

# The Board for Theological Education

## CONTENTS

	Page
<b>Members</b> .....	350
<b>Report</b>	
Introduction and 1980-82 goals.....	351
BTE response to Resolution B-127 .....	352
Management and financial studies by Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. ....	354
The work of the Case Committee for Theological Education .....	356
The legislative plan in Support of Theological Education (STE) .....	364
Selection criteria for Holy Orders.....	367
Continuing education .....	369
Diocesan schools and other training programs .....	369
Cooperation with ethnic and ecumenical programs .....	370
Lay theological education in seminaries .....	370
Collaboration with Episcopal agencies and programs.....	371
Acknowledgement .....	371
<b>Financial Reports, 1980-82</b>	
Program Budget .....	372
Assessment Budget.....	372
Support from foundations and grants .....	372
The Conant Fund.....	373
<b>1983-85 Objectives and Goals</b> .....	373
<b>Budget Requests</b>	
Assessment, 1983-85 .....	375
Program, 1983 .....	375
<b>Special Resolutions</b>	
Support for theological education (STE).....	375
Revision of Title III, Canon 6, Sec. 2(d) and Sec. 3 .....	376
<b>Appendices</b>	
A. A list of accredited Episcopal seminaries .....	377
B. Comparative revenues and costs for Episcopal seminaries .....	379
C. Financial statistics of accredited seminaries .....	381
D. Enrollment statistics of accredited seminaries .....	385

## MEMBERS

- \*The Rt. Rev. John B. Coburn, *Chairman*
- \*Mr. Karl Mathiasen III, *Vice-Chairman*
- \*The Rt. Rev. Robert B. Appleyard
- \*Ms. Dorothy J. Brittain
- The Rt. Rev. James B. Brown
- The Rt. Rev. Robert H. Cochrane
- Mr. Joseph Davenport III
- The Very Rev. O. C. Edwards, Jr.
- \*\*Mr. L. Nelson Foxx
- \*Mrs. Nell B. Gibson

\*The Rev. Charles H. Long  
Mrs. Nancie Oyama  
\*The Rev. Rogelio A. Pantón  
Ms. Sue W. Scott  
\*\*The Rev. James Tucker  
The Rev. Edwin G. Wappler  
\*Dr. Fredrica Harris Thompsett, *Executive Director*

\*Executive Committee  
\*\*Appointed as a seminarian

## REPORT

### Introduction and 1980-82 goals

The work of the Board for Theological Education (BTE), an agency of the Church established by Canon at the 1967 General Convention in Seattle, is directed toward strengthening the quality of theological education and coordinating the efforts of institutions involved in education for ministry. Our purpose has been, and continues to be: *To strengthen and to coordinate the bonds between theological learning and ministerial leadership.*

The duties of the Board are designated in Title III, Canon 6, Sections 2 and 3. In addition, we are charged with implementation of legislation assigned to the BTE by action of General Convention. In this triennium we were instructed by the 1979 General Convention to implement Resolution B-127. This legislation approved, in principle, a form of regular financial support for accredited Episcopal seminaries, and directed the BTE in consultation with others to study the financial needs of our seminaries and bring to the 1982 General Convention a plan for funding these institutions. Our efforts over the past three years have focused upon the response to Resolution B-127, and upon the ongoing duties assigned to us by Canon.

As the BTE report to the 1979 General Convention stated, our overall objective is "to be a national theological education resource to help dioceses, seminaries, training programs and others to provide and sustain ministry for the mission of Christ's church." In working toward this objective, we have in the past triennium pursued ten primary goals:

1. Addressing critical issues in theological education for ministry, and enhancing the accountability of seminaries and other training institutions to the Church and its mission, so that informed decisions on theological education may be promoted.
2. Seeking appropriate financial support for theological education.
3. Providing statistical and analytical reports on theological seminaries, and other training institutions, to the General Convention—in order to inform the Church on current resources in theological education.
4. Studying needs and trends in theological education in order to promote interaction and cooperation among seminaries, other training institutions, and diocesan authorities.
5. Strengthening the process of selection and enlistment of candidates for Holy Orders, in cooperation with diocesan authorities and others.
6. Encouraging development of, support for, and participation in, continuing education for clergy and professional church workers, in collaboration with diocesan authorities.
7. Offering counsel and assistance to the work of the diocesan schools and other training programs.
8. Evaluating how theological education can best respond and adapt in an age in which central issues concerning preparation for ministry are changing and a new understanding of mutual ministry is emerging.
9. Promoting increased development of lay theological education within seminaries and other training institutions.
10. Working in collaboration with the Council for the Development of Ministry, the Office of Lay Ministries, the General Board of Examining Chaplains, and other appropriate national and ecumenical agencies, to affirm and support education for the total ministry of Christ's church.

The Board, as constituted by Canon, is comprised of sixteen members. Implementation of the Board's work is provided by the Executive Director of the Board for Theological Education. Throughout the past triennium the Board as a whole met twice a year, and various BTE committees met as responsibilities required. A six-member Executive Committee met annually to insure coordination and evaluation of the Board's duties. At both plenary and committee meetings, we invited into our deliberations members of the Episcopal Church Center staff, representatives of other national Church agencies and ecumenical bodies, deans of the accredited Episcopal seminaries, and consultants to the Board who were working with us on specific programs. Our working style was, and is, to share our counsel with others, and to listen and learn from persons throughout Christ's church concerning critical issues and emerging needs in theological education.

An important aspect of our work has been the preparation of reports regarding issues in theological education. These reports are intended as research and resource documents, and are distributed throughout the Church. *Copies of these documents are available through the BTE office.*

The BTE, unlike most agencies of the General Convention, has both legislative and programmatic responsibilities. Meetings of the Board are funded by the Assessment Budget, while specific programmatic aspects of the Board's work are funded through the Program Budget. In addition, the budgetary capacity of the Board was extended in the 1980-82 triennium by foundation and trust fund grants related to specific Board projects. An accounting of the Board's financial resources is shown later in this report.

In the report which follows, we have organized our summary findings and recommendations by topics related to the BTE's legislative and programmatic responsibilities. Further, we have indicated within these categories suggestions for future work.

### **BTE Response to Resolution B-127**

This section of our report summarizes the work of the Board for Theological Education over the past three years in implementing the charge given to us in Resolution B-127. The full text of this 1979 resolution is:

*Whereas*, sound theological education and training for ministry are an imperative for the discharge of our Church's mission; and

*Whereas*, it is clear that there is a great need for a more concerted and comprehensive approach to the financial support of the Church's seminaries; and

*Whereas*, the voluntary system instituted by the 65th General Convention has not succeeded in significantly increasing support for theological education; therefore be it

*Resolved*, the House of Bishops concurring, That this 66th General Convention approves in principle a form of regular support for the theological education for the ministry of the Church; and be it further

*Resolved*, That during the next triennium the Board for Theological Education, in close consultation with the Council of Deans of the Episcopal seminaries, the Executive Council, and other concerned bodies, study the financial needs of our accredited theological seminaries and bring to the 67th General Convention a comprehensive plan for the funding of these institutions, including a method for the collection and disbursement of these funds; and be it finally

*Resolved*, That in view of the inadequate response to the appeals for voluntary giving, consideration be given in the plan to a requirement that each parochial unit annually allocate a designated percentage of its non-capital income to such funding.

Resolution B-127 is deceptively simple in its language; yet it speaks of a complex set of circumstances within our denomination in regard to theological education, and to our accredited Episcopal seminaries in particular. At the heart of the realities which produced this resolution, and its subsequent referral to the BTE, was *the challenge of strengthening the partnership between the seminaries and the people of the Church*. This task was born of the necessity to act responsibly, given the facts of shrinking financial resources for seminaries and increasing expectations from various constituencies throughout the Church for diverse services and programs of theological education. Our vision of education for ministry and mission is at the core of this challenge.

We began by asking what we in the Episcopal Church need to know, to question, to believe, so that we may make responsible decisions at the 1982 General Convention and beyond.

In order to address the educational issues and face the realities of financial support for theological education in our denomination, we identified three central and overlapping areas of responsibility.

- *Assessing the financial needs.* In order to study and to provide data to the Church on the financial resources and management of the accredited Episcopal seminaries, the Board employed the independent management consulting firm of Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. (PMM&Co.).
- *Developing the case for theological education.* The Case Committee for Theological Education—a group of thirty bishops, clergy, and laity from a cross section of dioceses and parishes—was asked to write an educational document on theological education and mission which addressed the significance of the accredited Episcopal seminaries in the life of the Church.
- *Preparing the legislation.* The Financial Planning Committee of the BTE was asked to design a plan of Churchwide support for theological education and to draft appropriate legislation for the consideration of the 1982 General Convention.

These three areas of responsibility were conducted and coordinated by the BTE, which assumes final responsibility for the findings and recommendations of this report. Yet an important and central aspect of our preparation has been to work in close consultation with other individuals, groups, and institutions—both ecumenical and Episcopal. The outline, which follows, charts highlights of the activities, events, and leadership related to the response to Resolution B-127.

**In 1980:**

- The BTE, under the leadership of Bishop John Coburn, appointed Mr. Karl Mathiasen to chair the overall efforts of the *seven working committees assigned with various aspects of the response to Resolution B-127*. Work by these committees began in the spring.
- In June the BTE met with the *Council of Deans*, chaired by Dean Gordon Charlton, to accept the proposal from PMM&Co. to study the fiscal and educational resources of the accredited seminaries.
- With a grant from the *Episcopal Church Foundation*, support from each of the *seminaries*, and a matching grant from the *Lilly Endowment*, the BTE raised by August \$120,000 to cover all meetings, consulting, publication, and other expenses related to the implementation of Resolution B-127 (NOTE: the 1979 General Convention passed this resolution without budgetary support).
- BTE representatives joined in the first of several meetings with members of the *Standing Commission on Stewardship and Development*.
- For six months, between the autumn of 1980 and the spring of 1981, Dr. Alceste Pappas of PMM&Co. conducted *site visits to each seminary* to review information

from the advance data collection instruments and to further discern the needs of these seminaries.

### **In 1981:**

- Under the leadership of Dr. Marion Kellerman and Mr. Wallace Frey, the *Case Committee for Theological Education* held in February the first of two meetings (the second held in September, 1982) to address the wide range of needs and concerns existing in the Church regarding theological education.
- In the spring of 1981 the *development officers* from the accredited Episcopal seminaries met with representatives of the BTE to address the stewardship needs of these schools. This group will meet again in April of 1982.
- The *Financial Planning Committee* of the BTE, chaired by Bishop Robert Appleyard, began work in the spring to draft a legislative plan of support for theological education.
- In June the *Council of Deans* met with the BTE to review and unanimously endorse initial reports from PMM&Co. and the principles for a legislative plan.
- At the *meeting of the bishops* in October, Bishops Anderson, Appleyard, and Coburn made an initial presentation on the BTE's work in progress in support of theological education.
- Some BTE members attended *provincial meetings of Commission on Ministry representatives* in Provinces I-VII to share information and learn from their concerns about theological education.
- In November the BTE convened a meeting with *trustee representatives from all of the Episcopal seminaries* to review and revise current plans and strategies.

