|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  | | --- | |  | |  | | **haitiboy** | |  | |
| A discussion paper  Five Learning Technology Phases in Urban Missions Education Viv Grigg |
| (Internal APU version) Oct 2017 |

Abstract

Missions education has always been global and had high levels of character and leadership formation. It involves extensive pastoral care issues. Five phases in the style of delivery of missions education over fifty years are identified. The MATUL at APU has been on the cutting edge these last several years in creating new patterns of phase 5 in-field delivery processes.

In contrast with the previous phase 4 of distance learning that are still the primary drivers of online higher education, we tumbled onto a synchronous online face to face delivery system that dramatically reduces transactional distance and enables genuine action-reflection learning, using a Freirean pedagogical basis, enabling character formation, faith in action formation, and leadership formation in cross-cultural urban missions contexts.

Sustainability of this advance requires supportive administrators to be expanding acceptability, encouraging technology and creating new assessment processes with the changes. The following lays out the theoretical and practical basis. Three objections are examined. Five recommendations for action are made.
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*...teaching cannot be a process of transference of knowledge from the one teaching to the learner. This is the mechanical transference from which results machinelike memorization, which I have already criticized. Critical study correlates with teaching that is equally critical, which necessarily demands a critical way of comprehending and of realizing the reading of the word and that of the world, the reading of text and of context*(Paulo Freire, page 22).

## Theoretical Approaches in Urban Poor Community-Based Education

Its 11 pm my time, 5 am in Mozambique. The eight inset videos of students on my screen are dynamic, though periodically one disappears in Nairobi, due to low bandwidth. Others turn off the video to conserve their power on their modems, but remain engaged. The discussion is poignant – about land ownership. In the scriptures and in their communities! Poignant with story! Poignant with commitment! Poignant with character formation! Poignant with a depth of new dimensions of theology!

“I grew up in a missionary family, so we have never owned a home”, shares one, currently living in a slum home in a tough Indian city. “As I read Brueggemann, I realized that I am committed to a lifetime following the Lord with no place to lay my head!” There was a quietness in the presence of God across cyberspace at a moment of such commitment. Another in Bangkok, told a long story of how she needed stability and security. She would never be able to be constantly mobile as a missionary. In a cohort that has spent 18 months together online 1,2,3 times a week, there was only affirmation that this too was within the mandate of the scriptures we were discussing. An older experienced missionary from Mozambique affirmed them both in prayer. Character! Cohort! spiritual formation! academic foundation! face to face pastoral care! engagement with reality in context! Best practice urban missions education!!!

What are some elements of the educational philosophy that underlies such a dynamic delivery system?

### Freiran Education

Brazilian educational philosopher, Paulo Freire, is well- known in educational circles. Some estimate that 2 million educators around the world work with his theoretical framework. His seminal work, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1996), sets a standard for education among the urban poor. Unfortunately, inquiries of senior educators at APU indicate he is not used in the APU context. Some of his significant ideas:

* **Education** is not a banking system where deposits of info are made to people deficit with knowledge, but the knowledge lies in the adult learners and in their understanding of complex contexts (in our case, Americans have little knowledge of the overseas urban poor context, so we are forced to draw on knowledge from leaders on the field)
* **The educator** is a facilitator to draw that out this knowledge and link it to globalized concepts.
* **Learning Outcomes:** Learning is for purpose of action, and transformation of oppressive situations.
* **Identity** is developed through processing responses to oppression (Freire 1998).

### Democratic Education

Freire is not the only basis for this style of education, part of which can be partially framed within the American ideal of democracy.

*Democratic/ freedom-based education is grounded in the premise that people are naturally curious and have an innate desire to learn and grow. If left un-fettered, un-coerced, and un-manipulated (e.g. by conventional educational practices that often result in the diminishment of these innate characteristics), people will vigorously and with gusto pursue their interests, and thus learn and make meaning on their own and in concert with others. And because these individuals are honored and respected in this process, they become socialized to honor and respect the dignity and autonomy of others* (Morrison, p2).

