May God bless you
with discomfort at easy answers,
half-truths, and superficial relationships
so that you may live deep within your heart.

May God bless you with anger
at injustice, oppression and exploitation of people
so that you may work for justice, freedom, and peace.

May God bless you with tears...
to shed for those who suffer from pain, rejection, starvation, and war,
so that you may reach out your hand to comfort them
and turn their pain into joy.

And may God bless you with enough foolishness...
to believe that you can make a difference in this world
so that you can DO
what others claim cannot be done.

A Franciscan Benediction
The Jessie Ball duPont Fund, as our mission states, invests in the organizations and communities that were important to Mrs. duPont. Among those organizations are 80 churches, ranging in size from major cathedrals to small congregations, and eight religious judicatories of the Episcopal and Catholic churches. Among the communities are urban areas, rural areas, small towns and multi-county regions – all places where citizens are hard at work trying to educate their children, grow their communities equitably, and improve their quality of life.

In many of these places, the church or judicatory is deeply involved in the work of supporting and strengthening community – whether by providing child care, working to develop affordable housing, supporting education through after-school and tutoring programs, advocating for the rights of the powerless, or providing basic charity to those in need. The scope and sophistication of this work varies greatly from place to place, but what is common is the commitment of pastors, congregants and church leaders to bring justice to their communities and hope to their people.

The Fund takes pride in and encourages this work. It celebrates both the individuals who perform the work and the faith, compassion and responsibility that motivates and inspires them. At the same time, the Fund has questions about the current drift of public policy toward relying more on the church to provide social services and less on traditional public support of established nonprofit organizations and the public sector itself.

In September, 2004, the Fund had the opportunity to explore the realm of community ministry by joining the Pulpit & Pew Project, directed by Jackson Carroll, at Duke Divinity School in convening a two-day symposium on Pastoral Leadership and Community Ministry on the Duke campus. There, a group of foundation leaders, theological educators, young pastors and veteran pastors confronted the mutual and multi-faceted challenges we face in ministering to our communities at this point in history.

The pastors present – six of whom will be featured in the forthcoming book *Travelers on the Journey: Pastors Talk about their Lives and Commitment* – reminded us of what we already knew from experience: that the work of bringing justice and equity to our communities, of supporting and serving citizens in need, is daunting. Congregations and pastors should not wade into these waters casually or without careful thought and preparation. As the author of *Travelers on the Journey*, Mark Constantine, writes:

> [We must] think anew about how communities - not simply communities of faith - should provide for the poor and vulnerable....
> Religious leaders, like all of us, can use their power, position, resources, and time to work for the public good. That is a decision they have to make. But they cannot do this work alone, in isolation, without benefit of the skills, resources and wisdom of other committed citizens.

> ...Responsible pastoral leadership requires that the men and women
who lead congregations work with their members to discern both what they as a collective body “do best” and how best they can creatively invest their considerable – albeit limited – resources to do justice and to care for the poor and disenfranchised. It may also require that pastors and congregations find ways to hold private institutions and government accountable to fulfill their public obligations to the vulnerable and marginalized.

The Fund – and philanthropy as a whole - must straddle this divide between celebrating, encouraging and supporting what the church can do and honestly confronting what the church is being asked to do and its capacity to do it.

In truth, philanthropy’s greatest support of the church in this time may well be its insistence that the church proceed with great care and deliberation – even in the face of great need and demand – lest it position itself for failure and our communities for disappointment.

In this issue of Notes from the Field, we begin with an essay by the Fund’s President, Sherry Magill, that explores the historical relationship between religion and public policy and provides a context in which to consider the current challenges.

The next section focuses on the individuals who are leading the church today. Jackson Carroll shares some findings from his exhaustive study of the state of the pastorate in America, work funded by the Religion Division of the Lilly Endowment, Inc. We then hear from the pastors themselves, as the six men and women featured in Travelers on the Journey share reflections on their lives and work. Finally, Bill Leonard, dean and professor of church history at The Divinity School at Wake Forest University, considers how we equip these pastors, and their peers, for work in their communities, how theological education has evolved in the past 30 years and how it might need to change going forward.

We turn our focus to the community with an essay by Bob Wineburg, Jefferson Pilot Excellence Professor at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, who provides insight into how congregations interact with local social service delivery systems in which they are embedded. Wineburg proposes eight strategies to inform future investments by philanthropic, religious and government leaders concerned about the health and vitality of local communities.

We conclude with thoughts shared by the funders and pastors participating in the Duke symposium – advice and guidance each would give the other to improve their work together, to improve their understanding of each other, and to help both, more comfortably, straddle the divide.
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“Congregations need the poor and the voiceless as much as the poor and the voiceless need congregations. We need them as much for our own self-awareness and life as a Christian community as they need us. It’s a very hard lesson to teach a middle-class community — that they have needs only the poor can meet. We must learn that to welcome the poor and the voiceless is critical in order to understand who we are and what we are called to be and to do.”

David McBriar

"Christian values and American social policy. It is a phrase we hear a great deal in contemporary public discourse. Influenced by journalists and political pundits, we are led to think that the relationship between religion and politics is news, and that the influence an office seeker’s religious faith has on his or her view of the world is peculiar to political conservatives and the domain of just one political party. Yet, the relationship between religion and politics dominates American history, and one can credibly argue that people’s theology creates a policy framework, whether they are conscious of its doing so or not and whether they talk openly about it or not. Furthermore, American history is a history of social reform, and all American social reform movements are rooted in religious ideas and fervor.

The current argument for increasing the role of the church in delivery of social services provides a wonderful juxtaposition to the Social Gospel Movement of the late 19th century. While the “faith-based” initiatives of the current administration and the social policies advocated by the leaders of the Social Gospel are both rooted in Christianity, they couldn’t be more different if they sprang from entirely different world views.

