

THE ASSOCIATION OF THEOLOGICAL FIELD EDUCATION
ADDRESS OF THE CHAIR, 2013

**From Pasts to Possibilities:
Finding our Way as the
Association for Theological Field Education**

Lorraine Ste-Marie

Summary

This essay was a speech given to the biennial conference of the Association for Theological Educators. It invites the organization and all individuals involved in field education to continue to be pilgrims on the way, who welcome voices that bring new ideas and help navigate the multiple realities of globalization in which the changing religious, political, ethnic, and cultural landscape offers opportunities for reimagining authentic praxis.

The Association for Theological Field Education alternates between an essay on best practices and publishing the chair address at the Biennial Consultation. This essay is an expanded version of that address presented January 25, 2013 in Williamsburg, VA.

The theme of the 32nd Biennial Consultation of The Association of Theological Field Educators (ATFE) provides the opportunity to review where we have come from, to explore our present context and look toward the future. This theme has motivated me to consult documents in the Association's archives to gain greater understanding of our past in order to better situate our current situation. In the process, I discovered a rich history that continues to inform our ethos and practices as an organization.

PILGRIMS ON THE WAY

Theological field educators know the power of images. Images give us great insight into who we are, to what is being lived and to what we are being called.¹ Over the years, invited speakers and leaders in the Association for

Lorraine Ste-Marie, DMin, Associate Professor, Faculty of Human Sciences, Director of Master of Pastoral Theology and Doctor of Ministry Programs, Saint Paul University, 223 Main Street, Ontario, Canada K1S 1C4 (email: stemarie.lorraine@gmail.com).

Theological Field Education have used a number of images to describe theological field education. Images such as boundaries, juncture, intersection, bridge, tunneling, plaza, and weaving reflect a dynamic sense of place and movement in which stability and fluidity are intrinsically connected. To this bank of images and metaphors, I add the image of “the way” in the sense of being a pilgrim on the way, the *status viatoris*, a dynamic state of being here but not fully, the “not-yet,” of becoming. As human beings, we are shaped by images of the “not-yet” future just as powerfully as we are influenced by our past and present. Theological field educators are pilgrims, sojourners on the way in which detours and side roads have been and are part of the journey.²

In her book *Finding our Way: Leadership for an Uncertain Time*, Margaret J. Wheatley offers us a guide for pilgrims on the way, for “finding our way into a hope-filled future.” Living systems, she proposes, “self-organize, change, create, learn and adapt”³ around two great forces, “creativity and connectedness.”⁴ Life is born from an unquenchable need to create something original and to connect to other forms life. By its very essence, life seeks “to form systems of relationships” in which individuals are offered greater stability and support than they would have on their own.⁵ Wheatley tells us that all living systems are comprised of three essential and primary domains; identity, information, and relationship that together provide the “conditions that support an organization’s capacity to access its intelligence and to change as needed.”⁶

The process of organizing begins with a sense of purpose and belief that something more is possible when people are together. “Relationships are the pathways to the intelligence of the system.”⁷ As information is created and transformed through relationships, the organization’s identity expands to include more stakeholders and the enterprise becomes wiser. When people have greater access to one another, they have more possibilities before them. In a living system, identity, information, and relationship are intrinsically interconnected and dynamic. New relationships connect more and more of the system, creating information that in turn affects the organization’s identity.

This framework from Wheatley is a useful lens to make sense of the beginning and developing story of ATFE—how we think about ourselves and others and “how we approach the task of organizing our endeavors”⁸ What tension between innovation and tradition shaped the ATFE story? How did relationships shift and realign in significant ways that included more stakeholders and so expanded possibilities? For the purpose of this es-

say, I have given a more detailed account of the association's founding years including its original external environment, concerns, and sense of purpose. This review allows us to see how these early years continue to shape the organization.⁹

