

“Informal and Non-Formal Models of Pastoral Training”

Conference III: February 25, 2017

Report prepared by Tyler M. Nelson
and Jonathan J. Armstrong,
with the assistance of Mark Avdeyev,
Catherine Christian, Timothy Gorrill,
Caleb Hamel, Noah Kimber,
Peter Klopfenstein, and Troy Williams

<http://aqueductproject.org>

SUMMARY:

Jason Tan opened the dialogue by articulating two central questions: (I) “How might non-formal and formal theological institutions partner together to advance pastoral training around the world?” (II) “Is there a need for a neutral body—parallel in some way to the International Council for Evangelical Theological Education (ICETE)—to represent and oversee the work of non-formal theological institutions?” Fregy John in India (2–44), Emmanuel Akatukunda in Uganda (46–67), and Howard Andruejol in Guatemala (91–112) then presented models of pastoral training from their respective institutional contexts.

The Timothy Initiative, Fregy John explained, is a two-year training program, facilitated within the local church and led by pastors; the program is now implemented in 27 countries and totals some 15,000 students (2). Students are trained using a 12-book curriculum, which has been translated into nearly 40 languages (23). In order to graduate from the program, a student must plant one church and disciple at least two people (8, 15). The aim of this program is to multiply believers while training pastors and church leaders.

Emmanuel Akatukunda described several characteristics of the non-formal training program at Kampala Evangelical School of Theology (KEST) in Uganda. While KEST is registered to offer undergraduate degrees, it continues to provide non-formal training in 13 subjects in a one-year curriculum (59, 61). The program utilizes the vocational experience of local pastors, who make up the majority of enrollment, while partnering with and empowering local church leaders (47, 63). Designed to suit the needs of local pastors, the curriculum is tailored for the Ugandan-African context, and instruction is offered in both English and the primary local language (48). Cost is intentionally kept low in order to remain affordable for those who desire training but cannot pay tuition at formal institutions (48). KEST works in partnership with local denominational leaders who assist in credentialing graduates (51).

Howard Andruejol, serving in Guatemala City, described the opportunities for his ministry to train leaders of children and youth in Latin America (91). Cohorts of about 25 students are trained each year, and many of the students are already practitioners in their local churches (91). Each training course aims to provide students with the necessary tools to develop projects in their local ministry (102). Through a partnership with the Central American Theological Seminary (SETECA), these courses are accredited for those who desire to continue their theological studies (92, 94). Howard noted that the program has been reproduced in local churches by many youth leaders (100).

Several elements were identified as contributing to the success or failure of training programs. The use of both digital and printed curriculum and materials has contributed to the success of many non-formal programs (2, 23, 25, 31, 49, 107, 104, 109, 121–125). Empowering local churches to participate in the training process has also proved advantageous (47, 140, 144); one aspect of this participation is the mentoring of future pastors by experienced pastors (87–89). Regardless of whether the training programs offered are formal, non-formal, or informal, successful institutions must develop relationships of trust with the leaders of local churches they seek to serve (115, 167). One challenge faced by non-formal institutions is that the success

of curriculum is dependent upon the commitment of local pastors (44); another obstacle is the lack of human resources to develop curriculum (143).

At the conclusion of the dialogue, Jason Tan offered the following summary: (I) There is a need for an association of non-formal pastoral training programs; (II) those who are part of formal pastoral training should teach in the field and develop relationships with those who are currently in the field; (III) churches need to have real ownership of the training programs; (IV) there needs to be a platform that facilitates the exchange of experiences and ideas among the pastoral training community, and GProConneXt.com was nominated as such a platform; (V) institutions of formal pastoral training need to develop relationships of trust with the leadership of local churches so that the formal programs can be implemented effectively; (VI) seminaries should consider developing non-formal programs in addition to formal programs.

TRANSCRIPT:

[1] Jason Tan: In the next hour and a half to two hours, we will be listening to a number of people who will be presenting some of their strategies of how they do pastoral training around the world in their area. First off, we will have Fregy John, who will be sharing what he's doing in that part of the world. Then Emmanuel Akatukunda will be sharing. Howard Andruejol will be coming in to share after that, and then we will be open to dialogue. I think it's better for everyone if we finish our presentations in 5-7 minutes. We can jump in and ask questions, and then proceed to the next one. I'll try to keep tabs on our time. Please bear in mind that the reason we're doing this is not only to listen to different strategies around the world, but we would like to address the larger question, which is how we can advance pastoral training and how we can work together between non-formal and formal institutions to advance pastoral training around the world. Perhaps a second important question we'd like to tackle today is if there is a need for a neutral body that is similar to ICETE (International Council for Evangelical Theological Education) which supervises the work of formal theological institutions around the world, since there's currently no such body for non-formal theological training. Perhaps we should begin thinking about, if there were such a neutral body that could represent non-formal theological training, what it should look like and what its purposes would be. Let's start off. If everybody's ready, we will be listening first to Fregy John. Fregy John, please tell us where you're coming from, and what you have been working on.

[2] Fregy John: Good evening, and for some of you, good morning. I'm Fregy John. I'm basically from India, but currently live in Malaysia, in the city of Penang. I've been involved with pastoral training for the past 13 years. I was part of formal theological education for 13 years, then in 2001 I became involved with non-formal training programs, starting in the Himalayan regions of India. Currently, the ministry is called the Timothy Initiative. We train pastors and church planters in the local church with the help of formally-trained theologians, or people we trained in our system. I have been looking at the formal discussions. In the everyday conversations with the theologians who are from formal settings and those practitioners of non-formal settings, I see a tension happening that we heard in some conversations in Bangkok. I always feel that this tension is complementary rather than competitive. There's no competition in spirit because it is complimentary. We feel the strength of it because 60-to-70 percent of all trainers we are using in India, Nepal, Bhutan, Bangladesh—in 27 countries—are from the formal theological background. But that is a relatively small number compared to the people who are getting trained. Currently, we have 15,000 people going through a training program which lasts for two years. We run a training program. It's a two-year training program run in the local church, and it is done by the local pastor. The whole concept is ministry leaders training the next generation of ministry leaders in the local church. Ours is a non-formal training program, but we have printed material. We have a printed curriculum that we follow systematically, and we know the practical elements of impediment. The whole philosophy is that this is not training for ministry, it is training in the ministry. That training is result-oriented. We try to see, as a result of the training, ministers who are prepared for the work. As a result, churches are being planted.

[3] This is one of my appeals to those who are in the formal training program. Most of the education our people receive in the formal setting is not fully used after graduation. After graduation, many times, most graduates only use their education to prepare a sermon once a week. My suggestion is that we have to use our education in the maximum way to train the next generation of pastors and church planters and ministry leaders there and beyond. That's one of the reasons we're saying that all the ministry leaders should train the next generation of ministry leaders.

[4] **Saji Lukos:** Fregy, wonderful observation that it is not a competition, but it is complementary between both the formal and the non-formal. That's wonderful. That's what Mission India does. We are involved in India. We have the seminary and Bible colleges. Also, we have the CBTT program, which is Church Based Theological Training. I think around 2000 people are involved in that training. We teach 12 subjects—one subject per month—and they get a certificate in Christian ministry. As you said, these are seminary-educated people and pastors teaching these subjects. The point is, it's complimentary, not a competition.

[5] **Fregy John:** Yes, some of your graduates are running our training program. We are happy that you are releasing your graduates to use our training tools.

[6] **Saji Lukos:** We love the Timothy Initiative. We love Fregy John.

[7] **Jason Tan:** Fregy, I have a question. If somebody goes through your program who wants to go ahead and finish a course in a formal theological institution, are those programs accredited by a traditional seminary?