### **In 1982:**

- By January the final versions of *two reports on the seminaries by PMM&Co.* were published for circulation.
- In February the *Executive Council* heard and discussed a presentation on the financial, educational and legislative proposals.
- In March the BTE approved all educational and legislative materials and recommendations for presentation in the *Blue Book Report* to the 1982 General Convention.
- In the spring and summer of 1982 BTE and Case Committee members will meet, as requested, with *provincial synods, dioceses, and other groups and individuals prior to General Convention.*
- If legislation in support of theological education is passed by the 67th General Convention *work to implement legislation* begins in the autumn of 1982 and throughout 1983 in congregations and diocesan conventions.

### **Management and financial studies by Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co.**

We as a Board are confident that we have discharged our responsibility "to study the financial needs of our accredited theological seminaries." (B-127) The success of this project to provide a detailed analysis of the educational and fiscal needs of our seminaries is due to the sensitive and skilled efforts of the consulting staff from PMM&Co. as well as to the cooperation of seminary deans, their staffs and faculties. Every effort was made to portray each of the seminaries fairly and accurately, and to assess common threads and diversities across our seminary system. The two study documents prepared by PMM&Co., and endorsed by the BTE and the seminary deans, provide our denomination with information which we believe has been, and will be, instrumental in interpreting and strengthening Episcopal seminaries in the decade ahead. We are as well gratified to learn

that other denominations, impressed with these efforts, are considering similar studies of their seminary systems.

The central use of the data from the PMM&Co. reports was to supply detailed information to members of the Case Committee, the BTE, and those shaping the proposed legislation. Given PMM&Co.'s conclusion that there is a critical need for Church support of our seminaries, we were able to draft both the Case document and the legislation with renewed confidence in the mandate stated in Resolution B-127. Several other uses were made of the data. PMM&Co. sent each dean a "management letter" enumerating perceived strengths and matters for improvement. The PMM&Co. findings have already strengthened fiscal responsibility in the seminaries. The Council of Deans was also asked to explore a number of key issues which emerged as affecting the entire seminary system. The PMM&Co. documents are as well being used in the continuing education of seminary trustees, and in long range planning processes at several seminaries. The BTE also devised a single instrument for collecting fiscal and educational data from our seminaries in the years ahead.

The two studies prepared by Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. are available from the BTE office. The more comprehensive document titled, "Theological Education in Accredited Episcopal Seminaries: The Data to Support the Case for Strengthening the Partnership between Episcopal Seminaries and the Episcopal Church," contains chapters on the research methods employed, overall observations of the seminary system, and analysis of key issues, an overview of the individual seminaries, and tables of statistical data on educational and fiscal resources in these seminaries. The shorter document is titled, "A Financial Assessment of the Accredited Seminaries and Highlights from the PMM&Co. Report, Theological Education in the Accredited Episcopal Seminaries." This study describes the financial pressures and management needs of the seminaries; it is helpful in analyzing seminary financial statements, key hidden costs, and data not revealed in financial statements. The period under review for both the PMM&Co. studies was three fiscal years, 1977-80.

In this Blue Book, we have included (in Appendix B) PMM&Co. tables on comparative revenues and costs for Episcopal seminaries. We have added (in Appendices C and D) our accounting of financial and enrollment statistics for our accredited seminaries in 1980-81 and 1981-82. We refer those who wish additional statistical and analytical information, to the two PMM&Co. studies. We quote below central conclusions from the PMM&Co. documents:

"The metamorphosis of these seminaries from schools primarily for the education of seminarians for the priesthood to centers for theological education serving lay as well as ordained members of the Church in degree and non-degree programs, continues. This dynamic environment has not been communicated effectively to the Church."

"The financial pressures currently felt by the ten accredited Episcopal seminaries... are: the spiraling costs of energy; the maturing of buildings and the accompanying need for major maintenance and replacement of equipment; rising costs for new plant construction; the percentage of tenured faculty to total faculty; and the increasing costs associated with academic and other institutional support services. In addition to these economic pressures are demands from lay and ordained members of the Church for continuing extension activities, programs for lay theology, a diversified curriculum for the traditional M. Div. program, field education, experience, and the like."

"When queried, most deans estimated the mean age of the student body as somewhere between 28-32. It is critical to underscore that these students typically are married and

have children, are responsible for their families' financial support, and are often embarking on second careers. The changing nature of these seminarians has and will continue to impact on a number of vital institutional support programs such as housing and child care, scholarship assistance, and other forms of financial aid."

"We would like to sensitize those who are responsible for securing a funding base from the Church that the dollars generated will not simply enrich programs. The dollars generated from the Church will enable the seminary system: to continue to provide core academic programs for seminaries; to sustain programs for the laity; to pursue its continuing educational endeavors; and to ensure that the requisite planning and financial management components are in place. In our opinion, Church funding is a matter of survival, not a matter of enrichment."

"For most stand-alone seminaries, in excess of twenty-five percent of their total revenues for the three-year study period are attributable to tuition and fees and auxiliary enterprises. . . . We believe it is important to point out that the tuition and fees, as well as the room and board rates, are priced with the understanding that graduates of these institutions cannot be expected to bear the 'actual' cost of seminary education."

"Sixty-five percent of the seminary system's total revenues . . . are attributable to private gifts, endowment income, and other sources. These funds are often influenced by environmental factors outside the control of the boards of trustees and the deans."

"It is readily apparent that Church funding is required to ensure the continued existence of the accredited Episcopal seminaries."

### **The Work of the Case Committee for Theological Education**

The focus of the educational task carried on by the Case Committee dealt with more than monetary concerns. This Committee was asked: To clarify and tell the story of the fundamental relationships between our seminaries and our Church; to "refresh the conversation" about theological education by providing an opportunity to raise legitimate and difficult questions; and to work to develop an ongoing network of support for theological education within our denomination.

Dr. Marion Kelleran, retired professor of Pastoral Theology at the Virginia Theological Seminary, and the Rev. Wallace A. Frey, Rector of Saint David's Church, DeWitt, New York, served as co-chairs of this Committee. Other members were:

The Rt. Rev. Robert M. Anderson (Mn)  
The Very Rev. Frederick H. Borsch (NJ)  
The Rev. Josephine Borgeson (Nev)  
Ms. Dorothy J. Brittain (CNY)  
Mr. John L. Carson (Colo)  
The Very Rev. Gordon T. Charlton (Tex)  
The Rev. William R. Coats (Pgh)  
Dr. Verna Dozier (WDC)  
Mr. Harry C. Griffith (CFla)  
The Rev. Barbara Harris (PA)  
The Rt. Rev. George N. Hunt (RI)  
The Rev. Robert H. Johnson (At)  
The Rt. Rev. Edward W. Jones (Ind)  
Mr. George S. Lockwood (CamR)  
Mr. Karl Mathiasen III (WDC)  
The Rt. Rev. Gerald N. McAllister (Okla)  
Mrs. Sarah G. McCrory (USC)

The Rev. Henry B. Mitchell (MI)  
Mrs. Babette Prince (NY)  
The Rev. Hays Rockwell (NY)  
Mr. Glenn R. Simpson, Jr. (Mil)  
The Rt. Rev. William B. Spofford (WDC)  
The Rev. Edward W. Stiess (MA)  
The Rt. Rev. Furman C. Stough (Ala)  
The Rev. Roy W. Strasburger (CamR)  
Dr. Fredrica Harris Thompsett (NY)  
The Rt. Rev. Arthur A. Vogel (WMO)

Since August of 1981, illness has prevented Dr. Kelleran from being an active participant in the work of this Committee, yet her wisdom, humor, and spirit have continued to inform our deliberations. Fr. Frey has served as primary author and editor for the Case Committee. The information which follows is endorsed by the Case Committee and the Board for Theological Education.

We believe that all evidence points to the absolute necessity for the whole Church to engage in concern for, support of, and action in behalf, of the accredited seminaries. No one dean or council of deans, no group of seminary trustees, no development officers, singly or together, can alone achieve the best solution. The strengthening of theological education for the Church's mission is the issue addressed. We who read this material will begin to take the needed steps. As we choose to do so, the whole Church and its total ministry will be strengthened. Not to act is to invite a weakening of that which we cherish. We encourage you to consider your own perspectives and questions as you read the following "conversation."

"A Conversation about Theological Education and Mission  
and the Accredited Seminaries"

*We thought about writing this document in a question and answer format. We soon learned, because of questions raised, that more than two voices and perspectives were realistically involved.*

*What follows is a conversation, not a play, about basic issues and concerns.*

*The participants in the conversation are:*

- *Dr. Theo, representing the Board for Theological Education.*
- *Mrs. Arnold, parish warden.*
- *Mr. Flynn, parish treasurer.*
- *Ms. Santos, member of parish education committee.*
- *Dr. Woods, member of stewardship committee.*

*Scene: a fairly plain room in a parish hall. The space is set for a meeting of five people. Dr. Theo has already arrived. He is seated with stacks of documents about him. Other people enter the room.*

Mrs. Arnold says, "Is this the room for the discussion about theological education?"

Dr. Theo, immersed in paper, replies, "Yes, it is."

"Well," says Mrs. Arnold, "what is all that paper you have there?"

"These," says Dr. Theo, "are reports, studies, documents, charts, graphs, tables and concerns about the accredited seminaries of the Episcopal Church."

"Surely you don't expect us to wade through all that?"

"No," Dr. Theo replies, "but I have, and I thought you might find it interesting to see for yourself just how much has gone on as a result of the resolution passed by the General Convention in Denver in 1979."

Looking puzzled, Mrs. Arnold asks, "What in the world are you talking about?"

"About B-127," Dr. Theo responds.

"I was a deputy to the last General Convention but I don't recall a resolution by that title—what is it?"

"Resolution B-127 asked the Board for Theological Education to study and to bring to the General Convention in 1982 a plan for the funding of the accredited seminaries of the Episcopal Church."

The group now having seated themselves, Dr. Woods says, "Is that what all those reports are about?"

"Yes. Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co., one of the world's leading management consulting firms, has done an in-depth study of the educational, fiscal and physical resources of our accredited seminaries. Deans, faculties, development officers, students, and trustees have all contributed to a total picture of seminary education. What I hope we will do here is talk about some of the conclusions and concerns that have come out of all this work and to answer questions you may have. A valuable piece of information to begin with is that the Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. study reveals that:

*the academic and support programs in place at the ten seminaries were in fact congruent with the mission goals and objectives of those individual seminaries.*

Dr. Woods asks, "Why is this so important?"

"Because the way each seminary sets its educational goals directly informs the way in which it allocates both its financial and educational resources. No two seminaries look exactly alike. There are indeed similarities. The seminaries are alike in that they all offer a three-year course of study leading to a Master of Divinity degree, and most of their students are college and university graduates. But there is also a diversity of ways in which the seminaries seek to serve the Church. For example: in one seminary a strong program in Hispanic ministry is developing; in others there is a focus on the urban scene; others focus on isolated or small church ministries; still other seminaries have developed ambitious and far-reaching programs in continuing education for clergy, in doctoral programs, and in education for lay persons."

"All that sounds fine to me," Ms. Santos says. "Why then are we concerned about the seminaries? It seems as if all is well."

"Simply put, it is that the financial resources are not adequate to the task. Too much energy is being poured into survival, and the creative educational efforts of many of the seminaries are in danger of being deferred and sidetracked as the funding base decreases and costs escalate."

Mr. Flynn leans forward, saying, "Let's slow down a bit so that I am sure of the basic facts. I have a question. Ten seminaries seem a lot for a denomination our size. Why so many?"

