

2015 Willson Lecture
Formation for Ministry in American Methodism
Dr. Russell E. Richey
William R. Cannon Distinguished Professor of Church History Emeritus &
Dean Emeritus of Candler School of Theology
March 12, 2015

This lecture treats the formation of Methodism's ministry from the 1770s to the present. The several stages and patterns of ministerial formation, I suggest, both tracked and guided the church's re-formation (or reformation). I want to encourage you to revisit these stages and be mindful of how changes in our ministry and in our Methodist life and structure have gone together. Why? Because GBHEM now plays a central role, probably the central role, in reshaping United Methodist ministry and in so doing the UMC as a whole. To appreciate this agency role, you just have to go online, examine the range of initiatives, view the incredible array of commitments, and even sample what GBHEM has already published on ministerial formation. GBHEM's denomination-shaping is really quite remarkable. If you want to think seriously about the nature and function and mission of the church, you ought to go on GBHEM's website. In some ways, the holdings there are much more substantial, sadly, than what you can readily get from our publisher. So this is, in some ways, a word of exhortation, but it's also a celebration of all you have done to this point and what really informs this lecture.

The table of contents (and a handout in the lecture) of my GBHEM book—*Formation for Ministry in American Methodism: Twenty-first Century Challenges and Two Centuries of Problem Solving*—map the history of formation for ministry on this side of the Atlantic. I want to take you briefly through these stages. You will, I think, find reading the whole more precise, but I think it is helpful to get the stages in view to get a sense of how things have unfolded. Although these are stages that characterize one period in the formation, they all live on today in the formation process. So this is both a mapping of our history and in some ways a characterizing of the diverse factors that are really formative today.

The Formational Stages

Counselled: Under Wesley's Imperatives and Through Books

The Counselled stage is primarily from 1773 on, when the first American conference met and gave Robert Williams instructions not to publish any more books. Why? Because they wanted publications circulated officially from John Wesley. What was really important from the very start was that Methodist people, particularly the preachers, have Wesley's writings. They were the guidance for understanding the Christian faith most obviously, but also for the practice of ministry. So books were really very important, and they were primarily Wesley's books or items that Wesley published and thereby endorsed. The first meetings of our council, the predecessor to General Conference, devoted much of its attention to regulating the book business for early Methodism. The imperative—live into Wesley's counsel by reading.

Three other points are important. Then as now, learn ministry by doing it. From the start, we have not been like the Presbyterians, who want people to graduate first and then be put in churches. We have insisted that people undertake ministry from the get-go. Another point is that you sometimes think of our preachers being loners in this early

period, but from the start, one learned ministry as a class leader, an exhorter, in community and in relationship from watching and learning and being reprimanded and instructed. From the beginning, there was the expectation that one would grow in one's gifts, grace – singular please – and fruit. Be intentional about one's spiritual formation. These four items were really there from at the start, and as I say in some ways formative.

Collegial: *Yokefellowed Tutelage*

Early American Methodism, because it worked across the landscape – on the coast and then increasingly inland – discovered that it had a lot to do in training its persons. And so pretty early on, it was very common to appoint two people to a circuit, including a person who was more senior. In some cases the second person was already a full member of the conference, and later after 1784 ordained, and in other cases simply just further along in formative experience. But this was a tutelage, and the senior person was a tutor and mentor, supervisor, and in some ways family. So early Methodism didn't want to take people in who were married. The relationships in these conferences were very intimate and close, and the relationships to your tutor were very important and yoke-fellowing. You might think yoke-fellowing would not pertain if you were on a six-week circuit and three or six weeks apart. But if you actually look at the journals of these folks, they spent time getting together to go to Quarterly Conference. So four times a year, they were together for several days, and then they would travel together from one circuit to the next circuit, pick up folks and go to the third circuit. By the time they got to conference, there would be a whole assemblage of folks who would laugh, and pray and tell jokes, but also preach as they went along. They would pray and nurture one another in their faith, and if Asbury happened to be on the route, it would be a huge crowd.

One preacher who left us very complete notes traveled quite a long distance from his conference. He was from New York or Pennsylvania and was going to Baltimore. He spent a third of the year with other preachers, which is really quite remarkable. So this formational process, the mentoring, was really very important and quite standardized well into the 19th century.