The Social Gospel was a deeply Christian movement. While not commonly understood or studied, it was led by North American Baptist ministers and provided the Christian theological foundation for broad acceptance of progressive social policy. It was, of course, the secular Progressive Movement of the early 20th Century that resulted in federal legislative accomplishments during the Great Depression that Franklin Roosevelt called the “new deal” and we remember as the beginning of the welfare state: legislation that included an old age and survivor’s insurance program; that created a minimum wage, the eight-hour work day and 40-hour work week; that protected a worker’s right to join a union and engage in collec-
tive bargaining and regulated the employment of children and women; that provided federal funding to encourage the states to provide benefits to the unemployed and disabled.

For turn-of-the-20th-Century evangelical Protestant Christians who believed in *laissez-faire* government and who believed social reform centered on a change in individual behavior and not on legislation, Walter Rauschenbusch articulated a theological argument that enabled them to embrace a progressive policy agenda and become comfortable with the idea that the federal government has a role to play in the country’s social wellbeing. His religious faith, and that of numerous politicians of the late 19th Century, made him an architect of what became the American welfare state.

What did Rauschenbusch mean by “the Social Gospel,” how did his Christian faith shape his policy positions, and do his arguments have any currency today?

Walter Rauschenbusch’s life was lived between the American Civil War and the end of World War I, an era of repeated economic depressions, and social dislocation and misery caused by rapid industrialization, urbanization, and immigration. He was a first-generation German-American North American Baptist minister whose religious training he wished to use “to preach and save souls.” His early theology was piestsic and otherworldly, and stressed profound personal religious experience, conversion, and individual salvation. He had no interest in the concerns of this world, the role of government, or social policy.

When Rauschenbusch pastored a congregation of German-speaking immigrants who attended church in the Hell’s Kitchen section of New York City, he had what he called a ‘social’ conversion experience, one that transformed his theology, oriented him toward this world, and caused him to champion the idea of social and economic justice through legislation. When Rauschenbusch had no contact with American social ills before moving to New York City in summer 1886. 1 Hell’s Kitchen exposed Rauschenbusch to abject poverty, disease, malnutrition, and child deaths. At 25, he was devastated by what he found: “I saw how men toiled all their life long, hard toilsome lives and at the end had almost nothing to show for it; how strong men begged for work and could not get it in hard times; how little children died – oh, the children’s funerals! They gripped my heart – that was one of the things I went away thinking about – why did the children have to die?”

Rauschenbusch’s New York experiences caused him to re-read scripture, and in doing so, he discovered a social message in Christ’s teachings. A Protestant evangelical, he moved away from an individualistic interpretation of salvation, arguing that his parishioners suffered not because they were unreconciled with God as Protestant evangelicals believed, or had a weak moral character, but because they lived and worked in an economic system that stressed the rights of private property over and against any rights that their labor might claim. He became an active social reformer, preached about the love of God and the brotherhood of man, championed political activism and adoption of specific social policies that included children’s rights, the eight-hour day, collective bargaining, a minimum wage, a progressive inheritance tax, and municipal ownership of utilities. He argued that the Kingdom of God was meant for this world, and that Christians should advocate for social legislative policies that reflected God’s love for humanity and Jesus’ commandment that we love our neighbor as ourselves. While he never abandoned the Protestant church and belief in a personal relationship with God, he stopped believing simple conversion of individuals would right social and economic wrongs.

Ironically, today’s conservative Protestant Christians, who are diametrically opposed to those made by Rauschenbusch. Rauschenbusch and other Social Gospel ministers were advocates for federal and state legislation that improved the country’s social wellbeing and emphasized economic justice; today’s Christian evangelicals most often argue against legislation aimed at alleviating social ills, and tend not to talk about economic justice, but advocate for legislation aimed at changing individual behavior.

Like the young Rauschenbusch uniformed by his Hell’s Kitchen experience, these contemporary evangelical Protestant Christian conservatives emphasize a theological position that represents a strong, enduring thread in American thought: One’s behavior in this world is a measure of one’s relationship to God, of one’s having been saved by faith in Jesus, of one’s moral character. One’s station in this world – rich or poor – is less important than one’s behavior, although one’s station probably reflects one’s relationship with God, one’s moral character. If the sinner accepts Jesus, one’s behavior or moral character will improve and thus one’s station in life will improve. To put it another way, if one is saved one will not be in need of social policy that aims at economic justice, that alleviates poverty, that is mindful of the country’s social wellbeing.

None of these Christian ideas is new in American thought. We can trace them back to the American Puritans who settled Massachusetts Bay Colony. However, during the past 25 years, a new wrinkle has appeared, one that marries Rauschenbusch’s acceptance of federal legislation with a more traditional evangelical ambition to preach and save souls. The idea is to use the power of government to influence individual behavior, to improve individual moral character.

It’s true that some American reform movements of the past emphasized leg.
islation to change individual behavior, e.g., the temperance movement, but our contemporary campaigns to legislate individual behavior seem especially extensive. Gone is Rauschenbusch’s peculiar evangelical Protestant Christian critique of the economic system and its corresponding social ills. Gone is Rauschenbusch’s prophetic voice.

What does any of this have to do with philanthropy? There is no question that early organized American philanthropy and the Social Gospel sprang from the same Christian impulse — to apply the Christian Gospel to the world, and in so doing improve the social and economic condition of the new urban population of the late 19th and early 20th Centuries.

Over time, this impulse developed a social safety network for poor and vulnerable people that included federal social legislation on one hand, and a vast nonprofit service provider network on the other. While public dollars granted by federal and state government have sustained the nonprofit network, it is private giving that incubated many of the programs in the first place. A measure of success, traditionally, has been to take a promising program with excellent results “to scale,” and that has meant, for the most part, securing public support that sustains these programs. Indeed, the Young Men’s and Young Women’s Christian Associations and the Salvation Army were born in the 19th Century and have their roots in evangelical Protestantism. Some of their current programs, especially those of the Young Women’s Christian Association that work with poor women with dependent children, are funded by public dollars.

Expansion of federal social safety net policies during the 1960s — while arguably still policies that had their roots in the American Social Gospel Movement though not commonly understood or popularly articulated — led eventually to a backlash against a federal social safety net funded by public money.