After years of fostering research-based graduate education in my classes around the English-education world, I was aghast at the regimentation required within the Sakai framework and the expectation of Masters students (independent researchers in the English or European world) that they would continue being structured every week with forum, assignments, readings into machine-like learning dictated by the professor. I am an organizational systems designer, so mused that I can not buck a system that has extended high-school type didactics, but I could perhaps shift it towards the higher levels of best practice.

As part of this Freirean/ democratic process, students became involved each year in the design and evaluation of the program. Some courses we were able to start with a clean slate as they involved topics where there was no previous field of knowledge, so we created them together – land rights, community economics in the slums. I guided them with the issues, and some initial frameworks. They fleshed these out with local knowledge and local literature. I supplemented that with experience and global literature. The learning was less in the content as in the process of discovering the content, the “aha” moments that occurred weekly as reports of action from 8 cities around the globe came in, with supporting literature from within the culture! Collectively-owned!

Take the struggle for land rights for example. To begin with no student knew what the issues really were of dispossession. Nor how the laws functioned. Nor how the NGO’s that were interning with engaged. Nor how Islamic or Hindu thinking affected concepts of justice, let alone Christian perspectives on advocacy. By the end of that class (the only one in the world connecting theology and practice of land rights that I can find), they were sufficiently expert as to be able to discuss with any NGO leader the processes, the issues, the structures needed. And they did it, I was just “one of the group”, quietly assisting them to design, directing to sources, integrating the ideas. And at times teaching as the expert theologian and practitioner – it is not all student -driven.

One could do that with face-to-face synchronous weekly online classrooms. It would not have been possible with the asynchronous and high transactional distance delivery that had been developed fifteen years ago and now was being perfeted across the university in preparation for roboticization.

### Grigg: Transformational Conversations

Over 30 years I have been developing a new urban missions theology paradigm entitled *Transformational Conversations* that begin with the motivation of entrance stories into poverty that shock people into seeking Biblical answers. These result in engaging in a *theological conversation*. At the same time they need to be fed by the *city conversation*, the socio-economic or political conversation. The result is a new conversation that seeks transformation. This is usually outworked in *urban structures* that are an outworking of an urban theology in praxis.

Training students in such processes requires constant conversations as they engage in their communities. The very manner of learning is conversational not didactic.

### Action-Reflection Research Methodologies

This has also been developed as a research paradigm underlying the degree. This is highly compatible with action-reflection research used in development studies, and anchored research among theologians. The global MATUL has seven courses designed around internships with churches or non-profits. Each is the basis of learning one type of research process. The final research requires working with an organization, in such a way that the organizational leadership are involved in the design and hence own the final decisions based on the research. Peer group discussion of how such processes develop is an essential tool in facilitating student success. To supervise 18 students one-on-one without that cohort dynamic would be highly inefficient. Thankfully with face-to-face internet based discussion that is now a real option.

### Vela on Adult Education

Further literature on adult education adds other perspectives similarly, that have been foundational in forming the MATUL. One item that is germaine to the following discussion is the flexibility of schedule needed for graduate-level, adult-learning as students juggle life, family, work and study.

### Specific issues within missions training online

* **Action to reflection orientation:** The rapid changes of **experiences generate the materiel** for learning
* **Pastoral Care:** There are **progressions of emotional/stress dynamics** that are well documented in cross-cultural transitions. Education needs to be paced according to those, requiring high levels of personal interaction.  We have found this most efficient in weekly classroom interaction where students can share personally in a supportive environment, and signs of stress can be detected and followed up.
* **Building a cohort community** of peers is critical in this
* **Mentoring of character:** As in all theological formation, we are forming character while knowledge is being learned, so **relational and mentoring processes are critical**i.e. we don't do faith integration as an optional academic issue, faith is a core character formation issue. In urban missions education, education is at heart, character formation or spiritual formation.

