

EVANGELICAL REVIEW OF THEOLOGY

VOLUME 14 p. 1

Volume 14 • Number 1 • January 1990

Evangelical Review of Theology



WORLD EVANGELICAL FELLOWSHIP
Theological Commission p. 3

Paul Bowers, deputy administrator of the Accrediting Council for Theological Education in Africa (ACTEA), has served in theological education in Africa since 1968, first in Nigeria and more recently in Kenya. He holds a Ph.D from the University of Cambridge, England. In addition to his work with ACTEA, Dr Bowers currently lectures at Scott Theological College and at Nairobi Evangelical Graduate School of Theology in Kenya. p. 64

Renewal of Theological Education: Commitments, Models, and the ICAA *Manifesto*

Robert W. Ferris

During the twelve month period from August 1988 to August 1989 I had the privilege of studying the growing worldwide movement toward renewal of ministry training in evangelical theological schools. The project undertaken consisted of four parts:

1. Clarification of the meaning of 'renewal' as advocated in the ICAA *Manifesto*.
2. Identification of evangelical theological schools which demonstrate values advocated in the ICAA *Manifesto*.
3. Survey of ways in which the ICAA *Manifesto* has been used to promote renewal values in theological education.
4. Development of guidelines for implementing a programme of renewal in existing theological education institutions.

Research procedures have included:

1. A review of recent literature to identify the background and present context for renewal of evangelical theological education.
2. A survey of ICAA member agencies, to determine level of commitment to renewal of theological education and use of the ICAA *Manifesto* as a stimulus toward renewal. (All six ICAA member agencies responded to my questionnaire.)
3. A survey of institutions accredited by ICAA member agencies, to determine level of commitment to renewal of theological education, commitment to renewal values advocated in the ICAA *Manifesto*, and awareness of ICAA and the *Manifesto*. (A nine page questionnaire instrument was sent to 242 accredited institutions, with a 67% rate of response.¹) p. 65

¹ Distribution of the questionnaire instrument was limited to accredited institutions, since I believe it is fair to assume that those institutions would be most likely to be aware of programmes promoted by our regional agencies and are the schools by which we would prefer to be known and judged. In recognition of the mutual agreement between Asia Theological Association (ATA) and the Philippine Association of Bible and Theological Schools (PABATS), Philippine Bible colleges accredited by PABATS were included in the ATA sample. Because North American graduate theological schools are not represented among ICAA member agencies, furthermore, the survey was broadened to include schools affiliated with the (North American) Fellowship of Evangelical Seminary Presidents.

Survey instrument distribution and responses were as follows:

4. Identification of institutions which, in some respect, demonstrate renewal values. (Ten institutions were identified, representing five of six ICAA member agencies).
5. On-site visits to selected institutions, to identify factors contributing to implementation of renewal strategies.

It has been a busy—but good—year. I must express my deep appreciation to ICAA for the cooperation and support given to this project. I trust the findings will be useful to you and to the cause of renewal of evangelical theological education.

MATTERS RAISING QUESTIONS AND CONCERN

My report is a ‘bad news, good news’ story. The findings of my survey of ICAA member agencies would qualify, on the whole, as bad news. All six agencies agreed that renewal is needed in theological education (that is good news, I should think), but agency leaders described themselves as only ‘somewhat familiar’ with the ICAA *Manifesto*² Furthermore, three out of six agencies report they have made no use of the *Manifesto*, have not found the *Manifesto* a significant stimulus toward renewal, and have no plans to use it in the future. Those findings raise concern and beg for clarification. **P. 66**

Agency	Sent	Received	Rate
American Association of Bible Colleges	87	52	60%
Accrediting Council for Theol.Ed. in Africa	18	12	67%
Asia Theological Association	47	38	81%
Caribbean Evangelical Theological Association	20	9	45%
European Evangelical Accrediting Association	22	10	45%
South Pacific Association of Bible Colleges	14	14	100%
Fellowship of Evangelical Seminary Presidents	34	26	76%
Totals	242	161	67%

² That is, when asked ‘Would you say you are familiar with the ICAA *Manifesto*?’, the modal response was ‘somewhat familiar.’ Two agency leaders reported they are ‘very familiar’ with the *Manifesto*, while three said they are ‘somewhat familiar’, and one reported he is only ‘slightly familiar’ with this document.