Conferenced: *Course of Study Guidance and Accountability*

The third formational stage is Conferenced. What the early Methodists had discovered, really by the time Asbury died in 1816, was that if you left it to all the preachers to read – even with some counsel from circuit writer colleagues – they might or might not actually do the reading, and there's no telling what they read. So in 1816 General Conference prescribed and by 1817, Methodist conferences laid out a reading list on the basis of which persons would be interviewed for deacons or elders orders. I have for us the first known list, which I reproduce in the book. What you need to know is that this relatively common reading list continued in American Methodism – at least in the Methodist Episcopal and Methodist Episcopal Church South portions of it – well into the 20th century. In fact, Methodism's fundamentalist controversy in the 1920s was over the inclusion on the mandatory reading list of "heretics" from Boston University.

The course of study was changed from time to time, but it was a remarkable set of readings, some in basic church history, a lot in Wesley and some things having to do with basic skills such as writing skills. If you look at the list, you will be amazed at the commentaries that are mentioned specifically and the Wesleyanna that is referred to. So from the General Conference of 1816 on, Methodism thought that it would prep its folk by having everyone read a common set of items, which is really remarkable if you think

about it, given the diversity in our church today. Well into the 20th century, everybody coming before Boards of Ordained Ministry, no matter what conference, and whether or not they had gone to seminary, were going to be examined on the reading list that was on the course of study. It was really a very interesting way in which Methodism sought to give integrity to the process, but also to make sure that folks were in some ways coming into the same self-understanding for ministry and the church.

Seminary: Specialized Theological Formation

By the 1830s, Methodism was losing some of its brightest and best – and most well-healed – because they chose to go to ‘heretical’ places like Princeton or Amherst for college and then to seminary at Yale or other Calvinist places. The church was really worried about it, and so across the country, starting in the 1820s but really increasingly in the 1830s and 40s, the Methodist conferences began creating ‘colleges’ almost everywhere. It’s just amazing. I mean there were a huge number of schools, many of which didn’t survive the Civil War, but they continued to a remarkable degree. Those of you who are involved in supporting the higher education side of things well know that we struggle with keeping our institutions well-funded and well peopled.

I actually went to Wesleyan University in Connecticut, which at one time was a Methodist institution. It’s not that now, and you think well, big deal, so what? Colleges really ministry-shapers? Well, the nineteenth century student body was diverse. It was not limited entirely to Methodists, but the faculty was entirely Methodist, primarily people who were ordained. The rhythm of the school was Methodist. I mean they had love feasts. They had revivals. Students were put out to serve in local churches. They interacted with the adjacent conferences. So these institutions were Methodist not just nominally, but in ethos and in style and in substance. And it was from them at this point that one would expect to get things written for the Methodists by Methodists.

By this point as well, we had *The Christian Advocate* and *The Methodist Review*. You folks need to know that Myron Wingfield is your representative on today’s online *Methodist Review* and GBHEM puts money into it. It is a successor to *The Methodist Quarterly Review* that goes back to 1818, and it succeeds *Quarterly Review* and *Religion and Life* before that. When the publishing house pulled its plug and funding of *Quarterly Review*, several of us put this together. It is sponsored with funds from all 13 United Methodist seminaries, with big chunks put in by Candler and Perkins. It is free, and I would really encourage you to subscribe to it. So colleges were really very, very important and continued to be well into the 20th century because required seminary came late in our life.

After the Civil War, and particularly towards the end of the century, Methodism recognized that it needed to do actually even more than it was doing through colleges. Boston and then Garrett and then Drew and then other theological schools became the post-collegiate institutions formational of/for ministry. The categories I have under that, it seems to me, are important to take note of because the seminaries really do then become the citadel for learning in the Methodist realm. [Faculties assembled the church’s theological leadership, established templates for ministerial formation, produced studies of church and ministry, wrote the books required by course of study, colleges and seminaries of all candidates and brought ministers-to-be into a learning community.] The theological leadership of Methodism moved from our journals, agencies and high steeple churches to the seminaries. These institutions set templates for formation. They produced the studies of church in ministry, and they wrote the books

that required for people through the Boards of Ordained Ministry. Such patterns continue to this day.

