Other evaluation instruments on integration seminars: on integration components, #728; on "non-exhaustion," #739.

An "integration seminar" being radically different from a "course," its leader should be radically different from the traditional "teacher" in the tranditional academic setting. But how different, i.e. different in what characteristics? In the past several years of leading integration seminars at NYTS [Second Career, MidCareer, pastoral counseling, doctor of ministry], and from prior experiences [(1) similar efforts as pastor of one church for more than a decade, with attendant clergy continuing-education responsibilities local and larger, denominational and ecumenical, and (2) almost a decade in a national church office, with continuing-education responsibilities for clergy and laity], I've been pondering this question. This Feb/76 thinksheet is the result of my asking myself what would the ideal integration-seminar leader look like? Col.A is the characteristics, in my order of priority (the first being the most important). Col.B provides you with the opportunity to reorder the items as you may wish. Col.C is your evaluation of a particular integration-seminar leader, my immediate hope being that my current integration-seminar folks will help me, with their responses, to become better at the job. SCALE: 1-5, 1 being highest.

5	COLUMN A: The Characteristics	Col. B	Col.C
	1. Extensive experience in the ministry area the integration seminar is beamed at. If at the parish, the leader should have had extensive experience as senior clergy of a parish. If at counseling, extensive counseling-ministry experience. As well, of course, in both cases, special training for the particular ministry. [In no case is mere head-trip knowledge sufficient credential: such a seminar aims (a) not at integrating knowledge and life, (b) not at integrating knowledge and ministry, (c) certainly not at psycho-integration or only thinking/feeling integration, but (d) at triangular integration: preparation/life/ministry. [Variable factor: If the seminar is part of a wider program, it may or may not have the function of program integration. In the case of the NYTS D.Min. program it does not, as program integration is under the mentor/mentee relation.]		
	2. Personal commitment to the religious vision of which the particular ministry is an action-expression, and current action both in the ministry sphere and in the devotion it subtends.		
	3. Love for the participants, sustained/expressed through thick and thinand the prayerfulness "thick" [viz., anger reactions] demands.		no. 1, po v n. n. n. migrafine proportion of the contract of t
	4. The courage of integrity vis-a-vis personal vision and seminar process, without copping out in the interest of 'peace and quiet.' Respect, without sentimentality and/or simplism.	,	
	5. Integral visioning as life-habit and as enabling skill (i.e., helping others develop the hermeneutic skill of convergence, "getting it together" around the biblical vision-obedience). For this, the leader should be a generalist weaver, a polymath at least in intention and eagerness, with infectious enthusiasm as well as incisive analytic/synthetic power. Image/idea love.		
	6. Combined emotional/intellectual freedom, so no trip-laying. Thus, a rubber fuse, flexibility, patience.		
	7. Interpersonal skills [1:1], especially discernment; suffering.	are the second of the second o	
	8. Group skills.		Manager and Co.
	9. Prior experience in clergy continuing-education.		