I also asked agency leaders to rate the frequency with which renewal values (as stated in the *Manifesto*) are evidenced among the schools of their region. On a seven-point opinion scale (1 = No Schools and 7=All Schools), respondents tended toward a mid-range assessment of renewal values in affiliated institutions. (Mean across all twelve renewal values was 4.12).³

When asked to rate the priority they would assign to promoting renewal values within their region, on the other hand, agency leaders responded somewhat more positively (mean across twelve values was 5.22, with 1=Unimportant and 7=Highest Priority). Mean scores have little meaning when the number of subjects is only six, however, and closer examination shows that four of the twelve items yielded a bimodal response pattern.⁴ This seems to indicate differences in values among ICAA member agencies, and suggests a topic for fruitful conversation around our dining tables.

One would expect that these two items would be negatively correlated—that is, when a renewal value is relatively common the priority attached to its promotion would be minimal, while values which are rarely demonstrated would merit higher priority in promotion. Surprisingly, correlation between these items is rather weak. This raises questions regarding the way we establish the educational services agenda of our accrediting agencies and poses yet another topic for informal discussion.

I wish I could assure you that the bad news is limited to findings of the ICAA members survey, but that is not the case. Analysis of survey responses received from 161 institutions accredited by ICAA member agencies reveals that ICAA is a well-kept secret. Fewer than one respondent in four (only 24.5%) reported they are ‘very aware’ of our international association.

Even more discouraging, over 85% of theological educators responding for our accredited institutions indicated they are not familiar with the basic contents of the *Manifesto* (72.4%) or they are not sure of [p. 67](#) its contents (12.8%)! Since ICAA adopted the *Manifesto* at its 1983 meetings (also held in Wheaton), one wonders why it has received so little exposure over the past six years. Are we really ambivalent in our own commitment to the values the *Manifesto* expresses? (Perhaps we affirm these values publicly, but manage to overlook them when forming our programmes and budgets.) Does the length and style of the text inhibit the usefulness of the *Manifesto*? Or has preoccupation with maintenance of our agencies precluded attention to issues which, in fact, lie close to our calling and mission? These are not questions to pass over quickly.

RENEWAL IS A FELT NEED AMONG OUR SCHOOLS

Enough of the bad news! I am pleased to report there is plenty of good news as well. My questionnaire on ‘Renewal of Evangelical Theological Education’ obviously touched a sensitive nerve with many school leaders. The 67% rate of return on the instrument must be considered gratifying by anyone familiar with standards of postal survey research. Furthermore, although the questionnaire instrument was nine pages long(!), 94% of respondents were the chief executive officer (president, principal, or dean) of their

³ Some items were reported to be more common than others (‘Integrated Programmes’ were relatively common—mean=5.33; ‘Continuous Assessment’ was reported to be rare—mean=2.83). There were also significant differences between regional agencies (highest across twelve values=5.00; lowest=3.25). This *may* accurately reflect educational development in these regions, but I am inclined to discount it as variation among raters.

⁴ Bimodal patterns showed up in prioritization of ‘Integrated Programmes’, ‘A Christian Mind’, ‘Equipping for Growth’, and ‘Cooperation’.

institution. This is not a questionnaire which was tossed to a secretary or junior instructor to complete. Beyond that, fully 55% of respondents requested a report of the findings of the study *despite the fact that there was no check-off space on the instrument to accommodate that request*. In light of all this, it seems conservative to conclude that the leaders of our Bible and theological schools are interested in renewal.

When I asked theological educators if renewal of theological education is needed, they answered with a resounding affirmative.⁵ I next asked if present approaches to ministry training are serving us well, or if major change is needed. Respondents were less emphatic, but still clearly affirmed that major change is needed.⁶ That leads one to wonder what theological educators mean by ‘renewal of theological education’—what is it they intend to affirm? When I asked that p. 68 question, I was unable to discern a consensus.⁷ When I presented the twelve points expressed in our *Manifesto*, however, respondents were emphatic in identifying themselves with those values.⁸ This strongly supports the opening statement of the *Manifesto* prologue, which reads:

The fundamental presupposition of the *Manifesto* is the perception that today there is a wide agreement among evangelical theological educators on the need for renewal in theological education and on an agenda for such renewal.