Synthesized: *Seminary Formation Compounded Anew*

I call the sixth category Synthesized. This really pertains to the late 1920s-1930s, particularly before and after the Second World War when Methodists really discover that the ministry for which they are preparing people is far more complex, differentiated and specialized. What schools put in place are much more sophisticated field education programs. They incorporate CPE into the program. They recognize diverse ministries. Deaconesses and deaconess preparation finally are part of ministry and ministerial formation. And schools and church leadership begin to see the ministry in professional terms and are in dialog with other parts of the higher education world and certainly other denominations' seminaries. Now the ATS – the Association of Theological Schools, then The American Association of Theological Schools – was in place. There were forums within which Methodists could talk about what they were doing and what others ought to be about. There was really a sense that we are now at a place where we need to train the different ministries in a more appropriate and therefore somewhat different fashions.

I want to turn to the seventh one, Contextualized, in just a minute. But I think it would be helpful to get a sense of the heroes for each of these stages. I have picked out figures, primarily folks who are in ministry, who in some ways stand for these different stages.

For the first one (Counselled), it is really pretty obvious – Francis Asbury. But you might include “Black Harry” – Harry Hosier – as well, although his formative role is harder to recover and trace. For the Collegial stage, perhaps no one better than Freeborn Garrettson, who was actually nominated for what we would call episcopacy but decided against it but exercising just such an office in a variety of ways. With his wife, Catherine Garrettson, he set up an enclave in New York that welcomed people in. His yoke-fellowing was typical of the second stage. His 1791 *The Experience and Travels of Mr. Freeborn Garrettson, Minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church in North America* was among the first such collegial counsel offered from the American church. For the Conferenced stage, perhaps no one served better than Peter Cartwright, who actually opposed the creation of seminaries and opposed mandating collegiate education for preachers. He thought it much better that formation would come through the regiment of being guided by one another. For Collegiate phase—maybe a good German and an MEC not from our United Brethren or Evangelical Association side—William Nast, who was actually educated on the other side of the Atlantic. He was editor of the German publication, *Christliche Apologete* and president of Baldwin Wallace University from 1864-1893 for 29 years. For the Synthesized, let me suggest three folks who held Ph.Ds. Georgia Harkness, who in some ways, though not fully ordained, stood for everything that needed to be remedied and raised the flag for all the causes that needed attention, including those in ministry. Her Ph.D. degree was from BU, and she was a longtime professor at Garrett. The second one, a personal friend, Maud Jensen, was the first woman fully ordained in 1956 and whose father, I think, was killed in Korea in mission there. And then of course, Marjorie Matthews, our first woman bishop. So in ways in seems to me, these three hold together the Synthesized ideals.

Contextualized: *Varying Pedagogies and Curricula*

For Contextualized I want to have you run quickly with me through the strains and pressures on/in theological education (on a handout and below) The first set I term (in the book) “Trends, patterns, events, episodes exerting pressure on American theological

education.” They pertain particularly to students and church. I itemized these and reproduce here because it is easy to forget just what incredible pressures seminaries went through in the last quarter of the 20th century. Many of you could name a good chunk of them, and you may be able to identify some that I have not listed here, but here are the ones real quickly:

- Civil rights, anti-war, and anti-poverty initiatives of that era and their echo within theological education;
- Fuller integration of historically white seminaries but also white flight that emptied out America’s cities, brought urban decay, and doomed so many of the church’s downtown “cathedral congregations”;
- The growing numbers of women students in seminary, among clergy, and very gradually on faculties; slowly as well the welcoming of feminists onto faculties and of feminism into theological curricula;
- Disparate vocational and learning agendas within the school, especially with students aspiring to quite an array of ministries and/or service careers;
- The explosion on the American social and political scene of conservative-evangelical Protestantism and the slowly dawning awareness by the mainline that their hegemony over American society was over;
- Ecumenical and interreligious agendas birthed by Vatican II and various World Council of Churches’ initiatives;
- Diminished denominational consciousness in the broader culture, but patterns of hyper-denominationalism in boards of ordained ministry;
- Second career, dual vocation, older, and denominationally diverse student cohorts;
- Increased non-residential student populations, the waning of the dorm and of the refectory as contexts for formation;
- Students who showed up with “about five days of post-conversion Christian life,” with little or no experience in local churches, and with the desperate need of catechesis;
- New (and old) disciplines of spirituality and programs for spiritual formation to help ground students personally and communally;
- Complex interplay within schools and in the church of multiple curricular, pedagogical, and formational visions, especially as informed by the various liberation theologies and reform agendas;
- Complex formational and educational schemes designed to train persons as diaconal ministers (and then deacons) and to do so mindful of relevant curricula and degree programs beyond or beside theological seminaries; and
- Pressures from judicatories to ignore all the “noise” and manufacture graduates/candidates who could “fix” all that was ailing in the churches.

