

ACPE News

of the North Central Region

PO Box 1832
Burnsville, MN 55337-1832
612-270-3313
Fax: 952-431-1423
E-Mail: ncracpe@ncracpe.org
Web Address: www.ncracpe.org
Gary Sartain, Regional Director

Volume XXXX, Number Three ACPE Annual Meeting Special Edition October, 2007

NCR Hosts 64 people at its Summit on Supervisory Education

The North Central Region held a Summit on Supervisory Education at the Bishop O'Connor Retreat Center in Madison, Wisconsin on May 18th and 19th. The event was attended by 40 members of the North Central Region and 24 guests from other parts of the United States and Canada. Region and Organizational representation and participants from each were as follows:

Northeast Region: Kathleen Gallivan, Mary Martha Thiel

Eastern Region: Meigs Ross (also ACPE Certification Commission)

Mid-Atlantic Region: Terri Bolotin, Jane Litzinger

Southeast Region: Sheryl Wurl

East Central Region: Mary Burks-Price, Walter Jackson, Ann Letson

South Central Region: James Gunn, Art Lucas, Frances McWilliams

Southwest Region: Gina Bethune, Gene Huffstutler, Carlos Sanchez, Ron Somers-Clark, Lerrill White

Pacific Region: Brenda Simonds, Sandee Yarlott

ACPE: Deryck Durston, Bill Scrivener

CAPPE: Tom O'Connor, Tom Powell

APC: Ted Lindquist

NACC: NCR's Kate Sullivan & Gerri Krautkramer



A Report & Comments on the Summit from Bill DeLong, Chair of the Planning Committee:



Bill DeLong

The North Central Region and selected guests from each of the other regions in ACPE gathered on May 18, 19 at the Bishop O'Connor Retreat Center in Madison, WI to discuss the state of supervisory education in ACPE.

The Summit utilized a process for discussion called the World Café that assisted the participants to delve into a variety of topics in a deepening conversation about our hopes and dreams, as well as the present reality of supervisory education. In the Café model, four questions were used to focus our conversation:

- **“What are your core beliefs about supervisory education?”**
- **“What interferes with you living out your core values in supervisory education?”**
- **“What do you believe is the Core Curriculum for Supervisory Education?”**
- **“What does Integration look like at each level Supervisory Certification?”**

Those in attendance grappled with each of the questions outlined above. And the dialogue increased in specificity and depth as the process continued. Along with an intense but fruitful dialogue, some of the following things emerged in the process of the summit as reflected in the many process notes from the day and a half:

- “Our core curriculum is a process, determining the “content” of that process is a different thing.”
- “Theory emerges from the individual story of the supervisory candidate and thus will be as unique as each story.”
- “Integration can be understood at each level of certification as ‘ease of access: to our story, to pastoral care interventions, to supervisory theory’, etc.”
- “Supervisory CPE is a difficult process, but that is not the same as an unjust process.”

Jane Litzinger from the Mid-Atlantic Region presented an overview of what she considered “best practices” in supervisory education from her center at Wake Forest North Carolina Medical Center. Jane provided the participants with a grid that she uses to guide the supervisory education process. Sheryl Linds-Stowman and David Rumbolt, both from our region responded to Jane’s presentation, helping to stir the rich stew a bit more.

Two panel discussions also helped round out the educational activities for the Summit. One panel was on the “Barriers and Blessings” in supervisory training and focused on the unique journey of the multicultural experience in certification. The other panel reflected upon the criteria for selection of supervisory students and reminded all of us how important it is to reflect critically on the gifts and abilities of those entering the certification process.

Having moderated most of the discussions I wanted to add that I found the experience to be quite meaningful for me personally. I was impressed and touched by the convictions of those gathered, by the genuine sense of care for the work that we do and by the diversity of approaches to supervisory education. Perhaps the most consistent comment I heard throughout the process was this: “We don’t gather enough together to listen to our own wisdom about what we do.” Perhaps the North Central Region will continue to lead the way in encouraging ACPE to listen to ourselves about what I believe is one of the core elements of our community- the development and certification of ACPE Supervisors.

The following letter was received from the representatives of the Canadian Association for Pastoral Practice and Education, Tom Powell and Tom O'Connor:

“Greetings from the 2 Toms from Canada,

What a great event you people hosted! And a big “thank you” from Tom O'Conner from Waterloo, Ontario and Tom Powell from Saskatoon, Saskatchewan for inviting CAPPE/ ACPEP to be a part of this Summit on Supervisory Education and for making it financially possible for us to participate. It was absolutely fantastic to be with our sisters and brothers from the US and to talk extensively about the issues regarding supervision of Supervisors In Training (in Canada we call them Provisional and Associate Teaching Supervisors).

Some of the things that struck the two of us are: the obvious money your institutions put into spiritual care and the training of spiritual caregivers. While our government funded medical care gives all Canadians free and equal access to essential medical care, there is very little money put into spiritual caregiving. It takes denominational support to fund most of our programs. The second thing of note is the sheer number of participants in your programs. In Canada we have fewer than 100 supervisors in total and there are not really that many people coming forward to take supervisor education. In some ways we found your situation a bit overwhelming.

Having said that, however, we also noted that many of the problems identified at this Summit are shared by your Canadian brothers and sisters. And we 2 Toms have already begun conversations with our Board of Directors to assist us in putting on an event for supervisors in conjunction with our Annual Convention and General Meeting to be held in Victoria, B.C. in April 2008. We are thinking of using the same process used in Madison to address many issues supervisors face as they attempt to provide quality supervised education.

Thank you for including us; and thank you to the whole of ACPE. Lets do more of these excellent educational opportunities

Blessings to you all!”