It is not encouraging, however, to realize that some of our accrediting agencies lag behind schools in their region in commitment to the ideals we profess.⁹

Having established that renewal values are important to theological educators, I next asked if those values were demonstrated in their schools. Although respondents obviously wanted to provide a positive report, they consistently rated demonstration

⁵ Mean response was 5.55 on a scale of 1 to 7 on which 1 = ‘Strongly disagree’ and 7 = ‘strongly agree’. It is noteworthy that 83.6% of respondents identified their opinion at points 5, 6, or 7 on the continuum.

⁶ Mean response was 4.95 on a 7 point scale with 1 = ‘Present Approach Serves Well’ and 7 = ‘Major Change is Needed’. Even though opinions were more distributed, 72.5% of respondents still located their position at points 5, 6, or 7 on the opinion scale.

⁷ Content analysis of responses the open-ended item yielded seven categories with more than 5.0% representation. If responses were evenly distributed across eight categories (i.e. the seven listed, plus ‘Other’), each would represent 12.5% of the total. Actual distribution produced no category with a response greater than 17, 9%. The most common responses were:

‘Refocus training on meeting the needs of the Church’ 17.9%

‘Refocus on applying biblical truth to social/cultural context’ 15.2%

‘Stronger integration of the present curriculum’ 15.2 %

⁸ Respondents were presented with a statement of each renewal value in turn, then asked, ‘Is this quality important to you?’ Responses were indicated on a seven point opinion scale, with 1 = ‘Unimportant’ and 7 = ‘Extremely Important’. Mean response across twelve renewal values was 6.23.

⁹ Compare the ICAA agency respondents’ mean ‘priority’ response of 5.22 with institutional respondents mean ‘importance’ response of 6.23!

lower than the level of importance assigned to renewal values.¹⁰ I believe this gap between affirmation of renewal values and demonstration of those values in our institutions accounts for the high level of interest observed in this study.

Perhaps renewal values are under-represented in our training programmes because they have not received appropriate attention from the faculty and administrators of our schools. To check this [p. 69](#) possibility, I asked theological educators if the faculty of their school has ‘deliberately worked on developing’ each renewal value in their training programme within the last five years. Apparently that is not the problem, for respondents affirmed that implementation of renewal values has received faculty attention.¹¹

When I asked theological educators if they can identify other schools which demonstrate renewal values to a high degree, however, fewer than half indicated they could so so.¹²

This presents a very interesting picture. Theological educators affirm renewal values, but admit that demonstration of those values in their own institutions falls short of their commitment. This disappointing status exists despite deliberate efforts to realize these values. Furthermore, theological educators do not know of other schools that are doing better.

The situation described presents a golden opportunity for renewal of ministry training. Renewal values are in place, and educators are eager for change. All they lack is models that show them how to implement the values they affirm.

Let me add one more piece to the picture. The survey instrument stated clearly that the values presented were taken from the *Manifesto*, adopted by ICAA. At the end of the survey instrument I asked if respondents would ‘like to know more about ICAA and its efforts to promote renewal of evangelical theological education’. Fully 92.4% of respondents requested more information.

This is good news for ICAA and for our regional agencies! If our agencies can move definitively to help schools experience renewal of ministry training programmes, we can realize our own objectives and meet a deeply felt need among our principal constituency. We do not need to drum up enthusiasm; we need simply to provide the educational services member institutions are crying for. These are certainly exciting days for theological education! [p. 70](#)

RENEWAL MODELS EXIST

I have more good news, besides. In our midst, some schools have mustered the courage and creativity to experiment with alternative models of ministry training. Without doubt,

¹⁰ See Appendix A for a comparison of mean responses for affirmation and demonstration of renewal values, by value and region. It is noteworthy that the largest discrepancies are seen in two values—‘Outcomes Assessment’ and ‘Creativity in Teaching’—and that these discrepancies exist across all seven agencies included in the study. It is safe to conclude these are areas in which our schools would appreciate help.

