a true friend and confidant of the candidate” (line 23). “The Advisor will hold an initial meeting with the new candidate in care very soon after he/she receives the in care status.” Emphasis is being placed on an early establishment of a “relationship that is quite unique” between these two persons (lines 33-34), indicating a hope that it will continue to develop over time. Candidate and Advisor are also encouraged to “discuss expectations each has for the other” (lines 32-33). These are all suggestive of the **Midwife Model** with its emphasis on personal companionship in the journey. In this model, gifts and spiritual growth are nurtured primarily through person-to-person relationships.

Remaining portions of the fourth section, as well as the fifth and sixth sections, cover aspects of ongoing assessment and/or assessment for authorization. Before turning to these later stages in the In Care (Member in Discernment) process, the psychological assessment is addressed.

**Document: “Ministry Assessment Program (MAP)”**

The “Psychological Assessment” mentioned several times in the *Manual* refers to a formal ministry assessment provided by the Samaritan Counseling Center of Lancaster. It is also described by the Center as “guidance on the vocational path.” Under RELATIONSHIP WITH LOCAL CHURCH CONSISTORY/COUNCIL it is stated: “The local church is requested to provide one-third (1/3) of the cost involved in the psychological assessment which is required of all candidates who have applied for in care status” (page 4, lines 24-26). Also, the directive is that, following an initial interview, “arrangements will be made as soon as possible for the candidate to undergo a psychological assessment by a group approved by both the Association and the Conference” (page 5, lines 1-3). A full description of this assessment is found in a

document supplied to the Lancaster Association Committee on the Ministry by the Samaritan Counseling Center (APPENDIX B).

The opening page offers an overview of the objectives of “assessment and testing of candidates seeking ordination” (line 10) as well as other possible ministry-related applications of the program. Of the three assessment batteries, the one used with candidates for ordination is the “VOCPSYCH” (at line 29) or “vocational, psychological, and spiritual assessment of those seeking ordination” (lines 15-16). The desire for denominational stability behind the engagement of a professional counseling center to assess all candidates for ordination from a psychological perspective relate to the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. In fact, the stated aim of the VOCPSYCH Battery is “[t]o try to answer questions that are important for candidate selection committees to consider” (page 2, lines 18 and 19). Under “Role of the evaluation in the candidacy process” on pages 2 and 3, the purpose of testing is indeed to “inform the committee” (page 3, line 3).

The elements of the battery of tests used are described in the pages that follow. Listed in the opening description on pages 1 through 3 are the broad goals of the battery: “[t]o provide a sensitive description of the whole person . . . [that] captures the more subjective aspects of the person . . . in the context of their family, vocation, community and church . . . sensitive to the complexity of the person as opposed to a sterile clinical portrait.” This holistic approach resonates with the **Midwife Model**. That the description is “supported by the scientifically informed techniques of psychology . . .” and offers a “clinical portrait” (page 2, lines 9, 15-16) aligns with interests of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model** in measurable skills and aptitudes (or deficiencies) in ordained leaders. The stated goal of “sensitively describing the



person's history and behavior in integrated framework and analyzing personality dynamics" (page 3, lines 3-5) relates to both of the models mentioned.

An overall concern for and use of techniques to ascertain a candidate's potential functioning within the church as a social system is a characteristic of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. This concern is in evidence throughout the document; for example, the stated intent of testing is to provide "an objective, scientifically supported description of the person" (page 3, line 2). Attention will be given to signs of "emotional/interpersonal concerns . . . evidence that a person is excessively seeking to nurture his or her own needs through the church . . . depression or anxiety . . . interpersonal difficulties " (page 2, lines 26-33). The VOCPSYCH Battery seeks to address the question: "Is there any indication that the person's ministry would be seriously compromised? For example: active psychosis, antisocial or clear personality disorder, primitive defenses with a resulting severe lack of self-awareness, high risk of acting out" (lines 37-45).

But there are indications of testing for preferences related to other models as well. The assessment is designed to also cover "spiritual" aspects of those seeking ordination (page 1, line 15, repeated in line 22), a concern of the **Mystic or Spiritual Charismatic Model**.

Also assessed are "gifts" the persons brings, or "shortfalls" (which it is assumed refers to a lack of appropriate gifts for ministry). Innate gifts could relate to more than one model, but this appears to mean attributes present in a person as part of their inner call, and so would be indicative of the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**.

There are additional items to note in the descriptive material provided for each of the individual tests in the VOCPSYCH Battery:

**Clinical Interview**. The holistic approach of the Clinical Interview is observed in the stated goal “to collect a rich personal and religious history that compliments and fleshes out the formal tests” (page 3, lines 14 and 15). The wide range of areas to be covered by the interviewer would reveal information deemed important in the integrated and relational **Midwife Model**.

In the specifics of the interview, though, attention to “Occupational Data” is more indicative of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**, as is a concern for information about “Family Background; Relationship . . . Health; Sexuality; & Finances” (lines 16-18).

Attention to the candidate’s personal “Religious History (including past and present relationship to God . . .)” resonates with the focus of the **Mystic or Spiritual Charismatic Model** on personal spirituality. The same is affirmed in the statements that “the interview explores such things as: Who influenced you most about God as a child?” (line 24), and “What have been some of the most significant religious or spiritual experiences in your life?” (lines 26 and 27). Attention to the candidate’s personal religious history in regard to “past and present relationship to . . . church” may be evidence of the **Priestly/Sacramental Model** and its sense of continuity with the institution. Concerns for assessing cognitive abilities are indicated in the questions “How has your view of God evolved since becoming an adult?” and “What religious idea or concept is most important to you?” (page 3, lines 25 and 28). These assessments of theological concepts and the expression of them relates most closely with the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**.

**Abbreviated Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised (WAIS-R)**. Described as a “cognitive test designed primarily to measure intellectual functioning” (page 3, lines 32-34), including “Verbal functioning and Performance functioning” (lines 35 and 36), the intent of the WAIS-R is most in line with interests of the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**, for a primary

purpose of this portion of the Battery is to assess the potential of the candidate for success in graduate studies (line 40). A secondary concern for “the examinee’s approach to problem-solving” (line 45) resonates with the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**.

“Performance functioning” could relate to all the models, but perhaps most notably the **Mystic or Spiritual Charismatic Model**, in the degree to which language skills and skills for self-expression facilitate persuasive witnessing and preaching. In terms of worship leadership, “performance functioning” could also relate to the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**.

**Thematic Apperception Test (TAT)**. The TAT is an instrument intended to uncover the degree to which the “examinee ‘projects’ his/her own needs, motivations, conflicts/stressors, thoughts, feelings and resolutions” in coping with “environmental and social stressors” (page 4, lines 8-17). This is a concern indicative of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model** and its emphasis on the church as a social system, its leaders equipped to facilitate its optimum functioning. Information on how one is affected by and interacts with his or her environment would also be important in the **Midwife Model** as these determine effective functioning in a relational community.

**Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS)**. The EPPS is described as a measure of self-awareness of “strengths and weakness in each of 15 different domains” in a self-reporting format administered by a questionnaire (lines 21-23). Based on the examples of “domains” given – “the need for achievement, the need for autonomy, and the need for nurturance” – the concerns of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model** for stability of the church as social system are primary. This information would be important in the **Midwife Model** of leadership as well, since inclinations being tested for could determine how a candidate would function in a more flexible and unpredictable environment.

**Strong Interest Inventory (SII)**. This assessment of vocational interest for the purpose of predicting occupational satisfaction, when it indicates a style of leadership that is function- and task-oriented, would associate it with the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. The range of interests could also prioritize leadership in the **Midwife Model**. This is especially true when the test assesses potential leanings toward “Artistic” and “Social” activities (lines 31 and 32). In fact, “Enterprising,” “Realistic,” and “Investigative” indicators (lines 33-36) would also support the **Midwife Model**, depending on the preferences the testing reveals. Working style indicators – “prefers to work alone or with things VS prefers to work in groups or with people” (page 5, lines 1 and 2) – could emphasize one leadership model or the other, again depending on testing outcomes. A preference for learning environments would relate to the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**, if a preference for “academic environments” is preferred over “practical learning environments” (lines 3 and 4). The latter is more strongly related to skill development, a concern of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**.

**Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)**. An indicator of preferences which “influence what one pays attention to and how one draws conclusions from what one perceives” (lines 17 and 18), the MBTI also focuses on functioning. This is a concern associated with both the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator** and **Midwife Models**.

**Religious Orientation Assessment Battery (ROAB)**. It is not clear that this battery, which indicates “different orientations to being religious” (line 42), would prioritize one model of leadership over another, although it is interesting that the three “Dimensions” each suggest leanings. For instance, “The END Dimension” . . . “views religion as an end in itself. The person tends to believe in traditional religious doctrines . . .” (page 5, lines 45 and 46). Affinity with this dimension would indicate the **Priestly/Sacramental Model** and its emphasis on creed,

catechism, and continuity with tradition, and also the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**. An inclination of a candidate toward “The MEANS Dimension,” an orientation which “views religion as a means to self-serving ends . . .” in which “[r]eligion may be used to provide security, comfort, social activity or status and a way to justify oneself” (page 6, lines 2-4) would seem to ferret out an undesirable characteristic rather than a positive one. This would be a concern mainly of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. “The QUEST Dimension” which indicates “an open-ended, responsive dialogue with existential questions raised by the contradictions and tragedies of life” ( page 6, lines 7 and 8) resonates most clearly with the **Midwife Model**.

**Beck Depression Inventory (BDI)**. The intent of this test to screen for indications of “the examinee’s current state of mood regarding whether they are depressed or not” relates most closely to the concerns of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**.

**Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI-2)**. The purpose of this test, which is based on “self-descriptions” through use of a self-administered questionnaire, is to provide measured indicators of “level of emotional adjustment” (line 26) and other personality features and psychological states, such as “depression, mania, antisocial tendencies and psychosis” (line 28). The MMPI-2 also observes “an open versus a guarded manner” (line 30). These concerns for a candidate’s psychological state most closely relate to leadership in the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**, although relating to others in a healthy way would also be fundamental to functioning in the **Midwife Model**. Another feature of the MMPI-2 is that it indicates “educational problems” (line 25), which would be a concern related to the academically-focused **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**.

**The Rorschach.** The purpose of this test is to “assess the structure of personality with regards to the examinees’ unconscious processes and how his/her environment is organized and given meaning” (lines 41 and 42). Responses “are created by relying on one’s personal ideas, relationships and internal images.” Such concerns could suggest the **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model**. Relational aspects of what may be revealed would resonate with both the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator** and the **Midwife Models**. The Rorschach’s potential for revealing “latent psychopathology” (page 7, line 9) relates it to the range of functional concerns of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**.

**General observations on the Ministry Assessment Program (MAP) testing.** Although “spiritual assessment” is listed in the opening description of the MAP, it seldom appears in descriptions of intended outcomes of the actual tests in the battery. The MAP battery appears to focus mainly on revealing psychological aspects of a candidate for ordination and how these relate to vocational aptitudes and skills. Such aspects would be important to leadership in the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**, if they indicate a person’s ability to function as motivator, counselor, and problem-solver in the oversight of the optimal functioning of a social system. On the other hand, the same psychological aspects could relate to the **Midwife Model**, if they indicate the capability of a potential leader to serve as a catalyst for the building of interpersonal relationships in community. The difference may be to what degree the stability of the system is important, and also how directive a role the leader is expected to take. These matters are not specifically indicated in the outcomes of the MAP battery. To a much lesser degree, the testing is intended to indicate academic potential, which would be a concern for leadership in the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**.

**Document: Lancaster Association In Care Manual** (continued)

The guidelines in the *Manual* are followed by several forms that are to be used for the formal application process. They are as follows:

**“A COVENANT WITH AN IN CARE PERSON OF THE LANCASTER ASSOCIATION, PENN CENTRAL CONFERENCE, UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST,”** (pages 10 and 11), is a joint statement of commitment to establish and nurture covenantal relationship with “both horizontal and vertical dimensions . . . not accidental, but deliberate” (page 10, line 6). It is to be signed by all the covenantal partners. The overarching intent of this document relates primarily to the priorities of the **Community Builder Model**, but other priorities are implied as well. That the “carrying out” of the covenantal relationship is “both delicate and demanding, calling us to live by relationships with God and each other and not by rules – by grace more than by law” (lines 11-12) connects with priorities of the **Midwife Model**. That the need is felt nevertheless for “minimum guidelines for candidates for ministry” (line 13) parallels what is stated in the “Introduction” section (page 2), referring to the particular process toward ordination in the UCC. This relates most closely to the denominational concerns of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. The normative “minimum of one year under the guidance and care of the Committee on Church and Ministry” (lines 13-14) has a covenantal ring to it and could indicate the desire for adequate time to build relationship; but the requirement may also relate to other concerns as well – such as time for the oversight of academic growth, spiritual growth, and the development of appropriate skills for ministry.

In “PART ONE,” the Lancaster Association’s portion of the covenant, it is stated that the candidate is to be guided “toward a vocational understanding consistent with the faith and

mission of the United Church of Christ” (lines 25-27), which resonates with the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model’s** concern for denominational stability. Financial assistance is suggested “in support of seminary preparation” (lines 28-29), which relates to priorities of the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**. Counsel regarding “skills” relates to the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**, while concern for “gifts for the practice of ministry” (lines 30-31) may relate to the **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic, Priestly/Sacramental, and Midwife Models**. “[O]ppportunity for assessment of personal and psychological gifts” (line 32) is a reference to the Ministerial Assessment Program which was dealt with earlier, where it was noted that concerns of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model** were being emphasized. The directive that the costs be shared equally among three partners – local church, association, and conference (lines 33-34) – indicates a covenantal approach, reflecting the **Community Builder Model**.

In “PART TWO,” which addresses the candidate’s role in the covenant, the following of denominational guidelines is affirmed (line 39), an indication of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. The candidate covenants to “accept the fellowship, counsel, evaluations, support and guidance” of the Association (lines 40-41), which indicates an emphasis on relationship-building and the **Midwife Model**. What follows (lines 42-43; page 11, lines 1-12) parallels the range of models observed in earlier guidelines for assessment of the candidate: “academic progress” (**Rabbinic/Magisterial**); “faith development” and “continuing growth in faith” (**Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic**); regular participation in worship “according to the faith and order of the United Church of Christ,” as well as participation “in the life and work of the local UCC church, the Lancaster Association, and the wider church” (**Reflective Practitioner/Administrator**); “evidence of developing skills for ministry” (primarily



**Reflective Practitioner/Administrator**, but could also relate to **Priestly/Sacramental** concerns for skills in leading worship). The candidate's participation "in an evaluation of this in care covenant whenever the need arises" (line 12) is a relational concern, resonating with the **Midwife Model**.

"PART THREE" addresses the covenantal relationship between the candidate and the SPONSORING CONGREGATION, which includes "support . . . as she/he continues the journey" (lines 17-18), a relational concern of the **Midwife Model**. It also calls for a commitment to "hold in prayer" (line 17), resonating with the **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model**. The directive to meet "at least 3-4 times annually with the candidate for support and to share gifts and experiences which might be mutually beneficial" (lines 21-22) has a relational quality to it, indicating the **Midwife Model**. Assistance with the cost of seminary education emphasizes educational concerns of the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**, and perhaps the **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model** as well in the area of spiritual formation. Faithfulness to "the processes for a sponsoring congregation as described in the MANUAL ON MINISTRY of the United Church of Christ" resonates with denominational stability concerns of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**.

"APPLICATION FOR IN CARE STATUS," (page 12), formalizes the request of the local church for the person they are presenting to the Committee to be "accepted as an in care candidate for Christian ministry" (lines 5-16). It is also a statement of the procedure through which this candidate was affirmed by the local church (lines 19-22), and an affirmation that the applicant is indeed a member of this local congregation of the UCC, concerns that relate to the

**Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model.** The document itself affirms and reflects proper denominational procedure.

“**RELEASE OF INFORMATION AGREEMENT,**” (page 13), is a statement of permission, signed by the candidate, authorizing the release of evaluative materials “to the chairperson of the In Care Sub-Committee” (line 12). While this is a proper procedural concern and states privacy policies of the Committee and the testing institution, an underlying commitment is that the candidate’s information will be treated with confidentiality by all persons involved in the In Care process. This is a covenantal concern that relates most strongly to the **Community Builder Model.**

Also included in these additional materials is a document intended as an aid to the candidate as he or she prepares for the initial interview with the Committee, “**POSSIBLE QUESTIONS FOR APPLICANTS SEEKING IN CARE STATUS**” (page 14). The questions reveal a range of ministerial preferences. “Why do you want to become a minister in the Church of Jesus Christ?” (line 4) implies an innate sense of call, resonating with the **Priestly/Sacramental Model** and its emphasis on an (inner) ministerial call directly from Christ. This emphasis, noted in a later question as well, “What is your understanding of the call you have received to become a minister?” (line 21), could also be seen as resonating with the **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model’s** interest in a sense of divine calling. The specific reference to becoming “a minister in the United Church of Christ” (line 6) resonates with denominational concerns of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model.** The question about a candidate’s being able to “see any negative aspects of being a minister” (line 3) is an experiential question, also indicating the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model.** The ability to

name and rank “your top three priorities as a minister” (lines 11-12) again indicates that the candidate comes with some innate sense of ministry. While this seems to indicate the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**, perhaps it would depend on what kind of ministry to which a candidate feels called - for instance, social activism. In that case, the **Social Activist Model** would be more strongly indicated. A sense of “your responsibility” to Association and Conference indicates a concern for denominational loyalty and the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**, while sense of responsibility to the “wider church” (lines 14-15) is an indication of concerns of the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**. A question about “educational goals and time frame” (line 17) resonates with the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**. Asking “what specific skills and interests do you bring to Christian ministry” (line 19) may be an indication of concerns of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**, but concern for “interests” in particular may resonate with the **Midwife Model** as well. A question about the candidate’s “understanding of the mission of the Church in today’s world” (line 23) resonates with both the **Social Activist Model’s** concept of the church as primarily in existence to fulfill God’s mission, and also the **Midwife Model’s** focus on transformative disciple-forming engagement in mission. The final questions, “Who is Jesus the Christ?” and “What is your personal relationship to Him?” seems to resonate most clearly with the personal and internal spirituality of the **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model**.

## ONGOING ASSESSMENT

**Document: Lancaster Association In Care Manual** (continued)

**“3. RELATIONSHIP WITH THE IN CARE SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE LANCASTER ASSOCIATION COMMITTEE ON CHURCH AND MINISTRY.”** In the

guidelines for decision-making by the Committee regarding the granting of In Care status, the statement is made that status is granted for one year, “to be reviewed thereafter on an annual basis” (page 5, line 9). Additional guidelines, continuing in this third section of the *Manual*, follow under several headings.

**ANNUAL REVIEWS OF IN CARE STANDING.** These yearly consultations of each candidate with the In Care Sub-Committee, which are to be “face to face if at all possible” (line 42), are scheduled on “dates established by mutual agreement.” They are “held for the purpose of maintaining contact with the candidate and for determining ways to improve the supportive relationship between the In Care Sub-Committee and the candidate” (lines 38-41). The collegiality and relational nature of the Annual Review process reflects relationship-building sensibilities of the **Midwife Model**. The invitation to “the candidate’s pastor and in care advisor” to participate indicate concerns of the **Community Builder Model** for covenant-building.

A closer look at the three portions of a Review indicates what it is intended to reveal. If the candidate is a seminary student, a “Seminary report” is to be submitted. It is to include “all grades, transcripts, field education reports, and review processes initiated by the seminary” (page 6, lines 7 and 8), indicating concern for academic achievement, a priority in the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**. For instance, field education at Lancaster Theological Seminary (as described on the seminary website) provides formative experiences in the practice of ministry outside the classroom, in cooperation with a teaching church or institution. It is an opportunity to develop skills in such areas as pastoral care, preaching, church administration, and social ministries. Field education also affords persons an opportunity to explore different kinds of ministry. Field education reports, based upon the observations of supervising pastors and teams

in the setting in which a candidate has been working, can give evidence of the development of administrative skills characteristically important in the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. As skill development relates to worship leadership and proper administration of the sacraments, which is a goal in most cases, it would resonate with the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**. Skills related to the practice of teaching Sunday School or leading Bible study, for instance, would reveal characteristics important in the **Rabbinical /Magisterial Model**. It should also be noted that a function of field education, an area in which a supervisor might make observations, is the development of pastoral identity. This could be seen as a significant aspect of leadership in the **Community Builder Model** with its emphasis on leader as community exemplar. But, depending on how that identity is understood, its development could also apply to other models as well – for instance, the **Priestly/Sacramental Model's** understanding of clergy in a role representative of the universal church.

The ability of a candidate to respond adequately, the focus of “Oral questions” (line 9) in the second part of the review, indicates a preference for a high level of verbal skills in leaders. This characteristic would be essential to the emotive preaching of the **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model**, to teaching abilities in the **Rabbinical /Magisterial Model**, and to effective worship leadership in the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**. Verbal skills would also be an important characteristic for leader as motivator and counselor in the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. In fact, it is difficult to imagine verbal skills being unimportant in any of these models of leadership, although they may receive more emphasis in one than another. For instance, the **Midwife Model** would place just as much emphasis on non-verbal communication, such as creating sacred space and an atmosphere conducive to creative

activity. In this model, visual, musical, and kinesthetic skills can be just as important as verbal ones.

The third part of an Annual Review includes “Written reflections” (line 11). It is stated that “[r]eflections will be assigned . . . prior to an annual review. Written reflections are to cover the subject adequately in as concise and brief a form as possible” (lines 12-14), indicating that attention is being paid to how well the candidate expresses himself or herself, which in turn implies a depth of learning and ability for theological reflection. Emphasis on clarity of expression in written form is highlighted in the **Rabbinical /Magisterial Model** perhaps more than the others, although cognitive abilities are valued highly in others as well, such as the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. Leaders in the style of the **Midwife Model** would be expected to show a wide range of knowledge, not only in Christian theology but in regard to other faith traditions as well.

Also helpful in gaining some insight into the purposes of the Annual Review is an analysis of the contents of the **ANNUAL REVIEW PREPARATION SHEET** (page 15). That this document is to be filled out by the candidate “together” with his or her in care advisor (lines 6 and 15) indicates the importance of both covenant-building and relationship-building, indications of both the **Community Builder** and the **Midwife Models** at work. The confidentiality of the document (line 8) also indicates that the keeping of covenant is held in high regard. Concern for familiarity with the In Care process and its requirements (lines 16-17) is a denominational concern relating to the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**, as is being “on track and up-to-date in meeting . . . Association requirements” (lines 22-23). Details of progress in seminary and the meeting of seminary requirements are to be given (lines 19–20,

also line 22), which would indicate emphases of the **Rabbinical /Magisterial Model**; another opportunity to comment in this regard is offered in lines 33-34. Furthermore, under “areas of suspected deficiency” (lines 25 through 31), the focus is predominantly on the academic, including Biblical exegesis, New Testament, Ethics, Church history, Old Testament, Systematic theology, and Christian education. “Ethics” could be seen to relate to both the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator** and the **Social Activist Model**. “Attention to spirituality” suggests the **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model**, and “Liturgics” to the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**. “History/polity of the UCC” could relate to both the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator** and the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Models**. “Personal fitness” is less specific, but if the concern is for the health and wholeness of the individual, it may be seen to relate to the **Midwife Model**. Concerns regarding “physical or emotional problems” would relate most strongly to the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. The document also offers an opportunity for comment on the relationship of the candidate to his/her advisor, and to the Committee, both indicating the covenantal concerns of the **Community Builder Model**.

**“4. RELATIONSHIP TO THE IN CARE ADVISOR”** (*continued*). Aspects of this relationship that relate to the initial phase of the In Care process have been addressed earlier. As noted there, the relationship between candidate and advisor is meant to continue throughout the process.

The relational quality of the concern expressed “that the candidate maintains active participation in the life of a local church” (page 6, lines 38-39) reflects the **Community Builder Model**, since it indicates a desire that covenantal relationship between the local congregation, pastor, and candidate will continue to be nurtured. The role of the In Care Advisor in assuring

that “contact be maintained with the home church” (line 40) is further indication of the importance being placed on covenantal relationship by all parties. It is also an indication of a desire to foster denominational ties, a concern of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. The expectation that the In Care Advisor “will sit in with the Sub-Committee’s Annual Review when his/her advisee meets with them” (page 6, line 43, and page 7, line 1) also emphasizes a covenantal approach. Direction to the Advisor to “provide written references on behalf of the candidate” (line 10) is another way of living out this ongoing covenantal relationship, as is the stipulation that a new Advisor for the candidate “will be named without delay” (lines 12-15) by the Committee, should the former “leave the Lancaster Association before the candidate is graduated and ordained.” The sensitivities to relationship-building expressed here are also important in the **Midwife Model**.

Several models are evidenced within the statement that it is the Advisor’s role to “provide the opportunity and environment for the candidate in care to raise and explore questions . . .” (lines 2-5). Exploration of questions about “faith and spiritual growth” would relate most closely to the internal spirituality and self-direction characteristic of the **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model**. Questions exploring “theology” relate to the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**, which values a leader’s expertise as theologian and interpreter. Questions exploring “the church’s mission and ministry in *today’s* world” (italics mine) suggest concerns of leadership in the **Social Activist Model**, since it appears to acknowledge a primary role of church to fulfill God’s mission in a changing world. This is also true of the **Midwife Model**, with its emphasis on church as vessel of transformation, engaged in disciple-forming mission in the context of a pluralistic world.



In another item under this heading, the Advisor is directed to “give guidance to the candidate in care regarding materials required at Annual reviews and as the candidate prepares for ordination procedures” (lines 6-8). The emphasis on following correct denominational procedures relates to stability concerns of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**.