The initial backlash to these policies centered on fairness, cost, and efficiency. Americans came to believe that the federal government unfairly taxed some and “redistributed” those dollars in the form of transfer payments to folks who are basically lazy and undeserving, that the federal government was particularly inefficient in the administration of federal welfare policies, and that these policies by their very nature contributed to the development of weak moral characters by creating permanent dependency. By 1996, Aid to Families with Dependent Children was changed to the Personal Responsibility and Work Act, setting time limits on receipt of welfare payments and requiring recipients to work, regardless of the condition of the economy. Throughout the debate about cost, efficiency, and fairness, the argument that focused on individual moral character began to stress the importance of family values rooted in religious faith traditions, especially Christian faith traditions. Gone was Rauschenbusch’s emphasis on economic justice. Gone was Rauschenbusch’s prophetic voice.

At the beginning of another century, Americans are engaged in a serious conversation about returning to an era of voluntary social service provision by “faith-based” organizations, especially churches. I emphasize churches because faith-based nonprofit organizations such as Lutheran Social Services, Jewish Federation, and Catholic Charities have throughout the 20th Century provided social services through a combination of public and private dollars. These organizations, however, are traditional 501(c)(3) organizations, and not churches. They do not have congregations and do not offer worship services. These traditional faith-based nonprofit organizations are not the organizations that are meant when the architects of our social policies talk about leveling the playing field so that “faith-based organizations” can compete for federal grant dollars in the delivery of social services. They mean churches.

During this our latest American social reform movement – one rooted in Christianity, one that dismantles federal welfare policies, one that returns us to a pre-Social Gospel era of preaching and saving individual souls – the country’s most experienced foundations have moved in the direction of developing comprehensive strategies aimed at developing a change in the system – affordable housing strategies come most readily to mind. These strategies are absolutely dependent upon financing arrangements that include private dollars, public dollars, and corporate dollars and that include community-based, traditional nonprofits in service delivery and in devising creative solutions to tough challenges.

For the most part, foundations have ignored the church as a social service provider, seeing it primarily in its traditional role of preaching and saving individual souls. There are notable exceptions of course, and some foundations have discovered a role for judicatories and networks of churches in systemic change work, helping them develop community loan funds, housing projects, community and economic development programs, and organize people for action at the neighborhood and community level.

While the public might not quite understand how the country has, since the New Deal, financed, maintained, and delivered a social safety net for vulnerable peoples, it’s clear the people who now write American social policy embrace a pre-Social Gospel view of social change: what matters most is change at the level of individual behavior.

It is unlikely that foundations will share a view that systemic level changes are unnecessary, but they might follow the lead of our current social policy architects and become comfortable funding churches to provide needed social services at the

“Early organized American philanthropy sprang from the impulse to apply the Christian Gospel to this world, and improve the social and economic condition of the new urban population of the late 19th and early 20th Centuries.”
community level, particularly if traditional nonprofit organizations have an increasing-
y difficult time competing for scarce dollars to deliver these services. If foundations
do embrace the church as the social safety net of last resort, they have every good rea-
tion to be cautious.

My experience teaches me that most churches in this country do
not have the capacity to deliver social services, and no amount of
technical assistance will substantially change this condi-
tion. Furthermore, when it comes time to account for the
use of public dollars, churches will inevitably suffer. Not
only must they develop financial systems and controls that
make them accountable for the use of public money, they
must be subject to the same accountability and outcome
measures that other nonprofit organizations are subject to
when they use public money. When churches fail in these
areas, government must withdraw public money from church-
based programs. Those churches that have become dependent
upon public money will suffer. If foundations find a role for churches
in a systems change approach, common sense tells us that such an
approach cannot be built with volunteers. Finally, if foundations participate in
asking — demanding even — the church to provide needed social services, we must
know that we are asking the church to assume a traditional role of government — pro-
viding for the common welfare — a change in its role that will further diminish the
church’s prophetic voice. When the church fails to lift the poor out of poverty when
the church discovers what Walter Rauschenbusch learned — that no amount of indi-
vidual conversion will right social and economic wrongs — what then?

“To Learn More


For those who sit in the pew, the individual who occupies the pulpit all too often is a one-dimensional character: the pastor, the preacher, the priest, the minister. Little thought may be given to his or her educational background, family or financial situation, job stress or satisfaction, frustrations and aggravations, or dreams and aspirations. And yet these are among the major dimensions of human character.

And in every case, the individual in the pulpit is a human character. That humanity, to a great degree, influences and shapes the strength, direction and impact of the church on American communities.

Who are these pastors, preachers, priests and ministers? Who are the individuals to whom congregations look for leadership? Who is speaking from the pulpit and working in the community?

A recent survey of Christian pastors conducted by the Pulpit & Pew project at the Duke Divinity School sheds light on these questions. Broadly speaking, America’s pastors are:

• Entering the ministry at an older age;
• Well-educated, holding a master’s degree or higher;
• Serving small congregations (350 or fewer members);
• Earning less than $40,000 a year in salary and housing;
• Spending more than 50 hours a week on the job.

They also are confronted by an array of challenges. For some, there are significant administrative burdens associated with their work. Others experience significant conflict within their congregation. And many experience dissatisfaction with their personal spiritual life.

Yet these pastors – all of whom are serving congregations – are overwhelmingly committed to their life’s work. Fewer than half have ever had any doubts about their call to ministry.

The data that follows represents selected findings from Pulpit & Pew Research on Pastoral Leadership, courtesy of Jackson W. Carroll, Director, Pulpit & Pew, Duke Divinity School.

These statistics, admittedly, reveal but part of the portrait of today’s pastors. But they begin to provide a foundation of knowledge upon which we can build our understanding of those who lead the Christian faithful in America today.
Older Pastors

Men and women are waiting until later in life to accept the call to ministry. Pastors ordained within the last 10 years were a decade older (median age) than their counterparts who were ordained 30 or more years ago. Why this shift? There are several likely reasons.

