

# **SHAPING ACADEMY FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION**

## **Sunday, July 16**

Al Truesdale: We are going to hear Mike's report and then we will take time for questions, discussion. I have also asked Jerry Lambert to come and give us at some point an orientation on how this idea originated. Jerry, be prepared to do that as much as you think appropriate. Mike come and tell use what we have created.

Mike Vail: What we did is go through a survey process called the Delphi Technique. In the Delphi Technique what you usually do is send out a blank piece of paper to all of your experts in the first round and ask them to put down all of the things of importance about a certain topic. Now, basically we did that blank piece of paper step because we took the original statements from all of the reports that were given from the different regions about what you thought the Academy should be. We took those statements and put them on paper and gave them to you and asked you to start prioritizing those. The first time we had 60 statements. Everyone was wise enough to recognize that there were not 60 different ideas there but only 60 different statements.

In round two we took the list that had been prioritized the first time and put some of the statements together in the same line. Others that no one wanted after the first round we just dropped. We asked you to prioritize them again. But this time you had more information because you already knew what some of the other groups were thinking about those items.

In the third round we dropped off some more. Now we have a weighted prioritization of the remaining items. I have not formatted this page yet because I think it is important that we talk about it the way it is.

Under the prioritized column we now have the total weight that was given to that item by all eight regions. The maximum score that any row could get or any item would be 64 because you each had 8 votes. The top priority gets a weight of 8, second priority got a weight of 7, and so on down the line. The most any line could have would be 64. The first item you see, which would be item number 3 got a score of 57 which to me says a lot of regions thought that was pretty important. So you get 57 out of 64 points on that one item.

The next one is item number 1 resources for faculty, identification and acquisition. It dropped down quite a ways but is still in pretty good shape. Items 57, 34, 32, 30 would be the first four items. I would say those are your top four priorities for an Academy. The other items need to be worked on but if I have to apply limited resources to meet your needs I'm going to start with the first one. If I have resources left over you move down the list and start to pick up additional items that are important to the regions.

Based on what you see here, do you have any questions or comments. I have not had time to analyze this. You people have been going through and prioritizing this so you've thought about these items.

Greg Crofford: If I understand correctly, Mike, this does not reflect the top 8 voting we did this morning?

Mike Vail: This is the results of the top 8. Just to show you.. If I scroll down to the bottom of the page you can see some of these things got just one weighted score out of a possible 64. It's all here, but it begins to taper off or the numbers begin to get much smaller than the one above it. You throw those out and say those are not as important to the group as a whole. You begin to work with the top of the list. Do you want me to put them up there? Some of you still have sheets in front of you. Do you want to write this down? We can print it and get it out to you tomorrow.

The first thing you want is for us to assist faculty development in all of its different ramifications. So it would be as listed here, educational methods, curriculum design, content, competency, professional development and whatever else you could throw in. I would think spiritual development should be included as well under faculty development. So when we say faculty development we really mean faculty, administration and staff development.

The next one, which is actually quite a ways down in comparison, would be resources for faculty, identification and acquisition. Now you folks tell me what you think that means or let me tell you what I think it means and you tell me if I'm right or wrong. One of the most difficult tasks as administrators that you have is finding qualified faculty for open positions in your university or college or Bible school. Is that correct? So what you're asking for is a type of registry or assistance in identifying qualified faculty members to interview and put through your qualification processes. Is that what that means to you?

Jim Burns: . . . quite a bit of discussion about two other categories that seem very close to that that add some possibly different perspectives to that, additional perspectives. Now that you've stated it how you have, I'm wondering if they truly are different categories.

Mike Vail: Jim, you're thinking farther down the line we have the one that talks about the registry of theological discipline people and non-clergy

Jim Burns: and then one further down that talks about sabbatical use and people for extension resources from various fields serving as extension. Our group sometimes had a tendency to collapse those into one category. Now the way you've stated this one I see it as possibly very different.

Mike Vail: So it is different.

Jim Burns: I haven't talked with my group. I don't know if it is different.

Dean: Mike maybe a way to clarify it for instance the one you have listed here might actually include a number of graduate students who are in academic programs right now but may be available say a year or two down the road for teaching as opposed to a list of existing faculty that would be available for exchange. Is that how you are sort of separating those two in the interpretation? Does that make sense?