"Good question and one that troubles many people. Each seminary of this Church came into being with a desire to be a place for sound education and spiritual development, and to strengthen the unique Anglican witness to solid biblical learning, to the rich traditions of the Church, and to the light of reason. Each seminary that exists today has a strong desire to live, grow, and serve, and one additional seminary is seeking accreditation. It is true that the question about the number of seminaries has been a focus of debate. Mergers have, in past years, taken place. Bexley Hall moved from Gambier, Ohio to join Colgate-Rochester in Rochester, New York; Berkeley Divinity School became affiliated with Yale University Divinity School in 1971; and, most recently, the

Philadelphia Divinity School and the Episcopal Theological School merged into the Episcopal Divinity School, located in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Some people believe that we, as a Church, would do better to have a smaller number of larger seminaries. Other people argue that it is best for the Church's mission to maintain our present ten accredited seminaries as they are, located fairly strategically around the country—where they can offer choices in the style of theological education and serve as regional centers for scholarship training. And, quite important, their small size enables them to give close attention to the individual student. There is nothing, however, in our present study or in the proposed plan for funding that would preclude a continuing discussion and study of this issue.

"Have you more to say on this?"

"Yes, I am bold to suggest that, through a greater involvement and responsibility on the part of Church members, there will be a significant increase in both support and interest in the accredited seminaries. The facts are before us: Unless the people of the Church support the accredited seminaries, some will fail. A plan for basic support is just that—basic—not luxury. There is no magic here. Seminary personnel, to be sure, have their active responsibility, but more of us at the parish level must become concerned and involved."

Dr. Woods asks, "Are you saying that the question of the number of seminaries will finally be settled by the people of the Church through the way they support individual schools?"

"Exactly. It will be done by the people of the Church, not by any national board, nor even by the General Convention itself."

Mrs. Arnold adds, "I find that interesting. That would mean that the seminaries which this parish supports would be responsible for interpreting themselves to us and at least listening to our concerns regarding what they are doing. I believe this discussion may have answered my question—I was under the impression that our Church already funded the seminaries—I gather that is just not so."

"You gather correctly. The official national Church Budget gives *nothing* to the seminaries. As one bishop has pointed out, 'There are funds in existence to aid seminarians, none to aid seminaries.' We should certainly be grateful to all those persons, parishes, and missions who have generously supported the seminaries through the Theological Education Sunday Offering and gifts to seminary endowments, but the fact remains that a *totally voluntary* system of seminary support is not sufficient.

"Many seminaries have had to invade their endowment to meet current expenses. Deferred maintenance in the seminaries cannot be deferred forever. Development officers, along with deans, faculty, students and alumni/ae, have worked, talked, and traveled in support of the seminaries. But no matter how much effort they put forward, it will never be enough unless the full membership of the Church becomes part of the support structure. Our brothers and sisters in the Lutheran, Methodist, and Baptist denominations have a much better track record than do we. Yet we continue to hold high expectations for excellence, disciplined minds, and spiritual depth. If we truly are committed to these ideals, then we had best get about the task of assuring their vitality."

Ms. Santos, who has been silent through most of the discussion, now asks, "Much of what has been said I find of interest, but there are other things that trouble me. For example, diocesan schools have been mentioned. Why not do our training for ordained ministry in these centers? They are close to home—there are more 'hands on' possibilities in such a setting—I'd like to hear something on this area."

Dr. Theo responds, "At the beginning, let me say that I do not see the accredited seminaries and diocesan schools and other training centers as necessarily competitive. The

educational range among these programs is diverse. The majority of persons affiliated with such programs are lay people gathered to strengthen the educational foundations of their ministries. There are also schools and programs which provide focused educational training for deacons, or for ethnic ministries, or for persons in isolated areas. To the extent that some of these programs are involved in pre-ordination training, they are supplementing at the local level educational resources which may, or may not, be provided at the accredited seminaries.

“There are other related issues. For example, many of the faculty for the unaccredited schools are drawn from accredited seminary graduates. Many of the books and other resources are produced by the faculty and graduates of the accredited seminaries. There is also a danger that, if all education were to take place at the local or diocesan level, we might lose the breadth of vision that is typical of our Church. I believe that the challenges of the decades ahead will demand excellence in leadership, and ministerial skill of the highest caliber.”

As a person interested in education at the parish level, Ms. Santos asks, “Other than the specific training of deacons and priests, are there other ways the seminaries relate to the local parish?”

“Yes, there are—for example, the new Church’s Teaching Series. When the need arose for an updated basic parish teaching series, the Church turned for its primary resource to the faculties of the accredited seminaries. The task of the seminaries is to serve the whole Church. The seminaries do much more than prepare persons for ordained ministry.

“If you will allow me,” Dr. Theo continues, “I’d like to add one other item related to the diversity of educational resources.”

“Go ahead,” the group responds.

“Some people who have looked at the Episcopal seminaries believe that we should place greater emphasis upon having our seminarians attend one of the major ecumenical theological centers. In fact, a number of students attend accredited schools affiliated with other denominations. Our point of view is that the Episcopal Church needs to have centers where the particular Anglican/Episcopal ethos can flourish and grow. I would go so far as to say that the whole Christian church would be impoverished if we lost that Anglican education and perspective. Most of our Episcopal seminaries are in relationship with major ecumenical centers or institutions and that is a good thing! Our appreciation of ecumenicity and Christian unity does not contradict our clear need of centers for Anglican scholarship, education, and priestly formation.”

“You sound convinced about what you are saying,” says Mr. Flynn.

“Good, because I am,” responds Dr. Theo.

“Well, let me touch on something we haven’t said anything about.”

“Fine.”

“Maybe not so fine. It is a problem, maybe a complaint. I’m not all that pleased with what I have heard about some of our seminaries; and what may be even more distressing, I am not fully satisfied with their graduates. Some clergy just don’t seem to know enough about running a parish.”

“Those are fair comments,” responds Dr. Theo. “They are difficult to address because of the feelings and emotion attached—let’s see if some wrestling will help.

“Rumor is a difficult thing to trace and even more difficult to correct. It is rumored that there are seminaries where there are no required courses. It is rumored that there is a seminary where no course in Bible is required. The fact is that these are just that—rumors, not truth. Such stories result from lack of accurate and recent information regarding curriculum and from how statements of requirements are communicated. The

seminaries need to more clearly communicate their goals for mission and ministry and to be clear that *all* the seminaries, while ordering their curricula in different ways, do require competence in academic and pastoral areas for graduation. We, on the other hand, need to be careful before we embrace each rumor. The fact is that no school is perfect, but that each accredited seminary is teaching in the canonically required areas of study. Each seminary faculty has high standards, and each school is aware of its primary goal to serve the Church in the careful preparation of people for a variety of ministries.

"Don't get me wrong. Like any institution, seminaries can be improved. But it is doubtful if they will be helped by a Church which does not work to support them and which is in too little dialogue with them.

"Your second question about preparation for running a parish gives serious pause. One person has said that the Church is the only institution that expects its schools to graduate fully qualified branch managers. We need to ask ourselves some tough questions. Where do the people come from who seek ordained ministry in the Church? Do they not come from us? Are they not recommended by their parish, their bishop, their Commission on Ministry, their Standing Committee? Is the seminary too often blamed for 'not doing its job' as a way of getting us off the hook?

"You are concerned about adequacy in running a parish. Someone else is concerned with the depth of biblical, historical, and liturgical knowledge. We ask the seminaries to do all things and, in three years, they cannot fill every expectation! Some persons want emphasis on 'practical courses'; others want focus on academic and spiritual matters. No one can graduate from an accredited seminary in three years completely skilled in all things. If we refuse to face this fact, then it is easy to turn on the seminary and declare it and its students deficient. Clergy, parishes, dioceses, seminaries, and other institutions of the Church are, together, responsible for post-seminary training.

"You mean," says Mrs. Arnold, "that we must be aware of the need for training beyond seminary graduation."

"Exactly. A Master of Divinity degree simply states that a level of basic competence has been reached. The many pastoral, administrative, liturgical, and personal skills—the gifts that God has given the individual person—are to be developed, highlighted, and honed, by and through the Church. There is clearly a need for continuing education, and for learning on the job."

Mrs. Arnold responds, "I'm not sure I ever saw it that way before; I want to give it more thought."

"Do that. Other questions?"

"Yes," says Ms. Santos, "I've read someplace that there are too many clergy. Why should we continue to educate persons for ordained ministry if that is so?"

"Let's look at it this way. There are, depending on your perspective, too many or too few ordained persons."

"How is that possible?"

"If you want to put the focus only on fully-stipended parish clergy, a case might be made for an over-supply. But if you focus more broadly on the mission of the Church, there is indeed an under-supply in many areas of the Church's ordained ministry. There are places in the urban scene, in rural areas, and in small towns, among minority groups, in some institutional settings, which are seeking trained and qualified ordained persons. The Church needs to begin to see and support new forms and new ways for ordained ministers to function. Some of our current seminarians will serve in parishes, but many others will exercise their ministry in prisons, hospitals, teaching, and in ways we cannot now even imagine. The form and shape of ordained ministry is changing. What we do know is that men and women believe they are called by God to serve the Church as

ordained persons. Diocesan Commissions on Ministry continue to send to seminary persons presenting themselves for ordination and/or being raised up by communities within the Church. None of us may know exactly what to make of this beyond the fact that, if this is the action of God's spirit, can we but respond?"

Mrs. Arnold asks the following question, "You have just mentioned the area of minority persons and the lack of ordained people who are minorities in our church. This upsets me. What about the Church's concern for the education of minority members?"

"That is a tough question," Dr. Theo says, "and one that I will try to be as clear about as I am able. The accredited seminaries have recently begun to shape programs to address education for ministry in areas of undersupply. For example, the Episcopal Theological Seminary of the Southwest, in Austin, Texas, is developing a major program for Mexican and Latin American persons. The Church Divinity School of the Pacific, in Berkeley, California, has focused on the Pacific Basin and Asian-Americans. Seabury-Western is now affiliated with the Native American Theological Association, and Bexley Hall has a specific program in black ministries. The General Theological Seminary is placing emphasis on urban ministry, and is strengthening its procedures for recruiting minority students. The seminaries recognize that all these areas need to be further expanded and developed. In the past three years significant progress has been made and will continue to be made—if adequate support is available and assured. In other areas of mission, both Seabury-Western and Nashotah House place emphasis upon small church ministry. Virginia has a significant program of continuing education for clergy, and Sewanee, through its extension program, Education for Ministry, has had and continues to have a profound impact on theological education for laity. Doctor of Ministry degrees are offered in three of our seminaries, and other schools offer advanced and doctoral programs. These specific examples illustrate how the demands of the Church on the seminary have changed over the years. It has been *in response* to the mission of the Church for urban, minority, rural ministry, continuing education for clergy and lay persons, needs in Hispanic ministry, Asian-American ministry, and graduate education, that the seminaries are serving the Church. It is true that these responses on the part of the accredited seminaries may not be, in every way, perfect. The schools are increasingly attentive to meeting multiple demands for educational programs."

Dr. Woods, who has been chairing the group, breaks in to say, "Time is getting on, and there are still some things I want to clarify. First, are you telling us that there is no accredited seminary of our Church that is adequately funded for the years ahead?"

"I am saying just that. In the judgment of Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co., 'It is readily apparent that Church funding is required to ensure the continued existence of the accredited Episcopal seminaries.'"

"Second, you're saying, if I listened correctly, that there has to be both financial involvement and substantial interest on the part of the parishes of this Church in our seminaries, *and* that one leads to the other?"