Older women who had long felt called to ordained ministry became able to realize their dream. Other women delayed pursuing their calling until after their childbearing years. Finally, a considerable increase in life expectancy may also be contributing to the growth in second-career clergy. In 1900, the average life expectancy in the United States was 47 years; in 1950, it was 68 years; by 2000, it had reached 77 years. These changes dramatically increase the average number of years that most now spend working, making career changes over the life course much more likely and feasible.

While there are positive aspects to this trend – older pastors are more mature, for instance – there are negatives as well. From a judicatory perspective, older pastors create higher health and pension costs but have fewer productive years. Additionally, they lack the long institutional knowledge of pastors who have spent a lifetime within a denomination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLDER PASTORS</th>
<th>Median Age at Ordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years Since Ordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainline Protestant</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Protestant</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historically Black</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education

Pastors generally are well-educated. More than half of all pastors hold a master’s degree or higher.

Advanced education is most common among pastors serving Catholic or Mainline Protestant congregations, less so among pastors serving Conservative Protestant and Historically Black congregations.

When asked which was most important, all Protestants identified “call” and “competence” ahead of “ordination” and “theological education,” though Mainline Protestants were significantly more likely to rank ordination and theological education as more important than Conservative Protestants or clergy in Historically Black denominations. Catholics rated ordination as most important, followed by call.

THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION OF PASTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Mainline Protestant</th>
<th>Conservative Protestant</th>
<th>Historically Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate, Training Program</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible College</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Divinity</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Masters Degree</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Ministry</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. or Th. D.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Full-Time or Part-Time?

Most pastors are single vocation – that is, their only job is that of pastor. Overall, a minority is bi-vocational – they serve as pastor on a part-time basis.

Bi-vocationalism is much more common among Hispanic and African-American pastors than white pastors. One in five white Catholic and Mainline Protestant pastors is bi-vocational, while half or more of African-American and Hispanic pastors are bi-vocational.

While the majority of bi-vocational pastors are serving small churches, a third of pastors serving medium-sized Historically Black congregations are bi-vocational. In fact, bi-vocational black pastors are typically professionals with higher levels of education than their full-time counterparts. One reason for the large number of black pastors who are bi-vocational is that many of their congregations or denominations do not provide pension benefits, regardless of congregational size or the pastor’s educational qualifications. In fact, many black pastors work well after normal retirement age.

The number of bi-vocational and/or part-time (e.g., retired clergy and lay pastors) is increasing in most denominations. They are serving in small, mostly rural congregations, either because those congregations cannot afford a full-time pastor or because they cannot attract a full-time pastor due to their location.

### Congregational Size

Protestant pastors serve congregations that, overwhelmingly, are small. Fifty-four percent of Mainline Protestant pastors and 66 percent of Conservative Protestant pastors serve congregations with fewer than 100 members. Only a fraction of Protestant pastors – fewer than 10 percent – serve a congregation of more than 350 people.

For many, this statistic is surprising. The vast majority of Protestants – roughly three out of four – belong to congregations of more than 100 people. Thus, the church experience from most congregant’s perspective is notably different from that of most pastors.

Catholic parishes, however, exhibit different characteristics. The majority of parishes have more than 350 members; in fact, more than 20 percent of parishes have more than 1,000 members. Most Catholics worship in these larger congregations – in fact, more than half are members of congregations with more than 1,000 members. The Catholic church has a more structured process for congregational formation, thus parishes are not as spontaneously formed as in the Protestant tradition. This fact, coupled with the demographic concentrations of Catholics in some areas, likely is responsible for this distinction.
Pastoral Work

Protestant pastors spend more time preaching, providing pastoral care and visitation, and handling administrative responsibilities than performing other tasks.

Less than five percent of pastors' time is spent on community or civic activities, or on denominational or ecumenical activities. The focus of pastors' work life is within the church that they serve, rather than the denomination or community of which they are a part.

Among Catholic priests, the administrative responsibilities are almost twice as time-consuming as for their Protestant counterparts, in all likelihood because of the tendency of Catholic parishes to be much larger than Protestant congregations.

Regardless of denomination, pastors invest well above 50 hours per week in their work.

### WHAT PASTORS EARN

**Median Salary Plus Housing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Mainline Protestant</th>
<th>Conservative Protestant</th>
<th>Historically Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest 75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CORE MINISTRY TASKS

(Median Hours per Week)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Mainline Protestant</th>
<th>Conservative Protestant</th>
<th>Historically Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preaching</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worship</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral Care/Visiting</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denomination/Ecumenical Activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic/Community Activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hours Per Week</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compensation

While a minority of Protestant pastors earn an average of $65,000 or more (including housing), the majority earn less than $40,000 in salary and housing allowances. Catholic priests are paid much less, averaging $25,000 or less. When all sources of income – investments, earnings of spouse, other forms of compensation, etc. – are considered, incomes for a majority of pastors still fall below $60,000.

A significant gap exists between the earnings of the top 25 percent of pastors and the earnings of the remaining 75 percent. That gap is most pronounced among pastors serving Conservative Protestant and Historically Black congregations, where salaries for the lower tier tend to be about $20,000 or lower, compared with $50,000 and more for the upper tier.

Most pastors do receive health benefits as part of their compensation package (though about one-third of pastors serving Conservative Protestant and Historically Black congregations do not). Most Catholic and Mainline Protestant pastors participate in a pension program. However, more than 50 percent of pastors serving Conservative Protestant and Historically Black congregations do not receive pension benefits.
The Challenges

Pastors face many challenges – some unique to their work and some not unlike those faced by other professionals.

Almost 70 percent of pastors reported some type of congregational conflict over the course of a two-year period. Most of that conflict was minor, but about one out of five pastors reported more serious conflicts.

Additionally, pastors express concerns about their personal spiritual life and their effectiveness with their congregations: only about two out of five pastors report being very satisfied in either arena. This compares with three out of four pastors who say they are very satisfied with their current position and more than half who are very satisfied with salary and benefits and relationships with lay leaders, staff and fellow clergy.