Mike Vail: I was giving you my opinion. I didn't write the original statement. We have to ask , "As you were prioritizing, how did you understand resource for faculty identification and

Greg Crofford: Ted's not here. Ted, are you here anywhere? He can better . . . What do we mean Ted by resource for faculty identification and acquisition? I believe that is your language. Would you come and explain what we mean by that?

Mike Vail: What Ted said was that it's a pool of qualified individuals to fill open spots at your schools permanently.

Terry Ketchum: . . . result is that when I first glanced at these 16 to reduce them to 8 I categorized. There are 2 or 3 or 4 in the first four spots that actually go together. One of the unfortunate things that I see when we have to differentiate first from second from third from fourth is that eventually we will miss some of the very essential elements in other very similar items.

Mike Vail: Can you give me an example?

Terry Ketchum: Sure, for number one priority which is not this one but the resource for faculty development, educational methods, curriculum design, content, competency and professional development I see that also as linked with a resource for curriculum development, assessment, evaluation model curricula they both deal with curriculum along with the third item on the old list, sponsoring meetings, workshops and conferences for our teachers which is faculty development. Those three honestly go together and if we have to pick one to delete the others I think is to our detriment. This second item, our second priority I have linked with three others so that we are looking at a resource of sorts for faculty identification. We are also considering a database plugging them all in where they might best fit. We are also looking at facilitating transactions among institutions to talk about faculty exchange. It all deals with faculty identification, faculty development moving on into curriculum development.

One of the weaknesses I see with this is I'm afraid if we only choose one and don't then consider the elements of the other that are very closely related we are the losers.

Mike Vail: I think that the way to proceed, and I will suggest this, and the group can talk about it, Terry to answer your question, I think what we should do is look at the first four items and then look down the list and see if others are related and how we might implement the priority that is given to us for instance in this item. So, the way in which we implement resources for faculty identification, acquisition may include databases, it may include registries other things, but the goal is to help fill slots that are open at your schools. Does everyone understand that?

Just because we are looking at item number 1 as the second priority doesn't mean that 51 and 52 don't get used in order to implement item number 1.

Other questions about what you see? I am still waiting a little bit, Suzanne forgive me for not waiting long enough but I'm still waiting for additional comments about the items that you see. I think it is important to understand that the Academy will be established to serve the needs of the regions. We want to make sure that we are addressing the needs that you have and that you have said are important to you. It's not our purpose to say we're only going to be a faculty development unit and all these other things on this list will be ignored. But we have limited resources so we need to put them somewhere that's important first. Then as we have additional resources we'll work on the other items.

Also, by having a list like this of 16 or 17 items we begin to look around the church and see how these are being supplied by other departments and other programs. Can we inform you as practitioners about the other resources that are available in addition to the Academy? All minds clear? We'll print this and have it to you tomorrow so you can take it with you as part of the minutes of this meeting.

Al Truesdale: Our interest here is not to eliminate as if we have decided what is not significant. But our interest, well it's a kind of triage. We're trying to decide what should receive the highest investment of our energies first, second, third fourth. I would hope that we will attempt to give attention to all of these finally. What would a cut list be? Is that too arbitrary to ask that? Would you identify something, Mike, that in this process finally would be identified as relatively insignificant to the group. You know, the scale diminishes I understand that. If it's important to

I appreciated what Terry said. These items are not neatly discreet are they? The relationships begin to surface.

Dean Blevins: Mike one question. Do you see this as if we have a general idea of what is number one and begin to work on that first. It's really working down our list of priorities. So if we do accomplish the first four then you really have the sort of resource data in front of you that you can begin to synthesize and create a fifth or sixth as needed.

John Haines: There is something niggling here and I'm not quite sure what it is. My only concern is that we somehow need an exercise that is going to compress rather than eliminate or filter out. I think our filters were pretty well built by the second round. I pretty much saw everything on this list as being priority. As we know, everything that is in a priority just belongs somewhere. They all should have some attention.

A second concern along that line is something we mentioned from our report this morning and that has to do with the way in which departments and ministries within the church work together or don't in regard to providing for these needs. I still believe the Academy ought to be almost a great provocateur or a prompter to other ministries that have a responsibility but may not be

fulfilling it very well. My only concern in that is that it is very easy to engage other ministries or departments for the sake of education. I don't want the Academy to become the puppet of some other entity that says, "Well, if you're going to serve these needs then you better do it this way." We need to have people sitting on the Academy helping you know how to do that.