The NCR and all of ACPE owe a big thank you to **Bill DeLong, Michelle Oberwise-Lacock, Jo Ann O' Reilly, Sheryl Stowman, and Barbara Sheehan**, who were key players in developing the Summit program. And thanks to **Emilie Wolf**, who found us the meeting place and coordinated the community forming and centering rituals, and **Peter Holland**, whose leadership and work on the NCR Strategic Planning Committee led the NCR Board to surface and the NCR membership to embrace this project. Also working on the Summit were **Beth Burbank** and **NCR Regional Director, Gary Sartain**. Gary acted as the conference coordinator and handled all of the site and registration logistics.

Proceedings of the Summit on Supervisory Education

Edited by William R. DeLong, Ed.D.

**North Central Region
Association for Clinical Pastoral Education, Inc.
© North Central Region of the Association for Clinical Pastoral Education, Inc.**

Table of Contents

The Background	2
The Café Model	4
1st Café Question	5
2nd Café Question	7
Best Practices in Supervisory CPE	9
3rd Café Question	14
4th Café Question	15

The Background

The Board of the North Central Region sought to use surplus funds to allow for a special educational event for the members of the region. Gary Sartain, the regional director for the NCR, sought ideas and advice from each of the sub-regions. This information was brought to the meeting of the Board where a consensus quickly developed to hold an educational event on the nature and current practice of supervisory education in the ACPE. The final resolution brought to the membership of the North Central Region and unanimously passed at the annual meeting in Tampa was:

“Given the current solid financial position of the North Central Region and in light of ongoing concerns about Supervisory Education throughout the ACPE, the North Central Region board proposes that \$25,000.00 be used to sponsor a Supervisory Education Summit to be held in 2007 in the Chicago area. The funds would be used to provide travel and lodging expenses for NCR Supervisors interested in supervisory education, and, for purposes of cross fertilization, to supplement the cost of bringing in a training supervisor from a Center in each of the other eight ACPE regions identified by that region as embodying best practices in supervisor education. The Region will seek additional support and participation (at their cost) from other regions who share the interest and concern about Supervisory Curriculum and best practices that lead to certification as a supervisor in the ACPE.”

The Board elected William DeLong to chair the planning committee for the Supervisory Summit. The planning committee included interested members of the region and we had several conference calls to begin the planning process. After a few such conference calls the group determined to call for a sub-committee to attend a planning day. This core planning team included Sheryl Linds Stowman, Michelle Oberwise-Lackock, Barbara Sheehan, Gary Sartain, Beth Burbank and JoAnn O’Reilly.

Since the original motion named Chicago as the place for the summit the committee looked at a number of sites in and around Chicago. It was determined that a more central location would assist the members of the NCR and hold down on cost. The Bishop O’Connor Retreat Center in Madison, WI was chosen as the site for the Summit and the date, again to hold down cost, just prior to the NCR annual meeting was also selected. The Summit now had a time, and a place.

The core planning team met at Advocate Health in Oak Brook for a day of planning the agenda for the Summit. The planning committee had already decided to use a process known as the World Café in order to stimulate thoughtful conversation in a brief amount of Time. Barbara Sheehan who had used the model in other events led the committee around formulating questions and in general educating the committee about the Café model.

The following agenda was set by the core planning group for the Summit:

Friday

2:00-2:30	Welcome and Introductions to the Summit Process
2:30-3:30	1 st Café Question “What are your core beliefs about supervisory education?”
3:30-4:30	Panel Discussion “Criteria for selection of Supervisory Students?”
4:30-5:30	2 nd Café Question: “What interferes with you living out your core values in supervisory education?”
6:00-7:00	Dinner
7:00-8:00	Surface patterns, insights, and deeper questions.

Saturday

7:30-8:30	Breakfast
8:30-8:45	Devotional
9:15-10:15	Components of Best Practice in Supervisory Education-Jane Litzinger Responses from the North Central Region
10:15-10:30	Break
10:30-11:30	3 rd Café Question “What do you believe is the Core Curriculum for Supervisory Education?”
11:30-12:30	Lunch
1:00-2:00	Open Mic Question “What are you doing in peer group meetings in Supervisory Education?”
2:00-2:15	Break
2:15-3:45	Panel Discussions Barriers and Blessings to Supervisory Certification within Regions.
3:45-4:00	Break
4:00-5:00	4 th Café Questions “What does Integration look like at each level Supervisory Certification?”
5:00-5:30	Connecting the Dots
6:00-7:00	Dinner
7:00-9:00	Gathering Collected Wisdom, Now What?

The Regional Directors of each region were invited to select a member from their region to attend the event as a guest of the North Central Region. In addition we invited members from the Canadian Association for Pastoral Practice and Education, represented by Tom O’Connor, Tom Powell. Ted Linquist, the current chair of the certification commission, represented the Association for Professional Chaplains. Also invited was Bill Schrivner, the President Elect of ACPE, Deryck Durston, the Associate Executive Director of ACPE. The National Association for Catholic Chaplains was represented by Kate Sullivan & Gerri Krautkramer, both of the North Central Region.

The following individuals represented the regions of ACPE:

Northeast Region: Kathleen Gallivan and Mary Martha Thiel

Eastern Region: Meigs Ross (also ACPE Certification Commission)
Mid-Atlantic Region: Terri Bolotin and Jane Litzinger
Southeast Region: Sheryl Wurl
East Central Region: Mary Burks-Price, Walter Jackson and Ann Letson
South Central Region: James Gunn, Art Lucas and Frances McWilliams
Southwest Region: Gina Bethune, Gene Huffstutler, Carlos Sanchez, Ron Somers-Clark and Lerrill White.
Pacific Region: Brenda Simonds, Sandee Yarlott

The Café Model

The World Café Model was chosen in order to encourage significant conversation and to deepen relationships. The model was originally suggested by Barbara Sheehan as a way to begin this conversation. The following letter was sent to all who registered for the summit with the encouragement to learn about the World Café Model:

April 16, 2007

Dear ACPE Colleague:

Welcome to the NCR Supervisory Summit. On behalf of the North Central Region and the Planning Committee of the Supervisory Summit, we want to welcome you to our upcoming meeting on May 18th, 19th. Several months ago the Board and membership of the North Central Region decided to host an event that focused upon supervisory training and the process of supervisory education. With many recent suggestions made throughout our organization we felt it was time to gather and listen to ourselves about the art of supervisory training and the future of our organization.