This historical review relies on the writing of Maureen Egan's 1987 dissertation *The History of the Association for Theological Field Education 1946-1979* as well as a compilation of information in a binder entitled *Moments in History: A Look at the Development of ATFE through Biennial Proceedings and other Archival Material*, both of which are unpublished. Much of this has been captured in *The History of ATFE: A Living Document* by Anne Reissner for the 1995 Biennial Consultation. The document prepared by Abigail Johnson, *Packing our Treasures for the Journey: A Reflection on the Ethos of ATFE* prepared for the 2007 biennium has been helpful for situating ATFE in a more recent context, opening the way for engaging future possibilities. Unfortunately, all of these documents are unpublished. However, they are available through ATFE archives.

IN THE BEGINNING: 1940S TO 1959

The story of the Association of Theological Field Educators (ATFE) begins in the 1940's when a small group of Protestant seminary educators met to discuss the place of field work in the theological education curriculum. At that time, many seminarians were employed in ministry sites away from the seminary as a means for financing their studies. The seminary educators were looking for ways to make those field work sites conducive learning environments as part of their overall seminary education. Many of them found themselves in unwelcoming, even hostile academic environments. Records of the first "field work conference" meeting in 1946 indicate that participants protested the views of faculty groups in theological education that regarded field work was the "stepchild of the seminary" and "was actually considered evil" and devoid of educational value.¹⁰ Arthur Swift, the Chair of that first meeting responded to this malaise in his Report to the American Association of Theological Schools (AATS) in 1946:

Now an unwanted child is always a problem and those of us who have been longest at the game of organizing field work are well aware that there has always been a certain coolness...a quite natural regret that theological students should find it necessary to spend time and energy elsewhere than in the classroom and in the library. But the temperature is changing and in the right direction."¹¹

At the Second Conference on Field Work in Theological Education in 1947, participants discussed the place and impact of field work within the academy, stressing the need to recognize formal studies and field work as important partners in an integral training for ministry.¹² Some participants objected to the comparison of seminary field work to the medical model of residency and internship training in which the language of functionalism implied the local church was being exploited for the sake of “learning by doing.”¹³ The ensuing discussions revealed the frustrations and “heightened tensions that existed between professors in the academy versus those in the practical areas of the curriculum,”¹⁴ a tension that continues to exist in some member schools today.

The participants of these two initial field work conferences did not intend to create an enduring group. It seemed that they had accomplished their original purpose of coming together, sharing their experiences, insights, and problems of field work as part of theological education.¹⁵ Rather than continue to meet to address specific issues in field work, many of the original participants joined the Association of Seminary Professors in the Practical Field (ASPPF). Formed in 1950, this association gathered seminary professors in what was then called the “Practical Field, which included religious education, homiletics, pastoral care, counseling, and church administration.”¹⁶ Although they all shared a common concern for “integration within the theological education curriculum,”¹⁷ and the importance of field work was acknowledged, very few discussions addressed field work. Field work personnel quickly found themselves marginalized from the ASPPF in terms of space on the agenda and recognition as one of the practical fields within the academy. Furthermore, membership for the ASPPF became restricted to appointed faculty members, eliminating many field work personnel who did not have faculty status. *In the language of Margaret Wheatley, new information regarding theological education could not “circulate freely” and create new possibilities because relationships were restricted.*¹⁸

Marginalization from ASPPF led to a Third Conference on Field Work in Theological Field Education in 1953 in which its earlier purpose to discuss issues and problems in field work opened the way for developing a clearer articulation of its educational philosophy based on theologies of ministry and a prophetic, servant model of church.¹⁹ In the early to mid-1950s an important survey of theological education was conducted by H. Richard Niebuhr, the results of which were presented at the 1956 AATS meeting. In reflecting on that study, Niebuhr stated that he “saw more fully the signifi-

cance of field work and in-service training" in theological education.²⁰ In the meantime, field work personnel continued to attend the ASPPF conferences in 1954 and 1956; however it was in a major presentation in 1956 that the theoretical and educational foundations to field work were judged insufficient to justify its recognition amongst the practical fields. This presentation delivered a fateful blow to the connection of field work to the practical fields.²¹ It also presented an opportunity for field work personnel to more clearly define its educational theory and theological foundations, a task that continues today. Again, Wheatley has it right. *Living systems like ATFE thrive in a dynamic zone only when new information can enter and the organization still maintains its identity.*