I'm not quite sure how to put all that into words but there's something here that I'm not quite settled with. I'm a little anxious that we find a way to really work collaboratively using models the other day to make sure that happens well.

Mike Vail: It hit me John as you were talking that the diagram that was presented this morning by the USA Region is upside down. The schools should be directing what they want the Academy to be not the IBOE. That's what we've got to be sure of is that we are responsive to the needs of the schools rather than dictating from a central location what the schools need.

John Haines: I think that's exactly right. My question in regard to that though is that, we also had in our report, we think the best connectivity for the systems of the church ought to be through the IBOE not have multiple entities through which we are trying to make those connections. I think you are right that the institutions need to be declaring what's necessary and what we would like to see happen. But I wouldn't want to see that just kind of go out in some vacuum. I don't think the Academy, whatever it may be presently as far as the rest of the church is concerned doesn't exist. So there has to be some point of connectivity through an agency or an entity that does exist and has a place, a voice, a forum, with the systems of the church to represent what we are doing.

Mike Vail: Yet that entity has to be focused. That's why we go through a prioritizing process here. Not to necessarily say we have now been made conscience of all of the need, which we

have, but we have to have a place to start with limited resources and I think that's what we've identified. A focus for the Academy until our next meeting like this.

David McEwan: I think a concern that I have may well be a cultural thing. We looked yesterday at how we learn. We learned that some people pick up information by listening, some by looking, and some by doing. It seems to me that we are in danger of our development process getting hijacked by those who learn by listening, who very quickly pick up on things, who very quickly want them structured, and who want all the i's dotted and t's crossed.

Looking at the list of 60 items we've been working with, many of them do overlap, many of them do interlink. Depending where you are coming from and what you are thinking about and where you are in your own journey at the moment, one of those items might be more important than the other, but not always at the exclusion of some other links. When you start to, as seems to be a habit structure wanting it nailed down, wanting it put together in the process of doing that you can often wind up at the end of the day with an artificial list.

It seems to me that we all agree we want to work with faculty and administrators. We want to be developed, we want to be resources, we want to be enriched, we want to be networked. We want to learn how to be effective teachers using curricula that is appropriate for our context and culture. We want to be resourced so that we as faculty can use that curricula to reach our students for transference of education.

All of that I think we agree on. But what I'm concerned about is that in the rush to build structure, the rush to put it all together and come out of here with a model for some cultures the journey is more important, the vision is more important. The relational connection is more important than winding up with a structure. I just have a niggling concern, maybe for different

reasons, John, but I have a nigging concern that we push the technological button and we push the structure and the data analysis and the scientific method and if we are in a post modern society then we don't buy that anymore. It is the relational reality.

For some of our cultures we like to take the journey together and be networked and let the structure evolve out of that. and maybe when we go back, well I represent my school but I'm only one voice. When I go back and share the results of this conference the other voices may say well if we'd been there we would have done it this way. I think the same three elements will arise of faculty, curriculum and resource but I can't say. Out of our fourteen schools on our region there are only 3 or 4 of us represented. They may also have their concerns but I think you'll find they come in the same three areas. I would just like to make a case that we don't get too carried away with one way of setting this thing up.

Murray Sandell: Well, I recognize the need to prioritize. We just can't do everything at once. It would be nice if we could. I would like to suggest that we take the first six definitely, possibly the first eight, put them together in a purpose statement and see what we have and then we could talk. I think when we put it together we are going to see that definitely the first six items work together and blend quite nicely. Maybe the seventh and eighth introduce a new idea. But start from there. Otherwise we are going to be going back and forth, we might as well start all over again.

Al Truesdale: This is the kind of discussion we need. I want to ask Jerry to come and just speak in a very very preliminary way, that's the only way he will speak at this point, in a very preliminary way about some ideas regarding structure. Now please understand this is very preliminary.

Jerry Lambert: Thank you. I'm not sure that I will really speak about the structure of the future but more or less about where I see us as educators, as church leaders, as we are considering the overall issues that lie before us in education.