## Synchronous Face to Face Online Learning

### Engagement

Students must engage with their context, the course material, with their peers and with their instructor. In synchronous engagement weekly there is more communication than in a face to face class on campus. It is in fact intense, very personal. There are personalities! The precise detailed story teller who takes ten minutes for each story, the quick thinker who has an immediate answer, the hesitant Hispanic, careful with words who ahs to be drawn out, the late coming philosopher, arriving 30 minutes into each class – it’s the normal chaos of group engagement.

And the role of the professor becomes paramount – humility is critical. When there is criticism, humbly receiving it – such as when a date is incorrect (which in online systems is not infrequent), when there is disagreement about an issue, listening to the various sides and adjudicating wisely, the skill of integrating a lesson and brining it to high point of motivation based on the discoveries, adding in expertise, connecting the dots, so all leave with a renewed sense of energy. Facial expressions form eight countries, some bored, some arrogant, some enthusiastic mean the professor constantly is reeling them in to engagement, pressing them forward to commitments, stirring up their curiosity and imagination.

In contrast, as I listen to an APU training video on asynchronous learning which states: “The weakest link in online learning is engagement with the instructor. Online instructors are often perceived as absent or apathetic or both”, I find myself bewildered. Why would they use such a backwards technological approach from a decade ago, when the technology has moved on?

### Retention

Our MATUL international retention rates have been 78-85% for students in 2-3 years of study.

The training video tells us, “Online students drop out at a higher rat then their face to face counterparts.” This is well known in the global online missions circles I am part of. Outside of APU in my responsibilities for grassroots training, our goal is to reach the masses, so we by necessity use asynchronous delivery, with courses no longer than six weeks as we know that 50% will drop by the 4th to 6th week.

The training video goes on to say, “Feelings of isolation is the number one reason for dropping out.” In contrast our students hang out on line. Even if they have to travel for two hours to a class they travel, because here is a supportive environment.

### Mentored courses

That has implications. Content is not the most important felt need, relationships are, so often we deviate to deal with a particular pastoral care issue as a group – the pain of engaging with with destitution, the frustration as they work with an organization and realize there is corruption, the despair as they fail day after day in language learning. They don’t always want more knowledge, they want support. And in that is the learning.

### Knowledge is not written, redacted, philosophical constructs

So we extend Freire to online delivery. Knowledge is warm, human, relational, wrapped up in a loving community of peers. The humanity is in the unpacking of the contextual realities. And the emotive responses to those realities of oppression, dispossession, poverty, dysfunction. We are not equipping students to push papers (Well we do, but that is not the primary goal). We are equipping them to engage, to feel, to reflect, to interpret, to act.

Knowledge then is not impersonal. It is human. In reflection we link it back to theories and behind them to philosophies. Our students complete a degree wel able to converse with diverse fields that impinge on poverty. But at its core it is not impersonal constructs of ideas. It cannot be roboticized.

### Transactional Distance

Why? One answer is the desire to deliver to thousands (As we seek in our grassroots training). This increases transactional distance. But our aim in a Masters level program is not thousands but mentoring 15-20 (15 has been demonstrated as an optimal learning size; 20 is a viable financial number) or maximum of 30 at a time.

Another answer that surfaced that finally helped me understand why the ITT department were so adamant in their opposition to synchronous online, was in the rapid expansion of APU’s risk management fleet of lawyers. As a good friend and expert mentioned, “Sometimes face to face teachers do not show up to class!! It is more risky!” As with multiple factors in the university, the risk management flotilla, on the new wild-west edge of this thing called risk management (nobody can quantify this knd of risk, so their aim is that all risk be eliminated –its actually a risk aversion strategy not risk management), had once again determined educational strategy, and once again increased risk for our students, who need the personal engagement.