THE TRANSITION YEARS: 1959 TO 1969²²

This decade was marked by a number of changes in American society, in the academy as well as for this group of field work personnel who were beginning to identify themselves as an organization. Attentive to all these changes, a sense of collegiality and mutual learning permeated this group as they listened to the calls to clarify their place and contribution in the academy, church, and enviring society. The names given to this developing organization are significant of its emerging identity and purpose, as well as to place of field work within the respective theological schools. The name changes from Seminary Field Work to Seminary Field Educators in the early 1960s to the Association for Field Education Directors are indicative of the emerging identity and purpose of both the organization as well as the place of field work within theological schools.

The 1959 Biennial Consultation on Field Work took a new turn in terms of its participants, stance, programming, and speakers. Except for two, all the participants who gathered for the Consultation on Field Work were attending for the first time. Two Canadians joined the American field work personnel, extending the network of relationships and opening up the avenues of information gathering. Records show that "the defensiveness of previous meetings had largely disappeared from the presentations."²³ Speakers from disciplines and field work outside of theological education were invited to inform participants with their own vision and experience of field work. Three speakers dealt with "What Other Disciplines are Doing in Field Work" from the educational, medical, and social work fields.²⁴ *Wheatley is*

clear (and the story of ATFE is testimony) that organizations thrive and grow when they open themselves to new information without losing their collective memory.

In his 1959 presidential address, James Glasse named trends in the growth in field work programs, changes in the seminarians' contexts of field work, and the contribution of field work to the theological curriculum. He also addressed the need for field work directors to define their roles within their diverse academic and denominational settings. The most significant address of this consultation was delivered by Dr. Jesse Ziegler, Executive Director of American Association of Theological Schools (AATS) who affirmed "the existence and the positive enrichment of theological education by field work programs."²⁵ Ziegler proposed a model for field work that promoted a dynamic relationship between the students' fieldwork experience and traditional academic theological disciplines. Furthermore, he offered his views on the education and training needed for a field work director that included a solid theological foundation as well as social and psychological sciences, training and experience in the arts of ministry, educational process, and supervision.²⁶

Although our legal records indicate that ATFE officially began in 1956, Egan suggests that this 1959 consultation marked the formal organization of what eventually became the Association for Theological Field Education (ATFE). The group committed to meeting on a biennial basis, approved a leadership structure, and elected a Committee for the next biennium. Rather than sever their ties with the ASPPF, participants were encouraged to attend the biennial gatherings and "that this group be our continuing membership group."²⁷ *As an organization like ATFE responds to new information and new relationships, its identity becomes clearer at the same time it changes.*

The period of 1959 to 1961 marked the beginning of using the term "field education" instead of field work. In an address at the 1961 Sixth Biennial Consultation on Seminary Field Work, J. Christie Wilson, a pioneer in field work at Princeton Theological Seminary, proposed "field education" as the preferred term. This proposal was the result of Niebuhr's study and Ziegler's subsequent endorsement of the findings, "other faculty members of [their] faculties began to admit that perhaps the *diversion* of church work could in certain cases become actual education."²⁸ This important change took seriously the call to establish educational theoretical and theological foundations for the work. This same call is captured by Milton C. Froyd, a consultant with the Association of Theological Schools.