With that in mind, we are using a process that encourages exactly that, "listening to ourselves." When we gather we will be using a process called the World Café. It is designed to assist us in deeply listening to each other. You are encouraged to visit the web site for the Café Model at www.theworldcafe.com to learn more about the process we will be using. Below is a brief description about the Café model.

As a conversational process, the World Café is an innovative yet simple methodology for hosting conversations about questions that matter. These conversations link and build on each other as people move between groups, cross-pollinate ideas, and discover new insights into the questions or issues that are most important in their life, work, or community. As a process, the World Café can evoke and make visible the collective intelligence of any group, thus increasing people's capacity for effective action in pursuit of common aims.

In addition to the conversations and presentations at the Summit, we encourage you to bring along curriculum or other materials you may wish to share with your colleagues. There will be tables available at the meeting room for distributing copies to others.

You will find below an agenda for the Summit. Please feel free to contact Bill DeLong or Gary Sartain if you have any questions with which we may help. We look forward to an experience that helps us center on the process we use to train ACPE Supervisors.

Summit Planning Committee
William R. DeLong, Chair
Michelle Oberwise Lacock
Sheryl Lyndes Stowman
JoAnne O'Reilly

The Summit

Following introductions and welcome the group was given more information about the World Café Model. This led to the first question. In part because of the newness of the model we were using, and because the facilitators were intent on gathering a great deal of

information the first question provided a tremendous variety of responses that are reproduced here as they were recorded. That is the data that follows were recorded from the participants at each table. They are provided here without ranking of any kind. There has been no editing or interpretation given to this data. Rather it is presented here for the individual reader to assess the meaning of the responses.

1st Café Question “What are your core beliefs about supervisory education?”

- Life blood of APC certification
 - Supervisory Alliance is crucial “no acting out”
 - Process as a whole is spiritual
 - Transformative
 - Life long learner
 - Complete process
 - Theory that is relevant
 - Integration of theology and practice
 - Spiritual/psychological growth & maturity
 - Cultural awareness
 - Integrity of supervisor & student
 - Students critical purchase of spirituality
 - A birthing process
 - Open ended ness for both student and supervisors
 - Learned process
 - Student is creator of curriculum
 - Its all about relationship
 - Co-learners/co-creator
 - Everyone’s journey is unique
 - Journey with the various subcultures of my being
 - Matures internally and externally
 - Doesn’t have to be chronological
 - Imp understand inner process of other
 - Master coaches-help them see
 - Motivation and calling- motivator
 - Life long journey
 - Hard work/rewarding. Important and life giving
 - Integration of theory and practice
 - Theory vs. experiences
 - Spiritual transformation
 - Let go things will happen
 - Humility
 - “Competencies”, “outcomes”, “structures” of ACPE may be leading us in a counterproductive direction for supervisory education
 - Students learn thru themes, stories, and metaphors. Each student addresses the outcome thru those themes, so
- “outcomes” of each student do not always looks alike
- What I am teaching is a life long process... I may not really ever know what I’ve taught a supervisory student. The realization of that knowledge may only emerge later
 - Sup. Educ. requires exposure to literature and concepts that most ministers have not been exposed to. Need conceptual grounding early on in the training process
 - Lively tension of paradox
 - Training supv model of what he or she teaches
 - Humane, respectful, collegial process
 - Creative tension vs. ind. + corporate integrity
 - Supervisor as master clinician
 - Let go to let learn
 - See and honor person in context
 - Supervisor understand role with student to assist in life long learning
 - Names to progressive levels of competence of training.
 - Salvific process
 - Experience makes for theology & theology ,akes for experience
 - Intensity and detachment with open endness
 - Accountable for standards
 - Sup ed involves a shift from pastoral care giving to education
 - Emphasis on integration-an organic process
 - Need for concurrent supervisory experience + learning about theory
 - Peer accountability
 - A lot we didn’t teach but still learn
 - Honest with students who “do not cut it”
 - Requires us to encounter sacred space
 - Needs to have more training and mentoring

- There is a core curriculum to be instilled
- There are many dimensions not just 2 players
- Clinical pasr experience drive theory
- Be grounded in our own stories
- Consultation is important and should be modeled
- Model of healing + inpowerment
- Integrative process bringing together pastoral, theological administrative, educational, psychological
- Looking at moving from the health of individuals toward the health of community
- It's about education, not certification
- It's costly for student and family, institution and needs to be supported and requires fortitude
- Critical reflection-bring & create from outside-interdisciplinary
- Importance of self awareness
- Process is kairos not clonos
- Insight into cultural contexts and how that contributes
- Immediate engage, involvement take very motivated students
- Student get it when and where you get it
- Spiritual and emotional maturity important for student
- We learn one another
- Clear critical feedback to supv resident for clear integrity
- Ability of supv to acknowledge being stuck
- Supervisors need to be committed to learning and growing
- SIT has to be liked + seen as certifiable by training supervisor
- Supv training→institutional gets least commitment to education return
- Passing on generational wisdom
- Professional competence integrative
- Pathway to health, creative not controlling
- Supervision as adt/ uniquely fits into profession
- Integrity-journey into self worth, identity formation
- Field hold knowledge not just dialogue
- Personal and pastoral integration is the core
- Process should be enjoyable
- Draws from outside resources and celebrative with other disciplines
- Pastoral formation is foundation
- Art & craft and skills
- Self directed
- Encourage SES to gain from others
- Inner experience of the clinical process important throughout
- Peer process
- Trust conducive to adult learner approach
- Cultural humility
- Readiness of student and training supv
- Supervisor open to learn from student
- Relational component to diad is important
- Supervisor is perpetual learner
- Journey in dialogue
- Maturity >35 will be difficult
- Chronological
- Connected & ethical God-revelativity of the more than human part of us
- Separate from other disciplines
- More training for supervisors
- Lack of standards
- Good thing to do
- Takes a community
- Supervisor relationship is key
- Ought to be more than me supv
- Trust is vital for openness
- Involve commitment
- Supervisory + SEE are 1 learner
- Knowledge clarity of power different boundaries is important
- Motivational + call critical for supv and student