### The underlying fallacy

The training video continues “For learning at a distance, face to face approaches do not work”. So here is the rub. They are aiming at thousands in courses with large transactional distances. But for graduate missiological training we are aiming at manageable class sizes of 15-30 over 8 cities at a time where face to face online delivery is eminently feasible. His conclusion was to communicate, communicate, communicate. Instead of utilizing the face-to-face zoom technology we use to communicate, the whole scenario then shifted back to impersonal paperwork

## Five Phases of Missiological Training Delivery

The following is a replay of the style of missions training over the last hundred years.

**Phase 1:** (1920’2-1970’s) Missionaries were trained in Seminaries or Bible Schools that focused on knowledge and character formation prior to being sent to the field. During the first two years of cross-cultural adaptation, they were then mentored on the field by older missions team leaders.

The next phases sought to deliver the training to workers on site in-field. The principle was “do not disturb the context or means of production.”

**Phase 2** (1970’s): TEE was an early form of dissemination. *Theological Education by Extension* used the mail system, and sent out written workbooks, and used mail to send back quizzes for evaluation.

**Phase 3** (1980’s): Fuller Theological Seminary then pioneered masters level missions education, that was reproduced at other missions schools.

* **Content:** A “banking system” of knowledge. The professor is expert. His expertise lies in readings. He downloads knowledge into the heads of students.
* **Delivery System:** using audio cassettes of professors in classes, and books posted out to missionaries around the world.
  + Lectures had been taped.
  + Lectures and Readings were typed up.
* **Evaluation:** Assignments consisted of two major papers and some book reviews.
* **Human interaction** was minimal.
* **Retention:** very low

**Phase 4** (late 1990’s-2009): This morphed into asynchronous online education. It continued the traditions. However, faculty were not impressed at the massification and depersonalization of education.

* **Content:** A “banking system” of knowledge. The professor is expert. His expertise lies in readings. He downloads knowledge into the heads of students.
* **Delivery System:** Audio tapes now moved to videod recordings of professors teaching and quoting from their written materials.
* Retention low.
* **Human interaction** now included some video calls for professor – student interaction, but essentially the system was knowledge transfer.
* No **character formation**
  + No leadership formation, just knowledge of theories
  + No pastoral care.

This phase began to highlight some major problems with online learning. First, the problem of *transactional distance* is repeated more than once in my university’s technology training literature. In fact, it is repeated many, many times, with disclaimers that while the form of impersonal asynchronous online education creates relational distance and hence considered retention issues, it is the only way to go. Many ways around this are suggested, such as Empathetic Pedagogy. There is always ways to learn. I just discussed with one expert how to make brief personal videos, the need to occasionally chat with students, a weekly welcome communiqué, where a 3-minute video would add to the humanity. But at best these are fixes. New technology has enabled ways to overcome this problem. A typical statement:

Many people have the misconception that online learning is nothing more than a virtual vending machine where students serve themselves with little or no interaction with instructors. This dehumanizing of online learning has consequences. Online students drop out at a higher rate than their face-to-face counterparts. Those who remain are less satisfied than students in traditional classes, and large numbers develop feelings of isolation and discouragement (McCombs & Vakili, 2005; Montazemi, 2006; Passerini, 2007; Summers, Waigandt, & Whittaker, 2005). If you have ever been a student in a bad online class, you probably understand that feeling of isolation. Perhaps you have even muttered, “I’m paying for this?”

(From document, *If Jesus Taught Online* Quoted in APU Online training).

**Phase 5** (2010-17): When the MATUL began, we[[1]](#footnote-1) pioneered a new style, not because we set out to do so, simply because we had developed within a different educational philosophy as urban educators, I had always been up with technology and didn’t know any better.