¹¹ Affirmative responses Varied from 93.0% (who claimed to have worked on strategies for spiritual formation) to 62.0% (who state their faculty has considered means of promoting student self-direction in learning). No renewal value was reported to have received ‘deliberate’ attention from the faculty of fewer than 62% of responding schools.

¹² Responses varied from 48.0% identification of one or more other schools which demonstrate ‘Cultural Appropriateness’, to only 17.5% identification of another school that demonstrates ‘Developmental Focus’. Across all renewal values, furthermore, missing responses for this set of items was unusually high, ranging from 29% to 41%. If missing responses are not factored out, therefore, even fewer educators are able to identify schools which model these values.

the most encouraging—and stimulating—aspect of my study this year has been the opportunity to visit schools around the world which are taking deliberate and positive strides toward renewal of theological education. Overall, these schools are rare, but they do exist. Furthermore, the ten schools I visited are not alone; it would be easy (and very profitable) to add ten more to these. It is important for us to be aware of the exciting alternatives which are being explored today, and to be ready to tell others about the training models they represent.

On the basis of survey responses and conversations with theological educators, ten schools were identified which illustrate this phenomenon.¹³ Between the first of January and the end of April, this year, I visited each of these institutions. My intention was to spend at least four days on each campus. In that time, I found, I could identify those aspects of training which are most creative and demonstrative of renewal values, and I could explore the factors which contributed to development of these innovations. While on campus, I would draft a case study which described the programmes of qualities of interest, and the factors contributing to their development. Before leaving campus I would request the president or principal to review the case study, providing correction or adding detail as necessary.

There obviously is not time this evening to discuss ministry training at all of the above listed schools, but I will highlight three.

Conservative Baptist Seminary of the East (CBSE)—For years Conservative Baptists in the eastern United States have felt the need for a seminary of their own. Because several fine evangelical seminaries exist in that region, however, they recognized that any new institution must offer an alternative approach to ministry training. Part of the impetus for developing a new seminary, furthermore, was the conviction that traditional models transfer responsibility for ministry preparation from the local congregation to the seminary. Conservative Baptists in the east believe that ministry preparation is the responsibility of the local church. They conceived, therefore, a seminary which sees its mission as enabling local churches to train their own ministers.

In order to provide seminary training in congregational context, CBSE has adopted an internship model. Students applying to CBSE must bring with them the endorsement of a local congregation which agrees to p. 71 provide an internship setting for the student. Strategic to that agreement is the further provision that the church will assign two internship supervisors—one member of the pastoral staff, plus one active layperson—to oversee the student's seminary programme. The supervisors are expected to meet weekly with the student, and are responsible for guiding and development of the student's interpersonal skills, spiritual maturity, and ministry gifts. The supervisory relationship is both highly formative and a major source of constructive stress in the seminary programme, CBSE provides training for internship supervisors, and ready support from seminary staff.

To ensure that training centres on the congregational context, formal instruction is offered only one day each week. To implement a one-day class schedule and still provide acceptable, graduate level instruction, CBSE's administrators have introduced several interesting innovations. The school year has been extended from eight to eleven months, and vacation periods have been shortened or eliminated. (Churches, they reason, run a fifty-two week calendar; why should seminaries be different?) This allows the seminary to offer three fifteen-week 'semesters' each year, instead of two. By this innovation alone they have extended the three-year seminary programme from six semesters to nine,

¹³ No entry found in print copy.

allowing students to complete their training in the normal time by taking only ten units each semester, instead of fifteen.

Next, CBSE administrators have recognized that seminary students are adults, and thus adult education strategies are appropriate for their instruction. On this basis, students are required to take at least three units of work each semester through learning contracts. The contracted learning is related to (but distinct from) subjects studied in class, and the learning contract must be approved and graded by the Classroom instructor. By requiring students to take three units of contracted learning each semester, a full-time class load is further reduced from ten units to seven. Classes for seven units *can* be scheduled on one day per week, although it is an exhausting day for students and teachers alike. Students still have class preparation to do the rest of the week, but a one day schedule *is* possible. Furthermore, it achieves the Seminary's objective of focusing the internship congregation as the centre of ministry preparation.

There is much more to tell about CBSE. The Seminary presents a genuinely creative model of ministry training, and one which deserves our thoughtful consideration.