[8] **Fregy John:** The answer is no, but I have an explanation. Most people who go through the training are not interested in a certificate of that kind. Those who need a certificate get a diploma in theology, but it is not an accredited program because most seminaries or accrediting agencies don't value non-formal training. It may be the time to think about an accrediting agency for non-formal theological training. In a simple sense, we are focusing on their ministry fruits, their spiritual fruits, like every student has to plant a church to graduate for our program. But for planting a church, no one grants an accredited degree. By scoring an A+ you'll get a degree, but for planting a church, no one will offer a degree!

[9] **Jason Tan:** Fregy, does it sound like we are operating like a formal institution once we come up with an accrediting tool for a non-formal institution?

[10] **Fregy John:** There are a lot of people using non-formal training. If we are ever to come together to see those strengths from each of us and create a body which approves not just the exams and papers but the ministerial support, then they can give validity and say that this is something that we can count to them for some credit, even if they want to continue in a formal setting. That will be good. Having said that, we have trained around 40,000 people in the last 10 years of the Timothy Initiative. Out of these 40,000, maybe 4,000 will be interested to continue their theological education. For them, this will be helpful. For the others, they will continue to

plant churches. They will not care about their formal certificate or an accredited degree. But for those 4,000, the 10 percent of the people who are interested to continue, it will help them.

[12] Jason Tan: How long does the program take?

[13] Fregy John: It is a two-year program.

[14] Jason Tan: At the end of the program, do you plant a church? What is required after two years?

[15] Fregy John: In two years' time, each student will have to plant at least one church, and have to train at least two people. They will have to train their disciples in the two-year span.

[16] Jason Tan: Thank you. Are there any other questions for Fregy John? If not, we will be moving to another presenter.

[17] Darrell Bock: Where was that? I just need to know where that was.

[18] Fregy John: This is happening in India, Nepal. We have 27 countries now.

[19] Darrell Bock: Okay, great. Thanks.

[20] Jonathan Armstrong: Dr. Fregy John, I have a question. When we spoke in person at the GPro Congress in Bangkok, you used the line, "Every church is a training center." Can you explain how your program couples with church networks?

[21] Fregy John: What we are trying to say is that every believer is a disciple, and every disciple is a disciple-maker. Every believer's home can be a potential church, and every church a training center. If you go back—you're all learned people so I'm not trying to teach you—if you go back in history, the churches were the places where ministries leaders were trained. Ministry leaders train next generation ministry leaders, following the biblical examples. Somehow, we felt it was the job of the seminaries to train ministries leaders, and so the church stopped training people, at least in majority cases. We are arguing back by saying that every church has to train their leaders in the local church. For example, a country like India—650,000 villages, and half of them have no Christian presence—if you want to see one trained church planter or evangelist or pastor in every village, it may take centuries. If every church starts training people, that will take care of the need.

[22] Jason Tan: Dr. John, can you please explain a little bit more about your material? Did you make this material? How is it delivered?

[23] Fregy John: Actually, we have a 12-book curriculum. It is prepared by a group of church practitioners and theologians. We modify it, and it is translated into nearly 40 languages—in the heart language of people.

[24] Jason Tan: Are these in print?

[25] Fregy John: Yes, it's all in print and electronically available.

[26] Jason Tan: Where are the electronic versions located? Are they on a website where they can be downloaded?

[27] Fregy John: We have a website, but the website only has samples. If any of you in the panel are interested to see them, I can send them to you.

[28] Jason Tan: Are these all free, or do you have to pay for any of this material?

[29] Fregy John: For the majority of the countries, we give it freely. But if you are sitting in the US and want to buy it, you have to pay a small amount of money—barely the cost of printing. We use the same material for training the ministry leaders.

[30] Darrell Bock: What generally gets covered in the material? I probably missed this, but what generally gets covered?

[31] Fregy John: The first book is about disciples making disciples. It is a simple obedience-based discipleship model and that is covered in three months' time. That is mainly to invest in a committed few. Then we have a ten-book core curriculum which covers how to interpret the Bible effectively, church planting, Bible exposition, a Bible doctrine survey, then apologetics, church history and spiritual warfare. These are the topics covered. Plus, we have some materials to teach the next generation of disciples. Every student has to do the ministry and bring new people, so they should also have something to teach them. We have a small material called TTI Lite to teach the next generation. We have 12 books in our curriculum. It almost covers 2000 pages of material. But it's all not about the head knowledge. It is about the life transformation and skills developed. That's the whole focus.

[32] Orbelina Eguizabal: Sorry I joined the conversation a little bit late. I wanted to ask, how do you select the people? Or are they already serving in the churches with no training?

[33] Fregy John: That's a good question. We don't select the people. The local pastor picks the people. He will pick the people because he's been observing the people. At the same time, he will give an open invitation in his local church so they can join. But the weeding-out process happens in 15 weeks. Those who are willing are those who are going to continue. In many situations, we find that when the pastor picks 30 people, after 15 weeks, those 30 people become 15 people. But we believe that God can do much better with an obedient few than many disobedient.

[34] Jason Tan: Do you have any attrition rate?

[35] Fregy John: Yes. Our attrition mainly happens in the first 15 weeks. In the first 15 weeks, some people say, "I am coming," because the pastor announces it and they want to be in the good looks of the pastor. Some people think it's a Bible study, so they just join. Then they realize they have to work. Every lesson has a practical assignment built in it. Some of them will find excuses and drop. It requires time. In the first 15 weeks, we find the attrition. But we have a really good system, and we do attendance and we evaluate every piece of work they have to do. After 15 weeks, when they're on the proper track, our attrition is much less.

[36] Jason Tan: What percentage is the attrition rate of the first level?

[37] Fregy John: Well, it varies from place to place. In several places, if you start with 30-35 students, we will have 30 students left. In several places, it may be a little more. Sometimes the pastor wants to have a bigger crowd. We are very strict on the evaluation. After three months, it varies from place to place. It's all based upon how the pastors pick the students. If they are selective in the picking of the students, then the attrition is very low.

[38] Don Davis: This is Don Davis. I have a question, and I hope our conversation at some point will discuss this. In just hearing you, Fregy, this question comes to mind. I think that you mentioned that the pastor actually selects the students who participate. What relationship does your training have to credential? Now, I'm not talking about accreditation. I'm not talking about formal or non-formal. I'm talking about a church that would say, "In order for you to serve with us, you must get Fregy's training and be a part of that before you can participate." I ask that question because I think that is a third rail for this formal, non-formal idea. We can think more. I've been involved in a similar project for 22 years and we are deliberately non-accredited, but we focus with denominations on their credentialing and ordination process, which allows us to do some pretty amazing things. We work with the denominations essentially to create a program that they endorse. In other words, it's their program, not our program. They use our program to credential their people. I'm just curious what kind of experience you have.

[39] Fregy John: In our experience, we work with the denominations, and most of our work is with the independent churches. Most independent churches we work with are not worried about credentials because most pastors are loaded with their work. They have no idea how to grow their church. We come along to tell them that you can multiply and you can use your training to train the next generation. Then their churches are multiplied. In that situation, they don't even ask what degree they are going to get or what kind of affiliation you have. Yet some of the denominations, like you have mentioned, will always ask, "What kind of degree can you give us and how can you ordain our people?" All those questions keep coming to us from a smaller group, but that group is very small. In those situations, what happens is the local church also conducts exams. It is their project so we don't interfere, because in India alone we have 400 locations we are having to train. Currently in India, we have 8,000 students. In all our countries, we have 15,000 students total, so conducting exams and evaluating those papers and getting into the city can make us formal training. We are not getting into that level, but we evaluate, giving them the ordinations and other approvals. Each denomination will have to

decide, because we are not saying that we have the only method. There are other methods that are degree-oriented training programs in a non-formal setting, but our focus is not a degree. Our focus is that people should be reached, churches should be planted, and disciples should be multiplied.