* **Concept of Education:** Education is not a “banking system of downloadable knowledge”, it is a professor’s facilitation that unpacks the knowledge existent in the student’s engagement in action with the local culture and context (Friere).
* **Content** definition is initially derived from student engagement in the **local context through action-reflection processes** and internships
* This they then interface with the **global literature in reflection** that is delivered to classmates
* **The professor (as facilitator) integrates** this with the major literature in each field (as expert).
* The professors need skill to **determine a pathway of experiences** step by step and to identify readings that enable reflection so as the student masters the breadth of theory and praxis in each field.
* This is largely **inductive education**, but some content by its nature is didactic, so an ebb and flow from student to professor-driven learning is normative in each class. An extreme pedagogical mindset is not realistic.
* **Measurement:** Skills and knowledge can both be measured by papers that integrate local, global knowledge with experiences or reports of internships
* Missions Education is centered on **spiritual formation, cross-cultural capacities and leadership formation** as students across the cultural divides (Illich).
* Each course identifies some character or **spiritual formation objectives**, but these tend to be diverse according to students backgrounds and experiences, so are more difficult to quantify than knowledge content objectives. (IDEA measures faith integration, but does not measure educating for spiritual formation).
* **Cross-cultural capacities** are well documented in missions circles but very different to intercultural cultural capacities required for example by nurses in the US. The WEA Training Commission for many years developed analyses of these (Brynjolfson, Robert & Lewis, J., 2006). The foundational framework and research underlying the MATUL were derived from their work.
* **Survival capacities.** Those values, skills, attitudes and habits that enable longevity on the field are better defined from work by the Missionary Care networks (Hay, Rob, Valerie Lim, Detlef Bloecher, & Sarah Hay, 2007).
* (How do we measure these across the degree? It is evident to both professor and other students, and we have some anecdotal evidence, but apart from cross-cultural capacity are there documented ways? We can measure impact on local communities, and anecdotal reports from internship supervisors and local church supervisors).
* **Leadership Formation.** Leadership education can be deductive downloads or actual education. Leadership education is multidimensional. Leadership trait formation can be defined. Specific elements of leadership experiences can be developed that cover some skills, some relational dynamics such as team building, some leadership within organizational analysis exercises. (These can be measured through internship reports, and papers). (IDEA does not look at this).
* **Pastoral Care and Reentry:** Spiritual formation can be utilized as a basis of self-care. But the complex experiences on the field are better handled by a pastoral care approach. This requires someone locally who can monitor situations, and a backup skilled pastoral care person. Since formal counseling is forbidden cross-culturally, a trained chaplain is preferred. Defining the dynamic of such relationships is important but also requires tailoring to the skills of the personnel. Training of a chaplain is needed. (IDEA does not look at his)
* The above goals requires significant **human interaction** between professor and student. Guidance across the degree as to what learning experiences and partnerships with local organizations is crucial. (How do we measure?)
* Formation of **learning communities.** Deep levels of loving, supportive community develop in each cohort. This diffuses the pastoral care and learning support to a significant extent, and is a significant part of the character formation process. (Anecdotal evidence from students ranks this very highly. How do we measure? IDEA does not even look at this)
* Primary **delivery system**: Face to face online. SKYPE had become viable globally by 2010. In the cities (not rural) up to 2014 mostly online discussion was viable with up to five nodes. We then used VSee, which accommodated lower bandwidth better and up to 9 cities. By 2017, Zoom was now available. Cables were laid to East Africa, so now clarity of face-to-face communication is very good up to 8 or so nodes (with up to 4 students in a city on each one). We have not experimented with more globally. (There are still delays in Manila with older technology due to corruption in ownership of the distribution and an unwillingness to move from a monopoly position with older delivery mechanisms). We are not trying to serve rural communities.

## Perceived Problems and their Answers

**1. The lonely pioneer, last unreached tribal view of missions:** “Your syllabi are out of compliance”. In all my years of innovating, I have rarely received such an officious note, though each innovation has created consternation among administrators. It was not signed. No discussion had occurred. But it was decreed we must go back a phase to asynchronous syllabi and may not require students to attend classes. Something must have offended someone.