Pastoral Commitment

A typical pastor accepted the call after age 30; invested in post-graduate education and accepted a full-time position at a small church; earns less than $40,000 a year and spends upwards of 50 hours a week at work, much of it on administrative tasks. Faced with congregational conflict, a desire for spiritual life that may outstrip the available hours or energy, and uncertainty about the effectiveness of it all, do pastors, one wonders, lose faith?

Never! So say a resounding 60 percent of pastors surveyed. Sixty percent have never doubted their call to ministry. Fifty-six percent have never considered leaving for another ministry position. And 70 percent have never considered leaving for a secular position. Theirs is a commitment of faith.
“Young pastors:
Be radical.
Be controversial.
Be revolutionary.
Don’t get caught up in the success syndrome.
Keep justice, fairness and equity as your base.”

Gerald Durley

In Their Own Words

Six pastors talk about ministry, communities, leadership, power and faith

Ministering to a congregation and a community is human work. Scholars may study and analyze, but the hand of the pastor touches lives.

In his forthcoming book, Travelers on the Journey, * Mark Constantine profiles six pastors ministering to congregations and communities across the American South. He describes them as “wonderfully human, committed, and spirited clergypersons...capable of inspiring and of befuddling. Some are funnier than others,” he writes. “They all worry, but about different things....[T]hey all grapple with the ambiguity and uncertainty of what it means to pastor a congregation faithfully with integrity and good judgment.”

“At the end of the day,” Constantine writes, “I’ve come to believe that each of the women and men whose reflections and insights are encapsulated in this text is a very good pastor. They all love God, love their congregations, care deeply about their work, and strive to do right by the people they serve. They are all deeply committed to addressing injustice. Unlike many people of faith who talk about the need to work for justice but who find reasons not to enter the fray, they have rolled up their sleeves and gotten to work. They are not afraid to make mistakes in their efforts to map a way.”

These six pastors joined Notes from the Field at the Duke symposium in September 2004 and shared their perspectives on the ministry, communities, leadership, power and faith.

*William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005
I am Margaret McGhee. One thing that you do not know about me is that I am legally blind. But that doesn’t stop me. I’m still preaching every Sunday morning.

Before I accepted my call, I said to the Lord, “If You’re going to call me to do this work, at a time when women are not looked upon and accepted in the role of pastor, then I better know that You are with me. I want to be more than just another church.”

I have learned through my 14 years as a pastor that I have to BE more than just another pastor. Ministry is more than just the spiritual aspect. I believe in the holistic. After I finish preaching to you, I need to be able to demonstrate that God is more than just the sermon I have preached.

In a rural area, you have to be everything to everybody who is a part of your congregation. You find yourself doing a lot of things, not always because you want to but because there is no one else to do it and you are compelled. If you have people in your congregation who are hungry or children who lack running water in their homes, you had better be prepared to deal with it. I recognize that not all pastors may run into these kinds of problems. But in this century, as a pastor, you are going to have to be familiar with the challenges in a person’s life.

In this work, in these troubling times, you have to have a heart that hopes beyond hope. You never stop. You never give up. You never quit. Many pastors don’t want to step out too far into community work because they feel they are already overloaded. And community work is taxing work. You may not be able to deliver solutions, but you must be able to point in the right direction. You must know about government, about the school system, and about the department of human services. All of that comes into the church, and ultimately, you will be dealing with it all.

We can no longer afford to think we can just preach the gospel and leave it off at that. True ministry is actual contact, actual work, actual doing. And to me, that is what we do.
Our church is a member of CLOUT. Through CLOUT, we helped organize the residents from the Clarksdale Housing Development, across the street from the church. The city had received a HOPE VI grant from the federal government because some officials said they wanted to “deconcentrate poverty” in the Clarksdale area. In the past in communities across the country, that has meant sending the poor to other housing projects so developers can build nice new neighborhoods for a different class of people. But the people who lived in Clarksdale wanted to have their homes rebuilt and stay in their neighborhood. We held a series of resident meetings, and formulated a list of demands. First, we wanted one-to-one replacement; in other words, for each apartment torn down, we wanted a new one built in its place. The recent redevelopment of another housing project in our city had resulted in the loss of more than 600 low-income units. We didn’t want that to happen again.

Second, we decided we wanted most of the new units built in the same general neighborhood, or in a neighborhood nearby. In a survey done by the Housing Authority, 73 percent of the residents said that they wanted to stay in their neighborhood. It was obvious that people felt a deep sense of community in Clarksdale. Third, we decided that people should not have to make a decision about where to move until the new or renovated housing was actually built.

We convinced the city to sign a memorandum of understanding, in which they agreed to the demands that I just listed, along with several others. We met with the director of the Housing Authority on many occasions to iron out the details of the agreement. We poured a lot of time and energy and sweat and tears into the effort over three years, trying to assure that the residents were treated fairly. And, as of December 2003, we were feeling very positive about how things were going.

In mid-December, I was at a community meeting and a number of residents approached me saying, “Cindy, look what I got through the mail, look what I got through the mail!” The residents had received their 90-day notices. Two weeks before Christmas they were being told, “You have to move out of here in 90 days.” This was in direct violation of our agreement with the city. I was stunned and dumbfounded. I couldn’t believe the Housing Authority had so violated their agreement with us and the residents.

During the next two months, we did everything we could to bring our power to bear on the Housing Authority. We met with the Board of Commissioners; we went to the media and met with the mayor. Though the mayor did halt the project temporarily, we ultimately were told that the city wasn’t going to honor the memorandum of understanding.

I feel stupid now, because I realize the powers always have done this to the poor. I don’t know why I thought the powers weren’t going to do it this time. I can’t tell you how many poor people, through the last few years, have told me, “They’re not going to do it.” And I’d say “Yes, yes they will! I have a memorandum of understanding! It’s been signed. Yes, they will!” And they would say, “No, they’re not going to do it.” I would get so frustrated that they just didn’t understand the way things worked.

Robert Linthicum, who is one of my mentors, years ago said: The rich know about power because they have it. The poor know about power, because they don’t have it. It’s the middle class who think they know about power because they have just enough to think that they have it. They can get credit cards and own their home; they can call a meeting and sit down with the mayor and think that meeting went really well. They think they have power.