If field work is to be viewed as a *field* in which educational purpose and meaning operate, then every member of the faculty has a stake in what goes on. Unless it is so conceived, field work has no more right to a place in the curriculum than has public relations or alumni placement.²⁹

A TIME OF FERMENT: 1969-1979³⁰

This was a time when questions of identity, structure, and style were raised and struggled with. The tone for this era is captured in 1971 by the Chair, James Bergland, who challenged field educators to “reconstruct their traditional understandings of supervision, theological reflection, spirituality, and the professional education model from the context of liberation, praxis-oriented perspective directed to the needs of society.” By this time membership had increased and represented most the regions across the United States and much of Canada. Most Protestant denominations were represented. The Second Vatican Council’s turn to the world and its ensuing engagement other Christian churches opened the way for Roman Catholic field educators to join what had now become an interdenominational organization, redirecting “the Association toward a broader constituency and [laying] the foundation for a new identity for its membership.”³¹ *Once again, as people had more access to one another, new possibilities emerged.*

During this same period, members were challenged to rethink theological assumptions and practices in light of the changing role of women in the church, in theological and field education, and in ATFE.³² By 1977, the Steering Committee election was representative of “ethnic, denominational, international, and female presence, signaling movement toward a more diverse and inclusive membership in the Association.”³³

The 1970s was also a time of great ferment for publications. Since its very beginning, ATFE has encouraged and circulated information both during and in between the biennial consultations. Reports of committee work, regional, and denominational meetings were circulated as well as biennial proceedings. Research was stimulated amongst the membership leading to the appointment of a research coordinator in 1979. Throughout the 1970’s several articles and books were written by active members providing important resources for theological field education and supervision. By the end of this decade, ATFE would have published the first two volumes of a series of key resources in theological field education³⁴ with other volumes to follow in the 1980s.

By the 12th Biennial Consultation in 1973, the Association was ready to vote on its name change from the Association of Field Education Directors for the Association for Theological Field Education. As with the move from field work to field education, this name change signaled the recognition that the type of practical education in the field was indeed theological and recognized as such in the curriculum of theological seminaries. The proceedings from 1973 noted that "we were coming of age as a theological discipline" and the name change "moved Field education (in our minds at least) from an administrative matter to a moment in theological study wherein God and the work of God in church and world was to be discerned and interpreted in order to move to embodiment within the individual and social existence. Tenure track faculty appointments were our goal for field educators."³⁵ Theological field education's claim to academic and theological credibility was strengthened by James and Evelyn Whitehead's method of theological reflection that became foundational for theological field education.³⁶

SEARCHING FOR DEEPER MEANING: 1979 TO 1995³⁷

This was a time for continuing to reshape ATFE's vision, adopting inclusive language practices, and for challenging "ourselves to engage in theological reflection upon God's call to us and upon the uncertain silent calls confronting us in our world today."³⁸ The Association had moved beyond the question for professional identity and turned its attention to the question of relevancy and the challenge of theological reflection. "The challenge to be inclusive and to respond to issues of globalization and to the needs of a pluralistic society emerged as major concerns of this time."³⁹ *In the language of Margaret Wheatley, there was a convergence of identity, information and relationships that together provided the conditions for ATFE to "access its own intelligence and change as needed."*⁴⁰

In addressing these concerns, Lynn Rhodes invited theological field educators to identify themselves as a "bridge people...connectors of academy and church, theory and practice...trying to honor the wisdom of the past while preparing men and women for future yet undreamed," finding ourselves at place of boundaries, never having a place of stability, never quite legitimate."⁴¹ In this same address, Rhodes attended to the growing diversity within the organization, calling members to "a truthful examination of our real differences as well as what we share in order not to become like each

other but to find out if and how our different experiences, visions, skills, and perspective might connect—not dissolve—into each other.”⁴²

A NEW MILLENNIUM: NEW POSSIBILITIES

Moving into the twenty-first century was in itself a momentous time for society as a whole. Issues of inclusivity, globalization, and pluralism have become entrenched in our sense of self and place. The 9/11 event profoundly changed the world’s sense of boundaries and security. Attentive to its purpose and location at the juncture of church, academy, and world, ATFE continues to work toward a more holistic, integrated approach to theological education. The biennial themes, breakout and plenary session speakers during this time are indicative of our desire to deepen our understanding of the political, socio-historical, economic, and ethnic dimensions of context in relation to pedagogical, ecclesial, and ministerial praxis. These are not new concerns; ATFE has addressed them in various ways in previous biennia. However, they take on a new meaning as our contexts change. We continue to call upon the wisdom and methods of other disciplines within the theological curriculum as well as in the social sciences to give us greater insight into the destructive impact of hegemonic paradigms and socio-economic practices on individuals and society at large.