The role of the International Board of Education of course highly a role of advocacy. For many years the only education office there was in Kansas City was for the U.S. and Canada. In 1985-1989 there was a study done, the commission of higher education, that said that in the Church of the Nazarene, we want to pull together all of our educational institutions and all the roles of education so that there would be a board, there would be an officer who would really be the advocate on behalf of quality education around the world and throughout the denomination. So the Commissioner of Education was elected, and the International Board is made up of people from every region. However, that Board meets once a year and it meets before the General Board and acts on items of business that are referred from the regions, from the individual schools, from any of the agencies of the church that need to go ultimately to the General Board.

All kinds of issues of quality, of fund raising, of theological issues of relationship, to other agencies in the church, all kinds of issues, evangelism, and tying education and evangelism together all of those things are a part of the role. Fund raising is a part of the role of the International Board of Education.

One of the issues is that we don't have very much time to do anything proactive. So the IBOE becomes almost a reactive thumbs up or thumbs down to what the institutions or the church wants to do. We felt like, and this came from the studies of the Commission on Higher Education, that we needed somebody to do more than just react. We needed somebody to be proactive, somebody to place and develop roles of leadership in different parts of the world that we could move ahead in education.

Now one of the things that happens is that board and the office of the commissioner, gives you and gives the church someone to be an advocate, someone to be a representative for education at the tables of the church. I meet with the Board of General Superintendents about every three months and we have the option to present the needs that you have and be an advocate for what education is doing. I meet with the General Board. I have access to put information through from you and from the IBOE and from educational leaders.

I have the role and joy of meeting with the Division of World Mission and the Office of the Ministry to be an advocate. Those are ways that education comes through the International Board of Education. However, we meet once a year. We don't see each other for the entire year. It really is not possible for that board to carry out everything because it is primarily the role of education. So probably four years ago someone, I have no idea who the person was, suggested that wouldn't it be novel if at Headquarters the walls came down. Not the walls of the building but the walls between the agencies of the church. Instead of World Mission functioning over here as an entity of and by itself, it's wall would come down and the IBOE that is intricately involved in educational institutions in the church and around the world that we would have conversations with each other. That we would do planning and innovating, and advocacy moving as we could the resources of the church toward the educational work of the church.

Office of the Ministry is very important. The course of study is ultimately approved by Office of the Ministry and Course of Study Advisory Committee and the International Course of Study Advisory Committee. It seems like the educators and World Mission need to be sitting at the table when we talk about the curriculum and the course of study, if it is going to be approved by the General Board and passed down to us then we ought to have people at the table.

Nazarene Seminary has been involved almost as something of a resource bank. I know the office of World Mission many times will call a seminary prof from the missions department to come and write some stuff and do some things for World Mission division. I know that Dr. Bustle and Rev. Hayse were on the campus of Mount Vernon in April and Trevecca in June. So there are all kinds of things happening between all of these agencies. This is a new and wonderful day of collaboration.

Now the Resource Institute came into being for communication, for dialogue, for the opportunity to experiment with new ideas, to do fund raising. When a representative from World Mission, which has been David Hayse and whoever the World Mission theological coordinator was at the time, the Office of the Ministry, Wilbur Brannon, and the president of the seminary came to the monthly meetings we talked about the issues facing us. Some of the creative experiments going on around the world, the seven global education initiatives that you've seen really have been compiled by this kind of group that was a think tank to process what is going on and what we can do to help.

One of the things we found was that by having this Resource Institute we could go to foundations and they can give to us without feeling like they are taking sides with one denomination. The Resource Institute for international education does not identify the Church of the Nazarene. Some of the foundations have said, "Well, it doesn't look like you are a sectarian little group but you have interest and you do things out of a box." In the last three, three and one half years, resources that will, in the next year and one half, probably amount to about 2.5 million dollars for educational projects. And that has been possible I think because we had some kind of coming together of people representing different agencies of the church that did not really bear the name this is only for the Church of the Nazarene. Most of those have given

money saying, “Well, if you do something will you invite other people from other groups and will you let them participate?” A Wesleyan was to have been at this conference but was unable to come at the last minute.

The development of partnering at the international center was really the primary reason for finding a way to share the thoughts that are coming in at a typical resource of international education meeting. If the World Mission theological coordinator has been out doing something he would give a report about what was happening in that part of the world. I would give a report about what was going on in the trips that I had taken. So World Mission, Office of the Ministry and IBOE would be talking together instead of being isolated in cubicles or working on different floors of the building. We were conversing.