All Nations Christian College (ANCC)—The roots of ANCC reach back into the nineteenth century, but during the 1960s the school faced p. 72 declining enrolments and possible closure. At that point a creative Principal conceived a different approach to missionary training. His patient and careful implementation of that vision must rank among the most significant stories of renewal of ministry training in our day.

At ANCC, husbands and wives prepare together for missionary service. (Why shouldn't they, since they serve together?) The two-year curriculum includes lectures on the Old and New Testaments, theology, history, missiology, cross-cultural life and ministry, and is supplemented with practical training in many skills useful to the missionary—including public speaking, photography, and pulling teeth. It is the role of the tutor at ANCC, however, which sets the institution apart.

Each student is assigned a tutor who assumes total responsibility for the academic, spiritual, interpersonal, and ministry skills development of that student. (Tutors typically are assigned nine to eleven students each year.) Although lecturers are expected to propose assignments for their classes, each student's assignments for all classes are given—and graded—by his or her tutor. In this way tutors are able to tailor assignments for all classes to address the specific development needs or ministry interests of each student.

To facilitate development of spiritual life and interpersonal skills, ANCC provides an active community life. Students live on campus, and are involved with the staff in manual labour, recreational activities, daily coffee hours, and frequent parties. Three times a week each staff person meets with his or her tutorial group for Bible study, sharing, and prayer. In addition, tutors schedule formal interviews with students for at least an hour every three weeks. The broad range of contacts thus provided allow the staff to effectively address the preparation of students for missionary service.

ANCC's innovative programme deserves a more detailed description. Suffice it to say that theological educators who question the wisdom of a tutor assuming such wide ranging responsibility for student development need to consider the training effect. Most will be impressed to learn that ANCC annually receives inquiries from 1000 applicants for 100 available places in its entering class. The school obviously is doing many things which deserve the attention of other theological educators.

Union Biblical Seminary (UBS)—CBSE offers a model of a new institution which, from its inception, opted for an alternative approach to ministry training. ANCC was a school in crisis when it introduced an alternative approach to missionary preparation, The

experience of p. 73 UBS, however, was different from both of these. In 1983 UBS was a widely recognized, highly regarded graduate seminary with an Indian president, a growing student body, and a new campus. Everything seemed in place for a strong theological education programme—there was no need to change.

Several on the faculty, however, desired something better. In response to this longing, and as a routine check on students' preparation for ministry, a senior student was invited to survey the Seminary's alumni. The findings of that study were not encouraging, and further dialogue was initiated with church leaders to develop a picture of UBS alumni in ministry.

Four findings emerged from the expanded study: (1) UBS alumni were recognized as very knowledgeable; (2) UBS alumni were good preachers and expositors of the Scriptures; (3) UBS alumni were generally weak in interpersonal skills; and (4) UBS alumni were ineffective pastors. The faculty decided that this was not good enough, and so set about to develop an alternative approach to ministry training which would address the interpersonal and pastoral training needs of students, while preserving the Seminary's well established emphasis on biblical and theological studies.

In 1987 UBS implemented its new B.D. curriculum, which runs thirty-four and a half consecutive months. First year students are required to come to campus on 1 June, six weeks prior to the normal mid-July opening date, for an 'Orientation Session'. During the Orientation Session, focus is placed on intensive instruction on theological study skills, the study of biblical languages, and principles of leadership in the local church. To train students to think theologically, field trips to points of historic and religious interest are scheduled, followed by periods of guided reflection.

Building on the Orientation Session, the first academic year focuses on developing sound methods of biblical study and cultivating the gifts and skills of ministry.

Following the first year, each student is required to enter a thirteen and a half month internship which is carefully supervised by a local pastor. Twice during the year the student receives on-site visits from members of the UBS faculty and on two other occasions the student is scheduled to return to the UBS campus. Because UBS faculty note that graduates tend to neglect continuing study after entering ministry, students are required to complete eight units of course work through extension during their internship. By placing students in ministry and requiring them to study, the UBS faculty hope students will develop the disciplines of study in ministry. p. 74

On 1 June of the third year, at the conclusion of the internship period, students return to campus for a six-week 'Reflection Session'. Each student brings to this session a full report of his or her internship, plus three case studies describing situations which the student observed or participated in during the internship. During the Reflection Session, students take turns in sharing reports and case studies with their faculty and peers, and reflecting theologically and pastorally on the experiences described.