In the last decade, many theological schools have changed the name of their theological field education programs to “contextual education” signaling a greater emphasis on the field placement context as the integrating center for an action-reflection model of learning. There is an intrinsic connection between the name of an organization and its sense of purpose and identity. Throughout its history, ATFE’s name changes have signaled shifts in its sense of the place and purpose of theological field education within the academy and church. Given this change, I wonder if the time is coming for ATFE to ask if its name, already 30 years old, is still relevant to its member schools’ vision and practices in theological field education.

The 2013 Biennial Consultation explored the theme “From Pasts to Possibilities” through a number of lenses. Both plenary speakers challenged us to rethink our problematic pasts, inspiring us to transcend our habitual paradigms and deepen our core identities. Dr. Kwok Pui Lan called us to reach beyond the traditional boundaries of churches and academies, to imagine theological field education as a laboratory in an increasingly global and pluralistic world that challenges our familiar patterns of leadership

and organizational structures. Rev. Dr. William Bobby McClain challenged us to accompany our students in deepening their sense of call and its ensuing disciplines and responsibilities. They both showed us a need for strong spiritual roots and a deep conviction in God's radical presence in the emerging realities of our time and place. *Once again, we are reminded of the wisdom of Wheatley's vision: living systems must creatively embrace the tension of both promoting innovation and honoring tradition.*

Since its inception, ATFE members have communicated their accumulated wisdom and perspectives to theological field education through keynote presentations and publications. Research and publications continue to flourish through articles, chapters in books, as well as full books addressing a broad range of topics that relate to theological field education such as best practices, emerging church, supervision, online technologies for students and supervisors, and intercultural immersions.⁴³ Several ATFE members have benefited over the years from grants from Wabash Centre and Lilly Foundation. The structure of internal research grants ensures that research findings are fed back into the organization through publications and breakout sessions at the biennial consultations. The Research and Publications Committee carefully gathers lists of members' publications and shares that information with its members at the biennial consultations as well as through the Association's website. In 2009, ATFE entered into a formal relationship with *Reflective Practice: Formation and Supervision in Ministry*, by way of financial and editorial support. Members publish in this journal recognizing it as an important medium for engaging and contributing to each other's learning.

High turnover continues amongst our membership. At every biennial consultation, we welcome several new members and lament the loss of those who have left theological field education. The 32nd Biennial Consultation was no exception. Over thirty percent of the participants were in theological field education for three years or less. This trend is exacerbated by the lack of faculty status for many theological field educators, as well as the current economic context in which some theological field education offices have succumbed to the financial constraints of their academic institutions. Such high turnover makes continuity and connection a challenge. On the other hand, this trend has shaped ATFE's ethos that is marked by collegiality and generosity. In her paper presented at the 2007 Biennial Consultation, past Chair Abigail Johnson invited ATFE members to see this high turnover as an opportunity that has given this Association a rich experience in being

hospitable and intentional in the open sharing of its accumulated wisdom and resources.⁴⁴ *New relationships create new possibilities.*

Our history shows us that ATFE emerged as an association in reaction to particular historical movements. Many members continue to live with a sense of being exiles or aliens in their academies, churches and world. Rather than maintain a reactive position, I echo Abigail Johnson's call to ATFE to continue to find our "power from within through our sense of self, our strong collaborative being, our understanding of our teaching and learning methodologies, our developing research and publications, and our passionate commitment to learning."⁴⁵