[40] Don Davis: Thank you very much for that answer. I want to be very specific in my question. What I'm saying essentially is this: Where is the pastoral and religious authority to do training? Does it reside with us as providers, or does it rest with the church who can use us to credential their own people? There's a real difference. I'm not talking about academics or anything. I'm talking about who owns the training. You see, there's a difference between you and I actually running programs. I have a program myself. We train thousands. But there's a difference between us running a program, and a church running its own program with us supporting that church to run its own program.

[41] Fregy John: Now I got your questions. Actually, Dr. Don, we are not on training terms. It is a church training program. We come along to help the church. Most emerging churches or newly planted churches don't have an idea of how to run it because most churches in the mission context don't have a discipleship program either. In those places, we have to talk about the need of it. At the end of the day, we give them the freedom to run it their way. Some of our partners only use part of our material. Some of them use only a few books of our material because that is all that is needed for their situation. 100 percent is owned by the church and it is fulfilling their mission. It is not under our own terms because they own it.

[42] Don Davis: What's really important about what you're saying, Fregy—and I hope at some point we can discuss this—in looking at the dialogues that we have set up, I have not seen a lot of our discussions about us providing structure to churches to start their own programs, and us to feed their own running of their programs. What the churches need is a structure that they own, that they can manipulate for their purposes in their contexts, not simply using programs that we think up. As a matter of fact, that's one of the main problems with formal academic training. The curriculum is set, the prices are set, and the places where you take it are set. There's no autonomy for churches to actually use material. They have to sort of conform to what an institution or enterprise creates and then that puts them in a tough position. If they can't afford it, if they don't have the academic background, they're just out to lunch. It would be better if we could help them establish a structure and then use our materials in their own structure. That's what I hope we can continue. It sounds wonderful what you're doing, by the way.

[43] Orbelina Eguizabal: I have a question. What are the main challenges that you have faced by conducting this type of training? Then, what have you done to work on those aspects to overcome them?

[44] Fregy John: The main challenges we face, because it is non-formal, it depends on the commitment of the pastor. If the pastor is not committed, things can fall apart. The pastor is the teacher, so it all depends on one person's commitment. But in institutions, even if one

faculty fails, the other faculty goes and complains. Here everything is run by the pastor. The challenge is the commitment of the pastor. Many times, our primary job is to take the pastor into confidence since he should be the one asking to have a training to enlarge our territories or expand the ministry team. In most different scenarios, the pastor is so tired of working alone. He has limited resources to send somebody to seminary or a Bible college, and there is no guarantee they will ever come back. They realize the need to train the ministry leaders that will be committed in the local church.

[45] Jason Tan: Thank you very much, Dr. John. We will proceed with Emmanuel Akatukunda. Can you please tell us where you're coming from, and please explain to us your ministry, Emmanuel?

[46] Emmanuel Akatukunda: Yes. Greetings to everyone. I am from Uganda and I work with the Kampala Evangelical School of Theology (KEST). At Kampala Evangelical School of Theology, we have a double emphasis on both the formal and the non-formal training. Actually, KEST started as a non-formal training institution way back in 1989, and then at the beginning of 2000, we were registered as a formal training institution, offering undergraduate programs. Then in 2012, we resumed our non-formal programs. We call them the community engagement programs. Right now, we have two centers that are operational where we offer the non-formal programs.

[47] Now, I would like to share about seven things—seven characteristics—that the non-formal training approach has. One of them is the imparting approach. I call it imparting because our training takes into account the formal—rather, the vocational experience of the local pastors. We avoid the unnecessary academic apparatus which tends to intimidate these pastors and disempower them. We want to empower their critical faculties. We want to enlarge their knowledge base. We want to cultivate a healthy self-awareness as far as their calling is concerned. That's what we call the imparting approach. The second one is what I call partnership and ownership. Before we start any community engagement center, we always have consultation with the local church deacons. This is very important that there is shared ownership of the training process by both KEST and the local church. We never go to a place where our training has been unsolicited. We always walk in consultation with the local church leaders. The third characteristic is location. Our community engagement centers are located close to where the majority of the pastors live and work. And so, we are the guest faculty. We go to where the leaders are located. That's where we train from.

[48] I talked about the empowering approach, the partnership and ownership, the location. The fourth one is the delivery mode. Our training is delivered in one-week modules, and there are four modules we deliver within a period of one year. They fit with the lifestyle and obligations of most of the pastors. The fifth characteristic is what we could call the curriculum. When we develop the curriculum for the non-formal training, we assume the realities of our own contexts—the Ugandan-African context—into the instructional processes. In terms of content, in terms of methodology, in terms of illustration. We are very aware and very intentional about how we design the curriculum to suit the needs of the pastors that we train. The sixth

characteristic is the medium of the instruction. We deliver the training both in English and the main local language of the region where the community engagement centers are located. These are the languages in which pastors preach and it is their language. We have the empowering approach, the partnership and ownership, the locations where the pastors live and work, the delivery mode, and four modules delivered in the span of one year. We have the curriculum which weaves the realities of the contexts of the pastors, then we have the medium of the instruction which is in both English and the main local language. The last one is the cost. We deliver at a cost that is intended to make it affordable, and that makes it available to more pastors. One of the reasons we realize is that many pastors, although they may like to be trained, usually the cost of delivering formal training is very high. We intentionally make these costs affordable. That has really worked well for us. Those are the seven things I would like to highlight.

[49] In 2012, this approach of the community engagement centers—and between December 2013 to June 2016—we have graduated three cohorts representing a total number of 136 pastors. Then we have about 80 pastors who will be graduating by the end of this year. We have 80 pastors who have finished training and are waiting to graduate. That would bring us to a number of about 216 pastors that have gone through our non-formal training. Now, to enhance our training we are devoting a training manual for the pastors. When we started, we were working off our notes that we used in the formal training and we realized how hard it was because you cannot just deliver non-formal training in the way we deliver formal training. That was a learning process for us, and in the end, we decided that we needed to develop training manuals for this process. This is a project that is on the way. We started at the beginning of this year. We hope to have our first edition of the training manuals by the end of June this year. Then, since it is the guest faculty that does the training, we find ourselves constrained in terms of human resources. Because it is a small institution, we don't have many people working full-time. Keeping the formal training at the guest center at Kampala running and having those two centers operating has been quite strenuous. We are asking some of our students who have gone through our training program to go through the training so that they can be helpful, delivering the training in those centers. We want to multiply ourselves through our graduates. Then, in the next six months to one year, we want to open at least three more training centers. We are assuming that by the time we open these centers, we will have our manuals worked and printed. We will also have our first batch of our students trained so that they can help with delivery. We want to see ourselves multiplying ourselves through the different centers that we are going to operate.

[50] There are two things that we asked Fregy that I could also respond to. One is the attrition rate, and also credentialing the graduates that go through our non-formal program. When we started, the attrition rate was very high, especially for the fast intake. I remember we had around 110 students who began. By the time we finished the program, we had 60 to 80. It was almost a 45 percent attrition rate. But as we continued and explained the programs, the attrition rates have been reduced to around 20-to-25 percent. I think it was progress.