I feel like we failed in a lot of ways – and sometimes that feels personal, like I’m a failure. I feel so stupid that I was so naïve. It has been an unexpected surprise how painful this has been to me as a pastor and as a friend of many people who live in the community.

With a lot of justice issues you lose, and you go back; you lose, and you go back; you lose, and you go back. But in this case, we lost and Miss Minnie moved into a housing project that’s a lot worse than the one she lived in. We’ve lost one person after another. Half of the people have moved out. The community as it was, and our dreams for the community, have been dismantled.

The prophet Jeremiah says: Oh that my head were waters and my eyes a fountain of tears that I could cry day and night for my poor, poor people. I’ve been astounded by the grief that comes with building such deep relationships with the community, and then seeing it dismantled.

Cindy Weber serves the Jeff Street Baptist Community at Liberty congregation in Louisville, Kentucky. The congregation provides a five-day-a-week morning drop-in ministry for homeless women and men. Church members were instrumental in establishing Norma’s House, a transitional shelter for homeless women, and Marijane Toney House for homeless women reunited with their children. The church sponsors the Urban Goatwalker Coffeehouse, a monthly open-stage event where church members, homeless people, and residents of the Clarksdale community gather to drink coffee, perform and listen to music and poetry, and get to know each other. Cindy and the congregation also are active members in Citizens of Louisville Organized and United Together (CLOUT), a congregation-based, grassroots community organization that works on local justice issues.

Cindy Weber
Jeff Street Baptist Community at Liberty
Louisville, Kentucky
I came from upstate New York in the Adirondack Mountains to New Orleans to pastor a reconciling congregation in the inner city and to direct a national mission of the United Methodist Church that was connected to the church. In New Orleans, I was a white person working in a predominantly African American community that had experienced the full history and impact of racism over the years.

Because I was new to the community, I missed a lot. I just couldn’t understand why the community and the people worked the way that they did. When you’re an outsider coming in, the power of history is so great. You need to understand people and the powers that are operative in their lives.

The Apostle Paul talked about faith in things unseen. As a pastor, you need to keep that faith at all times. You need to know what it is you’re working for. When you get hammered, you don’t turn away. You’ve got to keep working.

The leader has to be the glue that holds things together. There’s a lot going on within any congregation. People have their own needs, and there are competing individual needs. It can be a very lonely place. People say that leadership is lonely. But, I think holding it together is just as lonely.

I have learned how important it can be to have someone to talk to. There are certain things you can’t share with staff or parishioners. They aren’t standing on the edge of the diving board where you are. It’s a unique place. To have a knowledgeable confidant who can say, “You’re really not crazy for hearing things, seeing things” was a big help.

Reflecting on my experience at St. Mark’s, I am reminded of a story about Brother Juniper, who was one of the brothers under St. Francis of Assisi. Brother Juniper visited a friar who was sick, and the friar told him that his heart’s desire was for a pig’s foot to eat. Brother Juniper said, “Leave it to me!” and off he went. He found a herd of pigs, caught one and cut off its foot, and cooked it up for the friar. The friar was extremely happy.

A few hours later, the owner of the pig arrived. He went to St. Francis and complained about the Brother who had cut off the foot of his pig. St. Francis listened and, after the owner had left, he questioned Brother Juniper. “I did the right thing,” Brother Juniper declared. “The friar was sick, and he wanted the pig’s foot. I did it out of love.” But St. Francis instructed Brother Juniper to go and apologize to the owner.

Being a good Brother, Brother Juniper went to the owner, though he did not understand why he should have to apologize. The owner berated him, and Brother Juniper argued back, insisting that he was in the right. They argued back and forth and back and forth until, exhausted, Brother Juniper apologized. The owner accepted the apology and then gave Brother Juniper the rest of the pig.

The point of the story is: You have to be willing to do the right thing. You’ve got be willing to be like Brother Juniper and get yelled at by St. Francis. Eventually some people will get it.
What can I tell you about pastoral leadership and what it means to be led and influenced by God?

First, leaders are those individuals who do not aggressively seek to become leaders. Leadership finds you. When you seek justice, when you seek mercy, when you seek something that is larger than yourself – something challenges the very DNA of your being – that's when you know that you can no longer endure the kinds of atrocities that you see happening to people. Then you go out and work at what God calls you to do.

Of course, a leader must have followers. But, how do you get people behind you? First of all, people must respect you, understand you and trust you. If they don't trust or understand you, then you can't communicate with them at any level. When communication breaks down, it is clear that one is not a leader.

A leader often finds people who believe in a cause and makes them believe in themselves. A great leader is a cheerleader. A leader inspires, breathes into people, and makes them believe that they can accomplish what some perceive as impossible.

When leadership finds you, I believe it empowers you with a certain vision. Committees can have mission statements, goals and objectives, but a leader has to have vision – a vision that goes down inside and empowers the mind to act. A leader must be willing to submit to a higher power and, when necessary, to sacrifice for the cause. A leader must be willing to take risks.

Leaders are not afraid to do menial tasks. Leaders are not worried about who gets the credit. Leaders are unafraid to surround themselves with people who know more than themselves and who have different abilities to achieve mutual goals.

Leaders must have a sense of humor. Leaders must be able to laugh at themselves and at situations around them. I have had to incorporate a sense of humor because sometimes it is essential to apply humor when conditions and circumstances seem overwhelming.

Leaders must stay in shape, physically, mentally and spiritually. There is nothing worse than trying to lead others when you are not feeling well, your mind is twisted, your body is out of condition, and your spiritual life is in total disarray.

I have found that I need some people around me who are encouraging and supportive. Iron sharpens iron. When we are involved with the kind of projects that we are attempting to accomplish we must take care of ourselves so that we can lead. Leaders must believe that we can and must make a positive difference in the lives of those we are compelled to serve. When we learn to serve, then we are ready to lead.
I don’t know why people think I’m a troublemaker. I’m not. Trouble just finds me. This caused a problem in seminary: you know how you go around the class introducing yourself and the teacher asks you what your call was? Well, I said, “I volunteered.” And there was silence in the classroom. I explained: “I read Isaiah, and God was saying, ‘Who shall I send?’ I said, ‘I’m here,’ and He said, ‘Well, OK.’”