"Exactly."

"And do you also say that, if this takes place, it will mean that the seminaries will try to communicate more clearly with the Church at the diocesan and parish level?"

"Right again."

"One more question. Why not just have a Churchwide capital fund drive for theological education and let it go at that?"

"There is more than one answer to that question. First, a capital fund drive may be appropriate within some of these institutions. That would be for each seminary to determine. Second, the need we are here addressing is for *ongoing basic financial support and dialogue* between the Church and the Church's seminaries in order to strengthen our relationship. Other questions?"

“Yes,” Ms. Santos responds, “I’ve been thinking about something said earlier. It suddenly dawned on me that I am part of an Education for Ministry program. Week by week I read their educational material, and I now just realized that without one of our accredited seminaries, this program would not exist; and, further, that it is quite a new program.”

Dr. Theo, smiling, says, “A good example of ‘new occasions bring new duties.’ There is a growing desire on the part of clergy and laity for continuing theological education. Where do we turn for resources, courses, faculty, etc.? The answer, in part, is to the accredited seminaries and to their faculties and graduates.”

“You’ve been good about responding to our questions,” Dr. Woods comments. “Would you like the opportunity for ‘sum-up?’”

“Thank you, I would,” Dr. Theo responds. “We as a Church are confronted with information from the Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. study, which tells us that our accredited seminaries are in difficult financial shape; and when we look ahead, the fiscal situation of each school must be called precarious; no one school is amply funded; some are only marginally funded. There is no easy capital-fund-quick-fix for these problems.

“It is increasingly clear that the membership of the Episcopal Church needs to wrestle with its educational and spiritual ideals, and having professed them, to find practical ways to support those ideals. Do we want an ordained ministry of word and sacrament to be learned, caring people solidly grounded in the biblical witness, Christian liturgy, Anglican spirituality? Do we want thriving and alive centers for the training of both laity and clergy in a deepening of Christian ministry? Do we continue to believe that our particular Anglican/Episcopal perspective has something to offer the Christian world? Do we care that scholars among us can develop? The answers to these questions and others like them will form and shape theological education and ministry in our Church for years to come.

“What lies ahead of all of us, if we are truly called to be partners in shaping theological education—ministry for mission in our Church for years to come—is a *mutual task*. The seminaries are not separate sections of the Church, nor is the Church apart from the seminaries. We are all, in fact, the Church, called to serve the living Lord in speaking and living out the gospel. This is a ministry within which the seminaries have their role to play. The seminaries are *not* the whole of the educational process, but they do have a vital and lasting place within our Church’s educational systems. In the grounding in scripture, in the preservation and passing on of a lively tradition, in wrestling with ethical and moral decisions, and in learning to perceive the actions of God in this world, the seminaries assist in the never-ending task of ordering from chaos. Our mutual task is to address the issues and face the realities of financial support for theological education and training within our Church—not in a contentious way but in the power of the Spirit—trusting in the One who orders and makes new.”

#### *Summary Statements*

- The primary case for theological education is that the Church needs the theological learning that is the work of the seminaries. The Anglican tradition, with the emphasis on scripture, tradition, and reason, has helped to form our identity.
  - The seminaries not only continue the study and the enlivening of the Anglican theological tradition, they are also the centers for the spiritual formation of the persons in ministry. Distinctive Anglican forms of spirituality can best be developed within Anglican community life.
  - We are perplexed by the issue of the seminaries’ accountability to the Church and our participation in their lives. We do know that the relationship must be clear and that we must be more responsible to each other; the seminaries and the Church have work to do to ensure the viability of that relationship.
-

- Even as we speak of them, seminaries are changing, responding to new challenges—including lay theological education—and they must change if they are to be centers of excellence, and places where our best scholars will thrive and feed us.

- It is not only true that the Church needs the seminaries, it is also true that the seminaries need the Church. They need the Church, not simply for financial support, but for a continuing dialogue that will better allow them to fulfill their function as places that help prepare us all—not only to know but to live the Gospel.

### **The legislative plan in Support of Theological Education (STE)**

The ten accredited Episcopal seminaries exist as independent institutions in our Church; their primary goal is to provide sound theological education and training for ministry. Unlike seminaries of other major denominations, our Episcopal seminaries receive *no* national budgetary support from the denomination they seek to serve. Most Episcopalians are unaware of this and are therefore surprised to learn that each of the seminaries is not only responsible for raising funds for capital needs, but also for raising funds necessary for its day-to-day operation.

Since the 1940's General Conventions have recommended that a voluntary collection, the Theological Education Offering (TEO), be taken in every congregation on one Sunday each year, and that this offering be given to the seminary of the donor's choice. The 1976 General Convention set the goal of support of theological schools as 1½% of the net disposable income of each parish and mission. Despite the efforts of those congregations who have adopted this policy as their own, income from this voluntary system has failed in significantly increasing funding for our seminaries; in 1980-81 it provided only 4% of total seminary revenue. The average Episcopalian spends less today on theological education than on one newspaper.

This legislation addresses the challenge of mobilizing Churchwide support of our theological schools. We face the need to raise funds for seminary operating expenses, and thereby to assist those institutions which play a vital role in the education of ordained and lay leadership.

The Financial Planning Committee of the BTE, charged with formulating a plan for providing financial assistance to our seminaries, reviewed data from the PMM&Co. studies on seminary financial needs. It considered funding strategies used in other denominations, and the basic principles and structures for stewardship in our denomination. This Committee also learned from the experience of the Province of the Pacific, which in 1980 passed a resolution in support of theological education. After designing and testing with others throughout the Church several legislative options, the Committee and the BTE are recommending to the 67th General Convention a plan which is in accord with that currently used in most dioceses of Province VIII.

The policy we propose is based upon *congregational participation*—not upon the disbursement of funds from the national Church budget, nor upon the establishment of a new national fund-raising agency. We believe that support for theological education, and in particular for the accredited Episcopal seminaries, is the responsibility of the whole Church working through her parishes and missions. For the first time dioceses and congregations throughout the Church are being asked to establish a policy which will assure financial support for theological schools.

The full text of this legislative plan in support of theological education is:

### **SUPPORT FOR THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION (STE)**

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That the 67th General Convention:

**A.** Responding to the action of the 66th General Convention, which approved in principle a form of regular support for theological education and instructed the Board for Theological Education in consultation with others to bring to this Convention a comprehensive plan for the funding of the accredited Seminaries of the Episcopal Church, now directs each parish and mission of the several Dioceses within the fifty states of the United States to give annually at least 1% of its previous year's net disposable budgeted income (item E less line 1754 of the Annual Parochial Report) to one or more of these accredited Seminaries;

**B.** That to implement this action, this General Convention directs each Diocese as defined above in Item A to adopt a procedure by Resolution of its Convention, or by other appropriate means, which will assure that each parish and mission annually contributes at least this 1% of the support of one or more of the accredited Seminaries of the Church; this procedure to be adopted as soon as possible and by no later than January 1, 1984, and to be reported to the Board for Theological Education for presentation to the next General Convention;

**C.** That each accredited Seminary of the Episcopal Church be directed to submit an annual report to the Board for Theological Education of its income from the parishes and missions of the Church;

**D.** That each of these Seminaries, through and together with the Council of Deans, presents to the Board for Theological Education for each General Convention a report regarding its mission and goals, and progress in fulfilling them;

**E.** That these Seminaries and the Council of Deans assume more responsibility for strengthening the partnership between the Church and its Seminaries and for improving the dialogue with congregations and Dioceses by providing them with current information about the Seminaries and listening to their concerns regarding theological education;

**F.** That Dioceses, parishes and missions be encouraged also to support other programs and institutions of theological education that are of importance to their educational and missionary goals;

**G.** That this General Convention requests the Presiding Bishop to continue to designate one Sunday each year as Theological Education Sunday, to be observed at that time or some other appropriate day by all parishes and missions as an occasion for interpreting the work of the Episcopal Seminaries and other programs for theological education.

We have included the following information to further explain this resolution. The goal for annual congregational support of theological schools is *at least one percent* of the net disposable budgeted income for each parochial unit. Many of the congregations that have been generous supporters of the seminaries see this percentage as a minimum, and several are already happily exceeding one percent. Revenue now realized from parish sources is approximately \$670,000. Should all parishes and missions participate in this plan, the approximate total revenue (based on available 1980 figures for item E less line 1754 of the Annual Parochial Report) would be \$4,374,000. This increase would allow the seminary system to count on a funding base of closer to 25% rather than 4% of the seminaries' already lean and limited budgets. Fund-raising efforts for capital needs, other major gifts and grants, and improvement of current programs will continue in the schools. The funding generated from the Church would be used for daily operating expenses, including core academic programs, programs for the laity, continuing education endeavors, and the requisite planning and management components. We agree with the PMM&Co. report that, "Church funding is a matter of survival, not a matter of enrichment." If the people of the Church take this situation seriously and decide to alter it, they can revive the seminaries by feeding them with financial resources *and* can insist

of them that they improve their capacity to address the theological education needs of the people of the Church.

This resolution is directed to apply in dioceses of the 50 United States, not to overseas or missionary jurisdictions. We encourage people of these dioceses to support the theological schools in their regions which are training for indigenous ministries. The intent of this legislation is *not* to divert funding from these regions to support schools in the United States.

In paragraph B, each diocese is asked to adopt by action of its diocesan convention, or by other measures (one diocese is currently considering a revision of its canons), a policy which will assure regular support of theological schools. The exact policy may well vary from diocese to diocese, depending on what is considered the easiest and most appropriate method for collecting and disbursing monies for our seminaries. In most instances where this plan is currently in effect, funds are sent directly from the parochial unit to the seminary(s) of choice. We are requesting that each diocese implement this resolution no later than January of 1984, and report the nature of its policy in support of theological education to the BTE. On the basis of this information, the BTE will report to the 1985 General Convention on these diocesan policies.

Information on the overall amount of funds generated through this plan, and on their distribution among the several seminaries, will be collected by the BTE, as provided for in paragraph C, and published in BTE reports to successive General Conventions.

Paragraph D speaks to the need to communicate accurate, current information and a progress report on the mission and goals of our seminaries. To strengthen this accountability between the Church and her seminaries, we are also requesting, in a separate resolution, that the responsibility for providing information on mission and goals be established in Canon. In addition, the BTE will continue to report statistical data on seminary finances and enrollment.

We are convinced that dialogue between the Church and our seminaries should continue in the years ahead. Thus, in paragraph E, the seminaries and the Council of Deans are asked to provide information to congregations and dioceses and to listen to their concerns.

We are well aware that the accredited Episcopal seminaries do not, cannot, and should not fulfill all of the needs for theological education in our Church. Diocesan schools, indigenous training programs, accredited seminaries of other denominations, and interdenominational schools provide educational resources which are unique and which the Church needs also to support.

Finally, in paragraph G we request that Theological Education Sunday (TES) continue to be observed as an educational occasion for interpreting the work of our theological schools.

We believe that the combined provisions of this resolution will provide the Church with the most appropriate means for assuring regular financial support for theological education.

In addition, we recommend revision of Title III, Canon 6, Sec. 2(d) and Sec. 3.

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That Title III, Canon 6, Sec. 2 (d) and 3, be amended as follows:

Sec. 2 (d). To compile and present to each regular meeting of the General Convention *both a complete statistical report of the work of educational and financial data and a statement of mission and goals, and progress in fulfilling them*, for each of the several *accredited* Theological Seminaries of the Church, and, as far as possible, ~~of~~ *for* other institutions for the training of persons for Holy Orders.