## **ASSESSMENT FOR AUTHORIZATION**

**Document: Lancaster Association In Care Manual** (continued)

**“5. RELATIONSHIP WITH THE LANCASTER ASSOCIATION COMMITTEE ON CHURCH AND MINISTRY,”** found on pages 7 and 8, initiates the portion of the local guidelines which deals with the determining of a candidate’s readiness for ministerial authorization. Although it is not stated here explicitly, the Committee recognizes that it acts on behalf of the whole denomination, and indeed authorizes for ordination on behalf of the church universal. Concerns for denominational order are an aspect of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**, and a sense of continuity with the church in all places and times is characteristic of the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**.

That this process of authorization may not begin until a candidate who is a seminary student is “six months away from graduation” (page 7, line 20) indicates the emphasis placed by the Association on some kind of formal education as an integral part of preparation for ministry, a concern of several models including the **Rabbinic/Magisterial** (theology), the **Priestly/Sacramental** (church history and doctrine), and the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator** (professional skills). The **Midwife Model** also values a broad-based educational background for those in ministerial leadership. That “the requirements . . .

[of] the seminary” (line 25) as well as those of the Committee on the Ministry must be met, and that “the Committee on Church and Ministry” must be “reasonably assured of [the candidate’s] receiving a Master of Divinity degree or other degree approved by the Committee” (lines 25-27) further illustrate an emphasis on formal education.

The manual specifies that there are formal “ordination procedures” (line 21) delineated by the Association which a candidate must follow in order to be considered for ordination, evidence of a concern for denominational order and discipline which is an aspect of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. That the ritual is done correctly would be a concern of the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**.

The process begins with an “Ordination Interview” (page 7, line 22). In preparation for this interview, certain requirements must be met and necessary evaluative materials provided. One such requirement is that “[t]he candidate shall prepare either a video or audio tape of a sermon recently delivered to a congregation” (lines 28 and 29), an indication that preaching skills are considered a key element of readiness. Effective preaching resonates with leadership preferences of the **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model** (preaching as persuasive witnessing) and the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model** (preaching as right interpreting of the Word).

An Ordination Paper is required as well, suggesting concerns of the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**. (Additional materials on pages 17 and 18 provide the candidate with “SUGGESTED OUTLINES FOR AN ORDINATION PAPER,” which will be addressed later). That this paper is to be submitted “forty-five days before the interview,” and a copy provided to each person who will participate in the interview, points to the importance placed upon careful study of the paper by the Committee as an evaluative tool in determining the

candidate's readiness. The length of the paper, "not [to] exceed 15-20 single-side pages" (page 7, line 32) is an indication of the value placed on succinct writing and clarity of thought.

The "Ordination Interview" is described, beginning with its "primary purpose . . . to determine the candidate's readiness for ordained ministry" (lines 33-35). The invitation to the In Care Advisor to "freely participate in the interview and act as the candidate's advocate" (lines 36-37) resonates with the relationship-building focus of the **Midwife Model**, and as well as covenantal focus of the **Community Builder Model**.

A listing of "Areas to be covered in the interview" begins with "[t]he candidate's personal faith and his/her spiritual journey up to the present" (page 7, lines 38-40). This would be especially important to leadership in the **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model**, as it emphasizes evidence of a leader's internal spirituality. In its focus on the candidate's personal faith journey and ongoing spiritual growth, this item would also resonate with the **Midwife Model**. Areas related to concerns of the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model** include "[t]he candidate's theological knowledge" and "the Bible" (page 7, lines 41-43, and page 8, line 1). Also to be considered are skills in "pastoral care," important in the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**; "ecumenism," which resonates with all models in some sense, but most specifically with the **Priestly/Sacramental Model's** vision of connectedness of the wider church as a manifestation of unity in Christ; and "worship and sacraments," also resonating with the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**. "Christian Education" could be understood as a particular emphasis of the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**, but this could relate to other models as well, depending on the type of education described. "Stewardship" as well as "ministerial ethics" are both concerns that are lifted up in the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**, and "mission" would connect most strongly with both the **Social Activist** and **Midwife Models**.

“The candidate’s knowledge of the history and polity of the United Church of Christ” (page 8, lines 2-3) is included, indicating a concern for denominational stability which is a hallmark of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**, and the historical interests of the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model** as well. A final item in the list is “[t]he candidate’s ability to articulate thoughts and feelings” (line 4), which could be associated with leadership preferences in the **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model** (as it relates to persuasive witnessing), the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model** (when it is associated with professional skills such as pastoral care), and the **Midwife Model** (as it enables trust and relationship-building in the community).

The decision of the Committee is arrived at by “a vote” (line 6), and if the outcome is favorable, “a date, place, and time are set for an Ecclesiastical Council of the Lancaster Association. Approval by the council grants the privilege of ordination subject to the reception of a call” (lines 7-9). This is a procedure that has been established by denomination; adherence to it in the authorization of ministry suggests the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. That the procedure is carefully drawn for conveying of authority through proper channels is indicative of the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**, in which leadership is viewed as being endorsed and imbued with power by the institution as a channel of God’s grace. The process also affirms bonds of covenant among the parts, a characteristic emphasis in the **Community Builder Model**.

The guidelines also make provision for procedure following a negative vote (lines 11-14), in which case the covenantal care of the candidate continues. This is an indication that there is an observable “state of readiness” that may also be noted in its absence. In the event of a negative outcome, the candidate meets again with the Committee “at which time the concerns are

shared with him/her.” That the “candidate may work on these areas of concern and return for further examination . . .” is an indication of care for the candidate as the journey continues, a mark of the **Midwife Model**.

**“6. THE SEMINARY,”** the section found on pages 8 and 9, outlines requirements of candidates seeking ordination who are graduates of, or are nearing graduation from, seminaries. It is stated that the Committee “will accept the GPA [grade point average] standard for graduation established by the seminary” (page 8, lines 23-24), indicating a certain level of academic achievement. This is a quality valued in the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**, which is indicated again (lines 29-31) in a requirement for candidates to “complete all curriculum requirements for an acceptable degree before they become eligible for ordination. This includes classroom courses . . .”

The guidelines continue with a listing of field education as one of the curriculum requirements, through which “students will experience ministry in various settings (congregational and non-congregational) . . .” (lines 31-33). Eight specific areas of ministry are then itemized, several of these corresponding to the areas to be covered in the Ordination Interview (see pages 7 and 8): “preaching,” which resonates with leadership preferences in both the **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model** (preaching as persuasive witnessing) and the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model** (preaching as right interpreting of the Word); “pastoral care,” which is a skill important in the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**; “leading corporate worship,” a focus of leadership in the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**; and “teaching,” which connects with values of the **Rabbinic/Magisterial** and the **Midwife Models**. Additional areas include: “relating to colleagues in ministry,” a focus of both the **Community Builder**

**Model** (in regard to covenantal relationship) and the **Priestly/Sacramental Model** (as it relates to vision of unity of the wider church). Also listed but not explicitly defined is “community witnessing,” which could relate to either the **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model** or the **Community Builder Model**, depending on what is meant by the term. The listing of “parish management” reflects emphases of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**, and “evangelism” could correlate with either the **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic** or **Midwife Models**, again depending on its meaning in this context.

Candidates are also required to complete “at least one unit of Clinical Pastoral Education (CPE) before being ordained” (lines 25-26). CPE is professional education for ministry with persons in crisis, usually in a hospital or other institutional setting, conducted under the supervision of a practitioner certified by the Association of Clinical Pastoral Education. The intent of CPE is to enable participants to reflect theologically on human situations of need, and in the process develop both professional skills and a deeper awareness of themselves and their ministry. (A document describing CPE will be evaluated end of this section on Assessment for Authorization.)

The candidate’s knowledge of the history and polity of the UCC is mentioned again here, this time as a specific seminary course requirement (lines 27-28). The repetition may be an indication of the Committee’s view of the importance of the matter in preparation for authorized ministry in the denomination, a concern for denominational stability which is a property of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. Related to this is the directive that “[w]hen the field education experience occurs within a congregational setting, it shall be in a United Church of Christ church” (lines 36-37). It also relates to knowledge of the denomination’s traditions, which suggests the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**.

It is stated that the outcome of processes used by the seminary for “evaluation of learning and development” of the student are “important” to the Committee as an evaluative tool (lines 38-39). An assessment of learning would relate to valued characteristics of the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**; an appraisal of development would correspond to the values of the **Midwife Model**. If a seminary has no such evaluation as part of the normative process, then the student’s “advisor will work with the seminary faculty in crafting an effective evaluation process” (page 8, lines 42-43, and page 9, line 1). This statement, and the one which follows indicating that such a review “enables the Committee on Church and Ministry to . . . [p]articipate in significant communication with the student and the seminary” (lines 2-4), point to the valuing of covenantal relationship as various settings of the church work together. This modeling of leadership in the **Community Builder Model** is repeated in the statement that the review enables the Committee to “[p]articipate in the theological education and evaluation of the student” (line 7).

Another stated purpose of this collaboration with a seminary is to “[g]ather information about the student’s gifts,” which could relate to any of the models, depending on what kinds of gifts are revealed (e.g., for social activism). Information gathering also aims toward assessment of a student’s “abilities” (page 9, line 5), which, if referring to skills, would be particularly valued in the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model** of leadership. The **Midwife Model’s** interest in relationship-building is represented in the statement that partnering with the seminary in the review process is another way for the Committee to “[p]rovide care and support for the student” (line 6).

**“SUGGESTED OUTLINES FOR AN ORDINATION PAPER”** are also offered. Candidates for ordination are required to submit an Ordination Paper to the Committee. After

conversation with the Committee about the paper, which may include the Committee's recommendations for changes, the candidate's paper is to be offered to the whole Association for review in preparation for participation in the candidate's Ecclesiastical Council. This is an important document since the decision whether or not to ordain is made by the Association at large. Pages 17 and 18 of the *Manual* offer two suggested outlines for a paper, which are intended to assist the creative process rather than confine the candidate to a particular format for expressing beliefs. What these two outlines do indicate are fundamental areas the Committee has deemed it necessary to cover.

**“SUGGESTION #1”** (page 17) is doctrinal in emphasis, a concern of both the **Priestly/Sacramental** and **Rabbinic/Magisterial Models**. This is evidenced in part B, “Statement of Christian Beliefs,” which lifts up under “God, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit (the Holy Trinity)” the following items of import: “Creation and providence; judgment and grace; The person of Jesus the Christ related to the incarnation, atonement (problem of evil), salvation, resurrection; Divine revelation and the Holy Scriptures” (lines 12-16). Understanding of scripture may also signify the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**, although the emphasis here is on doctrine of divine revelation. “Your understanding of the Sacraments (baptism, Lord’s Supper” (line 17) is a particular concern in the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**. Under “Humanity” (line 18), “Your understanding of sin, repentance, and forgiveness” (line 19) is again doctrinal in nature, as is “Your understanding of the promise of eternal life through faith in Jesus Christ” (lines 21-22). “The place and importance of prayer in the life of a Christian” (line 20) however, indicates a more spiritual developmental concern, signifying an emphasis of the **Mystic or Spiritual Charismatic Model**.



A range of models is indicated under “The Church and the Promised Kingdom of God” (line 23 and following). Under “Relationship of the Church to the world” is listed “evangelism,” an emphasis of the **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model**. “[S]ocial action, and mission” (line 25) are also included under that heading, one of the few instances where the *Manual* shows resonance with the **Social Activist Model**. The inclusion of “Relationship of my local Church to the United Church of Christ” (line 26) indicates both covenantal and denominational concerns, resonating with the **Community Builder** and **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Models** respectively. Also included in that item are “Relationship...to...other Christians denominations,” an indication of ecumenical emphases of the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**. Reference to “Relationship” also includes “and other world faiths,” which would be a particular concern of the **Midwife Model**.

“**SUGGESTION #2**” (page 18) is described (in line 3) as being based on the “Order for Ordination to Ministry” service as outlined in the United Church of Christ *Book of Worship* (400-411). The **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model** is represented at the outset with the question, “Are you persuaded that God has called you to be ordained a minister . . .” (line 7), and the request for a brief “summary of your faith journey and your call . . .” (line 9). The specificity of that call “to the Christian ministry in the United Church of Christ” (lines 9-10) indicates a denominational focus resonating with the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. The question in regard to gifts for ordained ministry, “what particular gifts do you bring to this ministry?” (line 12), could connect with any one of the models, as was noted earlier. The **Priestly/Sacramental Model** is indicated in phrases referring to the universal church, such as “within the context of the universal ministry of God’s people” (line 11) and “the Church throughout the world (line 13). A **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model** focus is indicated in the

questions, “How do you understand the nature of the Word of God as it is revealed in the Scripture of the Old and New Testaments?” (lines 15-16), and “What does it mean to accept this Word as the rule of Christian faith and practice?” (line 17).

Additional evidence of the **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model’s** attention to personal piety is found in the question about diligence “in your private prayers” (line 18), and the question “How do you practice your devotional life and what is the place of prayer in your life?” (line 20).

Evidence of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model** is noted in questions about finding “rest and renewal . . . within the context of the ‘public duties of your office’ (lines 21-22), and “how do the present and future demands of family or single life fit within the context of these duties?” (lines 20-24). Such attention to the whole person would be an indication of the **Midwife Model** as well.

Resonance with the **Social Activist Model** is implied in the question, “Will you be zealous in maintaining both the ‘truth of the Gospel’ . . . speaking the truth in love?” (lines 25-26). The “truth of the Gospel” is further explained as meaning “the prophetic word” as related to “social justice situations” (lines 31-32). Social action and mission are mentioned again in the question, “How does ‘the church’ relate to the world (evangelism, social action, and mission)?” (line 40). The **Midwife Model** also lifts up mission as essential but to a lesser degree a goal in and of itself. Rather, it is understood in this model as transformational in becoming disciples.

This same “truth of the Gospel” is also understood in regard to doctrinal matters which include “the doctrine of salvation (the person of Christ, the incarnation, the Cross and Resurrection of Christ, sin, repentance, forgiveness, judgment, grace, and eschatology)” (lines 28-29). Clarity on doctrine is a concern of the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**, which emphasizes

unity and continuity of the community expressed through liturgy and tradition. This is true for the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model** as well. This model would also value minister as theologian, so that the “truth of the Gospel” is “rightly preached” and passed on, in creed and catechism.

Questions about the candidate’s understanding and acceptance of “the ‘faith and order’ of the United Church of Christ, specifically concerning the Trinity, baptism, the Lord’s Supper, covenant, and the STATEMENT OF FAITH” (lines 33, 36-38) express concerns for denominational stability that align with the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. Additionally, the portion of that question which refers to showing “compassionate affection toward all who are in Christ” (lines 34-35) might indicate the **Priestly/Sacramental Model’s** view of the wider church as a manifestation of unity in Christ. This same view is affirmed in a reference to the candidate’s understanding of the church “in its local, ecumenical, and wider settings” (line 39).

The final pages of the *In Care Manual* of the Lancaster Association are devoted to preparing a candidate for his or her Ecclesiastical Council. “**AN ECCLESIASTICAL COUNCIL**” (page 19) begins with words that emphasize once again the covenantal nature of the process. The roles of the Committee, the candidate, the local church, the Association and all its congregations and their representatives, are all explained in regard to the planning of this gathering of the body through which a decision will be made whether or not to ordain the candidate. That the planning and scheduling of the Ecclesiastical Council is to take place through consultation and cooperation among these partners (lines 4 through 17) signifies the covenantal concerns of the **Community Builder Model**, and the following of denominational procedure is indicative of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. The document

continues with “A SUGGESTED AGENDA” which again states proper procedure and roles, and follows the usual pattern for an Ecclesiastical Council as described in denominational guidelines, the UCC *Manual on Ministry*. A desire that the proceedings will also have spiritual and worshipful aspects is evident in suggestions for “Opening prayer” (line 20), and adjournment “with a song and a prayer” (line 40), acknowledging that an Ecclesiastical Council also represents the body as a worshipping community. This resonates with the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**.

“**POSSIBLE QUESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION AT AN ECCLESIASTICAL COUNCIL**” (page 20) is the final document included in this local *Manual*. While questions from all members of the Association are invited at an Ecclesiastical Council and are not restricted to the ones mentioned here, these possible questions are intended to help the candidate prepare. The questions offered represent a variety of ministerial leadership models.

“What is your understanding of what it means to be called into ministry?” (line 4) could relate to several models. The intent of the question would relate most closely to the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**, if it is inquiring about an inner call from Christ, recognized by the congregation and wider church. The questions could relate to the **Community Builder Model**, if it is in reference to a sense of call to the community; and it could relate to the **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model**, if what is meant is a sense of divine calling through some profound personal religious experience.

The four questions which follow (in lines 5-9 and 11) all resonate with the self-awareness and self-reflective aspects of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. Appearing to indicate concern for the church as social system and its leader as one responsible for the effectiveness of the organization are the questions: “What do you consider to be your strengths

that you bring to ministry?” “What do you perceive to be your weaknesses and areas where growth is needed?” “How do you feel about the fact that, even with your best efforts, you will never be able to please everybody?” and “How will you care for yourself while deeply involved in ministry?” The holistic approach these inquiries represent could also be an indication of the priorities of the **Midwife Model**; the difference would be in the importance, or lack of importance, of institutional stability as a primary goal. The question “What are the various roles of someone called to Christian ministry?” (line 14) could also be considered indicative of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model** and its more functional view of leadership. The question “What do you see as the three greatest opportunities in ministry today?” (line 9) is difficult to classify. It is perhaps how it is interpreted and the responses to it that would indicate its potential orientation.

“Do you understand the ecumenical relationships of the United Church of Christ?” and “Why are they important?” (lines 12-13) both relate to denominational identity, but are primarily oriented toward the vision of church as an organic whole, a manifestation of its unity in Christ, which is indicative of the ecclesiology of the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**. “How will you balance expectations of leadership in the local church and delegating significant amount of responsibility to your laity?” is a question that perhaps points toward the **Midwife Model**, in that the leader is seen in that model as catalyst and the congregation’s role as highly participatory and experimental. The question of “balance” would be especially crucial in this model.

### **Document: “Objectives of Clinical Pastoral Education”**

As stated in the local *Manual*, candidates for ordination in the Association are required to “satisfactorily complete at least one unit of Clinical Pastoral Education (CPE) before being ordained” (8). This is to be accomplished in a program conducted under the auspices of a

certified supervisor attached to a center accredited by the Association for Clinical Pastoral Education (ACPE). In Clinical Pastoral Education, a form of interfaith professional education for ministry, participants engage in supervised encounters with persons in crisis or dealing with long-term care issues (such as hospice). As described on the ACPE website, [www.acpe](http://www.acpe), “Out of an intense involvement with persons in need, and the feedback from peers and teachers, students develop new awareness of themselves as persons and of the needs of those to whom they minister. From theological reflection on specific human situations, they gain new understanding of ministry. Within the interdisciplinary team process of helping persons, they develop skills in interpersonal and inter-professional relationships.” The typical program chosen by candidates in the Lancaster Association is in a local hospital or nursing care setting. The Committee on the Ministry bases understanding of the program, and review of supervisory reports about a candidate who has completed the program, on the document, “Objectives of Clinical pastoral Education” (APPENDIX C) which lists the program’s objectives.

The document indicates the program’s primary focus on skill development in pastoral care and counseling, which is a hallmark of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. For instance, goals include the development of “skills to provide intensive and extensive pastoral care and counseling in persons in their crises and situation” (lines 7-8), “understand and utilize the clinical method of learning” (line 10), “developing the capacity to evaluate one’s ministry” (line 16), and “knowledge of the behavior sciences in pastoral ministry to persons and groups” (line 19).

Some elements of the program also indicate the influence of other models. The **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model’s** emphasis on pastor as theologian is evidenced in the goal to “develop the ability to make effective use of one’s religious/spiritual heritage, theological

understanding . . . in pastoral ministry” (lines 18-19). Since increased self-awareness and functioning in interpersonal relationships are both qualities valued in the **Midwife Model** and are also stated as objectives of the CPE program, there is considerable affinity with this model as well. This is indicated in statements such as: “[t]o become aware of oneself as a minister and the ways one’s ministry affects persons” (line 5); “[t]o accept and utilize the support, confrontation and clarification of the peer group for the integration of personal attributes and pastoral functioning” (lines 12-13); “[t]o utilize individual and group supervision for personal and professional growth . . .” (line 15); “[t]o become aware of how one’s attitudes, values, and assumptions, strengths and weaknesses affect one’s pastoral care ministry” (lines 22-23); working effectively as part of “an interdisciplinary team” (lines 25-26); and developing an awareness “of how persons, social conditions, systems and structures affect the lives of self and others and to address effectively these issues in ministry” (lines 28-29). The final objective listed, which aims at developing “the capacity to utilize one’s pastoral and prophetic perspectives in a variety of functions . . .” (lines 31-33) also suggests an interdisciplinary approach and the integrating of various aspects of ministry, which could resonate with both the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator** and **Midwife Models**. By far, it is these two models which predominate in the objectives of Clinical Pastoral Education, with the overall emphasis being on development of a certain set of skills, a hallmark of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator**.

### *Observations on the Local Materials*

While the sections dealing with Initial Assessment, Ongoing Assessment, and Assessment for Authorization flow into one another, there is a clear sense that one segment of

the process needs to be completed before moving on to the next, and it is noted that a difference in priorities is indicated among these three sections.

**INITIAL ASSESSMENT.** A full range of models is represented in guidelines for the initial assessment of a candidate, with the exception of the **Social Action Model** which is only found in one instance. Guidelines in this section tend to focus on identifying potential in a candidate rather than assessing actual skills attained or the degree to which innate gifts have been developed.

By far, the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model** has been observed more frequently than any of the other models in the initial assessment materials. One of the highest priorities expressed here is the desire for a candidate (and all settings relating to the candidate) to have deep concern for denominational stability, a sense of denominational loyalty, and a commitment to the careful following of denominational procedures. Other attributes desired or to be nurtured in a candidate include psychological stability, problem-solving ability, task performance, and an aptitude for development of professional skills for ministry. It is noted that a psychological assessment is a key component of the initial assessment procedure, and that this includes observations on undesirable or unsuitable traits as well. Indications are noted in several places that the church is seen primarily as a social system.

Also carrying significant weight is the **Community Builder Model**, since the intent to foster covenantal relationship is strongly affirmed throughout this section. This emphasis is noted not only in the language of the descriptive material but also in the use of the word “relationship” in every heading, indicating that this is an overarching premise being constantly encouraged in all partners. It is assumed that this awareness would be nurtured in candidates as well, as the theme of covenant-keeping continues to be reasserted in each step.



The **Midwife Model** is also well represented in this section in language that indicates a concern for wholeness in a candidate, as well as a breadth of interests, self-awareness, ability to be flexible in an unpredictable environment, and sensitivity to the complexity of human beings. Artistic abilities are valued, and also the ability to engage in open-ended dialogue. The nurturing of relationship is a frequent theme. This model may also be indicated by the broad range of areas that are considered in interviews, an approach which honors the complexity of an individual. Candidates and especially their Advisors are encouraged to think of the process they are engaging in in terms of personal companionship on a journey.

Represented to a lesser degree are the **Priestly/Sacramental, Mystical or Spiritual/Charismatic, and Rabbinic/Magisterial Models**. Resonances with the **Priestly/Sacramental Model** are indicated in a desire for candidates to have a concern for the proper celebration of the sacraments and be adequately supervised as needed. Worship leadership performance is also lifted up as important. Candidates and their partners in the process are expected to be concerned with proper observation of channels of church authority, as when a candidate is endorsed by the congregational governing body. Certain innate spiritual gifts are looked for in candidates, as an aspect of their inner call. There are also indications that knowledge of traditional doctrine is to be nurtured, as well as a sense of continuity with the wider church and the church through the ages. The **Mystical or Spiritual/Charismatic Model** is indicated in the valuing of certain qualities in a candidate: evidence of an internal spirituality and strong personal faith, a sense of divine calling, responsiveness to the Holy Spirit, and a personal relationship with God. To be nurtured are the candidate's practices of spiritual reflection, and also skills for persuasive preaching and witnessing. Awareness of the activity of the Spirit and the role of prayer in the discernment process are lifted up for all involved. The

candidate's growth in faith is a named priority as well. Indications of the influence of the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model** include attention to evidence that a candidate has the ability to reflect theologically and express theological concepts, and also gifts and/or potential in the areas of preaching and teaching. Verbal functioning is tested for, and clarity and writing ability are indicated as desired traits. Academic ability is valued, educational challenges are considered noteworthy, and support for seminary education is encouraged.

It is worthy of note that evidence of the concerns of the **Social Activist Model** appeared only once in this section, in a statement that the role of the church is to fulfill God's mission in the world. No particular gifts, attributes or inclinations of a candidate associated with that model were described, however.

**ONGOING ASSESSMENT.** The balance of types indicated in this section is similar to that noted in the Initial Assessment material, although guidelines for this part of the process are more brief than the first section and focus mainly on the annual review. Again, the strongest emphasis relates to characteristics valued in the **Reflective Practitioner Model**, with lesser emphases on **Community Builder** and **Midwife Models**, and even less on the **Rabbinic/Magisterial, Priestly/Sacramental, and Mystical or Spiritual/Charismatic Models**. In this section as in the first, the **Social Activist Model** is noteworthy in its near absence. Priorities of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model** are reflected in what is looked for in field education reports, particularly evidence of developing professional skills for ministry. It is considered important that the emotional and psychological status of a candidate is assessed, and exploration of ethics is valued in a candidate as well. Further evidence of this model is found in the emphasis on following denominational procedure and meeting requirements on schedule.