And then at the bottom in the next page, there are the ways in which the seminary faculties attempt to live with this. You know I’m very conscious of it, having played various faculty and administrative roles. So let me run through them: Deans and faculty members tried to cope. They underwent sensitivity training or did immersion trips. They revised their programs. They experimented with new models. They attempted to live with the diverse student cohorts. They taught out of various perspectives. They let the doctoral programs inform their teaching. They contextualized in various ways. They launched new fields, including congregational studies and leadership education. They created or recreated vocational tracks in the M.Div. (and added a variety of other masters degrees dedicated to a vast array of specialized ministries). They added new joint-degree ventures in the health sciences, conflict resolution, ecological studies. And

they gradually embraced new delivery systems, media, digital teaching resources, and the World Wide Web.

So schools went through a lot of trauma, and I think many folks think that we are still in that turmoil. I think by and large we have come through it and are becoming more stabilized. But as schools and faculties we still are struggling with issues having to do with formation of our folks. We are increasingly expecting that to take place prior to folks coming in and during, but to some extent afterwards. The programming is really quite diverse. If you go through Duke Divinity, you can come out with three different theological perspectives, depending on who teaches the basic systematic course the year that you take it. And that is true in so many of our places because our faculties – and you know, you're right in the midst of this – our faculties are not primarily United Methodist. In fact if you look at Duke, we have a slight majority of United Methodists, but not among the tenured folk. And frankly, Boards of Ordained Ministry hurt their cause by the constraints that they put on folk who wanted to maintain their orders or progress toward orders but also pursue a Ph.D.

Several of you have heard this story before. One of my favorite stories is about the daughter of a close friend, who as a United Methodist headed an African-American seminary. At one of the recruiting events at the American Academy of Religion and while I was dean at Candler, I saw the daughter. She was then finishing a Ph.D. in, I think the field of New Testament and at Union Theological Seminary. You know, having an African-American teach biblical studies on a seminary faculty, what an incredible appointment would that be? So I said, "How exciting. When are you going to get through and what's going on?" She says, "Well, I'm being ordained." I said, "Oh great!" She said, "As a Presbyterian, because my UMC Board of Ordained Ministry would not accept me." So her life now is as a Presbyterian, though her family was in Methodist missions and her father had exercised theological education leadership in various board and seminary contexts. Why are Boards so shortsighted? What a loss.

So advising is really much more complex when you don't have a fully Methodist faculty. It's really a different challenge.

Now to the last section of my book, where we are and where we seem to be going in formation for ministry.

Counseled Again: New Horizons, New Clientele, New Programming

I want to move us on below (in just a minute I said) to this last and current stage, *Counseled Again: New Horizons, New Clientele, New Programming*. I have termed it to echo the John Wesley-led formational guidance with a sense that our new online, tech-driven world places us under challenges and with opportunities akin to those of our 1770 denominational ancestors. I come to this new world best in the book. But a few hints here.

But first let me go back through these stages that we have just visited, just to get you a sense of not just them as stages, but of how they lived on up until the 1950s in our church. Methodism kept the several schemes going—not so much as alternative period-defined formational schemes—but as ongoing patterns preparing folks for ordained ministry. I can speak about these formational patterns as I myself experienced them.

So **Counseled**, how as ongoing, how for me? By being baptized, taken from a Methodist family to a church weekly, being brought into the Sunday school from the get-go, being nurtured in a family that was Methodist, sitting through regular worship, and going on to Vacation Bible School when of age.