Sec. 3 It shall be the duty of each *accredited* Theological Seminary of this Church, and, *as far as possible*, of each other institution for the training of persons for Holy Orders, to present ~~annually~~ to the Board for Theological Education *both* statistical reports, *and a statement of mission and goals, and progress in fulfilling them*, on forms prepared and provided by the Board.

The intent of this resolution is threefold: to add to the BTE's canonical duties responsibility for collecting descriptive information on our accredited seminaries; to canonically require seminaries to provide information on their mission and goals; and to report to successive General Conventions information which can assist in strengthening accountability between the Church and her seminaries.

In both of these resolutions it is important to note that the North American accrediting agency for theological seminaries (there are as well regional accrediting associations) is the Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada (ATS). The standard reference to *accredited* seminaries is to those schools accredited by the ATS, based on specific educational and ecumenical standards that each school must meet, and upon a regular review of each school by the ATS to insure that these standards are maintained. There are currently ten accredited Episcopal seminaries, and another Episcopal school is nearing accreditation (cf. Appendix A).

In the ensuing triennium, the BTE will continue to strengthen relationships, and accountability, between the seminaries and the people of the Church. We will provide statistical and analytical reports to the General Convention on these schools, address critical issues raised in the PMM&Co. studies and by the Case Committee, and in other ways work toward encouraging the long-term health of institutions preparing men and women for ordained and lay leadership. With specific reference to implementation of the plan for support of theological education, we will provide general information on theological schools; encourage continuing dialogue among seminaries, dioceses, and congregations; continue to work in coordination with the seminaries, trustees, and the Council of Deans on development needs; and report to the 1985 General Convention on the nature and success of policies related to funding of our accredited seminaries.

### **Selection criteria for Holy Orders**

A second major area of the Board's work in the past triennium was related to our canonical mandate to "assist in the enlistment and selection of candidates for Holy Orders." In 1979 we published a report, "Selection, Screening, and Evaluation of Applicants for Holy Orders," which surveyed procedures in use by dioceses of the Church for selecting persons for ordained ministries. This document was reprinted twice in this triennium and distributed in multiple copies to diocesan Commissions on Ministry (COMs). In this report we made only an initial assessment of the diverse patterns relating to criteria for Holy Orders. Over the last three years our attention has focused upon learning more about criteria for ordained ministries and the processes by which these criteria are employed. To carry out a thorough study of this area, the Board established a five-member Committee on Selection Criteria chaired by Ms. Sue Scott, and employed Ms. Margaret Fletcher Clark as project manager and author for the forthcoming document titled, "We Need People Who \_\_\_\_\_: An Exploration of Criteria for Ordained Ministries in the Episcopal Church." The Booth Ferris Foundation assisted in funding for this research. The report is intended for use by diocesan COMs, bishops, standing committees, and other participants in the selection process. It does not call for a legislative response by the 1982 General Convention—thus we include here only an outline of topics covered.

We begin by asking whom we need as ordained ministers to meet the challenges of the coming decade. There were many participants in this quest to gather, sort, and re-convey our common wisdom: diocesan COMs provided their statements on selection criteria, and two representative COMs met with us in plenary sessions; we requested information (for the first time) from diocesan psychological examiners through a survey instrument; and a variety of institutions, groups, caucuses, ethnic desks, and agencies for developing and supporting ministry—numbering 19 in all—shared their experience and assessment of selection criteria. We soon learned that there was no widespread agreement on stated criteria. There was some repetition in the categories of criteria, but no underlying consensus. We then organized the study into four chapters: three focusing on major families of respondents, and the last on overarching concerns.

In a chapter on selection criteria in use by Commissions on Ministry, we look at all available criteria from three different perspectives: criteria grouped by subject area, criteria related to ten models for parish ministry, and criteria sorted in accord with differing stances toward ordination. We conclude with reflections on how a COM might use these perspectives as aids to bring into focus its own operating criteria.

The experience of diocesan psychological examiners is the topic of another chapter. Here we include a general picture of our respondent's participation in the selection process, and then highlight the trends we found as they responded to criteria regarding maturity, authority, sexuality, and coping skills. We also raise questions regarding the implications of their work for COMs.

In a chapter on "Diversities and Particularities," we identify concerns of groups that represent minorities, and focus on special ministries (including those who minister on the urban scene and those who represent sparsely populated areas). We also explore tensions between traditional and transitional ministries.

In the final chapter we reflect on important factors that we believe underlie the formulation of criteria. We look at issues relating to criteria for indigenous ministries in urban areas, second career ministries, and ordination for special ministries; we also address issues related to recruiting, and explore ways in which COMs may function as advocates (not adversaries) of those persons seeking ordination. Throughout the report, specific suggestions are made for the use of this information, and a separate comprehensive use guide is included.

We believe that our report on selection criteria is a significant resource for persons engaged in the selection process because of its thorough analysis, its developmental format and accompanying use guide, and its discussion of the challenges facing current selection practices. Copies of the report will be sent in the summer of 1982 to diocesan bishops, psychological examiners, and COM chairs. Additional copies will be available from the BTE office.

In this triennium the Board also worked with individual COMs who were seeking advice on various aspects of selection. We have participated and provided resource information in provincial meetings of COM representatives convened by the Council for the Development of Ministry (CDM).

On the basis of these experiences and the findings of our report, the Board has become increasingly concerned about the sometimes cumbersome, sometimes abrasive, impact of selection processes. In the ensuing triennium we wish to address, in cooperation with diocesan authorities, possible ways of simplifying selection procedures; to work with COMs in interpreting the material on selection criteria; to engage, in coordination with the CDM, in reflection upon the work of COMs, now in their tenth year; and to continue to raise concern for recruitment needs in areas of ministry where there is an undersupply.

### **Continuing education**

Another canonical emphasis of the BTE during the past three years was the promotion of continuing education. This work was directed by a Board Committee on Continuing Education, chaired by the Rev. Charles H. Long. We began the triennium by sponsoring a Consultation for Diocesan Continuing Education Supervisors in Provinces V-VIII (held in April of 1980 in Scottsdale, Arizona) to learn from and address the concerns of diocesan leaders. A similar consultation had been held for Provinces I-IV in 1978. These consultations pointed us to the need to review current policies, practices, and resources available at the diocesan level for the continuing education of clergy and laity. We accordingly began work on three research projects. The first focused on an evaluation of the current status of diocesan continuing education, and was based on a BTE survey, completed by 84% of diocesan bishops. Our report on this subject was published in the spring of 1982 under the title: "Continuing Education in Episcopal Dioceses: A Creative Ferment," by H. Barry Evans. This document is available from the BTE office. An action/research project was also initiated by the Board under the auspices of the Alban Institute, with funding assistance from the Episcopal Church Foundation. This study, still in progress, surveys the engagement of clergy, congregations, and bishops in continuing education. It is entitled, "Priest and Parish, Learning and Growing Together." As we also received repeated inquiries about clergy sabbaticals, we are pleased to be sponsors of an ecumenical research project, directed by the Trinity Institute, on sabbatical programs, individual sabbatical experiences, and problems encountered during and after sabbaticals. Publication of this study is planned for spring of 1983.

As a result of this research it is apparent that the necessity to provide for the continuing education of the Church's leadership is widely accepted in principle, that dioceses spent a half-million dollars on continuing education in 1980, and that national funding through the BTE for continuing education grants is no longer an urgent need.

It is also true that there is no general agreement about the definition of "continuing education," that there are dioceses who do not yet make any provision for continuing education, that continuing education is still considered by many to be a private option rather than a professional necessity, that funding for the continuing education of lay persons is still in short supply, that there is apathy and lack of motivation among many clergy to undertake intentional continuing education of any sort, and that there needs to be more sharing of information and evaluation of the various programs of continuing education now available.

We therefore recommend that for the next triennium the BTE promote continuing education for clergy and laity by coordinating exchange of information among diocesan Supervisors of Continuing Education, by developing a directory of resources, and by initiating action/research projects that directly address attitudes hindering active participation in continuing education.

### **Diocesan schools and other training programs**

In 1979 the Board published a study and catalogue of diocesan schools and programs, "Paths to Ministry, Some Alternatives in Theological Education." We have not revised this text, although there have been changes in leadership and direction in some of the alternative schools. The central, and increasing, emphasis in most of these schools is upon providing resources for lay theological education. In those institutions which offer pre-ordination training, efforts are directed toward education for the renewed diaconate, non-stipendiary ministries, the special ministries provided for under Title III, Canons 8 and 10, and ministries of Native Americans.

---

In the past three years we have concentrated our efforts in working with members of these schools through the auspices of Educators and Trainers for Ministry (ETM). This association was formed in 1980 "to promote and support alternatives in theological education in the Episcopal Church." The work of ETM is carried on through a newsletter and by annual conferences. Conference themes have focused on: "Partnership in Theological Education" (in 1980, presented by James Fenhagen); "Innovations in Training for Ministry" (in 1981, with John Vincent); and the 1982 conference will discuss the BTE's plan of support for theological education (STE), criteria for evaluating lay education, and the role of volunteers in society. We are pleased that the BTE has been able to participate in these meetings and that we have been able to provide regular budgeted support to ETM. We will continue, in the next triennium, to offer counsel and assistance to ETM.

### **Cooperation with ethnic and ecumenical programs**

The first Board meeting of this triennium was convened in joint session with the Consultation on Black Ministries, held in Atlanta in November of 1979. While the Board had granted funds for this event, we were also beneficiaries of the Consultation's wisdom on recruitment, education, and deployment for Black ministries. Collaboration has continued and we now have a BTE member serving with the newly formed National Task Force on the Recruitment, Training, and Deployment of Black Clergy in the Episcopal Church. In 1982 the Board sponsored a meeting between representatives of the Instituto Pastoral Hispano and leaders from four northeastern dioceses, to explore cooperative efforts in selecting and training Hispanic applicants for ordained ministries. We have as well continued to make annual grants to the Fund for Theological Education, an ecumenical agency which gives fellowships to outstanding Black, Hispanic, and other ministerial students in Master of Divinity and doctoral programs. Our advocacy on, and work in, these areas of ministry development has only begun.

Two major ecumenical events captured our attention and support over the past triennium. We sent an Episcopal deputation and provided funding assistance to the U.S./Canadian Consultation on the Future of Ministry, held in Toronto in October of 1980. This meeting, sponsored by the National Council of Churches of Christ, focused on ecumenical resources in "a changing world, changing churches and changing ministries." In July of 1982 Board members, along with representatives of several Episcopal seminaries, participated in a North American Consultation on Global Solidarity. This event was convened by the Programme on Theological Education of the World Council of Churches. Justice, peace, racism, and liberation issues in North America and throughout the world were central areas of concern; recommendations from this Consultation were aimed at encouraging global perspectives in theological education.

During the last five years, the Board has participated in an ecumenical project of the Alban Institute, focusing upon long-range planning in Protestant theological education. The director of this project is Dr. John C. Fletcher, whose recent study, "Trends in the Futures of Theological Seminaries," assesses the impact of demographic, environmental, and educational factors on the long-term health of theological schools.

In the ensuing triennium, our goal is to promote the inclusion of racial, ethnic, ecumenical, and global perspectives within institutions of theological education.