The **Community Builder Model** is noted in this section in the continuing emphasis on covenant building, although not to the degree that it was stressed in the materials guiding initial assessment. A candidate's active participation in a local church is valued, and thus is required. Encouraged in candidates is recognition of their part in the strengthening of relationships among all the covenant partners. Similar emphasis is placed on some concerns that relate to the **Midwife Model**, for instance, the priority placed on building personal relationships. The wholeness and health of the candidate is emphasized. A wide range of knowledge of faith traditions is encouraged, as well a broad based educational background. Understanding of God's mission in a changing world is emphasized. It should also be noted that the guidelines for ongoing assessment rely primarily on verbal interviews and conversations with the candidate, rather than on information gathered through the use of formal assessment tools.

Priorities of the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model** appear in an emphasis in the guidelines on academic progress and achievement as well as a candidate's cognitive abilities. Skill development in teaching and Bible study is valued, as is a candidate's developing expertise as theologian and interpreter of scripture. Evidence of concern for development of skills in worship leadership and liturgics is found in this section of the guidelines, indicating the **Priestly/Sacramental Model** at work. A candidate's understanding of Christian history and doctrine is also being assessed. Clergy are described in a representative role. Priorities related to the **Mystical or Spiritual Charismatic Model** are represented in questions that assess self-expression through verbal and preaching skills, as well as attention to spiritual growth and evidence of self-direction in spiritual practices. The **Social Activist Model** is represented briefly in concern for a candidate's understanding that the church exists to fulfill God's mission in the world.

**ASSESSMENT FOR AUTHORIZATION.** If amount of space allotted is any indication of where emphasis is being placed, it should be noted that the guidelines dealing with authorization for ordination parallel the initial assessment materials in their extensiveness. In regard to the amount of detailed instruction contained in them, they appear to be even more extensive. These materials focus mainly on the Ordination Interview and Ecclesiastical Council, each of which relies heavily on verbal interaction with the candidate, as well as the Ordination Paper which is the candidate's written document. An additional source of information is the supervisor's report on the candidate's performance and growth in Clinical Pastoral Education.

The **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model** is again represented most prominently. In this final step toward ordination a primary interest is the careful following of proper ordination procedures, particularly in regard to ordination in the UCC; denominational order appears to become even more dominant in this part of the process. Emphasis is also placed on evidence of the development of professional skills for ministry such as pastoral care and parish management, an understanding of ethics, and psychological fitness for ministry. This emphasis reflects an understanding of the ministerial role as mainly functional in nature.

The **Priestly/Sacramental Model** appears to increase in importance in the assessment for ordination, reflected in concerns for knowledge of church doctrine and tradition, competence in leading corporate worship and administering the sacraments as well as possessing an understanding of them, and a sense of ecumenism. Gifts of the candidate for ordained ministry are again assessed, and the sense of call to ministry affirmed. The language also reflects an understanding of the church as universal, its unity and continuity being grounded in Christ. Therefore, evidence of a desire in the candidate for involvement in the wider church, in the denomination and beyond, is looked for. Another affirmation related to this model is descriptive

language suggesting that ordained leadership is endorsed and imbued with power by the institution, an embodiment understanding of the ordained role.

Resonances with the **Midwife Model** are reflected in the viewing of the candidate holistically. The values of this model are also evidenced in an emphasis of a broad-based educational background for ministerial leaders, including understanding of other faith traditions. The language at times describes leaders as catalysts for growth, and relationship-building in community is valued. The candidate's matriculation through the process toward ordination is described as an ongoing journey.

The **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model** is also one of the primary types represented in this section of the guidelines, largely in reference to the fulfillment of a course of study. Lifted up in importance are evidence in the candidate of overall education development, including theological and biblical knowledge, expertise in teaching skills and Christian education, preaching as interpretation of the Word, and knowledge of creeds and catechisms. Emphasis is placed on a candidate's having completed seminary educational requirements for an appropriate degree. Also valued are clarity of thought and the ability to write and speak succinctly, evaluated primarily through the Ordination Paper, and also through demonstrated skills for preaching.

Concern for preaching effectiveness and ability to articulate one's thoughts and feelings and witness to one's faith is also evidence of priorities of the **Mystical or Spiritual/Charismatic Model**, which is significantly represented in this section of the guidelines. Evidence of personal faith development and piety, diligence in prayer, articulation of a sense of personal divine calling, gifts for evangelism, and the candidate's overall progress in the spiritual journey are all looked for.

While the importance of covenantal relationship is consistent throughout all the local guidelines, evidence of the interests of the **Community Builder Model** are not as prominent in this section. One significant occasion is that the candidate is encouraged to develop relationships with colleagues in ministry, and in the wider community as well. While inclusion of all covenantal partners is valued in the final steps toward ordination as it has been in the initial steps, it may be observed that a shift has occurred in that the final decision-making rests largely in the hands of the Committee on the Ministry. The recommendation of the Committee to the Association will carry much weight. Relationship among all the partners in authorizing ministry is still obviously valued, judging by covenantal language, but the primary focus is on the relationship of the candidate to the committee, with the committee recognizing that it acts on behalf of the whole denomination.

The interests of the **Social Activist model** are slightly more prominent in this segment of the guidelines, in the form of language referring to social action, mission, and speaking the truth of the gospel, in love.

***General Comments about the Local Materials.***

Overall, the materials indicate an emphasis on acquired knowledge and skills for ordained ministry. This is especially true of the materials for assessment for authorization. An emphasis on skills is especially noted in the requirement for Clinical Pastoral Education. It has also been observed, though, that both embodiment and empowerment understandings of ministry are being nurtured throughout the process, the embodiment focus rising in prominence somewhat in the authorization stage. The various understandings of church and the kind of leadership that they imply appear to be mixed rather indiscriminately throughout the guideline materials, even so far as to shift from one type to another several times within the description of a single requirement.

## Analysis of National Guidelines

It is to be expected that the national guidelines draft of 2008 would differ significantly from local guidelines which have been in use since 2000. What has happened in the denomination in the intervening time is an ongoing discussion of need for change in light of new challenges. The initial outcome of that discussion was the adoption of the Pronouncement of General Synod 25 in 2005, *Ministry Issues: Forming and Preparing Pastoral Leaders for God's Church*. As an outgrowth of that Pronouncement, it was agreed that a modification of national guidelines for authorizing ministry was necessary in order to address "the changing needs of the wider church and the variety of circumstances in which those considering authorized ministry may find themselves" (31). A Ministry Issues Implementation Committee was formed to work on new guidelines. Modifications included both the development and testing of drafts in the various settings of the denomination. A set of "Marks of Faithful and Effective Authorized Ministers of the United Church of Christ" was developed, further tested, and revised based on feedback from the various settings.

It is stated in the current *Draft 3.1* that the "Marks" are meant to be used as guides along the way from discernment of call, through the journey of preparation and formation, the process of authorization, and throughout the continuing experience of authorized ministry following authorization. It is the most current version of these "Marks" and the explanatory material accompanying them that are being evaluated here under the heading, "Analysis of National Guidelines." The portion of *Draft 3.1* being evaluated is found in APPENDIX D.

Much can be gleaned from an "**Introductory Letter**" of October 20, 2008, from the Ministry Issues Implementation Committee addressed to the wider church, inviting comment on this latest *Draft*. The tenor of the letter is covenantal, reflecting the **Community Builder**

**Model.** For instance, reference is made to an earlier draft, “circulated in the church for comment and response” (page 4, line 7), with gratitude expressed “for the suggestions received and for the ways in which many in the UCC are contributing to the welfare of all” (lines 8-9). Responders had raised issues in regard to the earlier materials, as they were utilized by Committees on Ministry and in various other settings, which resulted in “greatly expanded” materials from the original drafts (lines 10-14). Further input is requested as the materials are put to actual use: “We invite you to let us know what works well, what needs more attention, what you suggest as improvements” (lines 14-15), and reference is made to “continuing to work with you as together we strive to respond to God’s call . . .” (28-29). This is not only an indication of a covenantal approach, but also an indication of a valuing of the process itself and the participants in it – an indication of the **Midwife Model**. Participants are invited to “Build on your own experience . . . Share your experiences and suggestions” (lines 18-19). That the particular focus of this effort is on “God’s call to the United Church of Christ at this time” (line 29) resonates with the denominational concerns of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**.

“**The Ministry Issues Project: A Narrative Overview**” (pages 6-9) is a continuation of introductory material which offers a brief summary of the Ministry Issues Project thus far, plus an explanation of the nature of the “Marks” themselves. The flexibility in their application is noted: “These Marks will be used variously as guides for discernment of call, preparation and formation for ministry, the determination and act of authorization, continuing personal assessment and guidance, and the continuing covenantal relationship of authorized ministers and the Church. They will serve as suggestions and marks along the way with the understanding that no one will ever be ‘finished’ or ‘complete’” (page 6, lines 16-20). Recognition of diversity and emphasis on ministry as an ongoing process resonate with the **Midwife Model**. The description



of “movements” that indicate “a progression from one stage to another,” the use of the “Marks” as “guides continually along the way,” and the comment that “[d]iscernment continues, with times of greater or lesser intensity” (lines 24-26) also resonate with the **Midwife Model’s** emphasis on an ongoing process or journey. Covenantal relationships essential in this process are again emphasized (lines 29-30).

The description of “**The first movement**” (page 6) emphasizes the “communal” aspects of discernment of call, “involving at least the member who may be called, the local church, and the Association” (lines 36-37). The description also resonates with the **Midwife Model**, in its emphasis on relationship throughout the journey, which may include “persons representing educational settings and others, such as family and friends” (lines 37-38). The closing statement in the paragraph, “Discernment of call is ongoing and open-ended, requiring continuing attention throughout preparation for, and service in, ministry” (lines 38-40), is again strongly indicative of the **Midwife Model**. Overall, the description of the “first movement” indicates a holistic approach.

The description of “**The second movement**” indicates some affinity with both the **Priestly/Sacramental** and the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Models**. While the continuing discernment and open-ended approach is noted again here, the focus in the second movement is the process of authorization and its implications: “Associations of the United Church of Christ are charged with the responsibility of authorizing ministers on behalf of the entire Church” (page 7, lines 9-10).

The description of “**The third movement**” again emphasizes the strong covenantal bonds and “mutually accountable relationships” both formal and informal (lines 32-33), that need to be nurtured after authorization takes place, among various settings and partners of the

denomination: “Local Church and an Association (Covenant of Ministerial Standing)” (lines 31-32). As the wider church is mentioned again (page 8, line 1), the words take on the tone of the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**. Resonance with the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model** is evidenced in an expressed concern for “the continuing education of the minister” (line 3), although the type of education may indicate resonance with other models as well.

The paragraphs that follow address some “particular concerns” (line 9) that have led to the development and adoption of the 2005 Pronouncement on ministry issues, especially “the needs and diversity of the Church requiring full recognition of multiple paths of preparation for authorized ministry” (lines 11-12). While these also suggest a valuing of covenantal relationship, as in the **Community Builder Model**, and concerns for denominational stability, as in the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**, the thoughts expressed here deal primarily with the acknowledgment of a need for change in the manner of authorizing ministerial leadership as way of valuing the diversity within the denomination. The statement is made: “. . . Associations are asked to determine readiness for authorization not on the basis of the particular education program the candidate has completed, but upon the candidate’s readiness for that authorization” (lines 14-16). This suggests a move away from the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model** and an inclination toward the values expressed in the **Midwife Model**.

It should be noted that throughout these introductory pages there is an emphasis on the process of “discernment” which, as will be noted later, has a fundamental role in the “Marks.”

“**CORE UNDERSTANDINGS**” is the heading of the next section of the introductory materials (pages 10-11), which offers a more thorough explanation of the “movements.”

**“I. Call to Ministry (The First Movement)”** defines ministry as the calling of all believers, a concept that underlies in all the models of ministry. That calling refers to serving and participating “in God’s mission in and to this world” (line 6 and again in line 13), language that relates most strongly to the **Social Action Model**, which envisions that the purpose of the church is primarily to empower people for mission in the world. The **Midwife Model** also characterizes the church as the setting for disciple-forming mission. Resonance with the **Midwife Model** is further affirmed in the statement that “[f]aithful discernment of and response to God’s call to ministry involves both individuals and the church itself. Such discernment and response is an ongoing practice” (lines 8-9). The emphasis in this First Movement is on a process that is relational and dialogic.

**“II. Call to Authorized Ministry . . . in the United Church of Christ (The Second Movement)”** deals with particular kinds of authorized ministry. Explanation begins with reference to “a member’s call [leading to] consideration of authorized ministry” (line 18) and “God’s particular call to that person” (line 19), which could be indicative of the **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model** in the sense that a desired leadership quality is a clear sense of divine calling. The statements could also indicate concerns of the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**, in the sense that this calling is directly from Christ, mediated through the church. That the “discernment” of call and “response” to it is part of as “an ongoing practice” ( lines 19-20) resonates with the journey metaphor fundamental to the **Midwife Model**.

A concern for denominational order is noted in the questions, “To what ministry is this person called?” and “Does this ministry require authorization? If so, what form of authorization?” (lines 22-23), a resonance with concerns of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model** for organizational stability. Also mentioned in this section

are “the needs of the UCC” (line 27) as one of the aspects which will guide “[t]he particular program of formation and preparation for possible authorization of that member” (line 25). The procedure is outlined here with emphasis on following denominational process. That emphasis is repeated in the later statement that “[a] Covenant of Discernment and Formation is the process to be followed for all forms of authorization” (lines 37-38).

The **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model** is also indicated in this section in an emphasis on formal education and knowledge: “It is anticipated that a seminary degree program will continue to be the preferred primary educational process for most potential candidates for ordination” (lines 29-30). But as mentioned earlier, the model represented depends upon what is being taught.

Covenantal relationship, emphasized in the **Community Builder Model**, is also being valued in the directive that “discernment continues within a covenant among the person, the Association (through its Committee on Ministry) representing the UCC, and the Local Church” (lines 32-34). Indeed, throughout the description of the Second Movement and the process toward authorization, covenant is a constant theme.

“**III. Readiness for Authorization (The Second Movement)**” (page 11) continues the description of the process of discernment and formation with emphasis on a covenantal approach grounded in “continuing conversation with the member” and both the Committee on Ministry and the Local Church (lines 2-3). Also emphasized is the sense that this is an ongoing process of discernment and assessment of “an appropriate and effective program of preparation . . . toward readiness for authorization” (lines 4-5). It is noted that an effective program “assesses progress” of the candidate (line 5), implying growth and development in skills and knowledge. Depending on the nature of what is being assessed, this could relate to several models, including the

**Reflective Practitioner/Administrator**, the **Rabbinic/Magisterial**, and the **Priestly/Sacramental**. A similar concern is also mentioned, the need to focus on “the potential candidate’s qualifications” in determining readiness for a particular authorization (line 8). That the emphasis is placed on this assessment “rather than on the completion of one particular education process” (lines 8-9) again indicates a move away from the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**. That the emphasis throughout this section is on matching an “effective program of preparation” to the uniqueness of the individual and his or her call resonates most strongly with the **Midwife Model**.

This section closes with an emphasis once again on the following of denominational processes as “defined by the UCC Constitution and Bylaws” (lines 13-14) and ultimate determination for authorization by the Association (lines 16-17). This is a concern that relates to the concerns for institutional stability expressed in the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**.

“**IV. Authorized Ministerial Standing in the United Church of Christ (The Third Movement)**” suggests an intentional balancing of, or perhaps interplay among, several models. In this section, concern is expressed for both the nurturing of covenantal relationship and the maintaining of denominational stability, reflecting leadership preferences in the **Community Builder** and **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Models** respectively. Ministerial Standing is described as an act of covenant among settings of the denomination (lines 21-22, and 26), but it is also guided by official denominational policies and documents (lines 23-25). “[F]aithfulness to all of the United Church of Christ” is mentioned (line 28), but also “the continuing discernment of call and formation for ministry” (lines 28-29) which has more resonance with the **Midwife Model**.

“**V. UCC Identity and Authorized Ministry (All Movements),**” as its title implies, emphasizes denominational identity and relationships as “a fundamental component of the call to, the preparation for, and the practice of authorized ministry” (lines 35-36), which would indicate the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. But it could also suggest the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**, as in the concern for the denominational ethos. However, this section concludes with a strong statement that seems to resonate more with the **Midwife Model**: “The United Church of Christ is committed to fostering an environment that celebrates diversity of expressions of Christian faith and promotes mutually enriching interaction of various Christian cultures, theologies, spiritualities and ideologies” (lines 38-40).

“**THE GUIDE IN EVERY MOVEMENT: THE MARKS OF FAITHFUL AND EFFECTIVE AUTHORIZED MINISTERS**” (pages 12-21) includes both introductory, background, and explanatory information, followed by description of the Marks themselves.

“**Introduction**” refers again to the purpose of the resource, which has an underlying covenantal theme: “a tool intended for the United Church of Christ to use in many settings as together the Church seeks to provide faithful leadership for the Church in God’s mission” (page 13, lines 5-6). This is language that resonates with the **Social Activist** and **Midwife Models** in addition to the **Community Builder**. The covenantal theme is also expressed in the following line which explains that this resource “is based upon the wisdom of the whole church gathered through the ongoing work of the Ministry Issues Implementation Committee in regard to the Pronouncement . . .” (lines 7-8). And since they are “[b]ased on materials and feedback shared with the committee from many persons and groups in many settings of the church” (lines 10-11), the Marks “reflect much of what the church as a whole sees as characteristic of faithful and effective ministry . . .” (lines 11-12). Various settings are “urged to review this tool and use it”

(lines 16-17). These statements are all indicative of values of the **Community Builder Model**. The introduction also refers to “faithful and effective ministry in these times” (line 12), and acknowledges that the Marks “will be interpreted variously in the particular contexts in which they are used” (lines 17-18), a reference to changing context of ministry. A variety of contexts is anticipated as well in the statement “interpretation will vary . . . among differing theological or ecclesial traditions, and in different locations” (lines 18-20). This same theme is noted in the statement that “ministry, as life, is a continuing journey of transformation” (line 21). Statements such as these indicate what is valued in the **Midwife Model**. The first suggestion of how the Marks might be used, “to generate conversation” in a variety of settings (line 24), is further evidence of the same model.

Another suggested use, “for assessment by prospective and authorized ministers” (line 29), indicates interests of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. Other examples suggest use in nurturing the relationship among the covenantal partners as they guide the discernment process, who are listed as “discernment groups in local churches,” “a member who may be called to ministry,” “prospective and authorized ministers,” and “Association Committees on the Ministry” (lines 27-31). A final suggested use, “to guide the planning for continuing education” (line 32), may resonate with the concerns of the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**. Other models may be indicated as well, depending on the type of education.

“**Background Information**” briefly reviews the Marks as an outcome of the Pronouncement on ministry issues, and the forms of authorized ministry and their oversight in the denomination as defined by the UCC Constitution and Bylaws. This denominational concern is indicative of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**.

“**Using the Marks**” lists the four main categories they cover: “Spiritual Formation for Ministry, UCC Identity for Ministry, Personal and Professional Formation for Ministry, and Knowledge and Skills for Ministry” (page 14, lines 9-10). Although these items will be evaluated in more detail later, it can be noted here that a particular emphasis is indicated in the statement that “[t]hese Marks will be most helpful to Committees on the Ministry when they use them developmentally, that is, throughout their relationship with Members in Discernment and formation, rather than saving their consideration for the end of the process” (lines 10-13). Reference is also made to their intended use “in conversation . . . as part of their continuing covenant” (line 14), and “throughout the relationship” (line 15). Such descriptive language emphasizes use which is flexible and ongoing, rather than end-oriented, indicators of a leadership style in the **Midwife Model**. Further evidence of this model is found in the encouragement to “apply the Marks dynamically in their work with the persons whom they accompany” (lines 17-18), strongly suggesting the journey motif. Diverse paths to authorization are honored through such comments as “patterns of strength and weakness in relation to the Marks will differ from one individual to the next” (lines 20-21), as well as encouragement to Committees to “adapt the substance of the Marks into the idioms of particular cultural communities as appropriate for their setting” (lines 24-25). While the directive to use the Marks for “realistic assessment” and to “encourage continuing development” may also indicate concerns of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**, the overall emphasis of this section aligns itself most closely with the **Midwife Model**.

“**Applying the Marks in Relation to Commissioning, Licensure or Ordination**” explains that the Marks “characterize the three forms . . . differently” (line 30-31), based on the uniqueness of each as “set forth in the Constitution of the United Church of Christ” (lines 33-35).



The focus in these statements being on constitutional definition of the three forms of authorization (line 39) relates this concern most closely to the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. The section goes on to quote the definitions of the three authorized ministries in the denomination in the *Constitution*. The first two, licensed and commissioned ministry, are beyond the scope of this research and will not be addressed here. In the final section on ordained ministry are noted the same sensitivities to difference and diversity evident in previous sections on the Marks. The statement that “this form [ordained ministry] is not defined by a specific sub-set of those responsibilities, nor by a particular location” (lines 5-6) is evidence of this, as is the statement that “variations in the degrees to which persons should manifest the Marks will be defined more by the varying profiles of individual gifts and frailties than by the definition of the ministry being authorized” (page 16, lines 9-10). Both characterize the flexibility emphasized in the **Midwife Model**. In this model, difference and diversity are to be valued and individual creative gifts nurtured. It is noted that reference to “responsibilities” could also suggest the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**.

“**THE MARKS OF FAITHFUL AND EFFECTIVE AUTHORIZED MINISTERS OF THE UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST (Revised, April 2009)**” offers a complete listing of the four areas covered by the Marks, with further descriptive comments for each.

“**SPIRITUAL FOUNDATION FOR MINISTRY**” indicates by its title what to expect as the main emphasis. This section has most resonance with the **Mystic or Charismatic/Spiritual Model**, as is indicated by the descriptive comments of what is being valued: “A lived faith showing love of God, trust in Jesus, and openness to the Holy Spirit” (page 17, line 5), “Commitment to life-long spiritual growth and practice, individually and in

community” (line 9), and “A sense of being called by God and the community to authorized ministry in the church” (line 11). Other models are in evidence as well. “Commitment to lifelong spiritual growth . . .” described (line 9) also resonates with the **Midwife Model**, especially since growth in community is mentioned, for in this model spiritual growth takes place in, and faith is transmitted primarily through, interpersonal relationships in community. Reference to “[a] lived faith” (line 5) and “[o]penness to continuing discernment of one’s call in community” (line 13) suggest values of the **Midwife Model** as well. In addition, “Devotion to the word of God as revealed through scripture and Christians traditions” (line 7) suggests association with both the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model** (word of God revealed through “scripture”) and the **Priestly/Sacramental Model** (word of God revealed through “Christian traditions”).

“**UCC IDENTITY FOR MINISTRY**” is by its title indicative of a concern for denominational stability, aligning with the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**, and possibly the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model** as well. This is evident in the descriptions of expectations that include “[a]ctive membership in a local church of the United Church of Christ” (line 21), “[an understanding of covenant and how it informs the nature, purpose, and polity of the United Church of Christ” (lines 23-24), “[o]ngoing demonstration of commitment to the United Church of Christ” (line 29), “financial support of the church in all its settings” (line 31), and “[p]articipation in the various settings of the United Church of Christ, including the conference/association and local church (lines 33-34). All of these reflect a of concern for denominational stability and identity.

Other models are evident under this heading as well. For instance, “[a]cknowledgment of Jesus Christ as the sole Head of the Church” (line 16) is an indication of the

**Priestly/Sacramental Model**, in which emphasis is placed on the church as extension of the Incarnation continuing in time, and the ordained leader is understood in a symbolically representative role as the presence of Christ. Reference to “[a] passion for the oneness of the body of Christ as expressed through commitment to ecumenism . . .” (line 18) is further affirmation of the influence of the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**. That this “oneness” is also to be expressed through “commitment to . . . justice” (line 19) indicates affinity with the **Social Activist Model** and its global centeredness on the gospel mandate for justice. Both the justice focus and a “commitment to . . . the full embrace of all persons in the radical hospitality of God” (line 19) relates to this model, and also to the **Midwife Model** with its understanding of the church as a “vessel for transformation” and the setting for disciple-forming mission. The strong emphasis on covenant, suggesting the **Community Builder Model**, can also be noted in this section in statements expressing concern for “[a]n understanding of the concept of covenant . . .” (line 23) and “[a] willingness to live in the covenants of mutual accountability . . .” (line 26). Mutual accountability is also a key element of the communal process of disciple formation in the **Midwife Model**.

UCC identity for ministry is also explained as “[t]he ability” (line 1) to act in certain ways that affirm the denominational ethos, such as the ability to “articulate diverse histories that comprise the United Church of Christ” (page 18, line 2), “explain and work within the current polity of the UCC and its denominational structure” (lines 6-7), “share key elements” of foundational documents (lines 10-12), and “use and promote . . . resources available through UCC publications and websites” (lines 20-21). Again, these indicate a desire for thorough knowledge of and commitment to the denomination, suggesting the institutional stability emphasis of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. Concern for knowledge of the

diverse histories of the UCC and its foundational documents also relate to concerns of the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**. The **Midwife model** is also represented in the stated desire for an authorized minister to be aware of the “diverse histories that comprise the United Church of Christ” (line 2), as it expresses the valuing of diversity. The ability to “situate [these diverse histories] in the broader evolution of faith traditions” (line 3) has a similar emphasis, which could also be seen as relating to the ecumenical vision of the wider church, with parts organically connected to one another, inherent in the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**. The ability to “envision how the UCC in its various settings may respond to religious, social, economic, and political trends, changing demographics, and other emerging factors” (lines 17-18) relates most directly to the **Midwife Model**.