The second question followed a panel discussion on the “Criteria for selection of Supervisory Students?” This involved a moderated discussion by Sheryl Lyndes Stowman and selected participants. A wide variety of criteria were mentioned including the need for careful evaluation of pastoral proficiency and capacity to use

the unique educational model of CPE. Others commented on the need for clear assessment of motivation of the potential supervisory student given the difficulty of the process. Cultural values and the match with centers and supervisors were also commented upon. The following lists some of the points of discussion.

**CRITERIA FOR READINESS OR ADMISSION INTO SUPERVISORY CPE
THE PANEL:**

Meigs Ross:

- 1) Smart, academic ability and emotional intelligence
- 2) Strong pastoral identity
- 3) Hard worker--Has fire in the belly for supervision
- 4) Ability to grow
- 5) Their fit for our particular center/personality

- 5) Know themselves, others and God
- 6) Love learning
- 7) Curiosity
- 8) Preference is to students who have been residents at their center or they accept them for one unit of residency prior to admission into supervisory
- 9) Can they withdraw their own projections?
- 10) Can they embrace their own healing

Steve Corum:

- 1) Highly motivated
- 2) Sense of call
- 3) Can we work with them
- 4) Theological and theoretical acumen

Tom O'Connor:

- 1) You have to be a master clinician
- 2) Completing a course on supervisory theory offered in Canada
- 3) Emphasize an adult educational approach
- 4) Work with clarifying the tension between supervision and therapy
- 5) Students need to feel called to it, should be fun and energizing
- 6) Theological aspect of education emphasized

Sandee Yarlott:

- 1) Am I going to enjoy being in relationship with this person
- 2) Seeking multi-cultural diversity
- 3) Strong pastoral authority
- 4) Wanting it that badly

2nd Café Question: “What prevents you from living out your core values in Supervisory Education?” Again, this data is not edited and is taken from the feedback provided by each table.

External Forces

- Cost / Long term process
- Distance / Peer group
- Corporate culture
- Endorsement

- Defended personally to be open to our process and to each other
- System rotating supervisory student what is our commitment to them
- Overwhelming multiple demands; no time for self reflection/study
- Lack of support / time / collegiality
- Exhaustion
- Enmeshment & over invest in students, lose objectivity
- Student requirements higher than when many supervisors trained
- Lack of consensus of theory integration & curriculum across ACPE
- Lack of time and attention to our own reflection
 - Self
 - Student(s)

Internal Factors

- Tension between learning and need to get student certified
- Fear of reaching out for consultation
- Weight on our shoulders to get person certified versus sharing this with other supervisors
- Physical and geography limitations
- Pressures—internal and external
- Not attracting students with “fire in the belly”

- God /higher power
 - Study
- Lack of deep conversation/collaboration among supervisor staff about selves and work relationships
- Complicated systems we work in and demands of students
- Internal fear of own inadequacy /incompetence and of external critique
- Mixed message/false dichotomy between being “proficient” and still needing consultation
- Anxiety about coaching students to meet committees interferes with our core educational values
- Theory envy and performance anxiety as supervisors
- Multiple internal and external demands and expectations
- Lack of ongoing peer-conversations about theory, practice and relationships: “supervisor peer-factor”
- Time
 - For self reflection— administrative/work responsibilities
 - So many competencies—labor intensive process
 - For peer reflection/consult
- Tensions
 - Outcomes / competencies vs. education; /messy learning process need to success
- Lack of self-differentiation & anxiety
 - Students over dependent
 - Students over invested
 - Supervisors competing
- External and internal interference
- Finances –stipend vs. staff
- Certification process adversarial?
- Minimalist vs. high expectations
- Trust in certification process-expertise of committees
 - Mutual accountability
 - Paper writing
- Letting others know-me claiming what I need to do and communicating it to the people I work for/with
- Being honest with my core/if I am not that then it gets in the way
- Not vulnerable w/ peers enough to get the supervision I need
- If I don’t do self-care, reading etc.
- If my values are not congruent w/ certification process/committees
- Too busy, to many responsibilities to attend to supervision
- To anxious (ref Friedman)
- Our own struggle to say “no” to set limits
- Our own humanity-more externally focused to detriment of inner work
- Tension between holding a core value of diversity and the complexities of it
- Endorsement issues
- Tension between learning and going through the certification process
- Exhaustion-busy with ministrations and other obligations
- Shame about students knowing more theory
- Fear-take appropriate risks
- Transference and projections gets worse with exhaustion

Following dinner we returned to voice what participants thought was most meaningful for them in this first part of the Summit. The summation includes the thoughts and reflections from Café questions 1 and 2. These comments are listed without edit.