### **Lay theological education in seminaries**

Several of the accredited Episcopal seminaries encourage the admission of students pursuing lay vocations. To address the needs of this constituency, the Board for

Theological Education, the Council for the Development of Ministry, and the Office of Lay Ministries have jointly sponsored the Task Force on Seminarians Intending Lay Vocations. An assessment of this collaborative work in the past triennium and of future directions for the Task Force is given under the "Seminarians Intending Lay Vocations" section of the CDM Blue Book report.

### **Collaboration with episcopal agencies and programs**

In the past triennium, we continued to join our efforts wherever appropriate with other agencies and programs in the Episcopal Church. Our collaboration and participation in the meetings and projects of the Council for the Development of Ministry has been referred to throughout this report. An additional project of the BTE and the CDM was the joint commissioning of a Consultation on the Theology of Priesthood, held under the auspices of the Trinity Institute. A summary of this meeting is contained in the CDM's Blue Book report. We also met in each of the last three years with members of the General Board of Examining Chaplains to discuss issues pertaining to the General Ordination Examinations. This year we began the first of several meetings with members of the House of Bishops Committee on Ministry to address mutual concerns for the academic training of candidates for ordained ministry. The Board continued to be involved in efforts to strengthen and evaluate training in preaching. In 1981 we helped to design and fund a Consultation on Preaching, directed by the College of Preachers. At this meeting, homiletics professors and a group of their former students together evaluated the seminaries' efforts to prepare students in preaching. On the basis of this evaluation, the Consultation made recommendations about the teaching of homiletics in seminaries and appropriate post-seminary education.

It is our intent to continue to cooperate with these agencies, and with others, so that we may together strengthen theological education for the total ministry of the Church.

### **Acknowledgement**

In conclusion, the members of the Board for Theological Education wish to record their very deep appreciation for the leadership provided by Dr. Fredrica Harris Thompsett, Executive Director. She has—more than any other person—been responsible for making these three years a time in which the Board has been able to advance the work of theological education in the Church; and she has done so with intellectual creativity, administrative ability, mastery of her field, and with the respect of everyone with whom she has been in contact. She is a person of infinite grace with whom it has been a genuine joy to work.

Respectfully submitted,

The Rt. Rev. John B. Coburn, *Chair*,  
and Members of the Board  
for Theological Education

**THE BLUE BOOK**

**FINANCIAL REPORTS, 1980-82**

**Program budget**

	1980 Actual	1981 Actual	1982 Budget
Conferences	\$ 4,507.61	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 5,000.00
Travel (Ex. Dir.)	8,876.21	8,961.93	9,000.00
Selection	6,679.00	6,250.00	5,000.00
Lay theological education	2,567.64	1,760.69	3,000.00
Diocesan schools and continuing education	4,145.06	3,997.64	3,000.00
Continuing education	-	-	5,000.00
Seminaries and long-range planning	-	-	5,000.00
Development in theological education	-	-	10,000.00
Fund for Theological Education (grant)	5,000.00	5,000.00	
Ecumenical theological education	-	-	5,000.00
Reference material	-	-	200.00
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$31,775.52</u>	<u>\$30,670.26</u>	<u>\$50,200.00</u>

**Assessment budget**

B.T.E. meetings (1980—3 meetings) (1981—2 meetings) (1982—2 meetings)	\$11,177.95	\$11,459.36	\$11,204.50
B.T.E. Ex. Cttee. meetings (1 meeting per year)	2,944.70	2,075.24	1,400.00
B.T.E. rep. to CDM meetings (2 meetings per year)	526.35	540.90	500.00
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$14,649.00</u>	<u>\$14,075.50</u>	<u>\$13,104.50</u>

TEO general income	\$1,068.53	\$663.00	\$500.00
--------------------	------------	----------	----------

**Support from foundations and grants**

	1980 actual income and expenditures	1981 actual income and expenditures	1982 budgeted
Booth-Ferris			
Selection	\$ 175.68	\$ 3,091.99	\$14,100.05
Theological literature	67.00	99.05	-
Episcopal Church Foundation			
Continuing education survey (Alban Institute)	3,600.00	15,000.00	1,400.00
Seminary deans, long-range planning	1,857.52	8,000.00	142.48
Resolution B-127	39,000.00	6,000.00	-
Lilly Endowment, Inc., B-127		18,300.00	19,200.00
Seminary deans, B-127	3,400.00	6,600.00	-
USAF, B-127		2,500.00	-
Constable fund, B-127		10,000.00	-
Ectene, B-127		15,000.00	-
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$48,100.20</u>	<u>\$84,591.04</u>	<u>\$34,842.53</u>

### **The Conant Fund**

The John Shubael and Mary McLaren Conant Fund was established in 1953 by a bequest for the improvement of theological education through the payment of all or parts of the salaries of selected teachers in the seminaries of the Protestant Episcopal Church. The income derived from this Fund is administered by the Board for Theological Education.

The academic year 1980-1981 marked the third and closing year for annual awards, given to: Berkeley Divinity School, Bexley Hall, Episcopal Theological Seminary of the Southwest, General Theological Seminary, and the School of Theology, University of the South.

In the academic year 1981-1982, the Board, in consultation with the Council of Seminary Deans, instituted a change in the distribution of Conant Fund grants. The protocols state: "With a primary goal of strengthening scholarship and teaching within Episcopal seminaries, the annual income from the Conant Fund will be used to supply study leave grants (understood to include sabbaticals, "mini-sabbaticals," special summer study programs, etc.) for full-time faculty members of the accredited Episcopal seminaries."

In 1981-1982, the Board issued ten such grants, ranging from \$1,500 to \$4,000, for a total of \$28,820. There were three recipients from the Episcopal Divinity School; one from the Church Divinity School of the Pacific; one from the School of Theology, University of the South; two from the Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary in Virginia; one from the Episcopal Theological Seminary of the Southwest; and one from Bexley Hall.

For 1982-1983 grants, there are two recipients from the General Theological Seminary; two from the Episcopal Divinity School, and one each from Berkeley Divinity School, Bexley Hall, Church Divinity School of the Pacific, Nashotah House, and the Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary in Virginia.

## **BTE OBJECTIVES AND GOALS, 1983-85**

### **Overall objective**

As a national theological education resource, the BTE seeks to strengthen and coordinate efforts of dioceses, commissions on ministry, seminaries, training programs, and others, to provide and sustain ministry for the mission of Christ's church. (cf. Title III.6.2.)

### **Goals**

1. To provide statistical and analytical reports on theological seminaries and other training institutions to the General Convention which accurately reflect current resources, progress on stated goals, and which promote informed dialogue between theological education institutions and the Church.
2. To address critical issues and future educational, management, and fiscal accounting needs in theological education, so that long-range planning may be furthered within theological education institutions of this Church.
3. To provide appropriate training resources to seminaries, other institutions, trustee boards, and the Council of Deans—which promote development and cooperation.
4. To promote the inclusion of racial, ethnic, ecumenical, and global perspectives within institutions of theological education.
5. To assist in improving the recruitment and selection of persons for Holy Orders, and,

## THE BLUE BOOK

---

in cooperation with diocesan authorities, to address ways to simplify selection procedures.

6. To promote continuing education for clergy and laity by coordinating exchange of information among diocesan supervisors of continuing education, developing a directory of resources, and initiating action/research projects.

7. To support institutional and other theological education programs for laity.

8. To offer counsel and assistance to diocesan schools and other programs through the auspices of Educators and Trainers for Ministry and other appropriate organizations.

9. To monitor, implement, and evaluate the Church's financial support for theological education.

10. To work in collaboration with the EFM&M unit, the General Board of Examining Chaplains, and other appropriate national and ecumenical agencies, and to provide progress reports on joint ventures to the General Convention.

### 1983 Objective

To organize the B.T.E. into appropriate committee structures and initiate actions and responses to 1983-85 goals, as established by mandates of 1982 General Convention and functions assigned to the Board in Canon III.6.2.

#### Budget for 1983

2 full Board meetings <sup>a</sup>	\$16,000
1 executive meeting <sup>b</sup>	2,400
BTE representative to 2 CDM meetings <sup>c</sup>	800
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$19,200</b>

### 1984 Objective

To continue studies, projects and work in support of goals, with mid-triennium evaluation.

#### Budget for 1984

2 full Board meetings	\$17,280 <sup>d</sup>
1 executive meeting	2,570 <sup>e</sup>
BTE representative to 2 CDM meetings	800
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$22,650</b>

### 1985 Objective

To complete projects and studies on major issues and to prepare reports and resolutions for the 1985 General Convention.

#### Budget for 1985

2 full Board meetings	\$18,670 <sup>d</sup>
1 executive meeting	2,750 <sup>e</sup>
BTE representative to 2 CDM meetings	800
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$22,220</b>

---

<sup>a</sup>Based on 16 members, each incurring \$400 for travel and \$100 per diem room and board, for a 2-day meeting (does not include ground travel and tips).

<sup>b</sup>Based on 6 members, each incurring \$400 for travel and \$50 for on-site expenses, for a 1-day meeting (does not include ground travel and tips).

<sup>c</sup>1 representative to 2 meetings per year, estimated expense of travel, room and board.

<sup>d</sup>Annual inflation rate of 8%+.

<sup>e</sup>Annual inflation rate of 7%+.

**BUDGET REQUESTS**

Assessment, 1983-85

Resolution #A—124.

*Resolved, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That there be appropriated from the assessment Budget of General Convention for the meeting expenses of the Board for Theological Education the sum of \$63,000 for the triennium of 1983-85.*

**Program, 1983**

**1. Program**

Development of theological education	\$10,000
Long-range planning in theological education	10,000
Selection for Holy Orders	7,000
Continuing education coordination	5,000
Lay theological education	3,000
Alternative theological education	3,000

**Total**     \$38,000

**2. Support for Program**

Conferences (to address critical issues)	\$5,000
Travel	9,000

**Total**     \$14,000

**Total BTE Church Program Budget:**

\$52,000

**SPECIAL RESOLUTIONS**

Resolution #A—125.

Support for Theological Education (STE)

*Resolved, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That the 67th General Convention:*

**A. Responding to the action of the 66th General Convention, which approved in principle a form of regular support for theological education and instructed the Board for Theological Education in consultation with others to bring to this Convention a comprehensive plan for the funding of the accredited Seminaries of the Episcopal Church, now directs each Parish and Mission of the several Dioceses within the fifty states of the United States to give annually at least 1% of its previous year's net disposable budgeted income (item E less line 1754 of the Annual Parochial Report) to one or more of these accredited Seminaries;**

**B. That to implement this action, this General Convention directs each Diocese as defined above in item A to adopt a procedure by Resolution of its Convention, or by other appropriate means, which will assure that each Parish and Mission annually contributes at least this 1% to the support of one or more of the accredited Seminaries of the Church—this procedure to be adopted as soon as possible and by no later than January 1, 1984, and to be reported to the Board for Theological Education for presentation to the next General Convention;**

**C. That each accredited Seminary of the Episcopal Church be directed to submit an**

annual report to the Board for Theological Education of its income from the Parishes and Missions of the Church;

D. That each of these Seminaries, through and together with the Council of Deans, presents to the Board for Theological Education for each General Convention a report regarding its mission and goals, and progress in fulfilling them;

E. That these Seminaries and the Council of Deans assume more responsibility for strengthening the partnership between the Church and its Seminaries and for improving the dialogue with Congregations and Dioceses by providing them with current information about the Seminaries and listening to their concerns regarding theological education;

F. That Dioceses, Parishes and Missions be encouraged also to support other programs and institutions of theological education that are of importance to their educational and missionary goals;

G. That this General Convention requests the Presiding Bishop to continue to designate one Sunday each year as Theological Education Sunday, to be observed at that time or some other appropriate day by all Parishes and Missions as an occasion for interpreting the work of the Episcopal Seminaries and other programs for theological education.