I don't think there ever has been a thought of this being a power group. I think we all felt it was headed by a volunteer. Al Truesdale was selected because he was coming close to retirement and was going to have some volunteer time and was willing to serve. I think actually World Mission suggested that we would have Al as the chairperson. It takes me off the spot of being in the chair and makes it more open for discussion and dialogue and it is not one of the particular agencies.

As I mentioned, the Resource Institute will give reports to the International Board of Education. I couldn't say that it is controlled by the IBOE. Education doesn't really control it because we have all of the entities at the table. We're really not talking about control issues. We are talking about shared vision, and partnering and creativity and empowerment and enablement and fundraising and those kinds of things.

For example, when Dr. Bustle and Rev. Hayse went to Mt Vernon I didn't know they were going. We share information but sometimes it is afterward. But it keeps us at the table so that

we're not far from each other. Now I don't know if the resource institute could be an umbrella that could house some of the initiatives. We know that the Board of General Superintendents got really excited about the modular course development for extension education. They were saying, "you know, we think we may be ordaining people who may not have had doctrinal teaching to the level that we really believe they need to have." They were asking, "What do we have?" So they have appointed a task force to gather information, to put together information about what is being done around the world, what levels of extension education, what modules are already in existence so we don't create more that are duplicating what is already happening. So they became involved in this one it was really initiative number 1 saying our doctrine is very, very important to us. We want to know what is being taught. Not a control issue but a resource issue. But that involves Wilbur Brannon and the Office of the Ministry. Now if we hadn't even talked, I think if Wilbur hadn't been sitting as a part of the resource institute if David Hayse and the World Mission people had not been involved, I don't think any of these things would be happening. I think we have given permission to each other just by conversing and empowering others. We had some catastrophes in different parts of the world where there would be a faculty exchange (not really an exchange) but someone would go to a part of the world without any orientation, without preparation. Some uncomfortable things happened. So the idea of an Academy that could bring orientation and preparation to do multi-cultural and multi-regional and be truly international. Those ideas really came from the grass roots but there was a table where we all sat and we could grind out these things and say what's being done well. We know what's going on in Russia and the CIS program. John Haines and those people are doing some wonderful things in modular course development and it's a place to share information.

Now whether or not that gives us some structure, I don't know but I think it is something you might want to talk about. Are there any questions about any of that. Maybe I talked too fast but are there issues or questions you have as a result? Maybe I've muddied the water.

John Haines: This is helpful. It seems that one of the questions that is bound to arise, particularly if we are wanting this to evolve more and more into something, is will there be more such meetings? I know that came up in several reports. How could we plan those and how often might they come and the regional counterparts to them which will also help to address some of the things seen as subpoints, some things are important to one region but maybe not as important to another. How can that be facilitated and do you have plans for that or thoughts.

Jerry Lambert: The Luce Foundation read about this proposal to have a global faculty and an international Academy and the man is Roman Catholic. He is director of theology for the Luce Foundation. It is a one billion dollar foundation. When he read, by the way we got in the door of that foundation because they knew about Nazarene higher education and they said, “The Nazarenes do good work in education.” So when I sat down and went over the proposal they were excited about it. In fact, the director came to Kansas City, meet with a task force which talked about what could happen, what possibilities were, but we said you know we’re not going to dictate that it has to be this, this and this. We want it to come from the grassroots. They said yes that’s what we’re interested in funding. If it comes from the schools, from the educators, not an office in Kansas City that decides what you need and does it do you whether you want it or not. They’re not interested in that and neither are we. So we went to them and they had never funded a denomination. They funded Princeton Seminary, individual schools but they were not really into denominations. The new director helped and I think two or three denominations were given money this year. The grant is a three-year grant. Most of the money, because this is a very expensive gathering as you can imagine, for a year is given to this conference with all that it takes, the preparation to make it happen. We have two years before us. Originally some of the consultants thought the next step might be regional gatherings where you would be able to sit down and do some of the same kinds of things you have done here, talk with each other, maybe