“**PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL FORMATION FOR MINISTRY**” highlights “[a] healthy sense of self as shaped by God, community, and personal experience” (line 24), [a] healthy awareness of strengths, weaknesses and limits, and assumption of responsibility for one’s body, mind and spirit” (lines 29-30), “[k]nowledge and observance of personal and professional boundaries in interpersonal, congregational, and community settings” (lines 32-33), “[a] commitment to . . . professional development” (line 35), “the ability to . . . engage in self-reflection and to seek and use feedback from others appropriately” (page 19, line 3), and the ability to “listen empathically, communicate appropriately, and keep appropriate confidences” (page 19, line 10). These can be seen as skill-related, which is indicative of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. “A commitment to continuing education . . . and life-long learning” (line 35) suggests the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**, as does the desire for “[a] sense of theological identity and authority” (line 26). “Demonstrated moral maturity, including integrity in personal and public life” (lines 36-37) resonates with the **Community Builder**

**Model's** concept of minister as central figure in the wider community, modeling exemplary behavior.

There is considerable evidence of the **Midwife Model's** influence in this section. A desired attribute of a leader is to be “responsive to the opinions and values of others” (lines 26-27). The following characteristics indicate that a holistic perspective is desirable: a “healthy sense of self as shaped by God, community, and personal experience” (line 24), “assumption of responsibility for one’s body, mind and spirit” (lines 29-30), and “integrity in personal and public life and responsibility to self, family, church, and community” (lines 36-37). “[P]ersonal and professional boundaries” and “interpersonal” skills (lines 32-33) are also essential in this model which emphasizes faith being transmitted through interpersonal relationship in community. Other evidence of the **Midwife Model** is noted in the following characteristics: the ability “to affirm the identities of others, including others very unlike oneself” (page 19, line 1), “to engage productively in public discourse, expecting to grow and be transformed through the exchange of viewpoints” (line 5-6), “to frame and test a vision in community” (line 8), “to function as part of a team . . . and to mutually equip and motivate the community of faith” (lines 12-13), “to be resourceful and adaptable, and know where to locate additional resources and seek consultation when needed” (lines 15-16), and “to accept and promote diversity, to inspire others to do so, and to minister in a multicultural and multiracial, open and affirming, just peace, accessible to all, united and uniting church” (lines 18-20). These are all characteristics which suggest leadership in an experiential setting, with leader as catalyst.

“**KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS FOR MINISTRY**” is divided into two parts, the first being “**General Knowledge and Skills**” (page 19), most of which strongly suggest the **Midwife Model**. This is noted in an emphasis on the valuing of diversity, an emphasis in this section.

Desired knowledge and skills include the ability “to understand and appreciate a variety of perspectives of life” (line 25), “to understand the profound difference that physical, psychological, gender identity, sexual orientation, age, class, cultural, religious, racial, and ethnic factors make in the ways that human beings experience the world” (lines 27-29), “to comprehend the impact of historical change upon the thoughts, feelings, and actions of individuals and societies” (lines 31-32), “to perceive how a person’s perspectives and interests shape communication, and to appreciate the virtues and limitations of those perspectives and interests” (lines 34-35), “to grasp and evaluate the justifications that people give for their opinions” (line 37), “to appreciate the importance of symbols and images in human culture(s)” (page 20, line 4), “to understand various meanings and purposes of the arts” (line 6), “to use respectfully and relationally a basic knowledge of specific human cultures” (line 11), and “to communicate clearly and effectively with appropriate media and technologies” (line 13).

Several of the abilities being valued are indicative of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. For instance, the ability “to apply basic concepts of psychology to the understanding of oneself, others, and human interactions” (page 20, lines 2-3) and the ability “to analyze social, political, environmental, and economic dynamics, using the tools of the social and natural sciences” (lines 8-9) suggest acquired skills.

“**Knowledge and Skills Specific to Authorized Ministry**” are also included under the heading of “KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS FOR MINISTRY.” A wider variety of models is represented here. “A thorough knowledge of, and personal engagement with, the Bible” (page 20, line 16), and “[s]kill with methods of biblical interpretation, including the historic interpretive traditions of the church and contemporary methods” (lines 18-19) emphasize interests of the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**. The additional phrase referring to contemporary

methods - “particularly those from historically underrepresented communities” (lines 19-20) – extends the thought to include concerns related to diversity, suggesting the **Midwife Model**.

The statement “[a] deepening familiarity with contemporary theological ways of thinking and with the rich and varied theological heritages, creeds, liturgies, and spiritual practices of the Christian churches” (lines 26-28) relates to both the theological concerns of the

**Rabbinic/Magisterial Model** and the historical concerns of the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**.

The inclusion of the phrase “contemporary theological ways of thinking” (line 26) indicates affinity with the **Midwife Model** as well. This is also true of the valuing of “[a] deepening familiarity with the global history of the Christian churches through the ages . . . and an understanding of the evolution of Christian communities in the United States” (lines 22 and 23-24), which suggests the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**. The inclusion of the word “global” and the phrase “and across cultures, including the newest Christian populations” (line 23) once again extends the valued attribute to include concerns of the **Midwife Model**. “An understanding of other religions and their foundational documents” (line 30) connects with concerns of the **Midwife Model** as well.

Under valued “ability,” the statement “to articulate a theological understanding of authorized ministry” (line 33) relates to concerns for pastor as theologian, an emphasis of the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model**. Skills related to the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model** are indicated in valuing the ability “to analyze, evaluate, and integrate the biblical, historical, theological, and pastoral disciplines and practices . . .” (lines 36-37); but the word “integrate” suggests an openness to exploration outside of old patterns, and interpreting information in non-traditional ways, which would be more typical of the **Midwife Model**.

Valuing the ability “to understand the nature, use, and misuse of power and authority, and to exercise them appropriately and effectively in authorized ministry” (page 21, lines 2-3) reflects skills necessary in the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model** which understands the church as primarily a human social system. Other statements relate to this model as well; for instance, the valuing of the ability “to understand and participate in the financial administration of the church and other religious organizations” (lines 37-38). But in many instances the stated abilities, while initially expressing concerns of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model** and others, are extended in some way to include interests the **Midwife Model**. This is true of the following statement as well. “[T]o appreciate, practice, and pass on traditions of faith . . .” (line 12) suggests concerns of both the **Rabbinic/Magisterial** and **Priestly/Sacramental Models**. That the statement continues “while interpreting them in light of the context of a diverse and changing world” (lines 12-13) shifts the focus toward concerns of the **Midwife Model**. Valuing the ability “to engage in respectful ecumenical and interfaith dialogue” (line 7) could represent views of church as an organic whole as in the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**, but reference to interfaith dialogue shifts the statement toward the **Midwife Model** as well.

The ability “to discern God’s mission in the world, and, in response, to lead ministries of compassion, nurture, justice, and proclamation that support fullness of life for all people” (lines 18-19) is clearly representative of the **Social Activist model**, but would represent concerns in other models as well, including the disciple-forming mission emphasis in the **Midwife Model**. The reference to the ability “to lead and encourage ministries of . . . service . . . and social transformation” (lines 34-35) are also indicative of the **Social Activist Model**, while reference to “evangelism” in that same statement suggests the **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model**, and “stewardship” suggests the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**.



Several other statements about knowledge and skills which are being emphasized in this section relate most closely to the **Midwife Model**. They include abilities “to engage in community leadership that is collaborative and transformative” (line 5), “to celebrate the unique features of local faith communities while encouraging them to be receptive to perspectives from the broader church and world” (lines 9-10), “to adapt the practices of ministry to the unique social, cultural, environmental and ecclesiastical aspects of particular settings” (lines 15-16), and “to read the contexts of a community’s ministry and creatively lead that community through change or conflict” (lines 31-32). It is noted that skills in conflict resolution would also suggest the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model**. That model is most clearly represented in lifting up the ability “to organize and implement programs, administer the operations of a complex organization, and initiate change when appropriate” (lines 28-29), and also in valuing the ability “to provide effective and appropriate pastoral care . . .” (line 25). Also mentioned in this item is “Christian education,” which would align with the **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model** concerns, while “to equip and motivate others to share in these ministries” (lines 25-26) indicates both the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator** and the **Midwife Models**.

Emphasis on the ability “to preach the good news” (line 21) relates to the **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model**, while the ability to “. . . lead worship and participate in the sacraments in a manner faithful to the broader Christian heritage . . .” indicates concerns of the **Priestly/Sacramental Model**. Inclusion of the phrase “. . . appropriate to the characteristics of a specific culture and setting” (lines 22-23) again suggests a shift toward the **Midwife Model**.

*Observations on the national guidelines*

The **Midwife model** is by far the predominant type in evidence throughout the portion of *Draft 3.1* of the national guidelines which was evaluated. Its predominance over other types exceeds anything noted in the local materials. Evidence of this type includes the following:

- the frequent expressed regard for diverse cultural idioms and theologies;
- the valuing of enriching interaction, in which diversity is recognized as an asset;
- an awareness of and desire to respond to changing demographics, contexts, and other emerging factors;
- an understanding of “discernment” as a continuing process of exploration that is relational and dialogic;
- an emphasis on relationship-building and the communal aspects of call;
- an understanding of ministry in all its forms as a continuum, a journey that is both transformational and lifelong, emphasizing use of the Marks developmentally;
- an emphasis on flexibility in application of guidelines, recognizing the uniqueness of individual call and the need for multiple paths toward authorization;
- a holistic view of the candidate;
- an openness to diverse ways of interpreting and a variety of perspectives, including appreciation of other religions, affirmation of the identities of others including those very different from oneself, contributions of the arts, and an appreciation for symbols and a variety of forms of communication;
- a valuing of interpersonal skills and a collaborative, mutually equipping leadership style;

- the concept of church is a vessel of transformation in which persons are changed in the exchange of viewpoints, with the leader as catalyst for change.

As in the local materials, predominance of the values of the **Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model** is noted. Denominational concerns figure significantly, for instance in the valuing of evidence in a candidate of commitment to the UCC, knowledge of constitutional guidelines for authorized ministries, and denominational histories, polity, and structure. Concern for denominational stability is encouraged, as is following denominational process. Involvement and support of the UCC in all its settings is nurtured in a candidate. Development of observable and measurable skills for ministry is also valued; for example, skills involved in pastoral care and understanding of professional boundaries. This model, along with the **Midwife**, appears to far outweigh the other models in importance.

The **Rabbinic/Magisterial Model** is moderately well represented, but a shift is often noted toward values associated with the **Midwife Model**. For instance, formal education and acquisition of knowledge are emphasized in the national materials, as are knowledge of scripture and theology, and interpretation of the word. But the completion of a particular education program is not prescribed or assumed, and a personal and individual approach to assessing a candidate's readiness is given priority over reliance on external criteria such as the achievement of a particular degree. Also, education for ministry is seen as ongoing, to be encouraged beyond as well as prior to authorization.

The values associated with the **Priestly/Sacramental Model** are represented to about the same extent as those of the **Rabbinical/Magisterial Model**. Authorization is understood to be on behalf of the entire Church; Jesus is seen as its sole head; call is understood as directly from

Christ. There is evidence that an ordained leader is in a representative as well as a functional role, so an embodiment concept of ministry is represented in the national materials, just as it is in the local guidelines. The passing on of traditions of the faith is valued, as is the proper administering of the sacraments. A passion for ecumenism is also valued in a candidate.

It is difficult to rate the representation of the **Community Builder Model** in the national guidelines. It could be said that the model carries as much significance as any of the others, since the tenor of the entire document is covenantal. This is especially noted in the expressed desire for feedback from all settings of the denomination as the materials themselves are being developed. Engagement with partners in all the settings is a constant theme; this is truly an example of covenantal polity in action. Perspectives of all persons in the conversation are obviously being valued, in a web of mutually accountable relationships both formal and informal. A shift toward the **Midwife Model** may be seen in the priority given to engaging a wide diversity of voices. Another such shift may be noted in the concern for developing and nurturing ongoing covenantal relationships, both before and after authorization.

The values of the **Social Activist Model** are more in evidence in the national guidelines. A global view is encouraged, as is an understanding of the purpose of the church to empower people for mission in the world. Language in the material frequently makes reference to the concept that it is God's mission. Radical hospitality is a value, as is commitment to the gospel mandate for justice, and to ministries of compassion. A resonance with the **Midwife Model** is noted in language that speaks of transformation.

The **Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model** appears to receive considerably less emphasis in the national guidelines, notably even in the section of Marks dealing with spiritual

formation. What is in evidence is the value placed on a clear sense of divine calling, and a demonstrated commitment to spiritual growth and practices.

## CHAPTER 4: Comparisons, Conclusions, and Recommendations

### *Comparisons of Local and National Guidelines*

**All seven ecclesiological models are represented in the local as well as the national guidelines.** This is an important observation, since it has been posited that these seven types reflect the broad range of ecclesiologies at work in the United Church of Christ. All would need to be represented in order to honor the diversity of faith communities, and guide candidates for ordination that are called from them.

**While both local and national guidelines exhibit this full range, the difference in how the types are represented could affect how readily users of the materials would be able to recognize them.** In many instances in the local *In Care Manual*, several different understandings of church and ministry are found within one guideline. Particular types are more clearly recognizable in the national materials due to the manner in which guidelines are grouped. The headings “SPIRITUAL FOUNDATION FOR MINISTRY,” “UCC IDENTITY FOR MINISTRY,” “PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL FORMATION FOR MINISTRY,” and “KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS FOR MINISTRY” give an indication of the kinds of aims that are being prioritized in each. When characteristic values of other models are additionally noted in a section, the heading is helpful in relating them to the main emphasis. This feature would facilitate discussion among those who are using the materials.

**Evidence of the Social Activist Model was observed significantly less than other models in the national guidelines, and was rarely found in the local materials.** The stronger representation in the national guidelines offers a more favorable balance among ecclesiologies. However, since denominational documents and articles leading up to the Pronouncement on ministry issues have frequently included language that resonates with the Social Activist Model, it is noteworthy that this language has not been observed as frequently in guidelines for authorization, especially in *Draft 3.1* which was an outcome of the Pronouncement. This is puzzling in a denomination that continues to place a lot of emphasis on issues of race, poverty, and human rights, and which has as its stated goal to be (according to Pronouncements of General Synods) an intentionally “multiracial-multicultural,” “open and affirming,” and “just peace” church that is “accessible to all.”

**Ecclesiological emphases vary in the local materials’ three stages toward ordination. In the national materials, the same “Marks of Ministry” are designed to be used throughout the ongoing journey of ministry, offering consistency.** It is noted in the local *In Care Manual* that, proportionally, the Reflective Practitioner Model is more strongly represented in the “Initial Assessment” section. While this model carries significant weight in the other two sections as well, it is in more balanced proportion to the other models. The Priestly/Sacramental type is given more emphasis in “Assessment for Authorization,” while the Rabbinic/Magisterial Model is more prominent in the “Ongoing Assessment” phase than in the other two stages. One might wonder why such differences in emphasis would exist, for such differences could create confusion for candidates and those who advise them. It is also noted that, in terms of extensiveness of guidelines offered, the “Ongoing Assessment” portion of the local materials is

shorter and less detailed than either the “Initial Assessment” or “Assessment for Authorization” sections of the local *Manual*. In comparison, one of the benefits of the “Marks of Ministry” approach in the national guidelines is the consistency they offer throughout their application.

**The Midwife Model is represented much more prominently in the national guidelines than in the local materials.** Since this type describes contemporary understandings and practices that are evolving out of the current changing social context, its intentional inclusion is crucial in materials for the calling and equipping of future leaders of the church. The difference is perhaps most striking in the valuing of diversity. It has been noted that the guidelines in *Draft 3.1* are not only intentional in recognizing diverse expressions of faith; they “celebrate” and encourage “mutually enriching interaction of various Christian cultures, theologies, spiritualities and ideologies” (30). This is rarely expressed in the local materials.

**In many instances in the national guidelines where one of the first six models is the main one in evidence, a shift can be observed toward inclusion of priorities of the Midwife Model as well. Since this is observed to occur over and over again, that inclusion appears to be intentional.** It is noted, for instance, how values of the traditional Rabbinic/Magisterial Model are adapted in *Draft 3.1* to include alternate forms of educational preparation for ministry, emphasizing both the need for a “learned clergy” and an openness to diverse ways of acquiring knowledge. This has far-reaching implications, including changes in what kinds of educational programs need to be offered by seminaries and judicatories. In regard to the Community Builder Model, the shift occurs when emphasis is placed on engaging a wide diversity of voices in the covenantal conversation. The values of the Social Activist Model are enhanced in *Draft 3.1*



with language that suggests joining social activism with spirituality. Social justice concerns are not absent; people indeed want to change the world. But, as Diana Butler Bass observes, they want to be involved in a way that transforms their lives as well (42). The near absence of the Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model in the national guidelines was noted, and the concept of charismatic leadership was rarely addressed. However, the concept may be changing to “charisma” that is “shared or dispersed throughout congregational systems” (307). Such shifts may reflect changes that are taking place in the models themselves, suggesting how they may manifest themselves in the church of the future.

**Local and national guidelines share a fundamental interest in the living out of covenantal relationship, as is evidenced in significant representation of the Community Builder Model in both.** *Draft 3.1* and the local *In Care Manual* recognize discernment as a communal process, lifting up the primary roles of the local congregation and Association in accompanying persons called to authorized ministry. One difference noted is that the local materials tend to place more emphasis on the role of the Committee on the Ministry, while *Draft 3.1* goes further in encouraging a “community of mutual accountability” that is inclusive of all participants (31).

**Both local and national guidelines are sensitive to call being a developmental and ongoing process, resonating with the “journey” metaphor of the Midwife Model.** There is a significant difference, however, in how that process is envisioned. In the local materials, preparation for authorized ministry is described in a linear manner, addressed in discrete steps or stages to be completed prior to ordination. Inherent in this approach is the implication that

authorization is the goal and “endpoint,” since the materials do not offer guidance beyond ordination. It should be noted that the practice of this Committee on the Ministry has been to employ guidelines for oversight of authorized ministry in the current *UCC Manual on Ministry* for that purpose. However, the need to consult a different set of guidelines in itself implies a delineation between the “before” and the “after.” The national guidelines, on the other hand, envision the process of preparation for ministry as a continuum that does not end with ordination. Therefore, some advantages of the “Marks for Ministry” described in *Draft 3.1* are not only that they can be applied beyond authorization, but also that they intentionally encourage an understanding of preparation for ministry as a lifelong process. The “Marks” are designed to offer help in the personal assessment and growth inherent in that journey. And since that developmental understanding is an element of contemporary models of leadership (e.g. the Midwife Model), *Draft 3.1* is more attentive to the full range of ecclesiologies represented in the denomination. The prominence of the Midwife Model in the national guidelines also indicates a recognition that new models of church leadership are presently emerging, and guidelines need to be responsive to changing contexts.

**The national guidelines are in tension with priorities of the Midwife Model in one significant way: their strong emphasis on denominational identity and stability.** Observers note that the emergent church is inclined toward being post-denominational, Also, stability is not a primary priority in this model. Based on the frequency with which the topic is addressed, the national guidelines appear to place even more emphasis than the local guidelines on denominational identity and loyalty. This is noted under “Core Understandings” (30) and elsewhere in the document.

**Discernment is an emphasis in both local and national guidelines.** One difference to note is that while *Draft 3.1* emphasizes discernment throughout ministerial formation, the local *In Care Manual* focuses on discernment primarily in regard to entry into the process toward ordination. While the national guidelines do describe a beginning or entry point, and an eventual formal authorization for ordination is involved, there is much more room in them for flexibility. The “movements” in the national guidelines describe a process of discernment continuing throughout a person’s ministry.

Since the local *In Care Manual* relies on a set of requirements that apply to all candidates, they do not readily lend themselves to individual differences in call. Indeed, this has been a stumbling block for some members of the Lancaster Association Committee who have had less experience with specialized ministry settings outside the local church. In the national guidelines, difference in call and diversity among candidates is not only accommodated; it appears to be expected, encouraged, and valued. There is openness to possibilities for many kinds of ministry, and one main purpose of the guidelines is to help a candidate discern the particular ministry to which he or she is being called. These materials also acknowledge that the kind of call directly influences how a formation process will be envisioned.

**Functional (empowerment) understandings of ministry are strongly represented in both the local and national guidelines, primarily through the values of the Reflective Practitioner/Administrator Model.** Ontological (embodiment) understandings are represented mainly through the values associated with the Priestly/Sacramental Model, a model which, it has been noted, is somewhat less in evidence in *Draft 3.1* than in the local *In Care Manual*.

This brings up an important point. It is quite possible that differences may exist in this regard between the national church and local settings. For instance, the stronger representation

of the Priestly/Sacramental Model in guidelines of the Lancaster Association may be associated with the influence of the Mercersburg Theology, especially in that part of Pennsylvania. So, while both national and local guidelines affirm the principle of diversity, they may differ on which ecclesiologies should be given more weight. Since it is the role of a local Committee on the Ministry to authorize ministry on behalf of the whole denomination, a tension may exist between their respective interests.

### *Conclusions*

Those who compiled the Lancaster Association *In Care Manual* should be commended for including interests representing the full range of ecclesiologies operative in the United Church of Christ. While this may have been more intuitive than intentional, the range is remarkable in that these materials were written in a time before the current conversation on ministry issues had begun in earnest. Written guidelines also provide a basis for having a conversation about the ecclesiologies underlying practices.

*Draft 3.1* of the national guidelines represents an effort to encourage more intentional awareness of these ecclesiologies, and to facilitate conversation about them. *Draft 3.1* also recognizes that concepts of church and ministry are not static but are evolving in response to a changing environment. In contrast to the more prescribed approach of the local materials, *Draft 3.1* is evidently grounded in an understanding that the process of preparing persons for authorized ministry needs to remain flexible, adaptable to change without spelling out what that change will be. More than a compilation of guidelines to follow, *Draft 3.1* represents the statement of a vision that can be realized in diverse ways. What the “Marks for Ministry” represent, in my observation, is the “strategic preparation” which Michael Piazza and Cameron

Trimble of The Center for Progressive Renewal reflect in their book, *Liberating Hope! Daring to Renew the Mainline Church*. Piazza and Trimble address the challenge individual churches are facing in a post-Christendom environment; however, their concept could just as readily apply to a denomination:

Strategic preparation has replaced strategic planning as the way in which effective leaders get a congregation ready for the opportunities to fulfill their mission in new and creative ways. . . . [A] community of faith must have identified its vision, core values, and unique mission so clearly that it is able to integrate them into its very DNA. Leadership gets a church ready for the moment when the Spirit presents opportunities to live into their call (142).

### *Recommendations and Remaining Questions*

#### **For the Lancaster Association Committee on the Ministry:**

**- Are differences in how ecclesiologies are prioritized in each of the three stages toward ordination intentional?** Such differences could create confusion, so it would benefit candidates and all who advise them if the Committee on the Ministry were to take a closer look at those differences and modify the local materials as necessary. This issue may be resolved as the Committee continues to utilize the “Marks” of *Draft 3.1* and its future revisions in combination with the local manual. It was also noted that shifting from one model to another occurs on occasion, for no apparent reason. This has resulted in several models being represented even within one guideline, which could also cause confusion for the users.

**- Is emphasis on the role of the Committee on the Ministry, as compared with other covenantal partners in the discernment process, intentional?** Are there ways to encourage greater responsibility and participation of the other partners in the process? *Draft 3.1* may serve as a guide in encouraging a “community of mutual accountability” inclusive of all participants.

**For the Ministry Issues Implementation Committee:**

**-Why do some models receive less emphasis than others in *Draft 3.1*?** This was observed in regard to the Spiritual/Charismatic Model, most notably in the section of the “Marks” dealing with spiritual formation. While a clear sense of divine calling and a demonstrated commitment to spiritual growth and practices do appear to be valued, the Committee may wish to consider whether more emphasis is needed on other values of this model. It was noted, too, that the Mystic or Spiritual/Charismatic Model was less in evidence in *Draft 3.1*. Since national materials will serve to guide authorization throughout this diverse denomination, it is important that they be broadly representative and inclusive of all the ecclesiologies.

**- Since documents and denominational conversations leading up to the Pronouncement on ministry issues have frequently included language that resonates with the Social Activist Model, a lingering question is why this model is only nominally represented in *Draft 3.1*.** This is especially puzzling in a denomination that continues to place much emphasis on issues of peace and justice.

**- What are some ways that “denominational loyalty,” so strongly emphasized in *Draft 3.1*, might manifest itself in an emerging church that is post-denominational?** The continuing conversation needs to address a fundamental tension that exists between the national setting’s desire for denominational stability and current trends in emerging church that are characterized by dissonance and change, and where institutional stability is not a priority.

The irony here is that it is the covenant polity of the UCC and respect for and loyalty to it, not to mention financial support for its Local Church Ministries, which have nurtured the lively discussion leading to the Pronouncement on ministry issues and *Draft 3.1*! The UCC has

been a setting conducive to the active “practicing” of covenantal relationship in the context of remarkable diversity. Perhaps that is where more emphasis needs to be placed as national materials are further developed, for that would be more in line with the values and interests of the emerging church.

**For National Instrumentalities of the Denomination:**

**- What understandings of ministry are currently represented in the “Order for Ordination to Ministry” in *United Church of Christ Book of Worship*, especially in regard to empowerment and embodiment?** Currently, a functional understanding predominates in the Order, as has been noted by Barbara Brown Zikmund and others.

**- Are the models themselves undergoing changes in response to new challenges?**

What can be observed, and how can this enrich the discussion on ministry issues?

**For All Settings:**

**- What are some additional ways we can continue to “pay attention to our theologies of ministry”?** Clearly, the ongoing conversation on ministry issues has been helpful in promoting awareness across the denomination that multiple ways of understanding church and ministry do exist. “Paying attention” on its most elemental level means talking about these different models of ministry.