**Resolution #A—126.**

Proposed revision of Title III, Canon 6, Sec. 2(d) and Sec. 3.

*Resolved, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That Title III, Canon 6, Sec. 2(d) and Sec. 3, be amended as follows:*

Sec. 2(d). To compile and present to each regular meeting of the General Convention *both a complete statistical report of the work of educational and financial data and a statement of mission and goals, and progress in fulfilling them*, for each of the several *accredited* Theological Seminaries of the Church, and, as far as possible, ~~of~~ *for* other institutions for the training of persons for Holy Orders.

Sec. 3. It shall be the duty of each *accredited* Theological Seminary of this Church, and, *as far as possible*, of each other institution for the training of persons for Holy Orders, to present ~~annually~~ to the Board for Theological Education *both statistical reports, and a statement of mission and goals, and progress in fulfilling them*, on forms prepared and provided by the Board.

## APPENDIX A

## A List of Accredited\* Episcopal Seminaries

- Berkeley Divinity School at  
Yale University (BDS/Y) New Haven, Connecticut
- Bexley Hall, of Colgate Rochester  
Divinity School/Bexley Hall/Crozer  
Theological Seminary (CRDS/BH/CTS) Rochester, New York
- Church Divinity School of the  
Pacific (CDSP) Berkeley, California
- Episcopal Divinity School (EDS) Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Episcopal Theological Seminary  
of the Southwest (ETSSW) Austin, Texas
- General Theological Seminary (GTS) New York, New York
- Nashotah House (NH) Nashotah, Wisconsin
- Protestant Episcopal Theological  
Seminary in Virginia (VTS) Alexandria, Virginia
- School of Theology of the University  
of the South (STUS) Sewanee, Tennessee
- Seabury-Western Theological Seminary (SWTS) Evanston, Illinois

## APPENDIX B

## Introduction to Statistical Tables

Before one looks at the following statistical data, a brief explanation is in order. Standardization of accounting and reporting methods has only recently been introduced and is not yet in uniform use. With continuing cooperation from the deans and their administrative staffs, we hope to have even more comparable data for reporting and planning purposes in the years ahead.

We must, however, face the reality of the diversity of institutional structures among our seminaries. It is difficult, for example, to isolate information relating to "Episcopal" endeavors at both Bexley Hall and Berkeley Divinity School, both of which are integrated components of larger institutions. It is also difficult to report comparable financial data for the School of Theology of the University of the South (Sewanee). Comparable data is available for the seven seminaries which are "stand alone" institutions.

Another inconsistency can be found in reported totals for deferred maintenance (the figure in the PMM&Co. report is \$13,200,000; that cited in the BTE table is \$10,500,000). It is the judgment of PMM&Co. that even its more generous estimate is conservative. It is also difficult to gather comparable data for revenue from the Theological Education Sunday Offering (TESO), as gifts from parishes and parish members are not always designated for TESO. Some seminaries have included for this amount all revenue from congregations.

\**Accreditation* is given by the Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada (ATS). It is based on specific educational standards that each school must meet, and each school is reviewed regularly to see that these standards are being maintained. One more Episcopal seminary, Trinity Episcopal School for Ministry, in Ambridge, Pennsylvania, is approaching accreditation.

It is important to understand that financial statements provide only one picture of the fiscal resources of an institution. The realities and constraints of renewal and/or replacement of major equipment, deferred maintenance, the percentage of tenured faculty, and cost of living increments are either unrepresented or understated. Thus an assessment of a seminary's financial health solely on the basis of a yearly comparison between revenue and expenditure is incomplete. Budget statements for some seminaries show deficits, others do not. The fact is that budgeting practices in all of our accredited seminaries are self-limiting, geared to revenue expectations based upon recent history. These budgets, therefore, are not accurate reflections of the seminaries' true needs.

Episcopal Seminaries: Comparative Revenues for Combined Fiscal Years—1977-1978, 1978-1979, 1979-1980

Seminary	Tuition & Fees		Federal Grants		Private Gifts		Endowment		Auxiliary Enterprises	Other Sources
	Unrestricted	Restricted	Unrestricted	Restricted	Unrestricted	Restricted	Unrestricted	Restricted		
1. BDS/Y <sup>1,2</sup>	49.7%	—%	—%	—%	22.6%	—%	14.3%	—%	12.4%	1.0%
2. CRDS/BH/CTS <sup>2</sup>	15.4%	—%	—%	—%	39.4%	5.2%	20.4%	6.7%	7.8%	5.1%
3. CDSP <sup>1</sup>	15.4%	—%	1.3%	—%	35.1%	13.8%	17.0%	—%	14.8%	2.6%
4. EDS <sup>3</sup>	13.7%	0.2%	3.8%	—%	19.6%	1.4%	21.8%	21.0%	18.2%	0.3%
5. ETSSW	11.3%	—%	—%	—%	11.5%	21.1%	31.0%	8.3%	12.4%	4.4%
6. GTS <sup>1</sup>	13.5%	—%	—%	—%	13.1%	11.5%	18.4%	22.0%	20.2%	1.3%
7. NH	17.0%	—%	—%	—%	48.2%	12.2%	6.1%	—%	13.7%	2.8%
8. VTS	13.5%	—%	—%	—%	26.8%	—%	37.6%	—%	15.1%	7.0%
9. STUS <sup>1,2</sup>	51.3%	—%	—%	—%	9.9%	—%	14.0%	18.9%	5.4%	0.5%
10. SWTS <sup>1</sup>	19.9%	—%	—%	—%	21.9%	5.2%	17.6%	14.3%	20.3%	0.8%
<b>Composite</b>	<b>19.8%</b>	<b>—%</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>—%</b>	<b>25.1%</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>21.2%</b>	<b>10.1%</b>	<b>14.0%</b>	<b>3.0%</b>

<sup>1</sup>Three-year costs exceed revenues.

<sup>2</sup>Berkeley Divinity School, Bexley Hall, and the School of Theology of the University of the South, are each a part of a more encompassing academic enterprise. In every case, the financial statements of these three Episcopal seminaries are not separate and distinct from the larger institution. The percentages which appear in the columns above may, therefore, not be as accurate as those for the "stand-alone" seminaries.

Episcopal Seminaries: Comparative Costs for Combined Fiscal Years—1977-1978, 1978-1979, 1979-1980

Seminary	Academic Support			Operation & Maintenance of Plant			Mandatory Transfers		Auxiliary Enterprises	
	Instruction	Student Services	Institutional Support	Scholarships	Transfers	Costs	Mandatory Transfers	Costs	Mandatory Transfers	
1. BDS/Y <sup>1,2</sup>	35.0%	—%	15.8%	13.0%	25.7%	—%	—%	7.3%	—%	
2. CRDS/BH/CTS <sup>2</sup>	34.7%	2.7%	22.1%	11.1%	8.6%	—%	—%	9.6%	—%	
3. CDSP <sup>1</sup>	37.8%	0.9%	23.0%	13.8%	9.4%	0.8%	0.8%	6.0%	0.8%	
4. EDS <sup>1</sup>	42.1%	0.7%	9.2%	11.7%	6.3%	—%	—%	17.4%	—%	
5. ETSSW	32.9%	14.1%	21.4%	13.0%	4.2%	—%	—%	13.7%	—%	
6. GTS <sup>1</sup>	26.3%	9.4%	14.4%	11.2%	10.9%	—%	—%	20.3%	4.2%	
7. NH	22.7%	1.6%	18.8%	19.6%	2.8%	0.7%	0.7%	22.9%	—%	
8. VTS	26.4%	1.1%	23.0%	19.1%	1.9%	—%	—%	19.4%	—%	
9. STUS <sup>1,2</sup>	60.9%	7.1%	7.9%	4.0%	15.0%	—%	—%	2.3%	—%	
10. SWTS <sup>1</sup>	27.5%	8.9%	21.1%	15.8%	9.3%	—%	—%	12.9%	—%	
<b>Composite</b>	<b>34.5%</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>17.3%</b>	<b>13.1%</b>	<b>8.5%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>14.2%</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	

<sup>1</sup>Three-year costs exceed revenues.

<sup>2</sup>Berkeley Divinity School, Bexley Hall, and the School of Theology of the University of the South, are each a part of a more encompassing academic enterprise. In every case, the financial statements of these three Episcopal seminaries are not separate and distinct from the larger institution. The percentages which appear in the columns above may, therefore, not be as accurate as those for the "stand-alone" seminaries.

<sup>3</sup>Includes student services.

APPENDIX C

Financial Statistics of Accredited Seminaries: 1980-81 Actual Budgets, 1981-82 Projected Budgets

Prepared by the Board for Theological Education

	BDS/Y <sup>a</sup>		CRDS/BH/CTS <sup>b</sup>		CDSP		EDS	
	80-81	81-82	80-81	81-82	80-81	81-82	80-81	81-82
<b>REVENUES</b>								
Tuition and Fees	\$ 680,000	\$ 890,000	\$ 356,768	\$ 359,106	\$ 223,076	\$ 243,000	\$ 2689,485	\$ 318,000
Federal Grants					12,223	12,000	77,732	23,000
Private Gifts, Unrestricted	12,000	97,000	518,360	502,832	415,431	500,000	253,210	300,000
Private Gifts, Restricted	40,000	35,000	24,613	29,000				
Endowment, Unrestricted	240,000	210,000	851,975	912,331	174,378	140,000	436,847	446,361
Endowment, Restricted	140,000	145,000	277,891	270,035	19,193	19,600	438,815	492,953
Auxiliary Enterprises	32,000	40,000	209,096	205,839	196,115	166,744	318,889	311,000
Other Sources	18,000	20,000	238,073	105,000	36,730	274,813	267,500	
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>\$1,162,000</b>	<b>\$1,437,000</b>	<b>\$2,476,776</b>	<b>\$2,384,143</b>	<b>\$1,077,146</b>	<b>\$1,111,344</b>	<b>\$2,069,791</b>	<b>\$2,158,814</b>
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>								
<b>Education and General</b>								
Instruction	\$ 392,000	\$ 428,000	\$ 617,304	\$ 671,481	\$ 488,305	\$ 542,390	\$ 846,142	\$ 881,425
Academic Support	285,000	342,000	169,443	181,547	255,574	298,337	120,772	132,636
Student Services	38,000	40,000	58,150	70,301	12,273	12,550		
Institutional Support	75,000	80,000	535,434	535,330	115,086	112,992	354,079	359,575
Op. & Maint. of Plant	236,000	247,000	270,422	302,556	127,650	129,896	288,617	330,341
Scholarships	230,000	298,000	162,430	195,000		30,000	117,390	122,000
Total Education and General	\$1,256,000	\$1,435,000	\$1,813,183	\$1,956,215	\$98,888	\$1,136,165	\$1,727,000	\$1,825,977
Mandatory Transfers								

APPENDIX C (Continued on next page.)

APPENDIX C (Continued from previous page.)