I tried to discern the reason. Perhaps it was just a fortress mentality in the IT folks who have faced a barrage of criticism from professors who do not want to use technology and this got lumped in the same basket. Each attempt to find out how such a decision was made lead to a dead end. Till someone mentioned they had been able to teach military personnel on duty for long months where they did not have access to internet for specific class times. That made sense, if that was what our objective was – teaching lone individuals anywhere in rural missions!! It is not, we are training urban missionaries*.*

**2. Impossibility of online cohorts:** Another mentioned, “Well you can’t teach a cohort all around the world at the same time!” Again on the surface very sensible.

How then had we been teaching for five years, all around the world to people who were constantly on the move? Quite simply. There are 2 sets of 12 hour time zones that cover 24 hours, so each class is split into two sections, or 3 sections covering 8 hours of time zones. It may be that the prof is teaching at 6 am and a student is at 10 pm on the other end. So there is some adjustment. It takes a bit of scheduling, and the professors have to be committed so as to sacrifice their schedules. Three time zones with bigger classes are better. SKYPE would only handle 5 sites, but we can handle 8 sites plus prof with VSee, so I can handle up to about 18 people at a time. Zoom thus far seems to handle that and more.

**3. Childhood education or undergrad methodologies of control:** And of course, as with all adult education, people are making trips, adjusting for workload, caring for kids, so not all will be online for all classes. That is a given.

**4. Access to the internet** is required as a condition of where they are located. But even in the slums, each student found ways to use modems. Others would go to a local internet café. Not perfect. But eminently feasible. The joy of connecting with others far outweighed the inconveniences.

**5. Reliability dramatically changed in last three years:**  It was a problem in Africa and in Manila. In Manila there was always a 12 second delay, we discovered this was simply because of corruption. Those who own the systems did not wish to upgrade as they would lose their monopoly. In much of Africa the technology jump has been rapid, and problems have largely been solved with the extension of cables and systems across the continent in the last three years.

**6. Alternative Assessment**: One year, an assessment was made, and the comments came back, “the assessor can’t see much in your forums”. My immediate thought was, “of course not”. In this kind of face-to-face instruction forums have been consistently rated by the students as the least helpful component of the delivery system, so we have maximized human time, time working in the community and self-directed papers and research. Since there is class interaction, written forum interaction is interesting but not felt as particularly significant.

It does lead to a question of how best to assess such educational processes and how to train assessors and deans in a new style of assessment.

7. **Lack of connection to the IDEA System of analyzing faculty:** I will note also the failure of the IDEA system to engage much of the former foci, thus biasing analyses against those teaching with a Freirean, inductive, or missiological perspective. It means that professors will not get promotion in the MATUL. Doing an analysis of this issue is immensely difficult as it is highly technical, though I have spent some hours and see some reasons for it. We know we have had some brilliant faculty and learning is in multiples of normative classrooms but the IDEA scores do not reflect this).

## Conclusion

In contrast with previous phases of distance learning that are still the primary drivers of education in higher education, we have developed a synchronous online face to face delivery system that dramatically reduces transactional distance and enables genuine action-reflection learning, using a Freierian pedagogical basis, enabling character formation, faith in action formation, and leadership formation in cross-cultural urban missions contexts.

Sustainability of this advance requires supportive administrators to be expanding acceptability, encouraging technology and creating new assessment processes with the changes. Three objections have been examined.

It would be unfortunate if APU forced a reversal from Phase 5 Freirean, action-reflection, cohort, pastorally-cared-for educational success with the MATUL to the difficulties inherent in Phase 4 transactional-distance-challenged, robotic asynchronous education, when none of the above justify it. This is feasible within instructional mode 3 of APU (APU, 2017). In the appendix are 5 recommendations to accomplish this.

(And to encourage others into this new phase, before phase 6 kicks in of educational 3 D gaming!! The request for that is that you focus your first games on how to restore devastated cities, and abolish urban poverty).