REBUILDING THE RELATIONSHIP TO PRACTICAL THEOLOGY

Relationships both within an organization and with other organizations are important sources of information sharing and identity-making. ATFE and what was originally called the Association of Seminary Professors in the Practical Field (ASPPF) are now finding their way as dialogue partners. The ASPPF is now known as the Association for Practical Theology (APT), whose purpose "is to promote critical discourse that integrates theological reflection and practice."⁴⁶ Chastened in the 1950s by this same organization for its lack of intellectual rigor and academic integrity, theological field education has since developed its own sense of identity and greater internal coherence that makes possible renewed recognition and partnership as one of the disciplines within practical theology. Several ATFE members have been members of APT for a number of years. Most recently, more formal connections have been made between the organizations through website linkages, and respective conference programming and publishing. In a 2012 publication entitled *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Practical Theology*, Emily Click (past Chair 2007-2009) argued for the connection between practical theology and theological field education in a chapter on "Contextual Education."⁴⁷ And, in the 32nd Biennial Consultation, Joe Bush (ATFE) and Joyce Mercer (APT) co-presented a colloquy that focused on the historical and continuing relationship between these two disciplines.

As a discipline within the field of practical theology, theological field education continues to find its way within the academy, the life of the church in which many of our students are preparing for leadership ministry, and the world. On the way, we find ourselves at junctures and intersections, in plazas, tunneling under the protected borders that divide our theological

disciplines,⁴⁸ chipping away at boundaries, and walking on bridges connecting what is artificially divided and unequally valued. As pilgrims on the way, I invite us to hold fast to our commitment to explore the parameters of the discipline, dig deeper into areas that are more familiar to us, and embrace alternative perspectives. Let us continue to be pilgrims on the way, who welcome voices that bring new ideas and help us to navigate the multiple realities of globalization in which the changing religious, political, ethnic, and cultural landscape offers opportunities for reimagining authentic Christian praxis. As pilgrims on the way, let us be lured by possibilities and God's desire for us and all of creation. Let our minds, spirits, and hearts be guided by the Light that shines on our path.

NOTES

1. Patricia O'Connell Killen and John de Beer, *The Art of Theological Reflection* (New York: Crossroad, 1996), 36.
2. Mind Your Maker weblog, "To Be a 'Pilgrim' (*status viatoris*)," May 23, 2007, accessed March 8, 2013, <http://mindyourmaker.wordpress.com/2007/05/23/to-be-a-pilgrim-status-viatoris/>.
3. Margaret J. Wheatley, *Finding our Way: Leadership for an Uncertain Tim*, (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2004), 3.
4. *Ibid.*, 23.
5. *Ibid.*, 25.
6. *Ibid.*, 36.
7. *Ibid.*, 40.
8. *Ibid.*, 19.
9. Unfortunately, this brief review does not allow for recognizing the significant contributions of many of the ATFE members, contributors and past chairs. It is my hope that this essay might entice a similar review of the more recent time periods.
10. Maureen Egan, *The History of the Association for Theological Field Education in the United States, 1946–1979* (St. Louis, MO: Saint Louis University, 1987), 40, unpublished.
11. Arthur Swift, "Field Work in Theological Seminaries," *Fifteenth Biennial of AATS* 88, cited in *Ibid.*, 45.
12. This discussion was based on a doctoral dissertation written and presented by Carl H. Morgan, "The Status of Field Work in the Protestant Theological Seminaries in the United States," PhD dissertation (Philadelphia, PA: Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1942), as cited in *Ibid.*, fn. 26, 82.
13. Egan, *History of the Association for Theological Field Education in the United States*, 51.