[51] Now, about the credentialing of the graduates. We've worked with the umbrella organizations of a number of denominations, the major one being the National Fellowship of Born Again Pentecostal churches. In fact, they have made it a requirement, especially for pastors in those areas where we train from, for their ordination. In fact, the last two graduations we held, we also held their ordination ceremony for those pastors who are going through our training and have also met the initial requirements of their mission. We are working in partnership with the local denominational leaders, and they are happy with the work that we are doing in the center. They have made it a requirement for those pastors who need to be ordained to go through our training. I think that's what I have for now.

[52] Jason Tan: Emmanuel, can you please tell us—and this question also goes for Dr. Fregy John—what is the average educational attainment of the pastors who are in your training program?

[53] Emmanuel Akatukunda: Most of the pastors we train have barely completed their grade school. Well, you have a few who have college degrees and others have completed high school, but the average pastors have been through maybe grade 5. They haven't gone very far in terms of formal education training.

[54] Jason Tan: How many percent do you think are in this 5th grade level, under primary school, or with only high school training?

[55] Emmanuel Akatukunda: 80 percent below high school. High school is around 15 percent, and just 5 percent with college degrees.

[56] Fregy John: The question is for me, also? Most of the students in the urban setting are high schoolers. Some are graduates, and we have doctors, engineers, and other from different walks of life. But when it goes to a rural setting, the educational level is much less because we don't make education a criteria. We always tell them that they've got to be able to read and write, to study, and to communicate with the next generation, then the pastor can bring them up. We don't make education a criteria, but since we provide the material, we want them to read it and be able to teach other people. That means the ability to read and write, maybe some high school. In most cases, pastors will pick up people who are able to read and write.

[57] Jason Tan: Great. Any questions?

[58] Saji Lukos: I have a question for Emmanuel with curriculum. How many subjects in a year do you teach?

[59] Emmanuel Akatukunda: We have four modules, and each module has an average of three subjects. We actually have 13 subjects that we teach.

[60] Saji Lukos: This is a one-year program or a two-year program?

[61] Emmanuel Akatukunda: One-year program.

[62] Saji Lukos: Is this only for pastors or can church believers who are interested in training attend?

[63] Emmanuel Akatukunda: The majority who attend are pastors, but we don't limit it to pastors. We have had other leaders interested in training who have come and joined the program.

[64] Saji Lukos: What time does this class take place? Is it evening or during the day? In our case, many are working during the day, so we do the class in the evenings and Saturday. What time does your program meet?

[65] Emmanuel Akatukunda: For the majority, it is during the day. We block one week per module, and then from 8:00am to 5:00pm. We have also had cases where we had to deliver an evening or night program for people who are not able to participate during the day.

[66] Saji Lukos: That's very good. Thank you, pastor Emmanuel. I appreciate it.

[67] Emmanuel Akatukunda: You're welcome.

[68] Otto Kladensky: Greetings. I don't want to burden the group by this, but I think it is important that not only you but the rest of us around this table share our experiences for others who have not gone these routes yet. Not only is the content very important, but the process. What you said—we learn this and we learn that, that's why we did this or we did that. I think the process is important. So please, I encourage all of us, if we could start writing this to share with the larger community.

[69] Emmanuel Akatukunda: Yes, I agree. I have something written down. I can refine it and then I'll send it to Jason.

[70] Otto Kladensky: Would you encourage others to do the same and have a deadline?

[71] Don Davis: To match Otto's point, Jonathan, I'm wondering if we couldn't have a page set-up somewhere where we could connect people with a link to the various things that we're doing. There's a lot of innovation in this meeting that won't get spoken of, and a ton of diversity. It would be great if we could have a place where we could send it to you, and you could post links to all our various enterprises, and we could read briefly about what we're doing. It would be a very simple thing to do.

[72] Jonathan Armstrong: Excellent. Thank you, Dr. Davis. The GProConneXt.com website is precisely intended as that platform. We should be using that platform. It reaches out to, I believe, almost everybody and beyond who was at the GPro Congress in Bangkok. Dr.

Kladensky, could you just identify, very briefly, what would be the type of document that you would want to see produced and disseminated to describe these programs?

[73] Otto Kladensky: Thank you for the doctorate. Just Otto is good. I appreciate your love. Jonathan, I would say that a brief history of how we have arrived would be very important. I always believed what Ramesh said, that one figure in the front is necessary, but then also include a longer history of why we're doing it and how we are doing it. The why is very important, not just the how, because it relates to many other audiences around the globe. Therefore, people can jump in and say, "Ah, this is that they did in the Philippines. I think that could be useful for me. This is what Emmanuel is doing. Wow. That was good. I was going to go this way, but when Emmanuel went that way, he hit his head against the wall. Therefore, he moved over. I'm going to learn from that and not repeat the same mistake."

[74] Jonathan Armstrong: The type of communication that you're describing would also allow, potentially, for collaboration. If we could understand one another's processes, we might be able to lend support. So that would be nice. Jason Tan, can you describe very briefly—to Dr. Davis' excellent question—how we should post these documents to GProConneXt.com?

[75] Jason Tan: You can just send it to me. My e-mail is here: jason@gprocommission.org.

[76] Fregy John: Can you write that in the chat?

[77] Jason Tan: jason@gprocommission.org. Just send it to me and we will make that available. We will develop a page and send you the link to it so you can view all the materials through GProConneXt.com.

[78] Jonathan Armstrong: Possibly even an example would be very helpful. So, if Otto is willing—I forget who was speaking—if somebody is willing to prepare one document that the rest of us could use as an example, that might also help.

[79] Fregy John: If you have some questionnaire—if we can answer it precisely—it may be better than a lengthy document.

[80] Jason Tan: Well, we will be summarizing the result of this consultation dialogue, and then all of you can read the summary. We can add some questions. That might be helpful for the group as well, once we're done with this. And then we will be posting all the other documents that you will be sending us onto GProConneXt.com.

[81] Jonathan Armstrong: Jason, that's an excellent idea. Let's aim the questions in our remaining time to the type of questions we want to answer across a wide spread of training organizations.

[82] Jason Tan: Any other questions? If not, we will be proceeding to the next presenter.

[83] Orbelina Eguizabal: I would like to follow up on the results of the work that they are doing in those churches. Let's say that you are training all the people, they go to churches, the training is short, the educational level is very low for some of them, but the churches are growing. Thank God for that. The question is, how can you make sure that the people who are becoming Christians are growing in their spiritual life, and that the churches are not full of new believers who, when something happens, they don't know what to do and they don't know how to really be salt and light in their communities and their society? The statistics in a lot of countries say that we have this percentage of growth, or the churches has that percentage. Sometimes, they are really high percentages. But when it comes to really impacting society and the community where they are, we do not see that happening. How does this training and how are these pastors prepared to help people grow spiritually, and not just adding numbers to the churches?

[84] Emmanuel Akatukunda: Can I respond to that?

[85] Orbelina Eguizabal: Yes, please.

[86] Emmanuel Akatukunda: Our trainings are very interactive. Pastors ask a lot of questions and those questions have to do with their pastoral experiences, their counseling dilemmas, their preaching dilemmas, their ethical dilemmas. These people have vast Christian and pastor experience and have been working with the people. When training for potential pastors, these training pastors are already in their walk. One of the responses that we have had after their graduation, especially from people who supervise them, is about the quality of their preaching, the quality by which they are handling people. Sometimes you have other leaders come in to train as a testimony of the lifestyle that the pastors are going through our training. That is one way that we are trying to monitor, through their leaders and from feedback that we get from their peers who are going through our training.