it would be long enough time that schools could process “wow this is a lousy idea” or “this is good. We need to be thinking about this.” But frankly, when you begin thinking about this kind of thing we can put this conference on cheaper than we could serve as resources for all seven regions. So we have to look for some money to go with the Luce Foundation grant. But I think I am more than willing for step number two to be co-sponsoring, working with you to sponsor regional conferences whereby you would be going closer to your grassroots and then year three it might be when we might come back to this gathering and review our priorities and look at what needs to happen next. I don’t know but I just think those are possibilities we have. We are looking for resources, particularly that relate to faculty. One of the things that is one of the seven global initiatives is training pastors as teachers. It has come up here, I don’t remember if it made your list or not, but I think it is one of the top issues we have to face. How do we train pastors as teachers. I think there is the possibility for some other funding if the regional education consultations if you were going to get down to business and start working on a training manual on how you develop your best educated pastors to be teachers in your extension programs and your other programs. I think there would be some funding to go with that because I think that is a crying need that we have to think about the development of pastors. That goes hand in hand with faculty. The pastor as teacher becomes a faculty member for that extension program so there’s no conflict of interest in that issue.

So I think as we go back home and try to think this thing through, as you come back to us and make conversation about it. I think the Lord’s going to help us do better perhaps even than we know to do.

Leah Marangu: I think we need to be very cautious on how to utilize the resources we have. I have been in a developing country and all throughout the 70’s and 80’s I know that the United Nations has been very, very generous in assisting people developing countries. What actually

ended up to be was that a lot of money was used doing conferences like this and many times it is the same people who go to those conferences. But when you look at the operation part of it, it was zero. I hope we do not use the Luce Foundation just thinking in terms of conferences and not thinking in terms of the items we have identified and how to solve those problems. We don't need many conferences to know the problems. I think we need to think very carefully whether we are going to be spending time coming to conferences or whether to spend the money solving our problems.

Al Truedale: I had really hoped this kind of discussion would occur. I think this is excellent.

Dr. Steve Weber is here. He is the director of the Jesus Film Project for the Church of the Nazarene. Jerry Lambert and Steve Weber are working very closely in looking for ways to make pastoral development and educational development a part of the Jesus Film Project. Steve, welcome and come on up. Is there anything you can share with the group? I know this is still very preliminary.

Steve Weber: Thank you for the invitation. It is true, Dr. Lambert and I have been spending quite a lot of time together. I think what I would say, basically having just heard this discussion here, just to very much verify what Dr. Lambert said, when you get into the issue of training pastors as teachers and to multiply that whole concept, there are other agencies and donors (in fact I have some good news to tell you tomorrow) this is an issue that is catching the minds and hearts of the same people who have been funding the Jesus Film. Showing this film or video as an evangelism thrust has created much excitement. The next level of that excitement, if you will, is probably for Wesleyans the most important, and that is, what do you do with the results of the film showing, which now numbers into the tens if not hundreds of thousands of converts. We are hard at work in the Jesus Film side. My job, as Executive Director, is to be involved in this kind of interaction

and to find ways to bring funding and resource together to do just what you were saying and that is the training of pastors as teachers to begin to get our arms around this incredible influx of believers into the church. So that is probably enough. I've been at this a total of two weeks so I'm a little bit dangerous at this point but I would just verify what you are saying. Thank you.

Al Truesdale: Jerry, would it be putting you on the spot, you and I have had lots of conversations about the whole issue of doctrinal coherency and of the importance of education. We are all elated with what is happening. The church is being changed from maybe being inward focused to being outward focused. The Jesus Film is doing more than just bringing in numbers. We are beginning to become even more evangelistic in some parts of the world than we were before, so there are lots of good things happening. But you and I have had conversations about concerns that we not just grow in numbers. I think the exciting thing about Steve coming on board we're in sync together in our understanding of what needs to happen in making sure that the church grows spiritually and doctrinally as well.

Steve Weber: It is true the growth in certain areas of the world is phenomenal, as compared to you go back to some of these fields 50 years and you've seen numbers in the last two years it would double those first 50 years of work. Obviously it means when you have an influx of new believers at that rate everything changes. The ability to assimilate those numbers of people into the Church of the Nazarene into a maturity of discipleship process. I think what I would say, Jerry, maybe that has not been said at least not in the last half hour that I've been here, I think the struggle that we're looking at in terms of the funding side of what we're doing, is how you tie together from the salvation experience until the person is ready for ministerial preparation or clergy training. This whole follow-up and discipleship process. What are we doing there. And I think you mentioned, the Board of General Superintendents want that studied. This is one of the areas, probably the first thing, that I personally am engaged in is to help gather up and find out

what is there because we do have funding to do more of that. I think it is so critical that second step. I mean the salvation and then the third level we've been talking about is the clergy preparation and ministerial education but there is this wide gulf in the middle. That's what needs to happen now because of the numbers of new people coming in.