- Core beliefs, the relationship was important, barrier our own self reflection
- Not alone in feeling threatened to share our own theory with peers
- Tension relationship, autonomy, etc. a variety of areas that are in tension with each other
- Which comes first theory / practice-the importance is the integration
- Practice and story drive theory
- Training for certification, giving and receiving feedback
- Curious about lack of discussion regarding peer groups, more focus on supervisory relationship w/ sup student
- Promote collaboration-grateful for this dialogue
- Greater consensus on supervisory education around theory/practice
- Teaching and learning from each other, keep doing this

- Develop accountability around supervisory education. So students benefit (well/and where its not happening)
- How do we model self-disclosure, accountability so those making an appearance know the committee more
- How do we set up research and learn from it
- Train people to be transparent and yet professional risky to do so
- Once certified to make sure to take time for own education, and to be vulnerable and transparent
- Training supervisor be vulnerable, willing to present
- Sensitive to location
- Full time chaplain and new time lines in certification
- What makes a unit of supervisory ed
- More mutuality in committee appearances before, during and after
- Receive presenters report earlier
- Tension between creativity and structure (core curriculum-resist defining that)
 - What do we have to know- resisted this?
 - A lot of tensions, diversity in the process, creates some confusion, also allows for creativity/diversity both + / -
- Value -we want it to be hard- difficult and tease out what that means
- Under valued systems kill your-our young- do we?
- Different supervisory students need different kinds of supervision
- Relationship w/ our faith traditions
 - are we drawing from faith groups that are growing?
 - Endorsement process, CPE is not a church like folks to have a connection
 - Tension between Z perspectives
- Values and than raise the bar for integration, etc-look at the “exhausted” trying to do so many things. Tension between two. What is the support we need?
- Spirituality more important as I am getting older. Integration more now “left brain” need more “right brain” Afraid to let others know our spirituality if it is different from our own. Tell their story
- What were the students goals if always focused on outcome?

After breakfast and devotions we began Saturday morning with a presentation by Jane Litzinger from Wake Forest University North Carolina Baptist Medical Center in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. Jane was invited to speak to us about best practices in supervisory education.

Best Practices in Supervisory CPE

Jane gave a stimulating presentation that centered on a supervisory grid they use at N.C. Baptist. The grid appears in the appendix of the proceedings. Briefly the grid provides a kind of road map for the progress of supervisory education and corresponds both to individual learning goals and to the outcomes for supervisory education. The response to Jane’s presentation was made by David Rumbold and Sheryl Lynds-Stowman. Both voiced appreciation for Jane’s perspectives and differed with her on some of the structure of the grid. A question in the later Q&A session was how dependent this kind of structure is upon having a large CPE faculty and institutional support. Jane’s presentation is reproduced here.

My assumptions about best practice in supervisory education

What is Best Practice?

- My sources (*Wikipedia*) say that best practice is a management idea which asserts that there is a technique, method, process, activity, incentive or reward that is more effective at delivering a particular outcome than any other technique, method, process. The idea is that with proper process, checks, and testing, a desired outcome can be delivered with fewer problems and unforeseen complications.

What is Best Practice in Supervisory Education?

- Best Practice in Supervisory Education is a whole set of curriculum practices that facilitate the achievement of the objectives that define supervisory education. (See Handout #A) Those objectives are stated (I think simply and masterfully) in Standard 313.

313.1 To develop supervisory students' knowledge in theories and methodologies related to CPE supervision drawn from theology, professional and organizational ethics, the behavioral sciences, and adult education.

313.2 To provide students practice in the supervision of CPE under the supervision of an ACPE Supervisor.

313.3 To facilitate students' integration of the theory and practice of CPE supervision in their identity as a person, pastor and educator.

- What makes them “best” is that they are particularly effective in assisting supervisory education students **in building a theory base** for their supervision, **in providing practice** of supervising and being supervised, and **in facilitating integration of theory and practice** of supervision in the supervisory student's identity as person, pastor, and educator.

- “Best” practices are particularly effective in assisting students to develop the competencies articulated in Standards 314 through 319, the Outcomes of Supervisory CPE.

- “Best” practices are particularly effective in assisting students obtain professional certification and secure real jobs where they can pursue the wonderful vocation called being an ACPE Supervisor.

- ”Best” practices are also particularly effective in assisting students who do not have the gifts or motivations needed to be ACPE supervisors to leave the process and find other ministry positions in which they can flourish.

- Yes, I am convinced that essentially the same best practices prepare our students to be excellent supervisors and to pass regional and national certification committees.

- This is a parenthesis that belongs in another presentation but I cannot resist it here. I believe that regional and national certification committees need to define and tend their own best practices as they certify. I was encouraged in this regard three weeks ago when I served on a panel of theory paper readers. I have done this before many times. However, for the first time the process required the three readers to complete and send to the paper writer our composite evaluation of 24 required dimensions in her three papers.

This begins to look like a certification best practice to me. (Note: we can learn from APC as we move ahead articulating competencies in certification process.)

Is there one set of best practices that will serve all ACPE supervisory educational centers?

●I do not think that there is a one size fits all set of best practices for all of our training centers. Training centers are different from each other and that is one of ACPE's great strengths. However, I believe that there may be "components" of best practice that would be consistent for all training centers. I think we have a lot to learn from each other's best practices even if we know that our own edition of a practice must look different from the center in which it originated.

So what are some best practices in supervisory education, who said so, and what are the components of best practice in ACPE supervisory education that might be consistent for all training centers?

I think that any practitioner of supervisory education whose students get certified and any student who gets certified can look at his/her experience and describe best practices. I am one of those practitioners and I want to describe for you three best practices from my center that have helped our students build their theory bases, practice supervision under supervision, and integrate their theory and practice in their identity as person, pastor, educator. The three practices include *a core curriculum, a contract between the center and the supervisory student*, and *educational seminars*. Of course, all supervisory education programs must have these three practices so I will explain why I think these are "best" practices. From the vantage point of these best practices that have been very effective at my center, I want to suggest some components of these best practices that might be important for all training centers.