The typology used in this study could be adapted for other use. For instance, the Rev. Dr. Donald Freeman has used a similar typology with search committees and pastor-parish relations committees. At his suggestion I have used the types in a simplified form as a tool in my own congregation to gauge agreement between myself as pastor and the other congregational

participants on what the church is and does. The sample survey form that was used is found in APPENDIX E.

**Opportunities abound for this rich conversation to continue!**

***“Directed by God, the whole company of Israel journeyed on by stages . . .”*** Exodus 17:1 (NRSV and *The Message*)



**IN CARE MANUAL**

**THE LANCASTER ASSOCIATION  
PENN CENTRAL CONFERENCE  
UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST**

Prepared by:  
The Lancaster Association  
Committee on Church and Ministry  
Penn Central Conference  
United Church of Christ  
August 10, 2000

**THE IN CARE PROCESS FOR INDIVIDUALS, LOCAL CHURCHES,  
AND THE LANCASTER ASSOCIATION  
Penn Central Conference  
United Church of Christ**

**INTRODUCTION**

This manual outlines the procedures for candidates seeking ordination in the Lancaster Association. It explains the relationship of the candidate with:

1. his/her local church pastor
2. his/her local church consistory/council
3. the In Care Sub-Committee of the Lancaster Association Committee on Church and Ministry
4. the in care advisor
5. the Lancaster Association Committee on Church and Ministry
6. the seminary.

The purpose of the in care relationship is to provide counsel, support, and assistance to the candidate throughout his/her journey of preparation for ordination and active, full time ministry in the name of Christ.

Candidates for ordination are encouraged to apply for in care status no later than the beginning of the first year of seminary. Ordinarily, the candidate must be in care of the Association Church and Ministry Committee for one year before the rite of ordination can take place.

**1. RELATIONSHIP WITH THE LOCAL CHURCH PASTOR**

The first step in this process takes place when the prospective candidate for ordination discusses her/his sense of calling with the UCC pastor of the church where he/she is a member. The possible candidate initiates this discussion after being an active member of the local church for about a year. Together they will seek to discern and possibly clarify the call which the candidate feels he/she has received. Together they will pray for God's guidance through the power of the Holy Spirit.

When the possible candidate and the pastor are in agreement about the call, the pastor will briefly explain the process involved in seeking ordination in the United Church of Christ. The pastor will give her/him a copy of the manual.

**THE PASTOR WILL WANT TO BE AVAILABLE TO THE CANDIDATE THROUGHOUT THE IN CARE PROCESS.**

The pastor is strongly encouraged to involve the candidate in as many local church activities as possible during the in care period. A student may not serve as the celebrant in Holy Communion, Baptism, or in weddings. However, the pastor may invite the candidate to participate in the leadership of the sacraments and rites aforementioned. With approval of the pastor and local church In Care Committee, the candidate may serve as preacher, liturgist, teacher, youth advisor, parish visitor, holder of office, etc.

APPENDIX A *Lancaster Association In Care Manual* Page 31 **2. RELATIONSHIP WITH LOCAL CHURCH CONSISTORY/COUNCIL**

2

3 Ordinarily, the candidate must be a member of a local UCC church for one year before  
4 approaching the consistory/council for approval as a student in care. The  
5 consistory/council receives the request of the candidate and either creates its own In Care  
6 Committee or assigns the responsibility to an already existing committee which can serve  
7 that purpose.

8

9 In preparation for the first meeting with this committee, the candidate will supply the  
10 following information in writing:

11

- A. A brief written statement (not more than 5 single pages double-spaced)  
12 on the following two subjects:

13

1. general faith pilgrimage (Christian experience, insights, and  
14 encounters which have shaped the candidate's faith through  
15 the home, local church, education, and community);
- 16 2. call to ministry (a theological statement reflecting on personal  
17 faith and life that leads to the feeling that she/he is being  
18 called to ministry in the Church of Jesus Christ.

19

- B. Academic transcripts from college and any graduate work, including seminary

20

- C. Current education plans, if appropriate

21

- D. A profession resume (listing work, education, and civic, church, and other  
22 experiences with dates).

23

24 When the local church In Care Committee meets with the candidate, the information  
25 submitted by the candidate will be discussed, plus the following possible issues:

26

- A. The candidate's history with the local church and level of participation (in  
27 particular, how this has contributed to the candidate's sense of call and  
28 gives evidence that the candidate has the gifts and maturity needed for  
29 ordained ministry)

30

- B. The candidate's understanding of ordained ministry

31

- C. The requirements and process of preparation for ordination

32

33 This local church In Care Committee then decides, either at its first meeting or at a later  
34 one, whether or not to recommend the candidate to the Association Committee on Church  
35 and Ministry for in care status.

36

37 If the decision is in the affirmative, the pastor fills out the enclosed **APPLICATION**  
38 **FOR IN CARE STATUS** and includes the following information:

39

- A. Verification and length of membership in this congregation and in all UCC  
40 congregations to date

41

- B. A brief description of the process used by the church to evaluate and  
42 recommend the candidate to the Association

43

- C. A brief statement regarding how the church and pastor will continue to relate

APPENDIX A *Lancaster Association In Care Manual* Page 4

- 1 to and support the candidate, including financial support  
 2 D. A brief comment about the student in the following areas:  
 3 1. Academic potential (intellectual alertness, curiosity, and ability;  
 4 openness of mind)  
 5 2. Communication skills (capacity to clearly express self both orally and  
 6 in writing)  
 7 3. Psychological stability (capacity to establish and maintain harmonious  
 8 interpersonal relationships with others, to cope well with stressful  
 9 situations, and to exercise adequate emotional control)  
 10 4. Leadership ability (capacity and confidence to lead effectively)  
 11 5. Sensitivity to and awareness of needs and motives of others (capacity  
 12 to care about and consider the feelings of others, and to attempt to  
 13 understand why people behave as they do; concern for social  
 14 issues)  
 15 6. Ability to assume responsibility (resourcefulness and capacity to deal  
 16 effectively and creatively with problems and to fulfill  
 17 responsibilities)  
 18 7. Physical health  
 19 8. Breadth of interest (evidence of varied interests, hobbies, leisure  
 20 activities and creative pursuits)  
 21 9. Ability to share his/her spiritual journey  
 22 10. Awareness of her/his own physical, emotional, and spiritual needs.  
 23

24 The local church is requested to provide one-third (1/3) of the cost involve in the  
 25 psychological assessment which is required of all candidates who have applied for in care  
 26 status. (In 1999 this 1/3 cost is about \$325). The Association and the Penn Central  
 27 Conference will equally share the other two-thirds (2/3) of the total cost. When possible,  
 28 the Association will give additional limited financial support to its candidates in care. It  
 29 is expected that the local church In Care Committee and the candidate will meet at least 3  
 30 to 4 times annually to provide support to the student and to review progress made in the  
 31 in care process. The local church's In Care Committee is invited to be represented in the  
 32 Annual Review of the candidate conducted by the In Care Sub-Committee of the  
 33 Lancaster Association Committee on Church and Ministry.  
 34

### 35 **3. RELATIONSHIP WITH THE IN CARE SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE** 36 **LANCASTER ASSOCIATION COMMITTEE ON CHURCH AND MINISTRY**

37  
 38 Upon approval by the local church In Care Committee and upon submission of the  
 39 required aforementioned written documents, the candidate is scheduled for an initial  
 40 interview with the In Care Sub-Committee of the Association. The candidate is  
 41 accompanied by her/his pastor and one or more members of the local church's In Care  
 42 Committee. The interview is a dialogue between the candidate and the In Care Sub-  
 43 Committee in which local church representatives are free to participate. If the In Care

APPENDIX A *Lancaster Association In Care Manual* Page 5

1 Sub-Committee agrees to continue the process after this initial interview, arrangements  
 2 will be made as soon as possible for the candidate to undergo a psychological assessment  
 3 by a group approved by both the Association and the Conference. The results of this  
 4 evaluation are CONFIDENTIAL and are sent by the evaluating group directly to the  
 5 chairperson of the In Care Sub-Committee. A summary of the assessment results is  
 6 shared with the candidate, who in turn may elect to share it with his/her advisor.  
 7

8 After this review and evaluation, the In Care Sub-Committee will decide whether or not  
 9 to grant in care status for one year (to be reviewed thereafter on an annual basis). The In  
 10 Care Sub-Committee will choose one of the following options:

- 11 A. YES . . . The Sub-Committee senses that this is a person with gifts for  
 12 ordained ministry, an authentic call to ministry, and the ability and  
 13 determination to meet the requirements for ordination.
- 14 B. YES, BUT . . . The Sub-Committee senses that the applicant may have the  
 15 potential for ordained ministry, but it has certain reservations and concerns  
 16 which must be addressed. The decision to accept the applicant as in care  
 17 of the Association is either postponed until the “buts” are resolved, or  
 18 received into care with recommendations for further  
 19 work/study/counseling to be monitored by the Sub-Committee.
- 20 C. NO, BUT . . . The Sub-Committee may feel that at this time it is not able to  
 21 make a positive decision to enter into an in care relationship with the  
 22 applicant. However, it could indicate its openness to consider the request  
 23 at a later time if the person is able to address the identified deficiencies  
 24 and wishes to make application again.
- 25 D. NO . . . In some cases the Sub-Committee may need to say no to an applicant.  
 26 This is not a decision which can be made lightly or without considerable  
 27 deliberation and prayer. The Sub-Committee can express its caring for the  
 28 person and for the whole church by denying the request.  
 29

30 When the Sub-Committee has made its decision, it will meet again with the applicant to  
 31 share its conclusions. If the decision is YES, then the Sub-Committee will officially  
 32 grant in care status for one year and assign an advisor. The new candidate in care will be  
 33 introduced to the full Church and Ministry Committee, to the next meeting of the  
 34 Lancaster Association, and to the annual meeting of the Penn Central Conference.  
 35

### 36 ANNUAL REVIEWS OF IN CARE STANDING

37  
 38 Annual reviews are held with all in care candidates with dates established by mutual  
 39 agreement. They are held for the purpose of maintaining contact with the candidate and  
 40 for determining ways to improve the supportive relationship between the In Care Sub-  
 41 Committee and the candidate. The candidate’s pastor and in care advisor are expected  
 42 to attend. The reviews are expected to be face to face if at all possible. If this is not  
 43 possible, it is the candidate’s responsibility to notify the chairperson of the In Care Sub-

APPENDIX A *Lancaster Association In Care Manual* Page 6

1 Committee.

2  
3 Annual Reviews normally consist of three parts:

4 A. Seminary report

5 If the candidate is a seminary student, she/he is requested to forward to the  
6 chairperson of the In Care Sub-Committee four weeks prior to an annual  
7 review all grades, transcripts, field education reports, and review processes  
8 initiated by the seminary.

9 B. Oral questions

10 Several questions will be sent to the student before each annual review.

11 C. Written reflections

12 Reflections will be assigned at least one month prior to an annual review.

13 Written reflections are to cover the subject adequately in as concise and  
14 brief a form as possible, and are to be sent to the chairperson of the Sub-  
15 Committee at least one week prior to the date of the annual review.

16  
17 **4. RELATIONSHIP TO THE IN CARE ADVISOR**

18  
19 When a candidate is granted in care status, the Sub-Committee assigns an advisor without  
20 delay. The ideal advisor is one who is a role model for the candidate, one who is  
21 available and ready to respond to questions and concerns. She/he counsels the candidate  
22 in the fulfillment of all requirements and standards as far as preparation for ordained  
23 ministry is concerned. The advisor becomes a true friend and confidant of the candidate.  
24 The advisor is usually an ordained minister who is not necessarily a member of the  
25 Committee on Ministry of the Association.

26  
27 The advisor will assist the candidate in the following specific ways:

28 A. The advisor will be very familiar with the in care process outlined in the  
29 MANUAL ON MINISTRY (pp. 28-46) and further spelled out in this  
30 manual.

31 B. The advisor will hold an initial meeting with the new candidate in care very  
32 soon after he/she receives the in care status. They will discuss the  
33 expectations each has for the other as they begin an exciting relationship  
34 that is quite unique.

35 C. The advisor will inform the In Care Sub-Committee if the candidate is not  
36 receiving appropriate mailings from the Association, Conference, and  
37 wider church.

38 D. The advisor will make sure that the candidate maintains active participation in  
39 the life of a local church and, if that church is not his/her home church,  
40 that contact be maintained with the home church.

41 E. The advisor will encourage the candidate to take an active part in the life of  
42 the Association, Conference, and wider church.

43 F. The advisor will sit in with the Sub-Committee's Annual Review when his/her

APPENDIX A *Lancaster Association In Care Manual* Page 7

- 1 advisee meets with them.
- 2 G. The advisor will provide the opportunity and environment for the candidate in  
3 care to raise and explore questions throughout the year about faith,  
4 spiritual growth, theology, and the church's mission and ministry in  
5 today's world.
- 6 H. The advisor will give guidance to the candidate in care regarding materials  
7 required at Annual reviews and as the candidate prepares for the  
8 ordination procedures. For example, the advisor is requested to work with  
9 the candidate as she/he prepares an outline of the ordination paper.
- 10 I. The advisor will provide written references on behalf of the candidate when  
11 requested to do so.
- 12 J. When an advisor leaves the Lancaster Association before the candidate is  
13 graduated and ordained, a replacement will be named without delay. All  
14 important records and evaluations will be placed in the candidate's file  
15 before a departing advisor leaves the Association area.

16  
17 **5. RELATIONSHIP WITH THE LANCASTER ASSOCIATION COMMITTEE**  
18 **ON CHURCH AND MINISTRY**

19  
20 When an in care seminary student is six months away from graduation, she/he may  
21 formally begin ordination procedures with the Association Committee on Church and  
22 Ministry. The process begins with an ordination interview.

- 23 A. Preparation for the ordination interview includes the following:
- 24 1. A candidate for ordination needs to meet the requirements established  
25 by the Committee on Church and Ministry and the seminary and to  
26 be reasonably assured of receiving a Master of Divinity degree or  
27 other degree approved by the Committee.
- 28 2. The candidate shall prepare either a video or audio tape of a sermon  
29 recently delivered to a congregation.
- 30 3. Thirty to forty-five days before the interview the candidate will submit  
31 twelve copies of his/her ordination paper to the Committee. We  
32 suggest that it not exceed 15-20 single-side pages in length.
- 33 B. The ordination interview will keep the following thoughts in mind:
- 34 1. The primary purpose of the ordination interview is to determine the  
35 candidate's readiness for ministry.
- 36 2. The in care advisor will freely participate in the interview and act as the  
37 candidate's advocate.
- 38 3. Areas to be covered in the interview include:
- 39 a. The candidate's personal faith and his/her spiritual journey up  
40 to the present.
- 41 b. The candidate's theological knowledge and perspective on such  
42 matters of faith as the Bible, pastoral care, ecumenism,  
43 worship and the sacraments, Christian Education,

APPENDIX A *Lancaster Association In Care Manual* Page 8

- 1 stewardship, ministerial ethics, and mission.  
 2 c. The candidate's knowledge of the history and polity of the  
 3 United Church of Christ.  
 4 d. The candidate's ability to articulate thoughts and feelings.  
 5

6 Upon completion of the interview, a vote is taken by the Committee on Church and  
 7 Ministry. If the vote is favorable, a date, place, and time are set for an ecclesiastical  
 8 council of the Lancaster Association. Approval by the council grants the privilege of  
 9 ordination subject to the reception of a call.  
 10

11 If there is a negative vote by the Committee on Church and Ministry, the candidate is  
 12 brought back to the Committee meeting at which time the concerns are shared with  
 13 him/her. The candidate may work on these areas of concern and return for further  
 14 examination at a time that is mutually agreeable to both the candidate and the committee.  
 15

## 16 **6. THE SEMINARY**

17  
 18 Candidates seeking ordination as graduates of seminaries are required to fulfill the  
 19 following expectations:

- 20 A. Unless otherwise required by the candidate's seminary, there will be no  
 21 restriction or limitation on the number of courses graded by pass/fail as  
 22 opposed to either a letter or numerical grading system. The Committee on  
 23 Church and Ministry will accept the GPA standard for graduation  
 24 established by the seminary.  
 25 B. Candidates will satisfactorily complete at least one unit of Clinical Pastoral  
 26 Education (CPE) before being ordained.  
 27 C. Candidates will satisfactorily complete the course on polity of the United '  
 28 Church of Christ before being ordained.  
 29 D. Candidates will satisfactorily complete all curriculum requirements for an  
 30 acceptable degree before they become eligible for ordination. This  
 31 includes classroom courses and field education. In field education,  
 32 students will experience ministry in various settings (congregational and  
 33 non-congregational) and in the following eight areas: preaching, offering  
 34 pastoral care, leading corporate worship, teaching, relating to colleagues in  
 35 ministry, community witnessing, parish management, and evangelism.  
 36 When the field education experience occurs within a congregational  
 37 setting, it shall be in a United Church of Christ church.  
 38 E. An import aspect of the seminary educational program is an evaluation of  
 39 learning and development completed after at least 24 and no later than 36  
 40 credit hours of study. It includes a self-assessment paper written by the  
 41 student, an interview, and a Comprehensive Ministry Review report, if the  
 42 student attends Lancaster Theological Seminary. If the student attends  
 43 another seminary, his/her advisor will work with the seminary faculty in



APPENDIX A *Lancaster Association In Care Manual* Page 9

- 1 crafting an effective evaluation process.
- 2 The review enables the Committee on Church and Ministry to:
- 3 1. Participate in significant communication with the student and
- 4 seminary;
- 5 2. Gather information about the student's gifts and abilities;
- 6 3. Provide care and support for the student;
- 7 4. Participate in the theological education and evaluation of the student.

**A COVENANT WITH AN IN CARE PERSON OF  
THE LANCASTER ASSOCIATION  
PENN CENTRAL CONFERENCE, UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST**

**PREAMBLE**

A covenant is “an intentional agreement made between or among parties in the name of God. It has both horizontal and vertical dimensions and is not accidental, but deliberate.” (Elizabeth Nordbeck, Andover-Newton Theological Seminary).

Recognizing that carrying out the Covenant of Ministry in the United Church of Christ is both delicate and demanding, calling us to live by relationships with God and each other and not by rules - by grace more than by law - still the Lancaster Association Committee on Church and Ministry feels the need for minimum guidelines for candidates for ministry. These minimal guidelines follow:

**THE COVENANT**

The Lancaster Association of the Penn Central Conference of the United Church of Christ has accepted \_\_\_\_\_ into the in care relationship. If the in care process leads to a request for ordination, ordinarily a minimum of one year under the guidance and care of the Committee on Church and Ministry and its qualified advisors will be required prior to ordination.

**PART ONE**

The **LANCASTER ASSOCIATION** covenants:

1. to provide a qualified advisor to guide the candidate toward a vocational understanding consistent with the faith and mission of the United Church of Christ;
2. when possible, to provide financial assistance in support of seminary preparation;
3. to provide advice and counsel regarding the skills and gifts required for the practice of ministry;
4. to provide the opportunity for assessment of personal and psychological gifts, sharing the costs equally with the candidate’s local church and with the Penn Central Conference;
5. to review and consider annual renewal of the in care relationship.

**PART TWO**

As a **CANDIDATE** preparing for ministry in the United Church of Christ, \_\_\_\_\_ agrees to follow the guidelines for the in care process, to accept the fellowship, counsel, evaluations, support and guidance of the Lancaster Association and its Committee on Church and Ministry, and covenants:

1. to meet with the designated advisor, sharing academic progress and faith, vocational, and personal development;

APPENDIX A Lancaster Association In Care Manual Page 11

- 1 2. to complete an assessment of personal and psychological fitness for ministry
- 2 administered by a professional chosen by the Committee on Church and
- 3 Ministry;
- 4 3. to worship regularly according the faith and order of the United Church of
- 5 Christ, and to participate in the life and work of the local UCC church,
- 6 the Lancaster Association, and the wider church;
- 7 4. to offer the Committee on Church and Ministry evidence of developing skills
- 8 for ministry and continuing growth in faith;
- 9 5. to meet with the Committee on Church and Ministry at least once annually for
- 10 a review and possible renewal of in care status. The in care relationship
- 11 must be renewed annually.
- 12 6. to participate in an evaluation of this in care covenant whenever the need
- 13 arises.
- 14

**PART THREE**

The **SPONSORING CONGREGATION** covenants:

- 17 1. to support and hold in prayer \_\_\_\_\_ as she/he
- 18 continues the journey of ministerial preparation;
- 19 2. to share one-third of the fee for the required assessment of personal and
- 20 psychological fitness for ministry;
- 21 3. to meet at least 3-4 times annually with the candidate for support and to share
- 22 gifts and experiences which might be mutually beneficial;
- 23 4. to consider the possibility of providing financial assistance to the candidate
- 24 toward meeting the high cost of today’s seminary education;
- 25 5. to remain faithful to the processes for a sponsoring congregation as described
- 26 in the **MANUAL ON MINISTRY** of the United Church of Christ.
- 27
- 28

**SIGNATURES**

**DATE** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
In Care Student

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair, Committee on Church and Ministry

\_\_\_\_\_  
In Care Advisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sponsoring Local Church

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

**APPLICATION FOR IN CARE STATUS  
Lancaster Association of the United Church of Christ**

**CHURCH NAME** \_\_\_\_\_

**ADDRESS** \_\_\_\_\_

**TELEPHONE NUMBER** \_\_\_\_\_

**APPLICANT'S NAME** \_\_\_\_\_

**We request that the above named person be accepted as an in care candidate for Christian ministry.**

**At an official meeting of the** \_\_\_\_\_

**on \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_ \_\_, it was voted to inform the Lancaster Association Committee on Church and Ministry of this desire.**

**The applicant is a member of our congregation. We request the she/he be examined and, if found to be fit and ready, be recommended to the Association as a candidate in care.**

**SIGNED** \_\_\_\_\_

**CHURCH OFFICE** \_\_\_\_\_

**Action by the In Care Sub Committee of the Lancaster Association Committee on Church and Ministry:**

**Interview date** \_\_\_\_\_

**Vote of the Committee** \_\_\_\_\_

**Advisor assigned** \_\_\_\_\_

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

**RELEASE OF INFORMATION AGREEMENT  
Lancaster Association**

I, \_\_\_\_\_ hereby authorize  
\_\_\_\_\_ to release the evaluation

(either written or oral) of my performance (academic, field work, spiritual development, psychological assessments, clinical pastoral education) to the chairperson of the In Care Sub Committee of the Lancaster Association Committee on Church and Ministry.

**SIGNED** \_\_\_\_\_  
**DATE** \_\_\_\_\_

**Send when completed to:**  
**Chairperson**  
**In Care Sub Committee**  
**Lancaster Association Committee on Church and Ministry**

**1 POSSIBLE QUESTIONS FOR APPLICANTS SEEKING IN CARE STATUS**

2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1. Why do you want to become a minister in the Church of Jesus Christ?
2. Why do you want to become a minister in the United Church of Christ?
3. Do you see any negative aspects of being a minister? If so, please give some examples.
4. What will be your top three priorities as a minister? How would you rank them (in what order)?
5. What do you see as your responsibility to the Association? Conference? The wider church?
6. What are your educational goals and time frame?
7. What specific skills and interests do you bring to Christian ministry?
8. What is your understanding of the call you have received to become a minister?
9. What is your understanding of the mission of the Church in today's world?
10. Who is Jesus the Christ? What is your personal relationship to Him?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

**ANNUAL REVIEW PREPARATION SHEET**  
In Care Sub Committee of  
the Committee on Church and Ministry  
Lancaster Association

TO BE FILLED OUT BY THE CANDIDATE IN CARE AND HER/HIS ADVISOR

CONFIDENTIAL

CANDIDATE'S NAME \_\_\_\_\_  
CURRENT ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_  
TELEPHONE HOME \_\_\_\_\_  
OFFICE \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE RESPOND TOGETHER TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

1. Is the candidate knowledgeable and familiar with the In Care process and requirements?

Circle either YES or NO

2. A. If a seminary student, what year and semester is the candidate currently in?

\_\_\_\_\_

B. Is the candidate on track and up-to-date in meeting seminary and Association requirements? Circle either YES or NO

If NO, check areas of suspected deficiency:

\_\_\_\_ Biblical exegesis      \_\_\_\_ Old Testament  
\_\_\_\_ New Testament      \_\_\_\_ Systematic theology  
\_\_\_\_ Ethics      \_\_\_\_ Liturgics  
\_\_\_\_ Church history      \_\_\_\_ History/polity of UCC  
\_\_\_\_ Attention to spirituality      \_\_\_\_ Christian education  
\_\_\_\_ Personal fitness      \_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

C. How does the candidate rate overall in academic experience to date?

\_\_\_\_ Excellent      \_\_\_\_ Good      \_\_\_\_ Fair      \_\_\_\_ Poor

3. Are there any concerns that should be raised at this annual review, including physical or emotional problems?

APPENDIX A *Lancaster Association In Care Manual* Page 16

- 1 4. Is the candidate accepting of you as his/her advisor? Circle either YES or NO
- 2
- 3 5. Is the candidate accepting of her/his relationship to the Committee on Church and
- 4 Ministry of the Lancaster Association? Circle either YES or NO
- 5
- 6 6. OTHER COMMENTS/CONCERNS:



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

## **SUGGESTED OUTLINES FOR AN ORDINATION PAPER**

Lancaster Association

### **SUGGESTION #1**

#### **A. STATEMENT OF CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE**

1. Home life and local church experiences
2. Educational experiences and degrees
3. Your understanding of your call to Christian ministry

#### **B. STATEMENT OF CHRISTIAN BELIEFS**

1. God, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit (the Holy Trinity)
  - a. Creation and providence; judgment and grace
  - b. The person of Jesus the Christ related to the incarnation, atonement (problem of evil), salvation, resurrection
  - c. Divine revelation and the Holy Scriptures
  - d. Your understanding of the Sacraments (baptism, Lord's Supper)
2. Humanity
  - a. Your understanding of sin, repentance, and forgiveness
  - b. The place and importance of prayer in the life of a Christian
  - c. Your understanding of the promise of eternal life through faith in Jesus Christ
3. The Church and the Promised Kingdom of God
  - a. Relationship of the Church to the world (including evangelism, social action, and mission)
  - b. Relationship of my local Church to the United Church of Christ, other Christian denominations, and other world faiths
  - c. Relationship between lay and ordained ministers

#### **C. FINAL STATEMENT AND CONCLUSION**

APPENDIX A *Lancaster Association In Care Manual* Page 18**SUGGESTED OUTLINES FOR AN ORDINATION PAPER****SUGGESTION # 2****BASED ON THE UCC BOOK OF WORSHIP ORDINATION SERVICE**

BEFORE GOD AND THIS CONGREGATION WE ASK YOU:

- A. Are you persuaded that God has called you to be ordained a minister in the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ, and are you ready to enter this ministry and faithfully serve in it? **I AM**
1. Briefly give a summary of your faith journey and your call to the Christian ministry in the United Church of Christ.
  2. Within the context of the universal ministry of God's people, why have you chosen to seek ordination, and what particular gifts do you bring to this ministry?
- B. Do you, with the Church throughout the world, hear the Word of God in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and do you accept it as the rule of faith and practice? **I DO**
1. How do you understand the nature of the Word of God as it is revealed in the Scripture of the Old and New Testaments?
  2. What does it mean to accept this Word as the rule of Christian faith and practice?
- C. Do you promise to be diligent in your private prayers and reading of the Scriptures, as well as in the public duties of your office? **I DO**
1. How do you practice your devotional life and what is the place of prayer in your life?
  2. How do you intend to find rest and renewal in the context of the biblical theme of "sabbath" within the context of the "public duties of your office," and how do the present and future demands of family or single life fit within the context of those duties?
- D. Will you be zealous in maintaining both the "truth of the Gospel" and the "peace of the Church," speaking the truth in love? **I WILL, RELYING ON GOD'S GRACE**
1. Concerning the "truth of the Gospel," what is your understanding of the doctrine of salvation (the person of Christ, the incarnation, the Cross and Resurrection of Christ, sin, repentance, forgiveness, judgment, grace, and eschatology)?
  2. Concerning the "peace of the Church," how would you deal with those conflict situations when you are called to speak the prophetic word of "truth in love," both in personal and social justice situations?
- E. Do you accept the "faith and order" of the United Church of Christ? And will you, as an ordained minister in this communion, show compassionate affection toward all who are in Christ? **I DO AND I WILL**
1. How do you understand the "faith and order" of the United Church of Christ, specifically concerning the Trinity, baptism, the Lord's Supper, covenant, and the **STATEMENT OF FAITH**?
  2. What is your understanding of the Church, in its local, ecumenical, and wider settings? How does "the church" relate to the world (evangelism, social action, and mission)?