The other thing I would say, it is a new day for us in terms of partnering. In the U.S. you use the word John Maxwell there are many reactions to him. But Maxwell as a philosophy of leadership but that is another dimension of this that leadership training and the types of people we need who among us would argue that we do not have sufficient numbers of leaders. So how do we get there in terms of leadership training. So these types of organizations, there's not only Maxwell but other groups, that are coming to us and saying well we understand you're partnering now as a denomination you're kind of breaking out of the box and you're willing to work with other people. Are you willing to work with us. There is a lot of different potentials for funding, for resources for other agencies that would come along, foundations, trusts, etc. It's an exciting time.

Jerry Lambert: I made a phone call last week to Focus on the Family because they have a fabulous film series in which they teach Bible history, and the demographics of the Bible land and the truth of scripture in a series from the Holy Land. I've had just enough gall to ask if Focus on the Family would not donate or make available to us at their cost this film series. It is a wonderful discipling tool and something that would really help people get ready with an overview and understanding before they would go into ministerial training. What Steve's talking about is what we've all experienced. The tremendous gulf between where a new convert is and where they need to be to begin theological studies. How do we get them there? I think that is one of the real issues we are struggling with. I don't know if Focus will do it or not but we're asking for them to help us in a partnership to make this one of the pieces, one of the resources that we could make available for discipling and getting people ready for ministerial study.

Steve Weber: One thing, Jerry, I would say that will impact all of you no matter where you are and what you are doing specifically is that it is a new day when you start talking about partnerships and this whole issue, I directed the Stewardship department for the denomination for the last 4 years and it is shifting rapidly from a united fund type of a concept the general budget, world evangelism fund, more and more to the issue of directed giving. So all of us are going to have to wrestle through that process. We're used to working with a budget, an amount of money that is provided for us, and we are pretty well free once we establish that budget to spend that money on whatever. The types of partners that I think are coming to the table, these agencies, trusts, individuals, they are wanting to be more involved in that process. So the day is rapidly changing and rapidly coming to where you have to become a funding partner even though you are out there doing the work, training people. But you have to learn to work with some of these high maintenance organizations, whether that's a trust or a foundation or an individual, and bring them along side of you at a very, frankly uncomfortable place, you'd rather do the planning and do the work and have them send the money. That day has largely passed so it will be something we will be working with in terms of the regional education coordinators of how to really get comfortable with these types of funding partners. It will be very important that we do a better job of that and then more resources would be made available.

Al Truesdale: I've known Steve Weber a long time. When I learned that he had become the executive director I felt very, very good about that. If you don't know, Steve began his career of service in the Church of the Nazarene as a missionary in Haiti. Steve thinks holistically. In reference to the Jesus Film the importance of discipleship, education, you don't have to tell Steve that all goes together. That's the way his spirit is wired.

I'm aware and have been for quite some time, that we are moving into new territory. This week we've been working in new territory. Much of what we are discussing just hasn't been mapped. So if you get that impression then you got it! We are creating some of this out of whole cloth. I find that exciting. Thank God that we have such rich resources in the church to do this kind of thing.

One more item that I would drop into the discussion. I don't know when this became an insisted upon part of the discussion, I think at least probably a year, I know at least a year ago, when we began to talk about an Academy for International Education it was made clear that the continuing life of that entity, whatever the animal may look like, would have to have on-going supervision, this would have to be one significant element supervision, it would have to have on-going supervision from world areas so that you don't just create an entity and then it is somehow run from Kansas City. But that in the on-going life of that entity, there will have to be continuing week by week , month by month discussion with persons all around the world. Now that may be through a council, through a series of councils, but the e-mail chat rooms have now made dialogue a much greater reality than ever before. We're not talking about expensive conference calls, we're talking about week by week, month by month, dialogue with the persons who help guide an institution. So we're going to have to insist on that. All of us are going to have to insist that whatever life this idea takes it is regularly infused with the contributions, the ideas, that emerge from Australia, Indonesia, Africa, you name it. Ears are going to have to be very close to the ground.

Who was it, Terry? We have to realize that this discussion goes on. This is a comma at best.