

This thinksheet is nothing more than a quick review of the essentials of case group-processing a la Jim Glasse's "A Case Method for Pastors," Chap. VII of PUTTING IT TOGETHER IN THE PARISH [Abingdon/72], which it assumes you've read. Of course I slip in some diagramming, to relate to my own integration processes. And there are slight variances from Glasse.

"EVENT," THE PROFESSIONAL

You as professional act[ed] as responsible agent--establishing an appropriate relationship, preparing for action, action, learning from the event. It's not a left-brain abstraction or a right-brain anecdote, but a concrete piece of practice amenable to analysis and evaluation--particularly, evaluation of you as to your commitment, the quality of your involvement, and the degree of competence in this instance of your ministry.

"ISSUES IN PRACTICE"

To get at these is the reason for the somewhat rigid structure for processing your case, which is written up on one line-numbered page as follows:

BACKGROUND--The situation. What's in play--persons, pressures, purposes, perplexities? And how come you're in on it?

DESCRIPTION--What happened? And what did you do?

ANALYSIS--Relationships, issues, change/resistance. What's going on?

EVALUATION--How effective were/are you? What questions do you have for your seminar peers that might make you more effective in future in similar situations?

"CASE CONFERENCE" [Flow regulated mechanically by liturgist/time-keeper.]

CLARIFICATION (5")--Avoid seduction and fascination! Ask the presenter dull, critical questions, instead of interesting ones.

ANALYSIS (20")--What were/are the dynamics in the event? Avoid all evaluation, for that comes in the next time-segment. The presenter is under the rule of silence for the 20", and I'll limit my participation to trying to keep you on track....except, of course, when I think something vital has been overlooked. What were the issues? The turning-points? The critical factors?

EVALUATION (10")--In the case, how did the presenter do as to....

PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE?

Did he/she do what he/she set out to do?

How well did he/she do it?

How adequate is the presenter's own self-evaluation in the written case?

What would have been more competent behavior?

THEOLOGICAL ADEQUACY?

Was the presenter's time and energy well spent on this case? Was it worth it? Decide in relation to the nature of the church, the meaning of ministry, the hierarchy of needs and values of persons/society, the character of God/gospel.

PRESENTER'S RESPONSE (10")--(1) The group helped me most at these points:..... (2) In my opinion, the group failed to see/understand these matters:..... (3) If we had had more time, I'd like the group to have addressed these questions:.....