APPENDIX A *Lancaster Association In Care Manual* Page 19

## AN ECCLESIASTICAL COUNCIL

## Lancaster Association

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

1. When the Committee on Church and Ministry approves a candidate for ordination, a date is discussed for an Ecclesiastical Council to take place as soon as possible.
2. The Committee on Church and Ministry representative shares the suggested date with the Executive Committee of the Association, seeking confirmation and their involvement.
3. The Committee on Church and Ministry chairperson verifies the chosen date with both the candidate and her/his local church (where the Council will be held).
4. The Committee on Church and Ministry is responsible for mailing out an invitation to all clergy with standing in the Association and to all Association churches, encouraging representatives from their congregations to be present. The mailing should be sent out at least 30 days before the Council is scheduled to take place. The notice will include short, biographical details of the candidate and a copy of her/his ordination paper.
5. The Committee on Church and Ministry chairperson/representative conducts the Ecclesiastical Council proceedings. He/she and the Association President/representative plan the agenda in consultation with the host pastor.
6. A SUGGESTED AGENDA
  - a. Call to Order by the Association President/representative
  - b. Opening prayer offered by the host pastor
  - c. Welcome to all delegates
  - d. A quorum is established
  - e. The purpose of the Ecclesiastical Council is stated: “to authorize the ordination of (name) who has successfully completed the ordination examination by the Committee on Church and Ministry of the Lancaster Association.”
  - f. Leadership of the meeting is turned over to the chairperson/representative of the Committee on Church and Ministry for:
    - Introductory remarks
    - Questions to the candidate from the Council delegates about her/his ordination paper
    - Possible question to the candidate from the enclosed list of questions (next page)
    - When there are no further questions to be answered by the candidate, he/she is excused to another room.
  - g. Further discussion and then action is taken to either approve or disapprove the candidate for ordination (led by the Association President/representative)
  - h. The candidate is recalled and the results are shared with him/her. If approved, the candidate is congratulated and invited to share some thoughts and feelings with the Council members.
  - i. The Ecclesiastical Council is adjourned with a song and a prayer
  - j. The host church may provide refreshments (optional)

APPENDIX A    *Lancaster Association In Care Manual*    Page 20POSSIBLE QUESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION  
AT AN ECCLESIASTICAL COUNCIL1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

1. What is your understanding of what it means to be called into ministry?
2. What do you consider to be your strengths that you bring to ministry?
3. What do you perceive to be your weaknesses and areas where growth is needed?
4. How do you feel about the fact that, even with your best efforts, you will never be able to please everybody?
5. What do you see as the three greatest opportunities in ministry today?
6. What do you see as your relationship to the Association, Conference, and wider Church?
7. How will you care for yourself while deeply involved in ministry? Your family?
8. Do you understand the ecumenical relationships of the United Church of Christ? Why are they important?
9. What are the various roles of someone called to Christian ministry?
10. How will you balance expectations of leadership in the local church and delegating a significant amount of responsibility to your laity?

## ORDINATION

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

1. When an ordinand receives a call to ministry, she/he informs the Committee on Church and Ministry. The ordinand makes an appointment with the Committee to go over the terms of the call. Plans for the ordination service are discussed. The date for the ordination service may be no sooner than one (1) month after the date of the vote by the Ecclesiastical Council to approve ordination.
2. The Committee on Church and Ministry chairperson discusses the date and plans for the ordination with the Association President. Proper publicity is planned and carried out. The ordinand and her/his local Church are responsible for sending invitations to the ordination service. The invitation indicates that both the Lancaster Association and the local church are extending the invitation. Address labels are available from the Association.
3. The ordinand and the church of location plan the service of ordination in consultation with the Association President and chairperson of the Committee on Church and Ministry. In planning the service, allowance should be made for creativity and integrity. The offering received at the ordination service is to be equally divided between the Association In Care Fund and a cause selected by the ordinand.
4. The Association President and the Committee on Church and Ministry chairperson, or a representative duly appointed, share participation in the ordination service as found in the United Church of Christ BOOK OF WORSHIP.

## APPENDIX B "Ministry Assessment Program" Page 1

1 **Samaritan Counseling Center**  
 2 1801 Oregon Pike, Lancaster, PA 17601  
 3

4 **Ministry Assessment Program**  
 5 **guidance on the vocational path**  
 6  
 7

8 The Samaritan Counseling Center offers **MAP** (the Ministry Assessment  
 9 Program). **MAP** provides assessment and testing of candidates seeking  
 10 ordination, of clergy experiencing difficulties, and vocational guidance to lay as  
 11 well as ordained ministers.  
 12

13 The objectives of **MAP** are to provide:

- 14 1. Confidential vocational, psychological, and spiritual assessment of those  
 15 seeking ordination. This includes an in-depth written summary to the referral  
 16 person(s), when appropriate, and a one-to-one feedback session to the  
 17 participant.  
 18
- 19 2. Psychological battery of tests for clergy currently experiencing spiritual,  
 20 psychological, or relational difficulties.
- 21 3. Vocational assessment at the inevitable crossroads in one's ministry.
- 22 4. A cost effective, relevant assessment process which includes the spiritual,  
 23 and where attention is paid to specific recommendations. This offers a  
 24 unique alternative to other programs.
- 25 5. Follow-up counseling or psychiatric services when appropriate.  
 26

27 **MAP** provides three model assessment batteries, which can be adapted to meet  
 28 the particular needs of a denomination:  
 29

30 **VOCPSYCH**

31 **Seminary Candidates**

32 Clinical Interview  
 33 Wechsler Adult Intelligence  
 34 Scale-Revised  
 35 Strong Interest Inventory  
 36 Myers-Briggs Type Indicator  
 37 Religious Orientation  
 38 Assessment Battery  
 39 Thematic Apperception Test  
 40 Edwards Personal Preference  
 41 Schedule  
 42 Minnesota Multiphasic  
 43 Personality Inventory –  
 44 2nd Edition  
 45 Beck Depression Inventory

**PSYCH**

**Troubled Clergy**

VOCPSYCH battery with  
 possible addition of:  
 Rorschach Inkblot Test  
 Suicide Probability Scale  
 Psychiatric Interview with  
 Dr. Nutter

**VOC**

**Vocational Guidance**

Structured Career Interview  
 Myers-Briggs  
 Strong Interest Inventory

## APPENDIX B "Ministry Assessment Program" Page 2

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

### VOCPSYCH Battery (For Seminary Candidates)

#### Goals of the Battery

**1. To provide a sensitive, description of the whole person that is:**

supported by the scientifically informed techniques of psychology, yet captures the more subjective aspects of the person, such as their spiritual and religious development.

in the context of their family, vocation, community and church.

sensitive to the complexity of the person as opposed to a sterile clinical portrait

**2. To try to answer questions that are important for candidate selection committees to consider, such as:**

What gifts and shortfalls does the person bring?

Are there things that a person should be aware and address to aide their personal growth?

Are there important emotional/interpersonal concerns? For example:

Is there evidence that the person is excessively seeking to nurture his or her own needs through the church?

Current indication of significant depression or anxiety.

Current significant interpersonal difficulties, e.g., marital strife or spouse who is not supportive of the call.

**3. Is there any indication that this person's ministry would be seriously compromised? For example:**

Active Psychosis

Antisocial or clear personality disorder

Primitive defenses with a resulting severe lack of self-awareness

High risk of acting-out

## APPENDIX B "Ministry Assessment Program" Page 3

1 **Role of the evaluation in the candidacy process:**

- 2 1. By providing an objective, scientifically supported description of the person, the  
 3 evaluator can at times inform the committee without making specific judgments or  
 4 recommendations by sensitively describing the person's history and behavior in integrated  
 5 framework and analyzing personality dynamics.  
 6
- 7 2. Makes recommendations regarding the candidate as needed.  
 8
- 9 3. Facilitates the ideal of continuous guidance through ones vocational life.  
 10

11 **Clinical Interview**

12 This is a comprehensive interview that typically takes over two hours to  
 13 complete. The goal is to collect a rich personal and religious history that  
 14 compliments and fleshes-out the formal tests. The interview can be divided into  
 15 the following topic areas: Family Background; Relationship; Occupational Data;  
 16 Religious History (including past and present relationship to God and church);  
 17 Problem Identification; Health; Sexuality; & Finances.  
 18

19 The Religious History was designed in consultation with Frank Stalfa,  
 20 D.Min., an ordained UCC minister who is a pastoral counselor at the Samaritan  
 21 Counseling Center and an Associate Professor of Pastoral Theology at  
 22 Lancaster Theological Seminary. The interview explores such things as:  
 23

- 24 - Who influenced you most about God as a child?  
 25 - How has your view of God evolved since becoming an adult?  
 26 - What have been some of the most significant religious or  
 27 spiritual experiences in your life?  
 28 - What religious idea or concept is most important to you?  
 29  
 30

31 **Abbreviated Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised (WAIS-R)**

32 The WAIS-R is a cognitive test designed primarily to measure intellectual  
 33 functioning. It can be thought of as a battery of eleven subtests which sample  
 34 behavior in different aspects of intellectual functioning. It has been divided by a  
 35 statistical procedure into two groups: Verbal functioning and Performance  
 36 functioning. The candidate's performance is compared to norms for the  
 37 examinee's age range. Scores are reported for Verbal, Performance and overall  
 38 functioning. For example, it might be reported that the examinee's score was in  
 39 the Average range for the Verbal sphere. It is generally expected that people  
 40 likely to be successful in graduate would score in the High Average range or  
 41 better. Any significant strength or weaknesses between subtests would be noted  
 42 by describing the particular intellectual function that the subtest is thought to  
 43 measure.

44 **The WAIS-R** can also be very helpful for observing the examinee's  
 45 approach to problem-solving. The results are interpreted cautiously since an  
 46 abbreviated version is used.  
 47

48 **Thematic Apperception Test (TAT)**



## APPENDIX B "Ministry Assessment Program" Page 4

1 The TAT is a projective test in which subjects are asked to create a story  
 2 about various pictures they are shown. Specific directions are provided so  
 3 subjects will describe what is occurring now in the picture, what events lead up to  
 4 this situation and what the outcome will be. Subjects are to include the thoughts  
 5 and feelings of the characters in each picture in their descriptions. This type of  
 6 test is referred to as a projective test, the pictures shown are ambiguous and  
 7 therefore, different descriptions may be given from one examinee to another. As  
 8 a result, each examinee "projects" his/her own needs, motivations,  
 9 conflicts/stressors, thoughts, feelings and resolutions onto the characters on the  
 10 cards presented in an attempt to make sense of the ambiguity.

11 This test assesses a person's features of their current life situation, not  
 12 their underlying personality structure. The TAT is useful in describing how  
 13 different individuals interact with their environment and how people are affected  
 14 by external forces, as well as by their different needs, attitudes, and motivations.

15 When combined with additional information yielded from other tests, there  
 16 may exist the presence of certain current themes, regarding the ways in which an  
 17 examinee copes with environmental and social stressors. For this reason it is  
 18 useful to administer the TAT in the context of a assessment battery.

### 19 **Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS)**

20 The EPPS is a self-report personality measure. Examinees complete a  
 21 questionnaire and results are reported in terms of their relative strength or  
 22 weakness in each of 15 different domains. These domains are based on a list of  
 23 manifest needs developed by H.A. Murray. They include, for example, **the need**  
 24 **for achievement, the need for autonomy, and the need for nurturance.**

### 25 **Strong Interest Inventory (SII)**

26 The SII is based on Holland's vocational theory. A person's vocational  
 27 interest will tend to be grouped in one or more of the following areas:

28  
 29  
 30  
 31 **Artistic**  
 32 **Social**  
 33 **Enterprising**  
 34 **Conventional**  
 35 **Realistic**  
 36 **Investigative**  
 37

38 Examinees complete a questionnaire in which they identify occupations  
 39 and tasks which they *are/are not* interested in or are *indifferent* to. Their  
 40 responses are compared with others of the same gender. A computerized  
 41 interpretation identifies what combination of vocational areas their interests fall in  
 42 and what job-related activities they prefer. Their interests are then compared to  
 43 the interests of others from the same gender who are satisfied in their  
 44 occupation. For example, one whose interests are similar to ministers who are  
 45 satisfied are likely to be satisfied as well. This particular feature has consistently  
 46 been shown to be highly predictive of occupational satisfaction.

47 Other vocational features reported on include:

## APPENDIX B "Ministry Assessment Program" Page 5

- 1 - prefers to work alone or with things VS prefers to work in groups or with  
 2 people  
 3 - prefers hands on practical learning environments VS prefers academic  
 4 environments  
 5

**Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)**

6  
 7 The MBTI involves four separate indices. Each index is represented by  
 8 two contrasting preferences on which each person's score will vary:  
 9

10 **Extraversion - Introversion**  
 11 **Sensing - Intuitive**  
 12 **Thinking - Feeling**  
 13 **Judgment - Perception**  
 14

15 For example, on the **Extraversion - Introversion** index a person's score would  
 16 fall somewhere between the two. Those who score on the introversion side are  
 17 said to have an introversion preference. These preferences influence what one  
 18 pays attention to and how one draws conclusions from what one perceives. A  
 19 brief explanation of each preference follows:  
 20

21 **Extraversion:** Primary orientation is toward the outer world, tending to  
 22 focus their perceptions and judgments on people and objects.

23 **Introversion:** Primary orientation is toward the inner world and therefore  
 24 tend to focus on ideas and concepts.

25 **Sensing:** Primary orientation is the world of the senses, tending to focus  
 26 on the present and on concrete information.

27 **Intuition:** Primary orientation is toward the future, with a focus on the  
 28 patterns and possibilities of things or ideas.

29 **Thinking:** Primary orientation in decision-making is a preference for using  
 30 logic and objective analysis of cause and effect.

31 **Feeling:** Primary orientation in decision-making is a preference for using  
 32 values and a subjective evaluation of person-centered concerns.

33 **Judging:** Primary orientation is toward a planned and organized  
 34 approach to life with a preference to having matters settled.

35 **Perceiving:** Primary orientation is toward a flexible and spontaneous  
 36 approach to life with a preference toward keeping their options open.  
 37  
 38

**Religious Orientation Assessment Battery (ROAB)**

39 This test is based on the work of Daniel Batson and Larry Ventis. They  
 40 consider the question "Am I religious?" They have recognized that there are  
 41 different ways of being religious. Through their research they have designated  
 42 three different orientations to being religious:  
 43  
 44

45 **1. The END Dimension:** This orientation views religion as an end in itself. The  
 46 person tends to believe in traditional religious doctrines and views religion as a  
 47 master motive for their life. Their orientation may be influenced by  
 48 their environment and religion may tend to meet their needs for certainty and direction.

## APPENDIX B "Ministry Assessment Program" Page 6

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

**2. The MEANS Dimension:** This orientation views religion as a means to self-serving ends. Religion may be used to provide security, comfort, social activity or status and a way to justify oneself.

**3. The QUEST Dimension:** This orientation to religion is more individualized and involves an open-ended, responsive dialogue with existential questions raised by the contradictions and tragedies of life. There may not necessarily be a definite belief in a transcendent reality, but there is a transcendent dimension to how one sees one's life.

### **Beck Depression Inventory (BDI)**

A brief screen of the examinee's current state of mood regarding whether they are depressed or not.

### **Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory – 2nd Edition (MMPI-2)**

The MMPI-2 is a standardized questionnaire that evokes a wide range of self-descriptions. These descriptions are scored to give a quantitative measurement of an individual's level of emotional adjustment and attitude toward test taking. The original MMPI and its second edition have become the most widely used clinical personality inventory.

The questionnaire itself is made up of 567 items relating to such areas as general health, occupational interests, preoccupations, morale, phobias and educational problems. The items are broken down into 13 different scales, each measuring different aspects of the examinee's emotional adjustment or approach to the test. Ten of the scales measure clinical or personality features such as **depression, mania, antisocial tendencies and psychosis**. Three scales determine whether or not the testing session is valid and to what degree the examinee approached the test in an open versus a guarded manner. In addition, more scales have been developed to round-out the interpretation possibilities.

### **The Rorschach**

The Rorschach is a projective test consisting of ten bilateral symmetrical inkblots. Unlike the TAT, all cards must be administered to each subject and in a specific sequence. There are also strict guidelines for the examiner when interacting with the subject so that administration procedures are as standardized as possible. The task of each examinee is to tell the examiner what each of the inkblots reminds him/her of. All responses are recorded verbatim. By doing this and through an encompassing scoring and coding process one is able to assess the structure of personality with regards to the examinee's unconscious processes and how his/her environment is organized and given meaning. In other words, when subjects are given the most ambiguous stimuli--inkblots, there is a greater need for organization and association; subjects create a need to organize their perceptions and associate them with past experiences and impressions.

Their responses, therefore, are created by relying on one's personal ideas, relationships and internal images.

## APPENDIX B "Ministry Assessment Program" Page 7

1 After the inquiry, coding and scoring are completed. There are specific  
2 guidelines and mathematical formulas (Structural Summary) which enable the  
3 responses to be scored and then factored into a system (Exner System, 1986)  
4 which provides interpretation necessary for generating hypotheses about the  
5 subject's personality structure.

6 This assessment is especially useful for bypassing one's conscious  
7 resistance and instead assessing one's underlying unconscious personality  
8 structure. In other words, this test may yield more information especially  
9 regarding latent psychopathology whereas other more direct or structured tests,  
10 like the MMPI may not. One drawback to this test is that it is considerably  
11 complex and requires extensive training on the part of the examiner in order to  
12 accurately administer and interpret.

13

14 To discuss the designing of an assessment battery to meet the needs of your  
15 denomination, please contact:

16

17

18

19

Perry Hazeltine, Ph.D.  
**MAP** Coordinator  
(717) 560-9969

## APPENDIX C "Objectives of Clinical Pastoral Education" Page 1

**Objectives of Clinical Pastoral Education**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

1. To become aware of oneself as a minister and the ways one's ministry affects persons.
2. To develop the skills to provide intensive and extensive pastoral care and counseling to persons in their crises and situations.
3. To understand and utilize the **clinical method of learning**.
4. To accept and utilize the support, confrontation and clarification of the **peer group** for the integration of personal attributes and pastoral functioning.
5. To utilize individual and group **supervision** for personal and professional growth and for developing the capacity to evaluate one's ministry.
6. To develop the ability to make effective use of one's religious/spiritual heritage, theological understanding, and knowledge of the behavior sciences in pastoral ministry to persons and groups.
7. To become aware of how one's attitudes, values, and assumptions, strengths and weaknesses affect one's pastoral care ministry.
8. To become aware of the pastoral role in interdisciplinary relationships and to work effectively as a pastoral **member** of an interdisciplinary team.
9. To become aware of how persons, social conditions, systems and **structures** affect the lives of self and others and to address effectively these issues in ministry.
10. To develop the capacity to utilize one's pastoral and prophetic perspectives in a variety of functions such as preaching, teaching, leadership, management, pastoral care, and, as appropriate, pastoral counseling.

**Draft 3.1 – Progress to Date  
Materials Shared for Use and Comment  
May 2009**

**IMPLEMENTING THE PRONOUNCEMENT:  
“MINISTRY ISSUES: FORMING AND  
PREPARING PASTORAL LEADERS FOR  
GOD’S CHURCH”**

**MATERIALS TO AID  
THE UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST  
IN FINDING, PREPARING AND AUTHORIZING THE  
LEADERS GOD IS CALLING FROM AND FOR IT**

**A Working Paper from the  
Ministry Issues Implementation Committee  
in collaboration with  
The Parish Life and Leadership Team  
Local Church Ministries**

**United Church of Christ**

APPENDIX D *Draft 3.1, Progress to Date . . . (1-21)* Page 2

1	Ministry Issues Implementation Committee	Draft 3.1 May 2009
2		
3		
4		
5	<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	
6		
7		
8	Letter of Introduction and Invitation	4
9		
10	Response Form	5
11		
12	The Ministry Issues Project: A Narrative Overview	6
13		
14	Core Understandings	10
15		
16		
17	The Marks of Faithful and Effective Authorized Ministers	12
18	Introduction, Background, Use, Application	13
19	The Marks	17
20		
21		
22	The First Movement	22
23	The Call to Authorized Ministry in the United Church of Christ	23
24	Creating a “Culture of Call” in the Local Church	27
25		
26		
27	The Second Movement	29
28	A Narrative Summary of the New “In Care”:	
29	A Covenant of Discernment and Formation	31
30	Understanding and Practicing Discernment	36
31	Local Church Ministry Discernment Committee	45
32	Advisor in Discernment	48
33	Covenanting for Discernment and Formation	50
34		
35	Assessment of Persons Seeking Authorization	
36	Introduction	57
37	Initial Assessment and Shaping an Educational Plan	61
38	On-Going Assessment	78
39	Assessment for Authorization: Ordination	82
40		
41	Licensed Ministry in the United Church of Christ	
42	UCC Constitutional Provisions with Proposed Amendments	85
43	Definition and Commentary	87
44	Preparation for Licensed Ministry	90
45	Assessment for Authorization: Licensure	92

APPENDIX D *Draft 3.1, Progress to Date . . . (1-21)* Page 3

1	The Third Movement	95
2	Standing of Authorized Ministers of the United Church of Christ	
3	as a Covenant Relationship	96
4	Use of the Marks for Authorized Ministers, Post-Authorization	99
5	Renewal of License	101
6		
7		
8	Resources for All Movements	102
9	Authorized Ministry of the United Church of Christ	103
10	UCC Identity Formation	104
11	Developing Formative Practices in the United Church of Christ,	
12	with Appendix “On Formation”	112
13	Meeting Communities New to Committee on Ministry Members	125
14		
15		
16	Appendices	
17	A. Sample Chart for Recording Assessment Results	130
18	B. Sample Chart for Correlating Educational History with Marks	
19	for “Knowledge and Skills for Ministry”	139
20	C. Sample Chart for Correlating the Marks with Educational Content	142
21	D. Resources for Assessment of Persons	149
22	E. Resources for Designing and Assessing Mentoring Programs	160
23	F. Resources for Designing and Assessing	
24	Regional Educational Programs	162
25	G. Resources for Assessing College and Seminary Programs	168
26		
27		
28	Resources to Come	
29		

30 Items will be added to this draft as they are ready for review and testing. Currently in  
31 process or under consideration are sections to address at least the following:

- 32 • assessment for commissioning,
- 33 • resources for Committees on the Ministry meeting persons with disabilities, and
- 34 • suggestions for organizing Committees on Ministry and managing work load.

35  
36 Materials in this current draft are in various stages of development; some have had much  
37 more refinement than others. As the work continues, readers share suggestions, and new  
38 ideas are incorporated, changes will be made.

39  
40 We are sure there are more subjects needing attention; please let us know if you have a  
41 particular request or concern.