[87] Fregy John: Can I answer from our experience? The best thing is that our students or the potential pastors-in-the-making have an advantage. They are still undergoing training when they are planting a church or starting a small group. They are getting an opportunity to apply whatever they are learning in a real-life situation. This is unlike a seminary situation, where after graduation they get into a ministry and have no place to go back and ask. Here, the advantage is that they are still under the mentorship of an experienced pastor, having good knowledge of Scripture. They always go back to the pastor who is training them to clarify difficulties and customs arising in the ministry. They have an advantage over a formal seminary. We provide the material so they can go back to the material, but we want them to go back to the pastor who is their mentor, their trainer, their disciple-maker. That happens because men are doing on-the-job training while doing ministry rather than strictly training for ministry. That is a huge advantage.

[88] Jason Tan: In other words, there is continuing oversight over those who have finished training, versus those who finish under a traditional or formal institution where they are on their own.

[89] Fregy John: Those in the non-formal setting have an advantage because their training never comes to an end. It is an ongoing relationship. It is a mentoring relationship continued. They can come back to the mentor all the time.

[90] Jason Tan: Thank you so much. We will proceed to the next presenter. Howard Andruejol, please tell us what you are doing, and where you are right now.

[91] Howard Andruejol: Hello everybody. I am in Guatemala City in Central America. The ministry that I develop is training the new generation of leaders of children, leaders in youth, and youth leaders in Latin America. I am wearing a tie today because I was in an event this weekend for this ministry program. The reason we're focusing on the new generation is because Latin America is a young continent. We realize that the youth leaders are practitioners, but they have not been trained or equipped to do their job. We are working on a different approach. We are inverting the process of theological education, starting with the hands-on training for the ministry they are already developing. We help them to be better disciplers, better counselors, to understand the youth culture, to understand the dynamics of family ministry, to be very specific in generational leadership. We developed a one-year program on-site. We have run it for seven years in Guatemala, and also in Buenos Aires, Argentina, where students come to our schools—cohorts of about 25 students each year—and then they go back to their cities or churches or countries and strengthen their churches by developing a more intentional and relational ministry. In Latin America, youth ministry is a program-oriented ministry. It is a very personal approach. By giving them the tools with a solid biblical and theological perspective, they are better equipped to transform their church and to strengthen their churches.

[92] At this point, we are shifting gears, expanding this year to an online program to reach other leaders who are unable to come to our countries. We'll be running our schooling in Buenos Aires, but then opening the online program, and closing the operations in Guatemala. It's a non-formal program. It's a 20-course program that you can study in one year. Our leaders come from different backgrounds. Most of them have gone to university. They are not looking for another degree. Some of them will pursue—after a specific topic such as generational ministry—theological education. So, we have partnered with the theological seminary in Guatemala, with the Central American Theological Seminary. They offer the bachelor's degree with different specialized tracks. The youth ministry track is the program that we offer. We have partnered in a way that those students from our institute who want formal education can get accredited for our courses, and they pursue their theological studies with the seminary.

[93] Jason Tan: Is that with SETECA?

[94] Howard Andruejol: Yes, it's with SETECA. The rest who are, at this point, only interested in the specific training for generational leadership, they take our courses. If, in the near future, they want to pursue SETECA, then we encourage them to do it, and their courses are accredited by the seminary. It's sort of a bilingual program—at the same time non-formal but with the

potential of being utilized to be a part of formal training. It starts not from the general studies but from the specifics and then pursues the rest of the theological and biblical education. We help them to realize that generational leadership is not only about the “how-to.” It’s to have a biblical and theological support. That is why we encourage them to continue at the seminary.

[95] Jason Tan: Howard, can you run us through the curriculum quickly? What subjects do you start with, and which subjects do you end with?

[96] Howard Andruejol: We start by laying down a foundation on what the pastoral ministry with a new generation is. That is a biblical overview of the ministry we should develop. Again, it is very rich in theological background, but we move them through a relational ministry. Not just the programs that are developing or the models that are operated by the church. We talk about relational ministry. We talk about an introduction to generational coaching, team work, youth and sexuality, holistic development of kids, adolescents, and college students. We end up by developing specific courses on discipline and childhood, gender development for teens, adolescent crisis, and vocation and marriage for college students.

[97] Jason Tan: What kind of ministry do these people get after your training? Most of them end up in what kind of ministry and church?

[98] Howard Andruejol: Most of them are already doing ministry at the church. They are already involved. They realize they need tools to develop their own programs. Some realize that something needs to happen. They need to shift gears and make a change at their church, but don’t know exactly what or how. They are already practitioners. Most of our youth leaders are very young. In Latin America, the youth ministry is run by youth in their twenties. They are just passionate for the new generations when they come back to their churches. Our focus is to strengthen the church, so they continue doing what they do.

[99] Jason Tan: Let me clarify this. When they finish your training, they then go back to their church and do it with their leaders. But can they replicate what you are doing? What happens if somebody else wants to get your training? Do they go back to you in order to get the training, or do they go back to those who have already trained them?

[100] Howard Andruejol: Actually, the first idea was an experiment. We said, “Let’s run this. Let’s train them to help them train their local people and local teams of volunteers in the church.” This is very important because we’re looking at a church that is losing our youth. We are losing generations because we don’t know what to do with them. After seven years of doing this, what we have seen is that after they come to our training then return to their church, they create their own replica for their denomination. In latest years, many denominations have opened institutes, or branches of their institutes, for youth leaders inside their own denominations using our program. To me, it’s something that is very fascinating and very exciting at the same time. We are very encouraged by that. They are making it their own. To answer your question, their training is not done locally but it is done within their denomination.

[101] Jason Tan: We have a couple of questions here. We'll go to Howard first, then circle back to Fregy and Emmanuel. To Howard, from Dr. Bock: How long do each of the twenty classes last? Are they a week or so? Are most of them self-interactive?

[102] Howard Andruejol: Our courses are at least 20 hours of on-site conversations and training. Of course, there's the extra projects that we develop. We are project-oriented. All of our courses focus on providing the tools to develop a project in their local ministry. Something that will strengthen them.

[103] Jason Tan: How long does each course take?

[104] Howard Andruejol: Approximately 30 hours. We do it in a one-month span, with different models. Sometimes it's on weekdays, at nights, or on Saturdays. Now we are doing this online program. It's going to be an eight-session course that you can take in one month.

[105] Jason Tan: Dr. Bock, do you have any other question?

[106] Darrell Bock: So, it's an eight-session course in one month. Is that two or three hours at a time? I'm just trying to get a sense of how long each of the 20 pieces of your curriculum are.

[107] Howard Andruejol: We encourage students to take two courses per month. Each session is at least three hours with online, bite-sized videos, conversations and interactions with the moderator, and also hands-on projects.

[108] Darrell Bock: Is it one-to-one, or is it one-to-many and they join in all at the same time?

[109] Howard Andruejol: With each online course component, they will be able to do it at their own pace during the one-month span. There will be interaction with a moderator or an assistant professor. During this month, there will also be webinars where everybody will come together at the same time. The other form of interaction is happening through a forum. Not all interaction is happening at the same time.

[110] Jason Tan: Thank you. Are there other questions to any of our presenters?

[111] Orbelina Eguizabal: I have a question for Howard. You have been doing the training in Guatemala and Argentina, but I understand that people from other countries have joined your training. Do you just focus on those two countries? I know that at SETECA, there are international students from different countries and Latin America, and they are taking the training as well. But when you do that in Argentina, how does that work? How are you reaching youth leaders from Latin America and the Caribbean, as I understand that is the focus of your institute?

[112] Howard Andruejol: In the beginning, students would have to come to our two locations: Guatemala and Buenos Aires. As we moved on, we developed an extension program where we

had students in different cities, like Santo Domingo in the Dominican Republic, where our professors in Guatemala would fly for a weekend and have a course with them Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. Two weeks later, we would have an online meeting through Skype or some other way. We would confirm cohorts in that city with some coordinator who would function as a mentor of the local community of youth pastors. Then our professors would provide content and follow-up. We tried that in different cities. We are still going to do that, but just as a platform to encourage and have a personal contact, and to encourage everyone to take the online course. It is an intermediate program that we are developing now. We are experimenting with different models. We have the extensions, now it's only going to be in Buenos Aires.