Financial Statistics of Accredited Seminars: 1980-81 Actual Budgets, 1981-82 Projected Budgets

Prepared by the Board for Theological Education

	BDS/Y <sup>a</sup>		CRDS/BH/CTS <sup>b</sup>		CDSP		EDS	
	80-81	81-82	80-81	81-82	80-81	81-82	80-81	81-82
Auxiliary Enterprises								
Expenditures	—	—	118,467	130,200	135,518	126,318	372,300	358,020
Mandatory Transfers	—	—	—	—	17,024	—	—	—
Total Auxiliary Enterprises	—	—	118,467	130,200	152,542	126,318	372,300	358,020
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$1,256,000</b>	<b>\$1,435,000</b>	<b>\$1,931,650</b>	<b>\$2,086,415</b>	<b>\$1,151,430</b>	<b>\$1,262,483</b>	<b>\$2,099,300</b>	<b>\$2,183,997</b>

<sup>a</sup>Method of computation for revenues and expenditures takes 1/4 of the total figures for Yale Divinity School, plus independent BDS accounts.  
<sup>b</sup>Figures are for combined institutions.

	BDS/Y	CRDS/BH/CTS	CDS	EDS	ETSSW	GTS	NH	STUS	SWTS	VTS	TOTALS
Deferred Maintenance (1982 Dollars)	\$268,000	\$558,600	\$137,164	none	\$150,000	\$6,008,950	\$1,885,000	\$150,000	\$247,300	\$1,100,000	\$10,505,014
Tuition Rate, 80-81	4,400	2,500	2,400	2,700	2,100	2,500	3,000	2,960	2,750	2,500	
Tuition Rate, 81-82	4,950	2,750	2,700	3,200	2,400	2,800	3,000	3,750	3,250	2,800	
TESO, 1980-81	18,533	NA	99,185	57,740	20,751	104,413	73,299	36,469	26,332	236,719	673,441

## Financial Statistics of Accredited Seminaries: 1980-81 Actual Budgets, 1981-82 Projected Budgets

Prepared by the Board for Theological Education

	ETSSW				GTS		NH	
	80-81	81-82	80-81	81-82	80-81	81-82	80-81	81-82
<b>REVENUES</b>								
Tuition and Fees	\$ 173,355	\$ 200,000	\$ 492,611	\$ 569,975	\$ 229,968	\$ 224,165		
Federal Grants	131,862	150,000	441,076	318,000	305,448	586,935		
Private Gifts, Unrestricted	140,714	174,000	272,102	162,000	66,222	38,745		
Private Gifts, Restricted	548,432	635,000	402,861	303,000	151,230	134,105		
Endowment, Unrestricted	107,767	111,000	569,302	690,000	30,740	43,500		
Endowment, Restricted	140,786	150,000	658,131	717,000	185,092	205,320		
Auxiliary Enterprises	111,953	120,000	24,352	15,600	74,565	83,285		
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>\$1,353,869</b>	<b>\$1,540,000</b>	<b>\$2,860,435</b>	<b>\$2,775,575</b>	<b>\$1,043,265</b>	<b>\$1,316,055</b>		
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>								
<b>Education and General</b>								
Instruction	\$ 321,376	\$ 377,241	\$ 616,737	\$ 726,705	\$ 303,665	\$ 350,760		
Academic Support	121,149	126,279	164,360	200,361	293,010	241,640		
Student Services	49,293	58,480	81,739	78,359	17,582	18,040		
Institutional Support	255,944	271,299	478,591	458,755	180,018	224,335		
Op. & Maint. of Plant	142,602	224,825	245,605	275,448	319,373	222,940		
Scholarships	20,231	24,000	352,847	345,000	18,941	12,000		
Total Education and General	910,595	1,082,124	1,939,879	2,084,628	1,011,589	1,069,715		
Mandatory Transfers	—	—	—	—	—	32,450		
<b>Auxiliary Enterprises</b>								
Expenditures	237,836	211,508	651,409	643,731	196,300	213,890		
Mandatory Transfers	—	—	178,091	84,000	—	—		
Total Auxiliary Enterprises	237,836	211,508	829,500	727,731	196,300	213,890		
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$1,148,431</b>	<b>\$1,293,632</b>	<b>\$2,769,380</b>	<b>\$2,812,359</b>	<b>\$1,207,889</b>	<b>\$1,316,055</b>		

Financial Statistics of Accredited Seminaries: 1980-81 Actual Budgets, 1981-82 Projected Budgets  
Prepared by the Board for Theological Education

	STUS			SWTS			VTS			TOTALS	
	80-81	81-82	80-81	81-82	80-81	81-82	80-81	81-82	80-81	81-82	
<b>REVENUES</b>											
Tuition and Fees	\$ 262,621 <sup>c</sup>	\$ 285,540 <sup>c</sup>	\$ 156,776	\$ 178,750	\$ 422,598	\$ 476,900					
Federal Grants	—	—	—	—	—	—					
Private Gifts, Unrestricted	74,823	98,419	138,279	165,000	468,058	473,000					
Private Gifts, Restricted	155,011	143,272	92,522	40,804	—	—					
Endowment, Unrestricted	—	NA <sup>d</sup>	224,068	263,000	1,614,483	1,753,990					
Endowment, Restricted	170,731 <sup>d</sup>	NA <sup>d</sup>	192,437	217,478	—	—					
Auxiliary Enterprises	—	—	179,827	204,666	239,204	263,300					
Other Sources	2,144	3,900	14,183	—	205,780	115,150					
<b>Total Revenue</b>	\$ 665,330 <sup>e</sup>	\$ 531,131 <sup>e</sup>	\$ 998,092	\$ 1,069,698	\$ 2,950,123	\$ 3,082,340	\$ 16,656,827	\$ 17,406,100			
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>											
<b>Education and General</b>											
Instruction	\$ 318,540	\$ 322,230	\$ 246,507	\$ 287,304	\$ 834,813	\$ 972,765					
Academic Support	297,122	329,520	77,043	83,903	583,189	667,320					
Student Services	15,100	17,200	36,364	58,857	—	—					
Institutional Support	352,400	391,600	218,250	211,048	295,422	327,920					
Op. & Maint. of Plant	117,400	130,400	160,030	232,714	533,875	673,470					
Scholarships	129,400	143,700	84,834	115,700	—	—					
Total Education and General	1,229,962	1,334,650	823,028	989,526	2,247,299	2,641,475					
Mandatory Transfers	—	—	—	—	394,445	—					
<b>Auxiliary Enterprises</b>											
Expenditures	—	—	108,138	79,500	305,943	440,610					
Mandatory Transfers	—	—	—	—	—	—					
Total Auxiliary Enterprises	—	—	108,138	79,500	305,943	440,610					
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	\$ 1,229,962 <sup>e</sup>	\$ 1,334,650 <sup>e</sup>	\$ 931,166	\$ 1,069,026	\$ 2,947,687	\$ 3,082,085	\$ 16,672,895	\$ 17,875,702			

<sup>c</sup>Excludes revenue from the Education for Ministry extension program.  
<sup>d</sup>Endowment income is not apportioned by any formula to the School of Theology. Whatever amount is necessary to balance the budget at the end of the fiscal year is transferred to the School of Theology budget.  
<sup>e</sup>Revenues are specifically related to the School of Theology. Expenditures include costs related to the School of Theology, and apportioned to it by the University of the South for overall administrative, institutional and library support.

APPENDIX D

Enrollment<sup>a</sup> Statistics of Accredited Seminaries

Prepared by the Board for Theological Education

	BDS/Y		CRDS/BH/CTS <sup>d</sup>		CDSP		EDS		ETSSW		GTS	
	80-81	81-82	80-81	81-82	80-81	81-82	80-81	81-82	80-81	81-82	80-81	81-82
<b>1ST PROF. PROGRAM</b>												
Headcount, M. Div.	92	103	20/121	32/133	75	64	102	97	63	67	124	143
Headcount: Other M.A., Certificate, Diploma, Special/Unclassified	14	12	4/47	8/50	34	27	17	17	16	20	56	46
<b>GRADUATE PROGRAMS</b>												
Headcount, Graduate (S.T.M., D. Min., Th.D., Ph.D.)	6	4	2/37	2/31	22	21	—	5	—	—	13	21
<b>TOTAL HEADCOUNT</b>	112	119	26/205	42/214	131	112	119	119	79	87	193	210
Women in M. Div., Other Masters, Certificate Programs	42	44	0/87	30/91	49	48	61	53	13	17	78	62
Women in Graduate Programs	1	3	1/2	1/3	7	6	—	—	—	—	3	5
U.S. Blacks and Minorities <sup>b</sup> Certificate Programs	2	4	0/32	0/28	3	—	5	5	2	5	7	14
U.S. Blacks and Minorities <sup>b</sup> in Graduate Programs	1	1	0/2	0/5	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—
Overseas Students in All Programs, Masters and Graduate	5	4	0/1	0/3	4	4	1	2	7	5	15	9
Extension and Non-Degree	—	—	0/2	—	180	199	87	96	125	28	NA	NA
Headcount, Faculty (includes part-time)	15	16	20	20	16	17	32	30	15	16	35	38
FTE Faculty <sup>c</sup>	12	14	17.5	17.5	12	12	18	18	10.25	10	18.33	18.66

<sup>a</sup>All figures are headcount, including part-time and full-time students.

<sup>b</sup>Minorities include Black, Hispanic/Americans, Native Americans and Pacific/Asian Americans.

<sup>c</sup>FTE faculty is calculated by dividing the total faculty coursework by the coursework of a full-time faculty member.

<sup>d</sup>The first number represents Episcopal students; the second represents the total number of students.

**Enrollment<sup>a</sup> Statistics of Accredited Seminaries**  
Prepared by the Board for Theological Education

	NH		STUS		SWTS		VTS		TOTALS	
	80-81	81-82	80-81	81-82	80-81	81-82	80-81	81-82	10 Accredited Seminaries 80-81	81-82
<b>1ST PROF. PROGRAM</b>										
Headcount, M. Div.	75	66	68	63	48	56	108	126		817
Headcount: Other M.A., Certificate, Diploma, Special/Unclassified	2	12	13	8	19	20	40	40	215	210
<b>GRADUATE PROGRAMS</b>										
Headcount, Graduate (S.T.M., D. Min., Th.D., Ph.D.)	1	2	43	48	—	—	32	39	119	142
<b>TOTAL HEADCOUNT</b>	78	80	124	119	67	76	180	205	1,109	1,169
Women in M. Div., Other Masters, Certificate Programs	8	6	15	12	15	22	56	64	337	358
Women in Graduate Programs	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	12
U.S. Blacks and Minorities <sup>b</sup> in M. Div., Other Masters, Certificate Programs	1	1	2	1	—	2	2	7	25	39
U.S. Blacks and Minorities <sup>b</sup> in Graduate Programs	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	1
Overseas Students in All Programs, Masters and Graduate	1	1	13	8	1	1	8	16	55	50
Extension and Non-Degree	—	—	3,581	3,747	25	11	418	584	4,416	4,665
Headcount, Faculty (includes part-time)	14	14	19	19	13	15	25	26	204	211
FTE Faculty <sup>c</sup>	9	9	11.41	10.6	10	9.5	21	21	139.49	140.26

<sup>a</sup>All figures are headcount, including part-time and full-time students.

<sup>b</sup>Minorities include Black, Hispanic/Americans, Native Americans and Pacific/Asian Americans.

<sup>c</sup>FTE faculty is calculated by dividing the total faculty courseload by the courseload of a full-time faculty member.