42  
43 Thank you for sharing this project with us and all in the United Church of Christ.

44 -- The Implementation Committee



APPENDIX D *Draft 3.1, Progress to Date . . . (1-21)* Page 4

October 20, 2008

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

For three years now the Ministry Issues Implementation Committee has been at work to provide resources and tools for the United Church of Christ to test as it lives into the commitments made in adopting the General Synod 25 Pronouncement, “Ministry Issues: Forming and Preparing Pastoral Leaders for God’s Church.” In February, 2007, a Ministry Issues Draft was circulated in the church for comment and response. We are grateful for the suggestions received and for the ways in which many in the UCC are contributing to the welfare of all.

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

This current draft uses some of the materials from 2007, but is greatly expanded to address many of the issues raised for the committee’s attention by the pronouncement itself or by responders to the earlier materials. We hope that you will read and use these materials as you participate in calling, preparing, and supporting leaders for the United Church of Christ. We invite you to let us know what works well, what needs more attention, what you suggest as improvements. Start where you are – with new Members in Discernment, with currently authorized ministers, with persons seeking privilege of call, with communities new to the UCC. Try the things which seem appropriate to your setting and community. Build on your own experience as well as the materials offered here. Share your experiences and suggestions.

20  
21  
22

This draft will be revised from time to time as new materials are written and current drafts improved. It will continue to be available with the Parish Life and Leadership Team resources at UCC.org.

23  
24  
25  
26  
27

Some of the commitments of the Pronouncement require changes in the ministry provisions of the Constitution and Bylaws of the United Church of Christ. To accomplish this, recommended amendments will be presented to General Synod 27 in 2009. If adopted by the Synod, the Constitutional amendments will be forwarded to the Conferences for ratification.

28  
29  
30

We look forward to hearing from you and to continuing to work with you as together we strive to respond to God’s call to the United Church of Christ in this time.

31  
32  
33

Ministry Issues Implementation Committee  
Marti Baumer, Chair

34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

## Committee Members (April 2009)

Henrietta Andrews	Michelle Hintz	Esther
Lee Barrett	Veronica Jefferson	Rendon-Thompson
Barbara Blodgett	Kekapa Lee	Bruce Saunkeah
Phil Campbell	Rosemary	Richard Sparrow
Kathy Clark	McCombs Maxey	Misipouena Tagaloa
Sheldon Culver	Holly MillerShank	Richard Weis
Rita Fiero	Marvin Morgan	

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

## **Response Form**

**Ministry Issues Draft 3.0**

**October 2008**

Date of Response\_\_\_\_\_

Section of Draft\_\_\_\_\_

Group/Person Responding\_\_\_\_\_

Email address or other contact information\_\_\_\_\_

Brief Description of your Experience/Situation

What works, seems helpful

What is problematic, and why.

Suggestions for new materials

Please use this format and respond to Ministry Implementation Committee, Parish Life and Leadership, Team, United Church of Christ via email or snail mail. And, thank you!

1

2

3

4

## The Ministry Issues Project: A Narrative Overview

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

The Ministry Issues Project encompasses the authorized ministries of the United Church of Christ – licensed, commissioned, ordained – and the varied processes involved in calling, preparing, authorizing, and maintaining covenant for those ministries and with those ministers. The work is based upon the Pronouncement adopted by General Synod 25, “Ministry Issues: Forming and Preparing Pastoral Leaders for God’s Church.”

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Since the Ministry Issues Implementation Committee developed and tested its initial drafts within the Church (February 2007), a set of “Marks of Faithful and Effective Authorized Ministers of the United Church of Christ” has emerged. This set of “Marks,” to be further tested and refined, is expected to guide the movements related to authorizing ministers for the Church, from the beginnings of a possible call through one’s “retirement.” These Marks will be used variously as guides for discernment of call, preparation and formation for ministry, the determination and act of authorization, continuing personal assessment and guidance, and the continuing covenantal relationship of authorized ministers and the Church. They will serve as suggestions and marks along the way with the understanding that no one will ever be “finished” or “complete.” They are to be understood and applied variously as Associations, local churches, and members carefully consider the differing forms of ministerial authorization and the diverse settings, communities, traditions, theologies, and other characteristics of the UCC.

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

The following “movements” indicate a progression from one stage to another, even as many characteristics of each movement continue through all. The “Marks” are guides continually along the way. Discernment continues, with times of greater or lesser intensity. The use of particular assessment tools, such as the portfolio, continues. The practice of assessment to inform discernment and decision continues, though it may well change in character and design. The covenantal relationships among members and various settings of the church certainly continue, again with variations; and all is, finally and always, dependent upon our continuing relationship to the living, speaking God known in Jesus Christ.

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

**1. The first movement** of the Ministry Issues Project is the recognition and encouragement of a lively Culture of Call within the church, based upon the convictions that all God’s people are called to ministry and that the church requires leaders who bring particular gifts and who are called by God and the church to particular service within the church. The discernment of a call to ministry is communal, involving at least the member who may be called, the local church, and the Association. It may well include persons representing educational settings and others, such as family and friends. Discernment of call is ongoing and open-ended, requiring continuing attention throughout preparation for, and service in, ministry.

41

Background and tools among these materials:

42

43

- The Call to Authorized Ministry in the United Church of Christ
- A Biblical Understanding of “Call”

APPENDIX D *Draft 3.1, Progress to Date . . . (1-21)* Page 7

- 1 - Call to Ministry in the United Church of Christ
- 2 - Who is Called? How?
- 3 - New Relationships, New responsibilities
- 4 - Creating a “Culture of Call” in the Local Church
- 5 **2. The second movement** of the project provides for the preparation and formation for  
 6 ministry of members who are called to authorization as licensed, commissioned, or  
 7 ordained ministers of the United Church of Christ. Preparation is understood to include  
 8 continuing discernment of the particulars of one’s call and thus is open-ended with  
 9 decision points along the way. Associations of the United Church of Christ are charged  
 10 with the responsibility of authorizing ministers on behalf of the entire Church and will  
 11 maintain and faithfully fulfill that role as the leading partner in the Covenant of  
 12 Discernment and Formation.
- 13 Background and tools among these materials:
- 14 - A Narrative Summary of the New “In Care”: A Covenant of Discernment and Formation
- 15 - Understanding and Practicing Discernment
- 16 - Local Church Ministry Discernment Committee with a Member in Discernment
- 17 - Advisor in Discernment
- 18 - Covenanting for Discernment and Formation
- 19 - Assessment of Persons Seeking Authorization
- 20 - Introduction
- 21 - Assessing a Member in Discernment’s Gifts, Needs and Circumstances and  
 22 Shaping an Educational and Formational Plan
- 23 - On-Going Assessment of a Member in Discernment While in an Educational  
 24 Program
- 25 - Assessment for Authorization: Ordination
- 26 - Licensed Ministry in the United Church of Christ
- 27 - Resources for Assessing College and Seminary Programs
- 28
- 29
- 30 **3. The third movement** of the project recognizes that all authorized ministers are in  
 31 continuing covenant with the Church through a Local Church and an Association  
 32 (Covenant of Ministerial Standing). They are participants in these mutually accountable  
 33 relationships with one another as well as with those formally representing particular

APPENDIX D *Draft 3.1, Progress to Date . . . (1-21)* Page 8

1 settings of the Church. The Marks become a basis for guiding the continuing  
 2 discernment of call, the relationships and responsibilities, the formative practices, and the  
 3 continuing education of the minister as well as the participation, support and encour-  
 4 agement of the Church.

5 Background and tools among these materials

6 - Ministerial Standing as a Covenantal Relationship

7 - Using the Marks for Authorized Ministers, Post-Authorization

8 - Renewal of License

9 Several particular concerns were included in the general considerations leading to adoption of the  
 10 Ministry Issues Pronouncement at General Synod 25 (2005). They included the needs and  
 11 diversity of the Church requiring full recognition of multiple paths of preparation for authorized  
 12 ministry, the character of the covenantal responsibilities of authorized ministers and the United  
 13 Church of Christ, and the understanding and practice of Licensed Ministry.

14 In response to the concern for multiple paths of preparation, Associations are asked to determine  
 15 readiness for authorization not on the basis of the particular educational program the candidate  
 16 has completed, but upon the candidate's readiness for that authorization. The Marks and a set of  
 17 tools to assist in assessment with persons and in assessment of educational programs are offered  
 18 as guides to help accomplish this task.

19 In response to the concern for the covenantal responsibilities of authorized ministers and the  
 20 Church, the Implementation Committee offers the concept of ministerial standing as an ongoing  
 21 covenant of mutual accountability among the minister, the Association, and the local church, with  
 22 the Marks guiding consideration of what it means to be an authorized minister of the United  
 23 Church of Christ and what it is that the Church needs to be and to do in support of those  
 24 ministers. The Committee also offers guidance on what might be included in the preparation and  
 25 formation of authorized ministers in their understanding of and relationship to the UCC.

26 And, in response to the concern for licensed ministry, the Committee proposes that the UCC Con-  
 27 stitution read:

28 A Licensed Minister of the United Church of Christ is one of its members whom God has  
 29 called and who has been recognized and authorized by an Association to perform  
 30 specified duties in a designated Local Church or within that Association, mainly  
 31 preaching and conducting services of worship, for a designated time under the  
 32 supervision and guidance of that Association. The license may be renewed.

33 A licensed minister may seek ordination if there is such a call acknowledged by the minister, the  
 34 Local Church, and the Association and achieving readiness for ordination. At the same time,  
 35 some persons are called to licensed ministry and not to ordination and are to be given full  
 36 recognition and regard as licensed ministers. A proposed amendment to the constitution changes  
 37 "Voting membership in that Association may be granted," to "Voting membership in that  
 38 Association is granted," to recognize the full responsibility and relationship of licensed ministers  
 39 and the Church.

APPENDIX D *Draft 3.1, Progress to Date . . . (1-21)* Page 9

1 Throughout the Ministry Issues Project to date, major attention has been given to licensed and  
2 ordained ministries. However, the Implementation Committee always includes commissioned  
3 ministry when referring to the authorized ministries of the United Church of Christ. The  
4 provisions for call, discernment, covenants of discernment and formation, authorization itself, and  
5 continuing covenants with authorized ministers apply equally to all forms of authorized ministry.  
6 Work still to be done includes identifying in more particular ways the use of the Marks and other  
7 tools in relationship to commissioned ministry and ministers (as well as to each of the other au-  
8 thorized ministries).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

## **CORE UNDERSTANDINGS**

### ***I. Call to Ministry (The First Movement)***

1. The United Church of Christ and all its members are called by God to be ministers, serving in God’s mission in and to this world.
2. Faithful discernment of and response to God’s call to ministry involves both individuals and the church itself. Such discernment and response is an on-going practice.
3. Some members are called by God and the United Church of Christ to serve on the Church’s behalf as authorized (ordained, commissioned, or licensed) ministers as the UCC participates in God’s mission.

### ***II. Call to Authorized Ministry (Ordination, Commissioning, Licensing) in the United Church of Christ (The Second Movement)***

1. When a member’s call leads to consideration of authorized ministry, the Church and that member together seek to discern God’s particular call to that person. Such discernment and response is an ongoing practice.
2. The primary question guiding discernment is, “To what ministry is this person called?” And then, “Does this ministry require authorization? If so, what form of authorization?”
3. The particular program of formation and preparation for possible authorization of that member is determined by the Committee on Ministry, in consultation with the member and the Local Church, according to the needs of the UCC, the gifts of the person, and the “Marks of Faithful and Effective Authorized Ministers of the United Church of Christ.” It is anticipated that a seminary degree program will continue to be the preferred primary educational process for most potential candidates for ordination.
4. As the member who is called prepares for possible authorization, discernment continues within a covenant among the person, the Association (through its Committee on Ministry) representing the UCC, and the Local Church.
5. The Covenant of Discernment and Formation replaces the current UCC practice of a “Student In Care.” A Covenant of Discernment and Formation is the process to be followed for all forms of authorization.

1 ***III. Readiness for Authorization (The Second Movement)***

- 2 1. Throughout the time of Discernment and Formation, the Committee on Ministry, in  
3 continuing conversation with the member and the Local Church, engages in discerning  
4 the member's call, determines an appropriate and effective program of preparation for  
5 that member, and assesses progress toward readiness for authorization.  
6
- 7 2. In determining readiness for authorization, the Committee on Ministry focuses on the  
8 potential candidate's qualifications for that particular authorization rather than on the  
9 completion of one particular educational process. This determination is guided by the  
10 "Marks of Faithful and Effective Authorized Ministers of the United Church of Christ"  
11 and the needs of the Church.  
12
- 13 3. Each authorization (licensing, commissioning, and ordination) is defined by the UCC  
14 Constitution and Bylaws.  
15
- 16 4. The Association determines whether and when to proceed to authorization on behalf of  
17 the United Church of Christ.  
18

19 ***IV. Authorized Ministerial Standing in the United Church of***  
20 ***Christ (The Third Movement)***

- 21 1. Ministerial Standing in the United Church of Christ is a covenant of an Association, an  
22 authorized minister, a local church and the calling body (if other than a local church).
- 23 2. The Covenant of Ministerial Standing is guided by the Constitution and Bylaws of the  
24 United Church of Christ, the "Marks of Faithful and Effective Authorized Ministers of  
25 the United Church of Christ," and the policies of the Association.
- 26 3. All the covenant partners are responsible to each and all of the other partners.
- 27 4. All Covenants of Ministerial Standing include, but are not limited to, appropriate support  
28 of the minister, faithfulness of all to the United Church of Christ, and the continuing  
29 discernment of call and formation for ministry.  
30

31 ***V. UCC Identity and Authorized Ministry (All Movements)***

- 32 1. All authorized ministers of the United Church of Christ, commissioned, licensed, or  
33 ordained, serve on behalf of the whole United Church of Christ.  
34
- 35 2. UCC identity and relationships are a fundamental component of the call to, the  
36 preparation for, and the practice of authorized ministry.  
37
- 38 3. The United Church of Christ is committed to fostering an environment that celebrates  
39 diversity of expressions of Christian faith and promotes mutually enriching interaction of  
40 various Christian cultures, theologies, spiritualities and ideologies.



1

# **THE GUIDE IN EVERY MOVEMENT**

2

3

4

## **THE MARKS OF FAITHFUL AND EFFECTIVE AUTHORIZED MINISTERS**

5

6

7

**The “Marks” were revised as of April 29, 2009.**

8

**This document includes those revisions.**

9

10

11

12

*Introduction*

13

*Background Information*

14

*Using the Marks*

15

*Applying the Marks in Relation to Commissioning, Licensure  
and Ordination*

16

17

18

19

*The Marks of Faithful and Effective Authorized Ministers*

## THE MARKS OF FAITHFUL AND EFFECTIVE AUTHORIZED MINISTERS

### *Introduction*

The “Marks of Faithful and Effective Authorized Ministers of the United Church of Christ” is a tool intended for the UCC to use in many settings as together the Church seeks to provide faithful leadership for the Church in God’s mission. This tool is based upon the wisdom of the whole church gathered through the ongoing work of the Ministry Issues Implementation Committee in regard to the Pronouncement adopted by General Synod 25, “Ministry Issues: Forming and Preparing Pastoral Leaders for God’s Church.” Based on materials and feedback shared with the committee from many persons and groups in many settings of the church, these Marks reflect much of what the church as a whole sees as characteristic of faithful and effective ministry in these times.

The “Marks of Faithful and Effective Authorized Ministers in the United Church of Christ” is a framework for the work that we do as a church in calling, preparing, authorizing, and remaining in continuing covenant with commissioned, licensed and ordained ministers in all settings in the UCC. Associations, local churches, other settings of the Church, and individual members are invited and urged to review this tool and to use it. The Marks will be interpreted variously in the particular contexts in which they are used. For instance, interpretation will vary among the three authorized ministries themselves (see further below), among differing theological or ecclesial traditions, and in different locations. No one is ever expected to have completed or finished the Marks; ministry, as life, is a continuing journey of transformation.

The Marks may be used in any number of ways. Examples of such uses include but are not limited to, the following:

- to generate conversation regarding effective authorized ministry in the United Church of Christ (for example, as part of an adult education class or by a local church Pastoral Relations Committee);
- as a guide for discernment groups in local churches as they meet with a member who may be called to ministry;
- for self-assessment by prospective and authorized ministers;
- by Association Committees on the Ministry as they work with both Members in Discernment and authorized ministers;
- to guide the planning for continuing education by authorized ministers, and by others.

### *Background Information*

In July, 2005, the twenty-fifth General Synod of the United Church of Christ, meeting in Atlanta, Georgia, adopted the pronouncement “Ministry Issues: Forming and Preparing Pastoral Leaders for God’s Church.” In the pronouncement’s Statement of Christian Conviction the Synod affirmed “that our baptism calls us all to minister in Christ’s name. Within the church, some are called to particular leadership roles in order to ‘equip the saints for the work of ministry’ (Ephesians 4:12, NRSV).” The forms of authorized ministry within the United Church of Christ are

APPENDIX D *Draft 3.1, Progress to Date . . . (1-21)* Page 14

1 commissioning, licensure, and ordination. Each of these forms of authorized ministry requires  
 2 formation and preparation, as well as ongoing covenantal accountability, appropriate to the needs  
 3 of the church. In the United Church of Christ, Associations, through their Committees on Minis-  
 4 try, have primary responsibility for forming, preparing, assessing, authorizing, and remaining in  
 5 covenantal relationship with commissioned, licensed and ordained UCC ministers.

6 ***Using the Marks***

7 The Marks of Faithful and Effective Authorized Ministers are intended to be used for all forms of  
 8 authorization: commissioned, licensed and ordained. They are organized into four main catego-  
 9 ries: Spiritual Foundation for Ministry, UCC Identity for Ministry, Personal and Professional For-  
 10 mation for Ministry, and Knowledge and Skills for Ministry. These Marks will be most helpful to  
 11 Committees on the Ministry when they use them developmentally, that is, throughout their rela-  
 12 tionship with Members in Discernment and formation, rather than saving their consideration for  
 13 the end of the process. They are also intended to be used in conversation with authorized minis-  
 14 ters as part of their continuing covenant with the church through the Association Committee on  
 15 the Ministry. When used throughout the relationship, the Marks become an effective tool for  
 16 helping to identify areas where growth is needed.

17 Committees on the Ministry are encouraged to apply the Marks dynamically in their work with  
 18 the persons whom they accompany. No single individual will exhibit all of these Marks fully or  
 19 equally well. Indeed, even at the end of a lifetime as an authorized minister, no individual will ex-  
 20 hibit all of these Marks fully or equally well. Moreover, the patterns of strength and weakness in  
 21 relation to the Marks will differ from one individual to the next. Thus committees should expect  
 22 individuals to show different profiles of strength and weakness in relation to the Marks, and  
 23 should use the Marks in ways that promote realistic assessment and encourage continuing devel-  
 24 opment. Committees are also encouraged to adapt the substance of the Marks into the idioms of  
 25 particular cultural communities as appropriate for their setting, as well as to the particularities of  
 26 each minister's call, whether it be licensed, ordained or commissioned ministry.

27 ***Applying the Marks in Relation to Commissioning, Licensure or***  
28 ***Ordination***

29 Although the Marks of Faithful and Effective Authorized Ministers are characteristics of good  
 30 authorized ministry in the United Church of Christ in all three of its forms, they characterize the  
 31 three forms (commissioned, licensed, ordained) differently. That the Marks can characterize all  
 32 three forms of authorized ministry is due to the essential parity and theological identity of the  
 33 three forms. That the Marks characterize them differently is due to the different definitions of  
 34 commissioned, ordained and licensed ministry as set forth in the Constitution of the United  
 35 Church of Christ.

36 Thus in using the Marks of Faithful and Effective Authorized Ministers, Associations, Commit-  
 37 tees on the Ministry, local churches, individual ministers, and Members in Discernment must nec-  
 38 essarily keep in mind the form of authorization for which a person is preparing or holds, and read  
 39 the Marks through the lens of the constitutional definition of that form of authorization. The de-  
 40 termination of the degree to which a member needs to manifest particular Marks before s/he is  
 41 judged ready for authorization or is judged to be acting consistently with the authorization s/he  
 42 holds is always a matter of judgment by the person, committee or other group involved. This is  
 43 not an exact science, but is a discernment grounded in the knowledge and wisdom of God's  
 44 people concerning the ministries of God's church. Nevertheless, thinking of the definition of

APPENDIX D *Draft 3.1, Progress to Date . . . (1-21)* Page 15

1 each form of authorization, and reading the Marks through these lenses can give individuals and  
2 committees a sense of direction in making such judgments.

3 The Constitution currently defines commissioned ministry in this way:

4 A Commissioned Minister in the United Church of Christ is one of its lay mem-  
5 bers who has been called by God and commissioned for a specific church-related  
6 ministry.<sup>1</sup>

7 When reading the Marks through this lens, it becomes important to take account of the respons-  
8 abilities of the “specific church-related ministry” for which a member is being, or has been, com-  
9 missioned. Not every Mark may be relevant to the specific work for which the member is com-  
10 missioned, and thus not every Mark need be considered in relation to that individual. For the  
11 Marks that are relevant, the degrees to which the commissioned minister will need to manifest  
12 them would also be determined by the nature of the work to which s/he is called. Since different  
13 ministers are commissioned to different ministries, necessarily there will even be variation from  
14 one individual to the next in judgments about which Marks apply and the degree to which they  
15 should be manifested.

16 The Constitution currently defines licensed ministry in this way:

17 A Licensed Minister of the United Church of Christ is one of its lay members  
18 whom God has called and who has been recognized and authorized by an Asso-  
19 ciation to perform specified duties in a designated Local Church or within that  
20 Association, mainly preaching and conducting services of worship, for a design-  
21 nated time under the supervision and guidance of that Association.<sup>2</sup>

22 As with commissioned ministry, reading the Marks through the lens of the definition of licensed  
23 ministry suggests that the particular set of duties for which the member is licensed (foreseen as  
24 preaching and worship leadership, but not always limited to that), the particular context in which  
25 those duties are performed, and the degree of supervision and guidance deemed appropriate are  
26 the crucial factors here. Depending on those factors it is possible that, as with commissioned  
27 ministry, not all of the Marks will be judged relevant for consideration. Similarly, the degree to  
28 which the relevant Marks need to be manifested will be determined by these same factors that  
29 define licensed ministry. For example, a licensed minister who serves as an occasional supply  
30 preacher within an Association will not need to manifest Marks related to aspects of  
31 administering a congregation to the same degree that s/he will need to manifest Marks relating to  
32 preaching and worship leadership.

33 The Constitution currently defines ordained ministry in this way:

34 An Ordained Minister of the United Church of Christ is one of its members who  
35 has been called by God and ordained to preach and teach the gospel, to adminis-

---

1 Constitution of the United Church of Christ, Article 6, §23.

2 Constitution of the United Church of Christ, Article 6, §30.

APPENDIX D *Draft 3.1, Progress to Date . . . (1-21)* Page 16

1           ter the sacraments and rites of the Church, and to exercise pastoral care and lead-  
2           ership.<sup>3</sup>

3           Ordained ministry is focused on a set of responsibilities that are as broad as the scope of the  
4           Marks themselves. Moreover, although it is always exercised in specific contexts and with sets of  
5           duties particular to those contexts, this form is not defined by a specific sub-set of those response-  
6           bilities, nor by a particular location. Thus it seems most likely that, when individuals and com-  
7           mittees read the Marks through the lens of this definition, they will conclude that all of the Marks  
8           need to be taken into consideration. It also seems likely they will conclude that variations in the  
9           degrees to which persons should manifest the Marks will be defined more by the varying profiles  
10          of individual gifts and frailties than by the definition of the ministry being authorized.

11

12          PLEASE NOTE: The Marks themselves were revised by the Ministry Issues Implementation  
13          Committee as of April 29, 2009, reflecting feedback received and other learning since mid-2008.  
14          The Marks following are the revised wording.

---

<sup>3</sup> Constitution of the United Church of Christ, Article 6, §23.



APPENDIX D *Draft 3.1, Progress to Date . . . (1-21)* Page 18

- 1 The ability:
- 2 9. to articulate diverse histories that comprise the United Church of Christ, to situate them  
3 in the broader evolution of faith traditions and to relate them to the theology, polity, and  
4 practices of the Member's local church, association, and conference.  
5
- 6 10. to explain and work within the current polity of the UCC and its denominational  
7 structure, and to describe the covenantal relationships among the General Synod, national  
8 setting, conferences, associations, and local congregations of the UCC.  
9
- 10 11. to share key elements of the UCC's statement of faith, constitution with its preamble, and  
11 bylaws regarding the governance, mission, and theologies of the UCC and their  
12 implications for the life of the church.  
13
- 14 12. to articulate the UCC's commitment to being a united and uniting, multiracial and  
15 multicultural, open and affirming, accessible to all and just peace church.  
16
- 17 13. to envision how the UCC in its various settings may respond to religious, social,  
18 economic, and political trends, changing demographics, and other emerging factors.  
19
- 20 14. to use and promote the informational and educational resources available through UCC  
21 publications and websites.  
22

23 ***PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL FORMATION FOR MINISTRY***

- 24 1. A healthy sense of self as shaped by God, community, and personal experience.  
25
- 26 2. A sense of theological identity and authority, while being responsive to the opinions and  
27 values of others, including those whom the Member will serve.  
28
- 29 3. A healthy awareness of strengths, weaknesses and limits, and assumption of  
30 responsibility for one's body, mind and spirit.  
31
- 32 4. Knowledge and observance of personal and professional boundaries in interpersonal,  
33 congregational, and community settings.  
34
- 35 5. A commitment to continuing education, professional development, and life-long learning.  
36 6. Demonstrated moral maturity, including integrity in personal and public life and  
37 responsibility to self, family, church, and community.