I think we are troublemakers but not because we want to cause trouble. We all want to be liked, and we want to have people say, “Come over to the mayor’s office and celebrate with us!” But when that doesn’t happen, when trouble finds us, it is a great gift to have someone to talk to. Especially when it is someone who will help you reflect on what you are doing.

One of the constant struggles with being a pastor is making time to take care of ourselves. It’s very easy to get in the trap of doing and doing. I have a quote from Thomas Merton in my desk drawer. It talks about how we do violence to ourselves as activists sometimes by being too busy.

Sometimes, funders attempt to assist by funding projects that provide support for ministers. I participated in one such project for about three weeks and dropped out. It was very, very painful for me to go and hear pastors talking about the things that they were doing. They were glad to see each other and felt supported. They talked about the parking problems in the church, what the deacon board was doing, and other problems that large established churches face. I kept thinking, “I need to grab that pastor and shake her and say, ‘You know what I have to deal with? A family was deported from my church this week.’ Or ‘Quit whining! You have a salary!’” Foundations interested in supporting pastors really need to remember that not all pastors are created equal and not all pastors need the same things.

The work that I do has special challenges. I want to tell others in the community about our ministry and our hopes. I want them to understand the realities of immigrant children and families: the hardships they face and the hard work they endure; their need to be needed and useful; their need for respect; their joy at starting over and their homesickness and fear.

I may spend my days organizing immigration conferences, or talking by telephone with our elected representatives, or hiring a lawyer to help people process papers. It can be drudgery.

The work that I do has special challenges. I want to tell others in the community about our ministry and our hopes. I want them to understand the realities of immigrant children and families: the hardships they face and the hard work they endure; their need to be needed and useful; their need for respect; their joy at starting over and their homesickness and fear.

I may spend my days organizing immigration conferences, or talking by telephone with our elected representatives, or hiring a lawyer to help people process papers. It can be drudgery.

But the people at the church see my ministry as good. They value the advocacy that we are engaged in, and the bridges of understanding that we build. Unfortunately, they are too poor to pay me a living wage. As a result, I’m no longer pastoring Iglesia Unida de Cristo. But I’m still worshiping there. I’m still helping the congregation. I just have another full-time job in Greensboro so that I can pay the bills. And I think that my situation is very common across all denominations.

If foundations are going to support prophetic ministries and leaders who have a vision, they must find people with whom pastors can work and who are willing to help them create a permanent transformation in an organization. If we are by ourselves out there, being the glue that holds it together, we become unglued. We cannot sustain our families and our lives.
I am glad we have invoked the presence of St. Francis. I am a Franciscan Friar, one of Francis of Assisi’s sons. One of his great sayings is this: “Preach the gospel and, only if necessary, use words.”

I belong to a huge institution, the Roman Catholic Church. I have a love-hate relationship with the Catholic Church, and I have had this love-hate relationship most of my adult life. I am an adult child of the ’60s, and I accepted the Catholic religion because my mother told me about it and raised me in it. I joined another Catholic church in the ’60s. The church that I knew as a boy was not the church that I came to know as an adult. As an adult, I have been empowered by people like Dorothy Day and Daniel Berrigan, and by people with whom I have served and whose life and commitment and witness to the poor and especially the voiceless have led me all my life.

Part of my love of the Catholic church, as a community of people able to make a difference in the world, has come from being part of an ecumenical and interfaith community. I grew up in a Catholic ghetto, went to a Catholic undergraduate college, and then entered the Franciscan Order. It was only when I went to graduate school in Toronto in the late ’60s, during the time of the Vietnam War, that I met men and women from across the religious spectrum – Jews and Muslims, Baptist and Methodists and Episcopalians, even non-believers. We worked together in the draft resistance effort there, and they opened my eyes to freedom. Catholics have never been too affirming of freedom, unlike our Protestant sisters and brothers for whom freedom of conscience was a way of life.

I ministered and witnessed with many of these people. We were in jail a couple of times for civil disobedience, and I grew to love them and they brought me Christ. They brought me the mystery of God in a way that I had not found that mystery in my own faith community.

As I look back on my life, now a priest for 40 years, I am grateful for the great witnesses in my church, despite the confusion and the scandals.

I think one of the greatest challenges I face as a Catholic priest, as a minister, is to convince my church that there’s nothing to be afraid of with women, with gay and lesbian people, with the whole surrendering of power. In recent years, I see a retrenching going on that frightens me. It’s what I call, “restorationism.” It’s a growing need for power. That frightens me because when we are powerful we cannot hear the voiceless. The voice of the immigrant, of women, of the poor, is muted because of our effort to be more and more powerful as churchmen. Clerical power separates us from the mainstream of the human heart and human need.

In spite of this, we are a church, a people, of hope. We will continue to put ourselves on the line for the gospel, for truth and for the dignity of the human person.
If I showed up on Sunday and did not preach a sermon, the congregation would definitely say I had failed - I did not do what I was supposed to do. If I never push for social justice issues, a few people might say I hadn’t done anything, but the vast majority would just go on about their business, if the sermon’s OK. We need to put it in the minds of seminarians that social justice is not optional, but rather an integral part of good ministry.

Stephen Lewis

The changing role of theological education in preparing pastors for ministry

By BILL J. LEONARD
Dean and Professor of Church History
The Divinity School at Wake Forest University

I began teaching in 1975 at a denominational seminary founded in the mid-nineteenth century. Students generally came from churches and undergraduate schools affiliated with that denomination, and expected to return to some sort of ministry identified and approved by the denominational system, or at least certain aspects of it. Most were in their 20s, white males preparing for pastoral or other types of parish ministry, chaplaincy, mission work or teaching. While a few women made clear their intent to secure the Master of Divinity degree and seek ordination, others were studying music, Christian education, or early childhood ministry, vocations in which ordination was less an option. Amid the classic curriculum of biblical, theological and historical studies, there also was a concerted effort to prepare students for work among a fairly prescribed denominational constituency in which identity and practice were defined by heritage and programs. The denomination contributed significant funding to underwrite a significant portion of tuition for each student.