The **Collegial** stage, it seems to me, was nicely represented by the MYF and then successive entities of that sort.

Conferenced: Our Methodist camps. I recall going to both those in both NC and WNC, to the former several times.

Collegiate: For me, the great example is Wofford because years ago you could take a bus and put 20 students on and just haul them up for entry to Duke Divinity School the next year. The pre-seminary numbers that were flowing through our collegiate system were just incredible.

Seminary: Well, I have to take Duke as illustrative. My dad was there before me – all three of his degrees from there. (And because of his exemplary role there I chose to go to Union so as to chart my own path.)

Synthesized: The Methodist faculty at Duke and at our several seminaries. They play key formative roles in and out of classroom.

Contextualized: At Duke, The Duke Endowment put folks out in small churches across the state for a full summer, paid for their housing and gave them a stipend when they returned, and then conference life carried on.

So up until the 1950s, you could look at North Carolina and you could see not only that these stages had occurred – albeit Duke was not founded in the 1830s – but you could see their interplay if you were really careful. All of these stages that Methodism had set out successively to form persons for ministry were alive, but functioning in a slightly different way in different contexts.

Well, let me tell you the details of my own story as they doubtless do shape how I read the larger story of formation for ministry. And I think my chaotic route to ordination and to clarity about my ministry resembles that of many now entering ministry and living through the diverse, competitive pressures and allures of our religious world.

When I was born, my Dad was the pastor in Cullowhee, North Carolina. After two other pastoral WNC appointments, he took us to Houston where he served as campus minister. Then he returned to Duke for doctoral studies and a Divinity faculty appointment. Methodism was our family's world. I'm a Methodist. I grew up Methodist, and to some extent, as hinted above, I was subjected to all of Methodism's formative processes. But most fully and on schedule I went through the church's Counseled to Collegial phases (the Collegial especially through our church's Boy Scout's God and Country program). Both in college and seminary (the 1960s mind you), I drifted somewhat away from Methodism. For me the latter stages but also the import of the early stages became apparent when I got to Drew as faculty member—that's post Ph.D. Then I really began to see what counseling and collegiality meant with respect to the exercise of ministry. That was late I know.

Conferenced: Here we expect the guidance as to what it really means to head into ministry. Well, again, I don't think that happened until the late 1960s, actually 1970s,

when I was teaching at Drew. The Methodist church on the corner of the campus boasted the president of the university, a VP or so, the several deans and a good chunk of the seminary's faculty. I was really brought into a community that guided me in my own reading on things religious. I was not a Methodist scholar then. My dissertation had been on English Unitarianism, of all things. So I had to learn this Wesleyan stuff from the get-go, much as had early itinerants.

Collegiate: I went to Wesleyan University but did not experience the collegiate phase there. It had long since abandoned its Methodist heritage. I did go for a summer to west Africa on Operation Crossroads Africa and in other ways experienced collegiate-level formational processes. However, it was actually in seminary that I got a sense of what it really meant to be in a collegiate setting.

While at Union Theological Seminary, I did field work in the East Harlem Protestant Parish, served a summer appointment in a Black Presbyterian church via the Student Interracial Ministry, and coordinated that program nationally the next year. Further at Union I worked in collegiate fashion with classmates, went to chapel, and learned about ministry. So there I did experience collegiate formation but of an ecumenical rather than Methodist sort. (And latter while in graduate studies at Princeton my wife and I actually associated with a Presbyterian congregation.)

So the Seminary phase: Union was certainly formative for me, though it not really in Wesleyan and United Methodist ways.

Synthesized: Actually, I don't think that occurred until I got to Duke and on faculty, which was after 16 or 17 years of being in theological education. When at Duke and associate dean, I began to see how CPE, the Duke Endowment, the practical disciplines, and the field education program interplayed in a significant way. So the contextualization I really learned late, and the Counseled really comes, as you'll see in a minute, in preparation for this lecture.

Counseled Again?