[113] Jason Tan: Okay, thank you. Are there any other questions? If not, then we will move on to another important matter.

[114] Jonathan Armstrong: I have a question for Howard, Emmanuel, and Fregy John. Not all need to respond, but maybe one. For those who represent formal institutions, what types of resources can be offered to these other training networks that you have developed? For example, Dallas Theological Seminary has some extensive amounts of free courseware available from their website. Biola University has the new program called Open Biola, which I understand is also free courseware. What type of courseware developed in these formal contexts would be applicable to you?

[115] Howard Andruejol: In my case, what I see is that there are a lot of resources from different ministries—especially now with new technology available—and different approaches and non-formal training going on. From my perspective, everything runs through relationships. When people can connect to each other, they build trust, and then they trust in the programs or in the materials being used. I think that for some formal institutions, having an approach or being on-site, coming to speak or to teach or to do a workshop, starts building that trust, relationship, and partnership. Then I think the materials and courses flow and can be utilized. Before that, from our perspective, it's just something else that is being offered. People don't know about it, and they don't know anybody providing the other courseware, so they don't trust them or they don't use it.

[116] Fregy John: Can I answer?

[117] Jason Tan: Please go ahead.

[118] Fregy John: Some of the seminaries you mentioned are some of the best in the world, but the problem with most of the crowd we are dealing with is that they do not use the English language. These seminary online courses will not be of any use for non-English speakers. For the local seminaries in this country, in Asia, or in Africa, if they are able to encourage their graduates to use non-formal education programs to train next generational ministers in the local church, then the need of pastoral trainers will be met. The head of the seminary and people of influence in a formal setting should encourage their graduates to use formal or non-

formal training programs to train the next generation of people. The need is so big, so instead of wasting time, they should train the next generation. Some of those people with access and who know the English language can use the online courses to continue their education.

[119] Jason Tan: What you are saying, then, is to do pastoral training with whatever approach we want, we just need to do it?

[120] Fregy John: Yes. Whatever it takes. For some places, formal training will not be a big problem. Go ahead and have it. For other places where formal education is a big and difficult thing, it is not possible and non-formal is the best.

[121] Emmanuel Akatukunda: My response would be that there has to be an integration, especially in sharing resources. For us, what we are doing is to establish resource centers, a central place where pastors can come and access extra materials. There they can read and study. But these resources have to be really simplified in a way that these persons can read and understand. If we can access those, that would be incredibly helpful.

[122] Jason Tan: Are you talking about a web platform where resources can be taken for free?

[123] Emmanuel Akatukunda: Both. But, of course, many of the pastors have limited accessibility to the internet. It is something that is still growing. If we could have the accessibility and the permission, then we could probably print them out or record them, maybe have digital files or printed materials to hand out.

[124] Jason Tan: You need printed materials and digital materials as well.

[125] Emmanuel Akatukunda: Yes.

[126] Don Davis: Could I follow up with a question that Howard intimated in an answer that he gave? Our conversation has focused pretty much on content and how to help people access and explore that. One of the things that is important is the character of the authority behind the training we provide. In other words, who actually endorses us? It is a very simple question. I don't know if this dialogue or another dialogue will focus more on the authority and credibility of training. Training without imprimatur just won't work in the networks that we service. In other words, undoubtedly, there are all kinds of platforms and variety in what we can provide. But if the local and indigenous folk do not endorse it, no one is going to use it.

[127] In some ways, we have to talk at some level about the authority behind what we are doing. Who endorses us? Why do we have the right to go into a community and have them listen to us or use our materials? That is a huge issue in the training that we provide. We provide movements, networks, and church organizations. We have created a platform where they establish their own extension sites and satellites. We essentially supply them with content if they want it. We would never interfere with the local church's ability to make its own pastors,

trainers, or credibility. There is such diversity in what people believe, and what their doctrinal allegiances are.

[128] I think Howard touched on it by saying that just making curriculum available does not mean that it is going to be trusted. He mentioned that briefly in one of his answers. I don't know if any of you have an opinion about it. Just having stuff available does not mean that it will be used by anyone unless you can create a credible relationship with indigenous churches and leaders, and they actually endorse what we are doing. It seems like that is a first and necessary step before we talk about content proliferation and distribution. However, that is just my own opinion.

[129] Brett Lamberth: May I respond to that?

[130] Jason Tan: Yes, please.

[131] Brett Lamberth: So, you're looking more for who the religious authority or sponsor is, or who is giving the okay for our program. I believe that's what you are looking for. But I would like to address, in the similar vein, ICETE, the International Council for Evangelical Theological Education. I think they do a very good job in helping us set standards for non-formal programs and, at the very least, that's kind of who we are up under whenever we say, "Here, we're going to give you this certificate," or, "This is our certified program." We have affiliated with them, and that helps give weight to our program and helps give way to the authority to do what we are wanting to do.

[132] Jason Tan: Excuse me, brother. You're talking about ICETE?

[133] Brett Lamberth: Yes.

[134] Jason Tan: That's for formal theological education, right? Not non-formal?

[135] Brett Lamberth: They have formal accreditation, but for non-formal programs, you can affiliate with them. If you submit your program to them, including what you teach, the format, and your teachers, then they will essentially put their stamp of approval on it. Nothing more because it's not accredited. They are just approving and saying that they, in a way, endorse this program.

[136] Otto Kladsensky: They have forms to do this. They have already set up forms that each institution just fills in and they overview them.

[137] Brett Lamberth: Right.

[138] Jason Tan: If ICETE is doing this, is there a need for a similar institution that covers non-formal institutions? Or, is ICETE sufficient to do this? Is this a part of their mandate?

[139] Brett Lamberth: I think there is another aspect that Don is asking about. For example, if you're training some Baptist pastors, does your program—and maybe ICETE does endorse it—does the National Baptist Association or Convention in a certain country endorse your program? That's when you get to start making inroads to the national denominations. I think that's essentially what brother Don is asking. Are we doing that ground work?

[140] Don Davis: Brett, thank you so much for your answer. We have close to 260 sites in 18 countries. We essentially function through local entities. We would never insist on our curriculum for anyone. All disciples are made locally. And so, it is our priority to only come alongside the churches. As a matter of fact, I believe that the dichotomy between formal and non-formal is exactly this: the authority of formal training lies in the institution—its faculty and its programming. That's who they are. They grant degrees based on what they provide their students. Real disciples are made by pastors and churches and movements in localities, and sometimes there's no correlation between an institution and a community of churches. They have no relationship.

[141] As a matter of fact, I think it's very telling that Fregy said that many of his students don't even care about the question of accreditation or any of that. They're not going to school for that. That's not the primary credibility that they're looking for. I think, in some ways, we just assume we have credibility when many indigenous movements frankly don't care about the questions that we are asking. They don't care about accreditation or not. That means nothing to their movement. They are trying to make disciples in depressed and difficult places. They have no money. They have no academic background. They'll never be able to cross the divide or the barriers of funds and all of those things. And so, to me, the real disruption in this has to take seriously the priority of local churches in their own communities to take charge, in full autonomy, of their own training and how that works. I think that institutions have fallen behind that, in some way. I think we are behind the eight ball. We still think we have credibility when, in many places, we have none at all. That's my view.