The final year of the B.D. programme focuses on integrating the student's internship experience with theological study, and extending the student's skills in biblical and theological reflection.

There are many other aspects of this creative programme which merit the attention of theological educators, but the innovative integration of campus and internship study at UBS must be applauded. In pioneering this model, the administration and faculty of UBS has challenged each of us to re-examine our training priorities and assumptions. They have demonstrated, furthermore, that a school need not be new or in crisis to move decisively toward renewal and change.

FACTORS COMMON TO SELECTED SCHOOLS

As I travelled around the world to visit the schools listed above, I was always watching for constants—factors which occurred in several (if not all) of the institutions I visited. I recognize that the educational modes developed in Regina or Jos or Pune or Adelaide may not be transferable to another situation, but perhaps factors exist which characterize institutions committed to renewal of theological education. If so, then these may provide insight for administrators who desire to see renewal of ministry training in their own institutions.

So far, I have identified seven factors which appear constant across the ten institutions I have visited. If I am able to extend this research to other schools, perhaps this list will be expanded or narrowed. I offer these observations, however, for your discussion and reflection:

1. All selected schools have a strong missions emphasis.
2. Renewal of ministry training is embraced and promoted by the chief executive officer (president, principal, or dean).
3. Careful attention is given to the school's constituent church and its training needs.
4. Focus is placed on training outcomes (i.e., the effectiveness of graduates in ministry), with freedom to adapt programmes and processes to improve graduate effectiveness. [p. 75](#)
5. Conscious effort is given to spiritual formation and ministry skills development, sometimes linked with deliberate attenuation of academic stress.
6. Faculty make themselves vulnerable to students through individual and small group mentoring and through involvement with students in ministry.
7. Administrators and faculty are aware of adult education principles, and design instruction for adult learners.

Some of these 'constants' reflect implementation of renewal values, while others suggest fundamental changes in the way we go about training for ministry. Most of those changes are threatening and involve risk. Nevertheless, I am optimistic. We have seen that theological educators desire renewal. They recognize that the values we affirm are right. If we now can show them that change is possible—and that others are experiencing the renewal they desire—I believe renewal will flourish.

ICAA, and our regional agencies, now face a great challenge. We have noted before that accreditation agencies can be impediments—or agents—of change. My data indicate that the desire for renewal is so intense among our affiliated institutions, I suspect change will come with our help or in spite of us. I pray that we will have the courage to be agents of renewal, to the honour of Jesus Christ and the strengthening of his church.

The research reported in this study was underwritten by a grant from the Billy Graham Center, Wheaton College, A full report of the research is available from the Center Director. Dr. Ferris served for twenty-two years as a missionary with SEND International. [p. 76](#)

Affirmation and Demonstration of Renewal Values (Comparison of mean responses)

Renewal value	Regional agency	US-SEMS n=26	AABC n=52	ACTEA n=12	ATA n=38	CETA n=9	EEAA n=10	SPABC n=14	Total n=161
Cultural Aff		5.500	5.692	6.250	6.289*	5.667*	5.400	6.214*	5.870*

Appr Dem o		4.577	4.904	5.333	4.811	4.556	4.600	4.929	4.825
Attent	Aff	6.115	6.000	6.250*	6.027	6.000	5.700*	6.071	6.031
To Ch	Dem	5.346	5.173	5.000	5.222	5.111	4.600	5.571	5.195
Flex	Aff	5,920*	6.115*	6.167*	5.947	6.000	5.500*	6.214	6.013*
Strat Dem		4.917	4.846	4.917	5.056	5.000	4.200	5.500	4.936
	TAff h e o	6.923	6.808	6.909	6.816*	6.556	6.667	6.714	6.805
Grou Dem nd		6.160	6.000	6.273	5.811	6.000	5.889	6.231	6.013
Outcome s	Aff	6.077*	6.180*	6.167*	6.263*	5.778*	5.889*	5.571*	6.089*
Asse Dem ss		4.385	4.840	4.167	5.027	3.778	4.100	3.714	4.551
Spirit	Aff	6.692	6.490	6.667	6.684	6.778*	6.400	6.786	6.619
For m	Dem	5.731	5.627	5.833	5.921	5.333	5.800	5.929	5.750
Holistic	Aff	6.500*	6.353*	6.583*	6.579*	6.444	6.300*	6.714*	6.481*
CurriDem c		5.385	5.196	5.250	5.447	5.556	4.800	5.286	5.294
Service	Aff	6.000	6.423*	6.500*	6.500*	6.444*	6.400	6.571*	6.394*
Orie nt	Dem	5.200	5.385	5.167	5.211	5.222	5.500	5.429	5.300
Creative	Aff	6.160*	6.231*	6.250*	5.816*	5.667*	5.800*	6.286*	6.069*