### Estimates of Transformational Leadership Educational Effectiveness on a scale of 1-10

| **Phase** | **2. TEE** | **3. Online audio cassettes** | **4. Asynchonous** | **5. Synchronous Face to Face** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Educational Level** | Bachelors or below 3/10 | Masters 5/10 | Masters, but using undergraduate approaches 5/10 | Masters, facilitating independent research, and cohort discovery processes 10/10 |
| **Effectiveness of Educational philosophy** | Didactic download in simple ideas. Knowledge delivery only. No character, leadership or cross-cultural formation. 3/10 | Didactic download by expert professor. Knowledge delivery only. No character, leadership or cross-cultural formation. 5/10 | Didactic download of knowledge by expert professor. Knowledge delivery only, including faith integration. No character, leadership or cross-cultural formation. 6/10 | Democratic, student-driven, action-reflection, cohort, learning is transformative of character, cross-cultural capacity, leadership, based on knowledge from readings, research and local experts integrated globally by professor and global readings. (Freire, Vela, Illich, democratic learning) 10/10 |
| **Role of Professor** | Writes material as didactic expert 2/10 | Writes and speaks material as didactic expert 4/10 | Writes course, engages in forums, occasional human communication. Didactic expert teaching students. 5/10 | Facilitator of adult learners. Engages in weekly classes enabling student input from action activities and their delivery of readings, as a facilitator and integrator, guiding progressions. 10/10 |
| **Delivery Mechanism** | Mailed books, course notes, assignments 2/10 | Mailed audio cassettes, books, course notes, assignments 4/10 | Web-based downloaded readings, course notes, assignments, videos of talking head profs, occasional chats online 6/10 | Face to face discussions on action activities, presentations of readings from students to other students, Integration by professor. Downloaded books, course notes, assignments, videos of talking head profs, occasional chats online 10/10 |
| **Overcoming Transactional Distance** | 5000 miles by mail 0/10 | 5000 miles by mail 0/10 | Occasional contact 2/10 | Face to Face 8/10 Still glitches with technology and internet. |
| **Cohort or Learning Community Cohesion** | 0/10 | 0/10 | 1/10 through forums | Based on cohorts. This requires working with three time zones across the world. 8 cities at a time are possible. 8/10 |
| **Pastoral Care** | 0/10 | 0/10 | 2/10 | 8/10. Weekly face to face interaction. Requires supplementing with international chaplain working in communication with missions leaders. |
| **Spiritual/ character/Identity Formation** | none | none | Minimal 1/10 | Extensive, but limited by locational distance 5/10 |
| **Leadership Formation** | Readings 3/10 | Readings, lectures 4/10 | Local mentoring possible, literature 5/10 | Experinces, trait analysis and development through personal engagement, literature, local mentoring 8/10 |
| **Cross Cultural Capacity Development** | None 0/10 | Information 3/10 | Information 3/10 | Mentoring, pastoral care, student interaction, cohort support 8/10 |
| **Retention**  (my guesses, needs research) | Medium – 70% | Low – 60% | Low – 60% | High 80% |
| **Technological Capacity** | Mail. | Mail, plus audio cassettes. | Low bandwidth online capacity in most countries. | High bandwidth online capacity in most cities in most countries. |

## Recommendations for APU

1. This approach can be delivered within the online synchronous definition of APU. MATUL International courses be structured within this guideline as they were previously, before the revision of definitions.

2. As MATUL Commission chair, I usually train the deans, directors and faculties of partner schools globally in these approaches, along with Dr Corrie de Boer of Manila. May I suggest that it would be appropriate that I do a session for CTLA, theology deans and MATUL faculty at APU, presenting and reflecting on the implications of these approaches hence getting all on the same page. Without that the default is to fall back into asynchronous learning.

3. Then work with someone at CTLA to put this training into videod format for all incoming adjunct faculty in the program, as part of their required learning. I am working on a four session training package for all schools globally, but have not got far with it – need support.

4. Viv work with APS Associate Dean John Ragsdale and someone in CTLA on how best to assess this approach (as using an asynchronous evaluation processes is catastrophic).

5. A taskforce be assigned to examine what needs changing in IDEA evaluations to work appropriately with action-refection, Freierian, cohort online models and missional training methodologies. It may confirm the existing system!
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