38 The ability:

- 1 7. to affirm the identities of others, including others very unlike oneself.
- 2
- 3 8. to engage in self-reflection and to seek and use feedback from others appropriately.
- 4
- 5 9. to engage productively in public discourse, expecting to grow and be transformed
- 6 through the exchange of viewpoints.
- 7
- 8 10. to take initiative in leadership, and to frame and test a vision in community.
- 9
- 10 11. to listen empathically, communicate appropriately, and keep appropriate confidences.
- 11
- 12 12. to function as part of a team, to give and receive supervision, and to mutually equip and
- 13 motivate the community of faith.
- 14
- 15 13. to be resourceful and adaptable, and know where to locate additional resources and seek
- 16 consultation when needed.
- 17
- 18 14. to accept and promote diversity, to inspire others to do so, and to minister in a
- 19 multicultural and multiracial, open and affirming, just peace, accessible to all, united and
- 20 uniting church.
- 21

## 22 ***KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS FOR MINISTRY***

### 23 **General Knowledge and Skills**

#### 24 The Ability:

- 25 1. to understand and appreciate a variety of perspectives of life.
- 26
- 27 2. to understand the profound differences that physical, psychological, gender identity,
- 28 sexual orientation, age, class, cultural, religious, racial, and ethnic factors make in the
- 29 ways that human beings experience the world.
- 30
- 31 3. to comprehend the impact of historical change upon the thoughts, feelings, and actions of
- 32 individuals and societies.
- 33
- 34 4. to perceive how a person's perspectives and interests shape communication, and to
- 35 appreciate the virtues and limitations of those perspectives and interests.
- 36
- 37 5. to grasp and evaluate the justifications that people give for their opinions.



APPENDIX D *Draft 3.1, Progress to Date . . . (1-21)* Page 20

- 1 6. to apply basic concepts of psychology to the understanding of oneself, others, and human  
2 interactions.
- 3
- 4 7. to appreciate the importance of symbols and images in human culture(s).
- 5
- 6 8. to understand various meanings and purposes of the arts.
- 7
- 8 9. to analyze social, political, environmental, and economic dynamics, using the tools of the  
9 social and natural sciences.
- 10
- 11 10. to use respectfully and relationally a basic knowledge of specific human cultures.
- 12
- 13 11. to communicate clearly and effectively with appropriate media and technologies.
- 14

15 **Knowledge and Skills Specific to Authorized Ministry**

- 16 1. A thorough knowledge of, and personal engagement with, the Bible.
- 17
- 18 2. Skill with methods of biblical interpretation, including the historic interpretive traditions of  
19 the church and contemporary methods, particularly those from historically  
20 underrepresented communities.
- 21
- 22 3. A deepening familiarity with the global history of the Christian churches through the ages  
23 and across cultures, including the newest Christian populations, and an understanding of  
24 the evolution of Christian communities in the United States.
- 25
- 26 4. A deepening familiarity with contemporary theological ways of thinking and with the rich  
27 and varied theological heritages, creeds, liturgies, and spiritual practices of the Christian  
28 churches.
- 29
- 30 5. An understanding of other religions and their foundational documents.
- 31

32 The ability:

- 33 6. to articulate a theological understanding of authorized ministry, and to relate it to the  
34 practice of ministry.
- 35
- 36 7. to analyze, evaluate, and integrate the biblical, historical, theological, and pastoral  
37 disciplines and practices in ways that contribute to fruitful and faithful Christian ministry.

APPENDIX D *Draft 3.1, Progress to Date . . . (1-21)* Page 21

- 1
- 2 8. to understand the nature, use, and misuse of power and authority, and to exercise them
- 3 appropriately and effectively in authorized ministry.
- 4
- 5 9. to engage in community leadership that is collaborative and transformative.
- 6
- 7 10. to engage in respectful ecumenical and interfaith dialogue.
- 8
- 9 11. to celebrate the unique features of local faith communities while encouraging them to be
- 10 receptive to perspectives from the broader church and world.
- 11
- 12 12. to appreciate, practice, and pass on traditions of faith while interpreting them in light of the
- 13 context of a diverse and changing world.
- 14
- 15 13. to adapt the practices of ministry to the unique social, cultural, environmental and
- 16 ecclesiastical aspects of particular settings.
- 17
- 18 14. to discern God's mission in the world and, in response, to lead ministries of compassion,
- 19 nurture, justice, and proclamation that support fullness of life for all people.
- 20
- 21 15. to preach the good news, lead worship and participate in the sacraments in a manner
- 22 faithful to the broader Christian heritage and appropriate to the characteristics of a specific
- 23 culture and setting.
- 24
- 25 16. to provide effective and appropriate pastoral care and Christian education, and to equip and
- 26 motivate others to share in these ministries.
- 27
- 28 17. to organize and implement programs, administer the operations of a complex organization,
- 29 and initiate change when appropriate.
- 30
- 31 18. to read the contexts of a community's ministry and creatively lead that community through
- 32 change or conflict.
- 33
- 34 19. to lead and encourage ministries of evangelism, service, stewardship and social
- 35 transformation.
- 36
- 37 20. to understand and participate in the financial administration of the church and other
- 38 religious organizations.

**"7 TYPES OF PASTORAL LEADERSHIP" Survey**\_\_\_\_\_  
YOUR NAME**Emmanuel participants: Thanks for your input!**

Please follow these instructions. As you do this, I would like you to think in terms of **the needs of our particular congregation.**

**1.** Based on the descriptions of each type – "Rabbi," "Community Builder," etc. – I would like you to **choose 5** of the 7 pastoral leadership types that would, in your opinion, best complete the sentence: "Emmanuel needs a pastor who is a/an \_\_\_\_\_." **Underline or circle your 5 choices, please.**

**2.** Then, **put a check mark** beside the one type of the 5 you chose which you think best suits Emmanuel's pastoral leadership needs.

**"Rabbi"****A minister in this model . . .**

- ...sees the church as a community "gathered and formed by the Word of God," with a fundamental calling to receive the Word (and authoritative teaching about the Word), and pass it on;
- ...has gifts and learned skills for preaching and teaching and interpretation of scripture;
- ...has acquired formal knowledge in scripture and theology, as well as other historical creeds and documents, and this educational background lends authority to the pastor's interpretations;
- ...believes knowledge and education is primary in spiritual/faith formation, and considers it important to teach persons skills for their own study of scripture.

**"Community Builder"****A minister in this model . . .**

- ...sees the church as a primarily a community in covenant with God and one another, in which stability and harmony are key;
- ...understands the pastor to be the central figure, facilitator, and guardian of stability and order within the congregation;
- ...provides an example for others in the life of faith, through personal faith practices and the modeling of Christian behavior;
- ...also serves as a social example, a "public guardian" who provides a stabilizing influence beyond the local congregation in the wider secular community; is actively involved in civic organizations and observances.

**"Spiritual Guide"****A minister in this model . . .**

- ...sees the church as a community of sinners in constant need of God's grace, and a community responsive to the Holy Spirit;
- ...highly values personal spiritual growth, especially through individual religious experiences (conversion and/or mystical); an experience of God is emphasized over knowledge about God;
- ...is dynamic and persuasive in the preaching of the gospel, in witnessing, and in prayer, in ways that can bring about a "change of heart;"
- ...is one who personally displays an internal spirituality and sense of divine calling; who may be said to possess a certain "charisma."

**"Priest"****A minister in this model . . .**

- ...understands the church to be an extension of Christ, continuing through time, with the parts connected and held together by word and creed;
- ...believes that the sacraments (Baptism and Communion) are central to the life of the congregation; and that the pastor is one "entrusted with sacred authority" to administer the sacraments according to accepted tradition and order;
- ...has gifts and skills for leading the community in its worship life, its rites and ceremonies, as a response to what God has done;
- ...highly values continuity with tradition.

**"Administrator"****A minister in this model . . .**

- ...sees the church as primarily a human social system, and makes as a primary pastoral focus the health and maintenance of that system;
- ...assumes the role of pastor is to act as "CEO," chief motivator, counselor, and problem-solver, so that the church will function as a productive, effective organization; the pastor is clearly where "the buck stops;"
- ...meets the needs of members by organizing programs and services;
- ...has mastered skill sets that maximize the effective running of an organization, such as management and administrative skills, goal-setting, program development and problem-solving.

**"Social Activist"****A minister in this model . . .**

- ...believes that the church exists not for itself but fundamentally to fulfill God's mission in the world, which is to bring about reconciliation and healing and overcome alienation;
- ...takes a global view, centering on acts of love and justice, especially in solidarity with people who are oppressed and "on society's margins;"

- ...understands the role of pastor as mainly "prophet" – one who through preaching, teaching, and example, motivates people for service; who brings attention to contemporary issues, in light of the acts of Jesus and the gospel mandate for justice;
- ...believes that the proper venue for the church is out in the world, and the stability of the institution is secondary to fulfilling its servant calling.

**"Catalyst"****A minister in this model . . .**

- ...sees the church as primarily a relational community, a setting for transformation in which persons of diverse backgrounds can gather to enjoy "cross fertilization" of ideas;
- ...believes the church is wherever people are engaged in disciple-forming mission – a process that evolves in community - rather than a formal "institution" bound to a particular place or form;
- ...provides creative opportunities for the community to engage in participatory worship, exploration of scripture, spiritual growth, and their own expressions of faith; and has skills for encouraging persons to discover their unique gifts, and for merging individual assets into the life of a diverse community;
- ...prefers a "team" approach to leadership; is sensitive to relational dynamics and able to guide without being overly directive; who also has a high tolerance for change and experimentation.

### Works Cited

- Aleshire, Daniel. "Eleven Major Areas of Ministry." *Ministry in America: A Report and Analysis*. David S. Schuller, Ed. Merton P. Strommen, and Milo L. Brekke. San Francisco: Harper, 1980. 23-53. Print.
- Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry: Faith and Order Paper No. 111*. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1982. Print.
- Barker, Lance R. and B. Edmon Martin, Eds. *Multiple Paths to Ministry: New Models for Theological Education*. Cleveland: Pilgrim P, 2004. Print.
- Barrett, Lee C. "Theologies of Ministry: Histories and Contexts." United Church of Christ Mid-Atlantic Church and Ministry Consultation, Lancaster, PA. Oct. 2007. Lecture.
- Bass, Diana Butler. *Christianity for the Rest of Us: How the Neighborhood Church Is Transforming the Faith*. New York: HarperCollins, 2006. Print.
- Bernier, Paul. *Ministry in the Church: A Historical and Pastoral Approach*. Mystic, CT: Twenty-Third Publ., 1996. Print.
- Commission for Racial Justice of the United Church of Christ. *A Pronouncement on Calling the United Church of Christ to be a Multiracial and Multicultural Church*. Pronouncement of UCC General Synod XIX, 1993. Cleveland, 1993. Web.
- Congar, Yves. "The Sacralization of Western Society in the Middle Ages." *Sacralization and Secularization*. Ed. Roger Aubert. New York: Paulist P, 1969. 55-71. Print.
- Cooke, Bernard. *Ministry to Word and Sacraments*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976. Print.
- Dulles, Avery. *Models of the Church*. Garden City, NY: Image, 1987. Print.
- Ehrman, Bart D. *Lost Christianities: The Battles for Scripture and the Faiths We Never Knew*. New York: Oxford UP, 2003. Print.

Evangelism Ministry Team, Local Church Ministries. "Navigational Vision and Strategies for the Twenty-first Century in the United Church of Christ." Cleveland: UCC, 2002. Print.

Faivre, Alexandre. *The Emergence of the Laity in the Early Church*. Trans. David Smith. New York: Paulist P, 1990. Print.

Fiorenza, Francis Schussler. "Thinking Theologically about Theological Education." *Theological Education* 24 (1988 2), Supplement: 89-119. Print.

Freeman, Donald. "Five Important Characteristics of Ministry: Owned, Recognized, Empowered, Authorized, Accountable." *Prism* 16.1 (Spring 2001): 53-60. Print.

\_\_\_, "Models of Pastoral Leadership, Elaborated and Expanded from Harry Taylor's Adaptation of Margaret Fletcher Clark's 'Ten Models of Ordained Ministry.'" N.d. TS.

Gerhart, Emanuel V. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Vol. 2. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1894. Print.

Guder, Darrell L., Ed. *Missional Church: A Vision for the Sending of the Church in North America*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998. Print.

Hadaway, C. Kirk. *Behold, I Do a New Thing: Transforming Communities of Faith*. Cleveland: Pilgrim P, 2001. Print.

Haendler, Gert. *Luther on Ministerial Office and Congregational Function*. Trans. Ruth C. Gritsch. Ed. Eric W. Gritsch. Philadelphia: Fortress P, 1981. Print.

Hough, Joseph C., Jr. and John B. Cobb, Jr. *Christian Identity and Theological Education*. Chico, CA: Scholars P, 1985. Print.

Jackson, Norman. "Ministry for Mission." Proceedings of the Ministry Issues Convocation, March 7, 2002. Cleveland: United Church of Christ, 2002. Web.

Keith, Kent M. *The Case for Servant Leadership*. Westfield, IN: Greenleaf Ctr., 2008. Print.

Kraemer, Hendrik. *A Theology of the Laity*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1958. Print.

Local Church Ministries, UCC. "Ordination to Ministry." *Book of Worship*.

New York: UCC Office for Church Life and Leadership, 1986. Print.

-- , *Draft 3.1, Progress to Date, Materials Shared for Use and Comment, October 2008,*

*Ministry Issues Pronouncement; Implementing the Pronouncement: "Ministry Issues: Forming and Preparing Pastoral Leaders for God's Church."* Cleveland: UCC, 2008.

Web.

-- , *Ministry Issues: Forming and Preparing Pastoral Leaders for God's Church.*

Pronouncement of UCC General Synod XXV, 2005. Cleveland, 2005. Web.

-- , "United Church of Christ Committee on Ministry Tool Kit, A General Synod Sampler."

Cleveland: UCC, 2005. Print.

-- , *United Church of Christ Manual on Ministry, Section 1: Partners in Authorizing Ministry.*

Cleveland: United Church Resources, 2002. Print.

McNeill, John T., Ed. *Calvin: Institutes of the Christian Religion, Vol. 2*. Trans. Ford Lewis

Battles. The Library of Christian Classics, Vol. XXI. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960.

Print.

Malayang, Jose. "Address to General Synod XXIV, Executive Minister, Local Church

Ministries." Proceedings of General Synod XXIV, United Church of Christ. Minneapolis:

July 12 2003. 20 July 2004. Web.

Manschreck, Clyde L. *A History of Christianity in the World*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-

Hall, 1985. Print.

McFayden, Kenneth J. *Strategic Leadership for a Change: Facing Our Losses, Finding our*

*Future*. Herndon, VA: Alban Inst., 2009. Print.



Mead, Loren B. *The Once and Future Church: Reinventing the Congregation for a New Mission Frontier*. Alban Inst., 1991. Print.

New, Jonathan. "Balancing Piety and Intellect: Perspectives on the 'Ministry Issues' Pronouncement of General Synod 25." *Prism* 22.1 (Spring 2008): 21-41. Print.

Newbigin, Lesslie. *The Household of God: Lectures on the Nature of the Church*. New York: Friendship P, 1954. Print.

Norrington, Eileen. "Re: Multiple Paths to Ordination." Message to the author. 7 July 2004. E-mail.

Office for Church Life and Leadership, UCC. "Ministry Issues Update: A Brief Summary of Feedback Received on Ordained and Licensed Ministries in the United Church of Christ: Issues and Possibilities." A discussion paper produced for the Ministry Issues Project. Cleveland: Office for Church Life and Leadership, UCC. 1998. Print.

- - -, "Ordained and Licensed Ministries in the United Church of Christ: Issues and Possibilities." A discussion paper produced for the Ministry Issues Project. Cleveland: United Church of Christ, 1997. Print.

- - -, "State of Ministry in the United Church of Christ." A discussion paper produced for the Ministry Issues Project. Cleveland: United Church of Christ (undated, c. 2000). Print.

O'Meara, Thomas F. *Theology of Ministry*. New York: Paulist Press, 1983. Print.

Osborne, Kenan B. *Ministry: Lay Ministry in the Roman Catholic Church, Its History and Theology*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock P, 1993. Print.

Osborn, Ronald E. *Creative Disarray: Models of Ministry in a Changing America*. St. Louis: Chalice P, 1991. Print.

Pagitt, Doug. *Church in the Inventive Age*. Minneapolis: Sparkhouse P, 2010. Print.

- Pauck, Wilhelm. "The Ministry in the Time of the Continental Reformation." *The Ministry in Historical Perspectives*. Ed. H. Richard Niebuhr and Daniel D. Williams. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956. 110-148. Print.
- Piazza, Michael and Cameron Trimble. *Liberating Hope! Daring to Renew the Mainline Church*. Cleveland: Pilgrim P, 2011. Print.
- Rader, Kay S. "An Exploration of Theological Grounding for Ministry in the United Church of Christ." Paper. Lancaster Theological Seminary, 2006. TS.
- Russell, Rollin O. "Standards for Ministry in a Covenantal Church" *Prism* 11.2 (Fall 1996): 37-43. Print.
- Schillebeeckx, Edward. *The Church with a Human Face*. New York: Crossroad. 1985. Print.
- Schmiechen, Peter. *Christ the Reconciler*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996. Print.
- Scott, Donald M. *From Office to Profession*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1978. Print.
- , *Pastors and Providence*. Evanston, IL: Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1975. Print.
- Shetler, John C. "The Ursinus School," *Hidden Histories in the United Church of Christ*. Ed. Barbara Brown Zikmund. New York: United Church P, 1984. Print.
- Shinn, Roger L. Afterword: The United Church of Christ Tomorrow. *Theology and Identity: Traditions, Movements, and Polity in the United Church of Christ*. Ed. Daniel L. Johnson and Charles Hambrick-Stowe. Cleveland: United Church P, 1990. 179-190. Print.
- Standish, N. Graham. Humble Leadership: Being Radically Open to God's Guidance and Grace. Herndon, VA: The Alban Institute, 2007. Print.
- Steckel, Clyde. "Authorizing Ministry in the United Church of Christ: Slouching Toward Order." *Prism* 11.2 (Fall 1996): 26-35. Print.

Strommen, Merton. "Models of Ministry." *Ministry in America: A Report and Analysis*. Ed.

David S. Schuller, Strommen, and Milo L. Brekke. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1980.

54-89. Print.

Thomas, John H. Forward. *Multiple Paths to Ministry: New Models for Theological Education*.

Ed. Lance R. Barker and B. Edmon Martin. Cleveland: Pilgrim P, 2004. vii-ix. Print.

--, "Something More: Authorized to Represent," Proceedings of the Ministry Issues

Convocation, March 7, 2002. Cleveland: United Church of Christ, 2002. Print.

--, "Pontiff, Prophet, Poet: What Kind of Leaders Will We Require?" *Prism*. 17.2

(Fall 2002): 63-72. Print.

Tentler, Thomas N. "Postscript." *Penitence in the Age of Reformations*. Ed. Katharine Jackson

Lualdi and Anne T. Thayer. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2000. 240-259. Print.

Tickle, Phyllis. *The Great Emergence: How Christianity is Changing and Why*. Grand Rapids:

Baker B, 2008. Print.

Ulshoefer, Gotlind B. "Book Review: God and the Economy." *Ecumenical Review*, July, 2001:

429-431. Print.

Van den Berg, Aart. *God and the Economy: Analysis and Typology of Roman Catholic,*

*Protestant, Orthodox, Ecumenical and Evangelical Theological Documents on the*

*Economy, 1979-1992*. Delft: Eburon, 1998. Print.

United Church of Christ. *Constitution and By-Laws of the United Church of Christ*. 2010 ed.

Cleveland: Executive Council, 2010. Web.

Volz, Carl. *Pastoral Life and Practice in the Early Church*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress,

1990. Print.

Walker, Randi. *The Evolution of a UCC Style*. Cleveland: United Church Press, 2005. Print.

- Whitman, Jeffrey. "Multiple Paths to Ministry Subcommittee Report and Proposal." Proceedings of the Ministry Issues Convocation, March 7, 2002. Cleveland: United Church of Christ, 2002. Print.
- Wood, Beatrice Y. "Theology of Mission." *Theology and Identity: Traditions, Movements, and Polity in the United Church of Christ*. Ed. Daniel L. Johnson and Charles Hambrick-Stowe. Cleveland: United Church P, 1990. 124-131. Print.
- Woodard, Marsha Brown. *Birthright: Midwife Leadership Style With African American Clergywomen*, Diss. Lancaster Theological Seminary, 2009. Ann Arbor: UMI, 2009. ATT. 3023579. Print.
- Yrigoyen, Charles, Jr. and George H. Bricker, Eds. *Catholic and Reformed: Selected Theological Writings of John Williamson Nevin*. Pittsburgh: Pickwick P, 1978. Print.
- Zikmund, Barbara Brown. "Empowerment and Embodiment: Understandings of Ministry in the United Church of Christ." *Theology and Identity: Traditions, Movements, and Polity in the United Church of Christ*. Ed. Daniel L. Johnson and Charles Hambrick-Stowe. Cleveland: United Church P, 1990. 79-89. Print.
- , Gen. Ed. The Living Theological Heritage of the United Church of Christ, 7 vols. Cleveland: Pilgrim P, 2000. Print.
- , "Unity and Diversity." Introduction. *Hidden Histories in the United Church of Christ 2*. Ed. Zikmund. NY: United Church Press, 1987. 1-10. Print.
- , "Setting Apart to What End? Reflections on Ordination for Tomorrow's Church." Paper prepared for Consultation on Ministry Issues, Office of Church Life and Leadership, UCC. Cleveland, Oct. 26, 1995. Print.

## Supplemental Bibliography

Bass, Dorothy C. and Kenneth B. Smith, Eds. *The United Church of Christ: Studies in Identity and Polity*. Chicago: Exploration Press, 1987. Print.

Brueggemann, Walter. "Missional Questions in a Fresh Context." *Hope for the World: Mission in a Global Context*. Ed. Walter Brueggemann. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001. 3-12. Print.

Cobb, John B., Jr. *Reclaiming the Church*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997. Print.

Fackre, Gabriel. "Christian Doctrine in the United Church of Christ." *Theology and Identity: Traditions, Movements, and Polity in the United Church of Christ*. Eds. Daniel L. Johnson and Charles Hambrick-Stowe. Cleveland: United Church P, 1990. 139-151. Print.

Freeman, Donald. "Autonomy: An Interpretation for the United Church of Christ." *Prism*. 11.2 (Fall 1996): 17-25. Print.

Gunnemann, Louis H. *The Shaping of the United Church of Christ*. Cleveland: United Church Press, 1977. Print.

Horton, Douglas. *The United Church of Christ*. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962. Print.

Hunsberger, George R. *Bearing the Witness of the Spirit: Lesslie Newbigin's Theology of Cultural Plurality*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998. Print.

Hunsberger, George R. and Craig Van Gelder, Eds. *The Church Between Gospel and Culture: The Emerging Mission in North America*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996. Print.

Jackson, Norman. "It's God's Mission: A Missiological Base for a Justice Ministry." Meeting of the Justice and Witness Ministries of the UCC. Franklinton Center, NC: April 26 2001.

Print.

Kinnamon, Michael. Foreward. *Our Futures Inextricably Linked: A Vision of Pluralism*. By Daniel F. Romero. Cleveland: United Church Board for Homeland Ministries, 1994. 4-6. Print.

- - -, *The Vision of the Ecumenical Movement and How It Has Been Impoverished by Its Friends*. St. Louis: Chalice, 2003. Print.

Kraus, Gene. "Theological Assumptions for United Church of Christ Ministry: Representative and Covenantal." Paper prepared for the Ministry Issues Project. Cleveland: UCC, 2000. Print.

Lang, Andy. "Should There Be Forks in the Road to Ordination?" *United Church News*. April, 2002. Print.

Local Church Ministries, UCC. "Church Covenant in the UCC: A Process for Exploring, Developing, and Affirming New Relationships." Cleveland, N.d. Print.

Malayang, Jose. "Report of the Executive Minister to the Board of Directors, Local Church Ministries." St. Louis: April 21, 2002. Print.

Maxfield, Charles A. *A Pilgrim People: A History of the United Church of Christ and Its Antecedents*. Cortland, NY: Maxfield Books, 2005. Print.

Nordbeck, Elizabeth. "On Being an Unfinished Church: Reflections on the Diversity in the United Church of Christ Today." *Prism* 16.2 (Fall 2001): 55-65. Print.

- - -, "Reaping the Legacies of the Past: An Agenda for the United Church of Christ in the Twenty-First Century." *Prism* 9.2 (Fall 1994): 4-15. Print.

Osborne, Kenan, *Priesthood: A History of Ordained Ministry in the Roman Catholic Church*.

New York: Paulist P, 1989. Print.

Potter, Philip. *Life in All Its Fullness*. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1981. Print.

Romero, Daniel F. *Our Futures Inextricably Linked: A Vision of Pluralism*. Cleveland: United

Church Board for Homeland Ministries, UCC, 1994. Print.

Steckel, Clyde. "Three United Church of Christ Ecclesiologies." Cleveland: Paper for Parish

Life and Leadership Ministry Team, Local Church Ministries. July 28, 2002. Print.

Wheeler, Barbara G. "Fit for Ministry?" Christian Century Vol. 118, Iss. 12 (April 11, 2001):

16-22. Print.

Witham, Robert. "Looking Back, Moving Ahead: Initial Reflections on Restructure." *Prism* 15.2

(Fall 2000): 8-24. Print.

Zikmund, Barbara Brown, Ed. *Hidden Histories in the United Church of Christ*. NY: United

Church Press, 1984. Print.