[142] Otto Kladensky: I second the notion of what Don has just said. I remember Gloria mentioning that in the other Aqueduct dialogue. She said that we, the formal institution guys, are fishing in the wrong pond because the needs are somewhere else. Nevertheless, we are the ones who could provide the stamina or the tools for them to do this better. How can we do that? I think that was one of the questions that Jason is posing. Is that right, Jason?

[143] Jason Tan: That's right. How do we do it better? How can we partner with formal and non-formal? What can we do to help each country, or each church, based on their need for pastoral training? I think what Dr. Don Davis is saying is that each curriculum will be decided on based upon the needs of each region or country, and that the ones who will dictate the shape of the curriculum will be the leaders themselves. We must be ready to help them create this curriculum because in some ways, coming from a Majority World country, one of the problems is that, although we know the need, the problem is that we don't always have the training to create the curriculum. We need to partner with other institutions and other people who have the skill and training to help us create the proper curriculum for our context. They may be able

to tell you, “Okay, we need this kind of teaching. We need this kind of curriculum on witchcraft or feng shui—a theology about those things. Those are our needs, but who is going to develop those materials for us?” We can develop it, but we don’t have enough people who have the right training to do that, so that’s not something that’s always easy to do. I think it will be best for us to partner with other groups who have the resources, especially the manpower, to develop these curriculums.

[144] Don Davis: I wonder what the openness of formal providers is to really shift the heart of training more to a local church-based authority of structures. To me as a churchman, I see the responsibility for disciple-making largely to be an ecclesial matter, not an education one.

[145] Jason Tan: The problem in our situation is this: most seminaries in our region are so concerned about ATA (Asia Theological Association) or ICETE—the accreditation. They get funding from other groups and donors if they are accredited by some theological organization. Because of that, these theological organizations are the ones providing direction for seminaries. Even if the seminary sees a big gap between what’s happening in the field and theological training, they couldn’t adjust to the needs of theological training because they are so concerned about getting accreditation. How can we address this issue if seminaries don’t get funding from other world donors or if they don’t get ATA accreditation, when ATA is the one providing the curriculum and requirement for accreditation?

[146] Darrell Bock: Jason, I think there’s another way to think about this, and that is to not think about it in terms of the curriculum that a seminary has and that kind of thing, but to think about what the seminary is able to provide in what I would call a co-curricular kind of way. The additional resources can be aimed at certain topics and orientated to certain topics and left with enough open-endedness that the local church could contextualize that material. For me, I don’t see this as providing a designed curriculum, per se, but as an array of resources that lays background and a foundation for people, so they can then pick up and localize in the context of their particular situations in which they find themselves.

[147] Don Davis: I think that’s brilliant. As a matter of fact, I can say, in our case, we are deliberately non-accredited with the Association of Biblical Higher Education. But to help all the students who graduate from our program, we have partnerships with formal schools—Fuller, other seminaries, and other Christian liberal arts—who can convert our material to credit. We absolutely defer only to local church-based authority. Now, the accreditation says nothing about the actual quality of what you are doing, but the seminaries that we partner with actually recognize the quality of our work. We are deliberately nonaccredited. By doing that, we can have any number of students take our material. We are in seventy medium and maximum security prisons. We can provide seminary education for incarcerated people, and do it very cheaply. You could never do that in a formal way.

[148] Darrell Bock: That’s right. There are multiple issues here. One is the delivery to the context, and the other is just the sheer scale of what it is we’re trying to talk about. The question is not just whether something is available, but can it be delivered with some level of

quality assurance, if I can say it that way, so it's worth passing on and distributing? That issue is something that we had discussions about, and is what I said it's doing. That kind of thing has potential also to take us in the right direction. This is a very layered discussion. There are layers, and in some ways, I think the philosophy behind these calls is to, at least initially, get our hands around the different layers that we have to be thinking about as we approach it.

[149] Jason Tan: Okay. Howard has something to share. Howard?

[150] Howard Andrujajol: Thank you. I realize that most of us who are involved in non-formal training have formal training backgrounds. I mean, we have degrees and we've benefited from the formal education, which has led us to think that there is a bigger need and that we can be translators of both worlds—of the local church, with its need to make disciples and strengthen leaders, and the formal education. A question that was posed before was: "How can formal institutions help?" One of the possible ideas is to take this account and realize that we can develop a formal institution's programs, or update its programs, or use short-term programs, for non-formal trainers who have formal backgrounds of education. These would be meant to continue education and to be translators to bring this to the non-formal world. I graduated from SETECA and I also was discipled at the local church by my youth leader. He inspired me to do this training with others. I wanted to share with others what I received. But I benefited from both worlds, and I still benefit from the formal education. I think that if many of us have this background, then we realize it's really something of great value. We can be translators, and the formal education can support us and help us with new courses or new scholarships from key people who can replicate that in a different level, in the local level.

[151] Darrell Bock: Howard, I think that's important. I actually think that the key service that formal institutions can provide into this is to be better connected with the people actually leading and doing the non-formal side of this, and to be their resource, their friend, their encourager, and to help them provide. We also need to hear from people in non-formal circles what it is you would like for us to be able to provide that you think we are able to help you with, because there are certain things we probably couldn't help you with. Helping us to sort out where we should give our attention would be helpful to us. I think that one of the potentials of this most recent discussion is that it's not a case of formal saying to non-formals, "We're going to tell you how to do what you do." But rather, that we want to be available to you as a servant to provide you with what you think you could need because you know, having experienced us, what we gave you that's valuable for what you're doing.

[152] Orbelina Eguizabal: I would say that—at least I can speak for Latin America because I travel to those different countries—what I see is that most seminaries or institutions who are classified within the formal education, or theological education, are doing some attempts to cover that piece of coming to the churches and bringing the training to them. They are realizing that people are not coming to the seminaries, so they are now evaluating and shifting their minds and bringing everybody to the main institution. Some of the experiences are wonderful. At the beginning, pastors or church leaders are very skeptical about that because of the

relationship that has been between the church and theological education institutions, but I think they are now bridging that gap.

[153] I would say what we need to do now is to keep encouraging institutions to do that, and to partner, as you were saying, with the local churches or the other denominations, which is the other challenge. We are very denominationally divided. Everybody is doing their little things. A lot of denominations are doing their training, but they are not partnering with other denominations or with other institutions who are not identified as part of that denomination. I think that there are these other aspects that we need to consider, or at least raise some questions, about how we could encourage and raise more awareness of the work that we need to do at this point with people who never would be able to come to the institutions for formal training. Yes, I agree with Howard. Most of the people who are going to be doing that, or already doing that, have some formal training in seminary, and now are going to the churches and communities to do that. I know several programs and attempts where they are doing that with pastors, but when it comes to see how we can cooperate and partner with them, I guess that is one of the big challenges—to strengthen what is being done in each country or in each context.

[154] Jason Tan: Okay. Thank you very much. Last word, because we have to end soon.

[155] Darrell Bock: Can I deal with the denominational thing? I think it is important. I think the kinds of materials that we are talking about dealing with have to be rooted—and this is part of the open-endedness that I was talking about earlier—rooted in a very core level orthodoxy, in which we aren't trying to sort out the Baptist versus the Presbyterian, etcetera. But you are dealing with, if I can say it this way, a Nicene core in terms of the content of what's going on, with perhaps some awareness of what the discussions are that are within the family. You're really trying to deliver some very basic core stuff, because my sense is that, with the initial delivery to the kinds of audiences that you are dealing with, you are building with a foundation that is coming absolutely from scratch, with nothing underneath it. And so, you want that starting point to be a solid starting point in something that most of us would be very comfortable with.