Yet another excursus in terms of my own teaching career and where we might go in this new century. When I went to Drew – and I could still do this if I went to teach there now – but when I went to Drew, I lived on campus and had an apartment with full cooking facilities. But there was a student body meal daily, so I could go across and eat in the cafeteria, if need be. The seminary hall was about 150 yards away with my office on the second floor and the chapel right down to the right. My favorite classroom was two doors down the other way, with my best colleagues there. Unfortunately, the men's room was two flights down; you know, I had to run there often. The library was not in that building, but two buildings over. The historic building at that point housed our admissions operation and the dean. I was associate dean there for a while, so I actually was in a meeting hall that burned and has been rebuilt. The library had all of our incredible Methodist holdings. Years later the General Commission on Archives and History Institution relocated there. If I was really farsighted, I could walk to the dean's house or the president's house, both on campus, and then over to the church for services. I oversaw their nursery for a while. And the conference headquarters was next door. So if my wife would do the shopping, I could just stay on campus.

Now if you go to Candler with its grand, new building, if you eat and sleep at home, you get to the complex there. The library and faculty offices, teaching space and just wonderful study areas are in one building. Across a little plaza is Cannon Chapel with the bookstore and a luncheon thing. If you're brave, you can walk elsewhere for lunch,

but everything is right in that complex. You might have to brave the weather to make chapel but otherwise could stay the day inside.

The Duke Divinity School is even better in some respects. Again, you have to eat and sleep at home, but on a rainy day if I get into my office, everything is there – men's room right next door, the copy room across the hall, library up one flight, the book store around the corner, lunchroom next to it and a few more feet a grand new chapel. If I'm really open-minded and want to think about things Methodist, I can go down one flight to Randy Maddox and folks, and several flights up is the Religion Department. So I get in there, and everything is just there.

So you can see that from my faculty/administrative seminary tour, getting a theological education meant getting on campus at Drew, into Candler's buildings in the complex and simply into the Duke Divinity building. And of course, unless you actually got to be a chaplain at Duke or Candler or Drew, you'd have to go off campus for field education. And for CPE, you'd have to go elsewhere on the university campuses. But what really struck me as I was getting ready for this lecture was how well we had brought into a building complex the systems that would prepare persons for ministry, and how all one really had to do was just get into the building. All the things were there. It was incredible what was then possible because it was all simply right there.

As I was getting ready for this presentation, I thought, have I told this story right? As a firm advocate for keeping our focus on North America, am I being fair? Here I am in Duke Divinity School, and everything is here. If you come here, you can prepare for ministry and you do that in the building and not go out. And I thought, this is a building that sees the role of forming persons for ministry in the United Methodist Church in the U.S. in an extraordinary way.

But then I just thought about what happens if I wander around a bit. So if I come out of my office and turn right, I come to one of the offices for Leadership Education at Duke Divinity – but it actually should be Leadership Education *from* Duke Divinity School because its primary clientele are young outstanding clergy, executives in business and in other Christian institutions, wired communities through its online publication and denominational leadership. These are not folks on campus for the M.Div. Its program functions off-campus and for non-campus corporate and religious executives. Its call is: Denominational leadership equips denominational staff members who have previously served congregations with tools and strategies to effectively navigate the complexities and changing landscape of institutional leadership.

If I come out of the office and turn left, I come to the Center for Reconciliation. I love to chat with the staff woman next door, but she might as well be doing programming in East Africa. The program there is called the Great Lakes Initiative, and it serves Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi and the Democratic Republic of Congo. And they just created centers for Christians from Germany, Japan, China and Hong Kong. So again, programming that is not for Duke Divinity students or even just to have them involved abroad, but actually programming aimed at persons in other religious communities.

If I'm really adventurous and go one more door over, I hit the Hispanic House of Studies. Of course, it functions on behalf of our Hispanic students there and for Hispanic leaders in both the North Carolina and Western North Carolina conferences. But it's also running programs in El Salvador, Guatemala and Peru. The first two are actually co-sponsored by GBHEM and GBGM. The one in El Salvador meets twice a year for a week for students, taking staff down there to train for 60 students per unit. The one in Guatemala

also has 60 students and meets more briefly, for two-and-a-half day sessions. The Peruvian one is cooperative with the Methodist Church of Peru.

In the same office cluster is the Thriving Rural Communities. It, too, offers some help for our own students, but often reaches beyond them to other leaders.