Three Best Practices from WFUBMC

#1 Develop a Map/Core Curriculum/A Grid

What is it that supervisors and supervisory students are doing together in the supervisory education process? A map or core curriculum or grid is meant to answer this question and provide a specific yet flexible statement of what this educational process is all about. (See Handout B) Here is an example from our center of what our map, our grid looks like. Obviously, there is an edition of this in which all the blocks are filled in. Here I just want to picture the general outline. Notice the educational process it describes:

- Supervisory education is *developmental* (See **horizontal axis**).
- In each of the four phases students will be working on certain *skills* and *theoretical mastery*. We think it is helpful to articulate a sense of the students *self understanding* in each phase. We remind ourselves and our students what *learning formats* and *program settings* will be part of each phase and we note the focus for **bibliography** and examples of the most important kinds of sources that students will be consulting in each phase. (See **vertical axis**).

- So for example, the first phase looks like this. (See Handout #C) We see phase one as very focused on the development of grounded pastoral care competence and our students have significant pastoral care responsibilities in the medical center. We want our supervisory residents to be excellent pastoral care givers and the skill segment here is

all about the level 2 outcomes. Our theoretical focus in this segment is on competence in the theoretical frameworks our residents will soon be teaching to their level 1 students. What makes this segment different from the second year pastoral care residency most of our supervisory residents have is a focus on use of self in pastoral care with its significant requirement for self knowledge.

●For a second example, the second phase looks like this. (See Handout #D) The skill level for this segment is much about basics...what our colleague; David Carl at Carolinas Medical Center calls the “horsy/ducky” dimension of learning. All of the good “verbatim habits” developed in pastoral care are translated now in the student’s supervisory relationships. These students discover much more about counter transference and we want them to be able to articulate pastoral issues that emerge in their work with students. Hard work on the theory papers begins here and students bring drafts of their papers to individual supervision as well as to theory and practice seminar. In terms of self understanding, in the supervisory dimension of his/her work this is a time of trials and tribulations (image from Stoltenberg and Delworth) as the beginner faces the repeated cycles of fluctuating between dependence and autonomy with his or her own supervisor and between over-confidence and being overwhelmed with his or her own students. (This image is from Hawkins and Shohet.) However, as a pastoral care giver, the supervisory student is accomplished and able to accompany students in the clinic with some ease.

So, what makes our grid a best practice? The grid describes **concretely** some important supervisory competencies. The grid is not expansive and attempts to enumerate **minimal** competencies. The grid makes provision for the **developmental** nature of the educational process and we think this helps us define a level of supervisory presence/absence to the supervisory student that is responsive to his/her place in the process and provides consumer protection to the level 1 students he/she is supervising. Finally this overall view of what we are doing together and which we hold flexibly allows us to be a community of supervisors who can all take our turns working with students.

#2 A time-limited, three year contract for supervisory education

Our supervisory residents know when they begin that their process with us will be a three year process. (See Handout B, below the grid outline.) You see there about where we expect our supervisory residents to be, approximately, as they pursue the course of their training.

What makes a time limited contract a best practice? It helps our students be **self defining**. For example, they set their own deadlines for completion of theory papers. The time limitation tends to help our students be **active participants** in their own educational process. From the center’s side of things, the time limited contract is situated in our commitment to provide supervisory residents with **generous personnel and time resources** as we participate in their journey. It is part of our ethic not to take advantage of supervisory residents by extending for months and years the time they work on a student’s stipend with limited benefits.

#3 Regularly scheduled, structured, educational seminars

THEORY AND PRACTICE SEMINAR

This seminar meets weekly for 75 minutes for 10 to 14 times during each of the three annual educational units. (See handout #E1) Our (two) supervisory residents and at least three faculty members attend. One faculty member is assigned to convene this seminar and plan the sessions. In each unit we focus four seminars on one of the three theory areas required in paper writing. Supervisors present seminars on practical supervisory skills. Supervisory students present drafts of their theory papers and other work they are preparing. Supervisory residents also present each unit's final evaluation in this seminar.

CONSULTATION SEMINAR

All faculty and all supervisory residents attend this 60 minute weekly seminar. Supervisors and supervisory residents bring issues/concerns from their own supervisory practice and seek consultation. Everyone consults. Supervisory residents often bring clips from the video of their supervisory sessions as basis of their consultation.

SUBREGIONAL SUPERVISORY PRACTICE SEMINAR

Four and sometimes more of the North Carolina training centers participate in this seminar. All centers that send supervisory resident/s send a faculty supervisor. The meeting occurs bimonthly for 3 hours and has 2 sessions. All supervisory students are in a clinical presentation rotation for the first seminar. There are no spectators! All present break into two or three smaller groups to give feedback to the presenters. This is followed by an IPR, co facilitated by two supervisors. There is a (supervisor) process observer who leads a discussion at the end of the IPR. This discussion provides great commentary on group process. The planning function for this meeting rotates among the centers with a supervisor from one of the centers acting as convener for each of the three annual segments of the gathering.

What makes our educational seminars a best practice? Our seminars provide **regular and titrated spaces to develop the theory base** for supervisory practice. They provide **consistent** places for supervisory students and supervisors to be on their feet in **participative** educational process. In these seminars we are able **to develop the educational culture** that is required to support the sophisticated, interdisciplinary, ministry education project we call supervisory education.

Components of Best Practice in Supervisory Education

You will remember that I do not think that these best practices from WFUBMC are necessarily best practices for every center. No doubt, some of these practices could and have been revised to be functional in other centers. But are there any “components” of best practice in supervisory education that can be identified from these specific practices to serve as criteria for best practice development throughout ACPE's supervisory education centers?

Here is my answer to that question. (See Handout #E2)

Supervisory Education must be rooted in a serious educational culture. The educational culture required for supervisory education is different in quality and quantity from that required to provide education for level 1 and level 2 outcomes. A serious education culture for supervisory education will include:

- A map of the process of supervisory education that is understandable and functional for students and supervisors;
- A structure for the educational process that provides for engagement and accountability between supervisory education students and training supervisors/training centers;
- A capacity for training centers/supervisors to assist supervisory education students in building the knowledge base articulated in Standard 313.1;
- Clarity about the minimal skills/competencies required for students to be certified as practitioners and places for supervisory education students to be supervised as they attempt to live into these competencies in their supervision of students.