[156] Jason Tan: Thank you. Just one last question and then we will try to summarize some of the main points. Fregy, you mentioned at the beginning that there is a need for some kind of accreditation for non-formal training. Can you explain why you said that? You mentioned a while ago that there are very few people who need accreditation.

[157] Fregy John: Yes. Actually, 70-to-80 percent of our people who are graduating from our program don't even care about accreditation because they may continue to work as pastors, or some of them work other jobs, and continue to lead the church. They don't care. Only those 20-to-30 percent of people think about an accredited degree because they think about continuing their education.

[158] Jason Tan: And for the sake of those people, you wanted some kind of relationship between formal and non-formal accreditation?

[159] Fregy John: Not only for that. I am talking about a concession or coming together to form an association of non-formal trainers because we can grow in strength from each other. Each of us has our own strengths. We brag about our own greatness and our training, and together we will be able to learn from one another. I don't have to make someone else's mistake. I can make my own. We learn from one another and grow in strength from one another. We can learn how the evaluation process works, what people are doing, how we can verify the quality of education. Then we can come to our formal similarities. This helps us to improve our material and look at our material, and say that it is not because we are seeking their approval, because most of us are also from a formal background. It is actually mutually helpful for each other. One of the participants said that seminaries are losing students. It is true in India. In most countries that I travel to, I find the number of students that are coming to seminaries are becoming less and less. But that does not mean that the need in the mission field is becoming less. The need in the mission field is become more and more. We have to use either a formal method or non-formal method. We have to prepare an army for the ministry, and prepare our people for the ministry. Both formal and non-formal has its own strength, so we can always learn from one another.

[160] Jason Tan: Thank you very much. Just one last chance for all those who have not spoken yet. If you want to say anything, this is your chance.

[161] Brett Lamberth: Yes, I would like to add something. I have a little time to speak. One thing I'd like to mention—I can't speak for everyone—as we are in a non-formal training setting, our problem really isn't material resources. We can get those pretty easily. Every non-formal training program here might be developing their own. For us, our biggest resource is always going to be human resources. Right now, we have three missionaries on the ground, including my family. Then we have five national trainers—three full-time and two part-time. We just transitioned to where all the nationals are training the national pastoral leaders. We are very excited about that, and so we're going to these pastoral leaders on a monthly basis. Our pastoral trainers are maxed out. If you take us missionaries out of the equation, and out of actually doing the training, we can't train any more pastors. We are maxed out at 450 pastors with five pastoral trainers. But the need is huge, as we all realize, and so one of the biggest resources for us is human resources. I think the seminary can help us with that.

[162] Jason Tan: Brett, where are you based at? Where are you ministering right now?

[163] Brett Lamberth: I'm in Guatemala City.

[164] Jason Tan: Great.

[165] Enrique Fernández: Hey friend, if I can make a comment here. I'm sorry I was late for the meeting. I'll probably add just one comment about ProMETA, the school for which I work,

which is 100% online and 100% in Spanish. Right from the beginning, after conducting a qualitative study all over Latin America to see what the needs were and what the approach to training leaders would be, we decided to go first with only one single program at the master's level—two Masters of Theology and a Master of Leadership. We have the idea of not necessarily teaching and training students who will go out and pastor a church or plant a church, but to focus on those who are already leaders of movements, denominations, etcetera. We also have the idea of focusing only on those people who are professionals, medical doctors, and so on. Regarding this issue of accreditation being a problem or not, what we are finding out is that after ten years of working, we have been able to train those people who are already leaders, but need the training to train more leaders at other levels in their denominations or organizations, etcetera. Very recently, we have gone now to the other extreme, to focus on non-formal training with certificates or postgraduate certificates to the point that we have been able to cross all denominational frontiers. We have students from many denominations, organizations, or missions agencies, who see that we are focusing on training even faculty of other schools. That helped us to develop credibility because, for us, the issue of accreditation has been a nightmare. There is no way that in Latin America we can get accreditation, but we have come to the point of creating credibility primarily because we are training those who are already leaders. Then these people have been able to go back to their denominations, or organizations, and train many more leaders with or without accreditation.

[166] Now we are focusing on non-formal education. I'm glad that some of you are saying that we shouldn't care about accreditation. Instead, you care for the credibility of the leaders and denominations. Our experience has been that by primarily focusing on those who are already leaders and now trying to provide non-formal education for the same movements that these students represent, we have been able to make a good connection with these students, so much so that our last school term had one hundred master's level students graduate from these groups. It seems to me that by focusing on those leaders which the denominations and movements need, and those who are already professional leaders rather than just seminary students, we are able to provide a service to the church which they are currently excited about. Also, the fact that probably fifty percent of our students are professional people, such as medical doctors, architects, engineers, etcetera, the church is trying to put these two groups together—those who are in ministry and those who are ministering in the marketplace. By focusing on these two groups of people who are already leaders, churches have seen the benefit of coming to study with our school, ProMETA. This has been a blessed experience for us.

[167] Jason Tan: Thank you very much. As we close our time, I'd like to request that Dr. Bock would please close us in prayer. Let me just summarize everything before the prayer. To begin with, we need to have an association of non-formal training so that we can learn from each other. Also, as Otto raised earlier, we need to see the processes that were involved in creating materials, programs, and curriculums in seminaries so we can learn from one another. We recommend that those who are part of formal education would be exposed to the field in order to develop relationships with those who are currently in the field. We need formally-educated people to be exposed to that context to understand what is happening in the field. They could

also help those who are already in the field to improve their material. Dr. Davis said that there is a need for churches to have a training structure that can be manipulated or developed on their own where we can help them out, but the churches can also provide the basic structure for them to have their own accreditation. Someone said that we need to have a place where we can study these processes and the learning experiences of other people. We suggested that GProConneXt.com would be one of those platforms where we could see some of the strategies our colleagues are using. Someone said there is a need for formal institutions to develop relationships of trust with leaderships in the local church so that we have the mandate and authority to combine some of our programs with them. Dr. Bock also mentioned that perhaps seminaries could develop a two-tier curriculum system, with one curriculum for formal education and perhaps another curriculum for those who are involved in non-formal education. Dr. Armstrong will be summarizing more of this discussion, and we will be sending this interview to him. We would like to thank all of you for being part of this dialogue. Dr. Bock, could you please lead us in prayer?

[168] Darrell Bock: Let me first thank you all for hosting this, and to Jason and Jonathan for putting this together. This is a great conversation that I think we are walking into. Our prayer will be that we might listen to God's direction because I think He's been involved in pulling us together from these various places in the world to discuss this.

PARTICIPANTS:

Jason Tan (Dialogue Chair), TOPIC (Trainers of Pastors International Coalition), INTERNATIONAL Global Ministry Facilitator (Philippines)

Emmanuel Akatukunda, Academic Dean of Kampala Evangelical School of Theology (Uganda)

Howard Andruejol, Director del Instituto Especialidades Juveniles (Guatemala)

Jonathan J. Armstrong, Associate Professor of Bible and Theology at Moody Bible Institute – Spokane, President of Aqueduct Project (USA)

Darrell Bock, Executive Director of Cultural Engagement and Senior Research Professor of New Testament Studies, Dallas Theological Seminary (USA)

Don L. Davis, Senior VP of World Impact (USA)

Orbelina Eguizabal, Professor of Christian Higher Education, Biola University (USA)

Enrique Fernández, Director of Contextual Studies Department, ProMETA (Costa Rica)

Fregy John, Asian Director of the Timothy Initiative (India)

Otto Kladensky, TOPIC (Trainers of Pastors International Coalition) (Costa Rica)

Brett Lamberth, President of Chosen People International (Guatemala)

Saji Lukos, President of Mission India Theological Seminary (India)