Teac Dem h	4.640	4.712	4.250	4.395	4.333	4.100	4.714	4.531
Christ'n Aff	6.679	6.712	6.667	6.514	6.000	6.400*	6.929	6.631
Worl Dem dv	5.808	5.712	5.833	5.629	5.286	4.900	6.643	5.731
Develop Aff	5.615	5.788*	5.917*	6.135*	5.778*	5.889*	5.643	5.843*
Focu Dem s	5.038	4.635	4.583	4.838	4.222	4.444	4.769	4.722
CooperatAff	6.000	5.569	6.000	6.316	5.667	5.600	6.071	5.900
Spiri Dem t	5.400	4.824	5.083	5.500	5.000	5.400	5.714	5.220

Total number of cells=84

In 84 cells (100%) Level of Affirmation-Level of Demonstration>0

In 42 cells (-50%) Level of Affirmation-Level of Demonstration>01

In 11 cells (-13%) Level of Affirmation-Level of Demonstration>01.5

In 3 cells (—4%) Level of Affirmation-Level of Demonstration>02

p. 77

ICAA *Manifesto* on Renewal of Evangelical Theological Education

12 Renewal Values

1. Cultural appropriateness
2. Attentiveness to the church
3. Flexible strategizing
4. Theological grounding
5. Outcomes assessment
6. Spiritual formation
7. Holistic curricularizing
8. Service orientation
9. Creativity in teaching
10. Christian world view

11. Developmental focus
12. Cooperative spirit

No. 15	June/July	1st Semester	2nd Semester	No. 15 June 1
1st year				
	13½ month internship study			
3rd year				

Robert W. Ferris, formerly Dean of the Asian Theological Seminary, Manila, and recently Missionary Scholar in Residence at the Billy Graham Center, Wheaton, Illinois, is now teaching at Columbia Biblical Seminary, South Carolina, USA. p. 78

An Evangelical Theology of Pluralism: A Personal View

Christopher Lamb

Reprinted with permission from Spectrum, Volume 21 No. 1, Spring 1989

INTRODUCTION

We are in urgent need of a theology of pluralism. But for this we look in vain to the Fathers (or Mothers) of the church. Augustine's use of the text 'Compel them to come in' echoes down the centuries. Nor is the Dissenting tradition of much help in Britain. We are also, however, heirs to the Enlightenment, to a democratic humanism with all its differing effects. The worst of these may be the privatisation of religion which disables our city fathers and other legislators from considering religion seriously at all. I sat with others recently considering a paper on Equal Opportunities produced by a working party from a local education authority. This group of people had managed to handle the subject of preserving and promoting minority cultures in schools, and the issue of enabling children to feel proud of their inherited traditions, without once mentioning the subject of religion in a paper which was concerned with beliefs and values on every page. Many of our secular contemporaries find religious issues embarrassing and problematic to deal with. Consequently they are in danger of leaving us the victims of a crass materialism, a *pleonexia* ([Col. 3:5](#)) or 'ruthless greed which is nothing less than idolatry'. Yet this same humanist tradition can also be an invaluable counterweight to totalitarian forms of religion, and has probably preserved us from the fate of nations like Iran. What is more, Christianity, like some forms of Buddhism and Sikhism, has an inbuilt critique of religion which can contribute to a proper Christian humanism. This is something of the context in which RE. is taught, and why it has become the storm centre of the contemporary debate about Christianity and other faiths.