14. Ibid., 51.
15. Ibid., 53.
16. Ibid., 54.
17. Ibid., 54.
18. Wheatley, *Finding our Way*, 40.
19. Egan, *History of the Association for Theological Field Education in the United States*, 63.
20. H. Richard Niebuhr, "A Panel Discussion: The Purpose of the Church and its Ministry," Twentieth Biennial Meeting of the AATS, Bulletin No. 22 (Berkeley, CA: AATS, 1956), 101, cited in Ibid., 65.
21. Ibid., 69.
22. Anne Reissner, *The History of ATFE: A Living Document*, 1995 (unpublished). In this document, Dr. Reissner categorizes three decades ranging 1959 to 1989 according to themes.
23. Egan, *History of the Association for Theological Field Education in the United States*, 79.
24. Ibid., 70.
25. Ibid., 79.
26. Ibid., 73.
27. Ibid., 74.
28. J. Christie Wilson, "Field Education Comes of Age," *Sixth Consultation on Field Work*, 32 cited in Ibid., 106. For further exploration of changing terminology, see Charlotte McDaniel, "Vision for the Future: Terminology in Theological Field Education," *The Journal of Supervision and Training in Ministry* 20 (2000): 208–218.
29. Milton C. Froyd, "The Educational Significance of Field Work for Theological Study," *Encounter* 24, Spring (1963): 196–214, cited in Ibid., 110.
30. Reissner, *The History of ATFE*, 3.
31. Egan, *History of the Association for Theological Field Education in the United States*, 203.
32. Ibid., 199.
33. Reissner, *The History of ATFE*, 4.
34. Donald F. Beisswenger, Tjaard A. Hommes and Doran McCarty, ed. *Theological Field Education: A Collection of Key Resources, Vol. 1 (ATFE, 1977), Vol. 2 (ATFE 1979)*.
35. Reissner, *The History of ATFE*, 2, in reference to an interview with Don Beisswenger of Vanderbilt Divinity School.
36. Egan, *History of the Association for Theological Field Education*, 260.
37. Reissner, *The History of ATFE*, 5. Adapted from period of 1979 to 1989 for purpose of essay.

38. *Report of the Proceedings of the 17th Biennial Consultation of the Association for Theological Field Education* entitled "ATFE in Search of Paradigms," held in San Antonio, Texas, 1983, 3 in binder entitled *Moments in History: A Look at the Development of ATFE through Biennial Proceedings and other Archival Material* available in ATFE archives.
39. Reissner, *The History of ATFE*, 5.
40. Wheatley, *Finding our Way*, 36.
41. Lynn Rhodes, "Opening Address," in *The Report of the Proceedings of the 19th Biennial Consultation of the Association for Theological Field Education* (Louisville, KY: ATFE, 1987), 4 cited in Reissner, *The History of ATFE*, 5.
42. *Ibid.*, 6.
43. Two recent books are indicative of the flurry of research and publishing activity. Matthew Floding (past Chair 2009–2011) edited a book entitled *Welcome to Theological Field Education!* that gathers the wisdom and perspectives of eleven theological field educators. See Matthew Floding, ed., *Welcome to Theological Field Education!* (Herndon, VA: Alban Publications, 2011). Also, Alice Rogers (Chair 2013–2015) co-edited a book with David Jenkins entitled *Equipping the Saints: Best Practices in Contextual Theological Education* bringing together the vision and practices of thirteen theological field educators. See Alice P. Rogers and David A. Jenkins, eds., *Equipping the Saints: Best Practices in Contextual Theological Field Education* (Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 2010).
44. Abigail Johnson, *Packing our Treasures for the Journey: A Reflection on the Ethos of ATFE*, (included in registration packet for 29th ATFE Biennial Consultation, 2007. Unpublished), 2.
45. *Ibid.*, 2.
46. The Association of Practical Theology website, accessed March 8, 2013, <http://practicaltheology.org/>.
47. Emily Click, "Contextual Education," in Bonnie J. Miller-McLemore, ed., *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Practical Theology* (West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 347–356.
48. Harvey Cox, "Revolution: Changing Church and Theological Education" in *The Report of the Proceedings of the 26th Biennial Consultation of the Association for Theological Field Education* (Boston, MA, ATFE, 2001).