If I'm really feeling adventuresome, I can go upstairs and find the Duke Clergy Health Initiative. It has an \$18 million, seven-year program to improve the health and well-being of United Methodist clergy in North Carolina.

The Theology, Medicine, and Culture endeavor features trans-disciplinary conversation and practical collaboration, and I'm quoting, "at the intersections of religion, theology and healthcare." It draws upon Duke University faculty from theology, medicine, nursing and public health for various outreach ventures.

Similarly, the Duke Initiatives in Theology and the Arts does some things on campus, but it also has an onsite program in Cambridge, England. Among its projects is one looking to create a new musical based on the passion and the Gospel of Luke.

The Summer Institute for Reconciliation involves various publics, for not just students. The Lifelong Learning program includes some things for clergy, some for laity, some for institutional leaders all, and then it has a Youth Academy, one of the Lilly-funded things that brings in high school kids.

On the Divinity website are listed eighteen "Initiatives & Centers."

- | | |
|--|---|
| * Anglican Episcopal House of Studies | * Hispanic House of Studies |
| * Baptist House of Studies | * La Casa De Estudios Hispanos |
| * Black Church Studies | * Initiatives in Theology and the Arts |
| * Center for Reconciliation | * Leadership Education at Duke Divinity |
| * Center for Studies in the Wesleyan Tradition | * Lifelong Learning |
| * The Center for Theological Writing | * Methodist House |
| * Clergy Health Initiative | * Summer Institute for Reconciliation |
| * Gender, Theology, and Ministry Program | * Theology, Medicine, and Culture |
| | * Thriving Rural Communities |
| | * Youth Academy |

Of these 18 initiatives listed there, only four are really aimed at divinity students. And, of them, the Center for Studies in the Wesleyan Tradition functions both off campus and on campus and for both degree and non-degree folk. The bulk of the incredible array of programming goes quite beyond the Divinity School. It's remarkable in size, scope, staffing, expenditure and imagination. I walked us through these because what's really impressive – and was in some ways a discovery for me as I got ready to do the lecture on this book – was that though I wanted to stay on campus and look to the U.S. as the horizon, what's really striking is how broad our theological schools are now in their thinking about their programming.

I didn't know such theological expansiveness was on-going. And while I don't go to Duke faculty meetings, I'd be willing to bet you a big chunk of money that few of the Divinity faculty would have any sense of the range of these things – the number, the staffing, the expenditures. I don't think Duke has a sense of this, and to me what's really interesting is that I don't think these several programs collaborate and cooperate with one another in a

2015 Willson Lecture Formation for Ministry in American Meth.mp3

way that is mutually interfacing and enriching between and them among them and in relationship to the rest of the divinity school.

Nor, at this point, do the basic degree programming and students typically participate fully, if at all, in these ventures. However, as we well know, some seminaries have moved aggressively into online and digital formation. Across our United Methodist theological schools we've got incredible programs. Experimental, interesting, new formatted degree and non-degree systems are being launched from BU to Claremont and up north and south. In some cases, the faculty of a school may be fully involved in the new ventures, but we don't know what one another is doing. We tend to compete not cooperate.

Counseled Again?

In the *Formation for Ministry* book, I try to imagine some innovative and collaborative ways forward. However, in the lecture, I urged, and here in its revision continue to urge, GBHEM to find helpful, imaginative, resourceful ways of encouraging exploratory cooperation between and among the seminaries. Can GBHEM with the schools discern Wesley's counsel for a new day?

You are hosts for the AUMTS – the Association of United Methodist Theological Schools. Through AUMTS and the multi-denominational ATS meetings, deans and presidents get together. But, at least in my experience, concerns about money, denominational policy, federal regulations and the like consume such gatherings. More promising, I would think, would be several-day retreats, less threatening and more exploratory agendas, inclusion of academic associate deans and key faculty, presence of strong clergy and lay leaders, and an orientation toward reimagining Wesley's counsel now for a troubled world. Such a gathering and group could think together about what we can do that's collaborative and cooperative. How can we be better accountable to the church, the enriching of our students, and working for the kingdom?

So there are really interesting, important questions and challenges that bid our UMC schools work together on various planes. Each of the schools must continue to do their thing but also, as it's appropriate and funding permits, collaborate and cooperate.