Yes, this is a large order. Yes, I think that the national organization will need to invest significantly in the development of vision and resources for supervisory education centers. Yes, I hope that centers and regions can assist each other as we work more creatively with distance learning possibilities and the development of DVD libraries. My sense is that attention to best practice development in supervisory education is critical to the survival and continued influence of ACPE at the ministry education table.

Above all, I hope that as we continue the best practice discussion in ACPE we will approach each other relationally as respected and wise co-workers who can learn from and with each other. Obviously the North Central Region understands this as is evident from the format of this whole meeting...as we might say in Winston Salem, Ya'll come! Thank you. I think that documents sent down from above will never work if we want to really and effectively "grow" the supervisory education process and therefore our unique ministry in the world

The third question in the World Café centered upon the question of core curriculum. The question we struggled with on Saturday morning was:

3rd Café Question: "What do you believe is the Core Curriculum for Supervisory Education?" The data from that round is below.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Process is our curriculum's frame of reference • "Courageous Conversation" around self, theory, and practice • "The story" (centrality of narrative) is the starting point • Group Process (commitment and consistency) • Observing Supervision <u>Truth & Grace</u> <-> <u>Practice from Theological Core</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Doing supervision • Observe Group, participate in group, supervise group • Reflection on supervision with a supervisor and peers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instruction in theory and Practice <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Reading ◦ Study ◦ Course work • Competent in receiving and giving critique • Dynamic relationship-story <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ continuing clinical practice of ministry • Peer group for S.I.T.-required and some flexibility • Dedicated time for written reflection on practice and theory e.g. writing retreats • Modeling by supervision of integration of theory and practice-mutual use of self in relationship |
|--|--|

- Use of right brain and whole person approach-use of images and metaphors for integration-finding a common “language”
 - Nature of theory and creating it
 - Basic/core concepts of supervision
 - Nurturing students into the culture of supervisory identity
 - Conversation around competencies
 - History of theory which informs CPE
 - Peer group-learning group
 - Debatable question: core body of knowledge?
 - Knowing self/use of self in supervision
 - Dialogue their theory and practice and identity that interfaces with certification
 - Knowledge of all ACPE manuals
 - Use of soulful and creative methods
 - Inner work essential (however defined)
 - Competence in critical conversation
 - Foundation / knowledge
 - Integration is key word in curriculum
 - Action-reflection core
 - Peer group is core
 - Tending to boundaries
 - Reflection on practice
 - Theological
 - Theory
 - Vulnerability of supervisor to benefit of student
 - Lifetime learning
 - Process pedagogy
 - Standards & manuals (competencies)
- Begin theory work with students expertise
 - Sharing work and feedback
 - Video taping and reflection on theory and practice
 - Modeling transparency, on going authentic conversation
 - Learning from students theory and reading sources they find valuable
 - Attending to emotional field of supervisory student, supervisor, CPE students
 - Training Supervisors share their history with students
 - Value integration of the knowledge more than the body of knowledge in and of itself and how it connects to personal history, pastoral identity and Supervisory practice.
 - Core set of concepts: resistance, parallel- process, transference, counter-transferences, power, authority and others
 - Skill development: accreditation, organize a program assessment of level I and level II
 - Use of self :supervisor/student is/as curriculum
 - The capacity to have “difficult” conversations with the intention to create peer-ship

The next portion of the meeting focused upon a discussion of what was being done in the regional and sub-regional peer groups. This conversation was not moderated and there were many commonalities voiced in this session. The structure of sub-region meetings and the use of peer groups for theory and IPR were discussed.

A recently certified CPE Supervisor Carlos Sanchez and a Supervisory Education Student, Brenda Jackson, discussed the unique journey of racial and ethnic minority students in the supervisory process. Multicultural dynamics were discussed and there was a good deal of discussion about the pilot project and the assistance this provided for one of the participants. General agreement was reached about the need to continue to find helpful approaches to assisting minority students in the supervisory education process.

The 4th Café question was: “What does Integration look like at each level of supervisory Certification?”

The data provided, I believe, some of the most interesting comments thus far. As before the responses are provided here without edit.

- Progressive levels at each level
 - Pastoral identity educational
 - Honesty at the core
 - Humility as a life long learner that moves to maturity
 - Freedom and creativity
- Integration- ease of access with:
 - Faith story
 - Theory of human development
 - Practice of ministry
- Readiness
 - good at one does pastorally
- Candidacy
 - Demonstration of passion
 - Wrestling with theory
 - Stay emotionally involved
- Associate
 - Confidence with the “why” behind the “how”
 - Revisiting of characteristics above at a deeper level
- CPE supervisor-develop new theory
- Leadership consequence
- Self supervision
- Developmentally appropriate integration
- Constructive use of self history with others (in relationship)
- Committed to life long learning
- As anxiety drops, integration manifests in personal authority/competence
- Increased differentiation of self in anxious moments of group & student work
- Fluid narrative that includes hearing strengths, woundedness, growing edges that can be shared with strangers
- Integrative paradox “I know what I know and express it confidently AND I know what I don’t know and look for consultation confidently” –Supervisory Humility
- Readiness
 - Learn:
 - Integration of personal story and pastoral identity and authority
 - Do
 - Candidate (empowerment and vulnerability)
 - Anxiety –clinical expertise in place
- Authority – developing desire / demonstration potential to be educator
- Teach
 - Associate
 - Self supervision
 - Theory/practice/identity as educator
- Learn
 - Supervision
 - Becoming a learner again
 - Humility, collaboration
- Creek to brook to stream to river
 - From moving around, picking up to flow: a deepening, widening, broadening momentum and power
- Readiness:
 - Demonstrated pastoral competency
 - Fire in the belly
 - Understanding one’s story
- Candidate:
 - Self critique in/of practice wrestling w/ theory
 - Being comfortable w/ self to risk stepping out side of comfort
- Associate:
 - Articulate theory supported by congruent practice
- If you are a learner you will do well at integration
 - Integration is expressed in congruence and with evaluating identity and role
- Ability to access your story as a resource in your supervision (candidate)
- Behavioral consistency with theoretical framework, personal identity and practice
- Ability to use one’s own anxiety in supervision
- Readiness :
 - pastoral competence
 - Level 2 outcomes; curiosity; familiar with story
- Candidacy:

- Self-supervise ones own pastoral care
 - Pastoral identity w/ some theoretical basis of pastoral care
 - Pastoral story is a resource
 - Associate:
 - Integration of story through theory and practice
 - Critical purchase of theory in practice
 - Self-supervision of supervision
 - CPE supervisor:
 - Integrated use of self
 - Integration
 - Awareness of your process—able to communicate disorientation
 - Readiness
 - Talk about Personal identity
 - Candidacy
 - Personal, pastoral, beginning
 - Associate
- Personal, pastoral
 - Full
 - Personal
 - Pastoral
 - Educator
 - Capacity for courageous conversation
 - Readiness
 - Professional, identity, clearly, congruently
 - Candidacy
 - Educator
 - Communicated
 - Clearly
 - Congruently
 - Associate
 - Theoretical, communicated, clearly congruently
 - Full
 - Communicated
 - Clearly, congruently, black belt integrator
 - Integration = Congruence

Following dinner and singing Happy Birthday to Jane Litzinger, we gathered for the final summation of the conversations. The participants were asked during the dinner break to go around the room and look at all of the comments posted. Each person was asked to select one or two items that seemed to them to be the most important thing they had learned in the day and a half together. This final session was titled “Gathering Collected Wisdom, Now What?” The following is the data collected from the participants at that meeting.

- Sacred journey=kairos
- Tension diversity + core knowledge
- ** Deepening difficult conversation
- * Importance of use of anxiety in supervisory process
- Observation
 - Practice of individual supervision
 - Reflection on practice
 - Didactic instruction
 - Identify key reading
 - Collaborative peer group
 - Integrating past practice
 - Integration of self
- Supervision from growth perspective
- Professionalism as an educator certifying potentials
- Importance of transparency
- Container / map / schema
- Conversation around theory practice
- Curriculum as the intentional and developmental senses of relational events
- Process formed into a new culture in ACPE
- Training Supervisors who are not well connected affects their supervisory students outcomes in the certification process
- Supervisory authority and the importance of balancing the mutuality/vulnerability with that
- Black belt integrationist
- What integration looks like at each level of the process
- Supervision is an art and it fits into our profession
- Process of integration is a journey of faith, not the attainment of a goal of certainty:

- Maintaining a calling-how develop a curriculum for a calling-
 - Tension between too
 - Clarity of calling as educator
- Valuing integration of knowledge and how it connects to personal history pastoral identity and supervisory practice.
- Teaching the history of theory which informs CPE core concepts
- Different stages: learn, do, teach, learn
- Collaboration-takes a village to raise a supervisor. Place of technology w/ supped; use of Jane's grid process
- Partnership, balance, tension of the practice and relationship between truth and grace
- Exploration of my story and my student's requires courageous conversation
- Story & centrality of narrative is the starting point for theory (container)
- The capacity to live with the tension of paradox
 - Recognition of our identity as educators
- How much work there is to do and how it interferes with supervision and time for education
 - Fitting supervision in the margins
 - Balancing with volunteer work for ACPE
- We deal more theories than just ed., Psych and theology, but we don't have to demonstrate competence
- Conversation requires competence in hospitality, courageous curiosity
- Creating a serious culture for education
- Students as the curriculum
- The heart of integration is "I know what I know-I know what I don't know" and seek consultation
- Using a container or map and make it visible transformational event needs a container
- Connection between protecting SES and their process and support for supervisors (elders) who need support and value their gifts
- Clarifying minimal competencies in everyday language
- Process as a whole is spiritual creativity deeply spiritual
- Transformative as a key word-creating safe places for students to talk about their unfolding spiritual lives and to develop critical purchase and where they are coming from
- Passion for CPE (fire in the belly) desire to be an educator
- Definition of best practices given by Jane
- Tension between creativity and structure
 - Comes from deep spirituality to be transformative
 - Could we advertise CPE "workings"
- Core curriculum is CPE process
 - Pedagogy (and being a master clinician in process pedagogy)
- Importance of context
- Supervision as congruence and authenticity of self
 - In relation to praxis and theory
- Mutuality and vulnerability
 - Rooted in clarity asymmetry or role and to benefit of student
 - In SES (inside-outside) and among supervision in supervisory education
- Ability of students to demonstrate writing theory in vignettes
- Village to raise a supervisor (collegiality)
- Being competent with the "why" behind the "how"
- Self critique /self supervision
- Over complicated supervisor education
- Ongoing education for training supervisors
- Container of centrality of narrative
- Use of self
 - Ongoing integration of personal and professional identity through levels
- Humility as life-long learner moves to maturity
- Access to my story
- Passion about practice

A second purpose of gathering for the Supervisory Summit was to assemble a sample of Supervisory Education curriculum from a variety of centers in various regions. Each of the Summit participants involved in Supervisory Education was encouraged to provide an electronic version of their curriculum. The submissions received are included in the full version of this report published on the North Central Region website: www.ncracpe.org.

ACPE

Association for Clinical Pastoral Education, Inc.
North Central Region
PO Box 1832
Burnsville, MN 55337-1832

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 697
Sioux Falls, SD