In short, 25 to 30 years ago the old denominational system was relatively intact and set agendas for the theological education offered by denominationally-supported seminaries. University-related divinity schools were, with a few exceptions, affiliated with specific denominations. (And, it seems, this still is true today.)

By the 1980s, however, things began to change. Indeed, I would suggest that religious communities in the United States currently are experiencing a time of permanent transition in a variety of institutional and individual expressions. Churches and denominations across a wide theological spectrum confront significant changes that have created numerous organizational, financial, and doctrinal challenges, all of which impact the training of ministers. These transitions are so pervasive throughout American religious life that they are certain to be with us for some time. Even a brief list illustrates the extent of the changes:

• Fewer religious Americans think of their primary identity as a denominational identity. A growing number consider themselves non-denominational in their religious preferences.
• Many congregations minimize their denominational affiliation, and some have even dropped denominational labels all together.
• Protestant religious life is increasingly influenced by a growing num-

1 Currently the non-denominational divinity schools in the U.S. are at Harvard, Yale, Chicago, Vanderbilt and Wake Forest universities.
ber of so-called “mega-churches,” congregations of several thousand members providing specialized ministries to target groups, led by a popular CEO/pastor, and organized around intentional marketing techniques. Many of these church eschew denominational labels as non-denominational communions. Some are developing their own programs for theological education.

- Denominations themselves, from conservative to liberal, are engaged in extended conflicts over a variety of issues including biblical authority, governance, ordination, sexuality, and politics.
- The number of religiously non-affiliated Americans appears to be growing. These are individuals who have not attended a religious service in the last six months unless for weddings, funerals, or other special events.
- At the same time, many Americans, in and out of the church, express a concern for cultivating “spirituality” in their personal lives.
- In an effort to reach a new generation of “seekers,” many churches are developing new approaches to worship, offering “contemporary” or “alternative” worship services, practices that may divide persons over so-called “worship wars.”
- Churches and educational institutions struggle with ways to extend racial, ethnic, and economic diversity for students and parishioners alike. Churches continue to search for ways to bring diverse groups together implicitly if not explicitly.
- Many churches and denominations are caught in declines of both members and ministerial candidates.

Others acknowledge that many of their new ministers have limited knowledge of or perhaps appreciation for the denominational traditions in which they have received ordination. Lay leaders continue to ask that their ministers know how to preach and teach the Bible, lead a congregation, and provide pastoral response to needy persons, issues that seem ever present in Christian communities.

At the same time, a new generation of seminarians has descended on seminaries and divinity schools. While there is some indication that younger men and women are going to seminary, the average age at theological institutions tends to be somewhere in the mid to late 30s. In many schools, upwards of half the students are female and are preparing for ordination and the pastoral ministry. Many seek to understand the way in which feminism shaped biblical and theological studies. Others raise even larger questions about the impact of feminism and gender studies on traditional theological studies.

These days, students at evangelical institutions outnumber those at mainline and Catholic schools. Many come to seminary uncertain as to the nature of their vocation and their denominational preferences, yet as graduation nears it becomes increasingly clear that the door to ministry is still a denominational door. Still other individuals are not certain if they need a seminary education at all, choosing instead to get training in specific congregations where they are mentored by pastors who might or might not encourage them to continue their formal theological training.

Changes in context and constituency have led many divinity schools and seminaries to revisit their curriculum in hopes of attracting a new generation of believers and in responding to the needs of participating congregations. These curricular changes are evident in the following:

- First, during the last 25 years, a growing number of theological schools have added or expanded courses relating to the role of Christianity/Spirituality and its place in the religion.
- Second, seminaries large and small, conservative and liberal, increasingly choose to address the “woman’s issue” on their respective campuses.
- Women’s studies programs are present in many schools. Others, however, have retained more traditional approaches that deny women ordination, but educate them for non-pastoral ministries in the church.
- Third, various seminaries have developed new approaches to “globalism,” expanding traditional curriculum related to Christian missions to include multicultural immersion or experiential learning opportunities at home and abroad. Many schools also are encouraging professors to deal with multicultural perspectives in classical courses in ethics, history, and theology.
- Likewise, in the aftermath of September 11th, the reality of global religiously has had significant impact in seminaries, many of which have added required courses in world religions to their Master of Divinity curriculum.
- Fourth, some schools have extended their emphasis on biblical, historical and theological studies as well as on preaching and pastoral care. Clinical Pastoral Education, a program that allows students to experience hospital chaplaincy, is also an important option (or requirement) in some places.
- Fifth, cross-disciplinary courses, team-taught courses and partnerships with churches in the community and the nation are also gaining greater prominence for both educational and economic reasons.

Finally, seminaries in the United States are themselves evidence of the permanent transition in organizational life. While many remain closely connected to denominations, and offer courses related to specific denominational history and practice, they also are forced to come to terms with the “emerging churches” in which traditional connections and networks are long gone or going. Indeed, given the dissolution of denominations in the new century, courses in ecclesiology may not be merely necessary, they are essential.

Given these realities, what might theological schools do in extending student proficiencies as they prepare to work in churches and community-based agencies? These are a few suggestions:

- Develop more extended programs in leadership training and development.
- Provide students with the tools for doing appropriate social analysis as a means for understanding the context of specific congregations in specific...
Preparing For Public Leadership

During the Duke symposium on Pastoral Leadership & Community Ministry, pastors, funders and theological educators discussed the needs of young pastors preparing for ministry and the role of educators in helping to prepare them. From their discussions came these thoughts:

**Pastors and churches seem to have lost their place at the leadership table in many cities. In the ’60s, if civic leaders wanted to move anything in an area, they couldn’t do it without senior pastors. (In the ’60s, of course, there weren’t as many other community institutions, particularly in the African American community; the church and educational institutions were THE major institutions.)** Now, it seems, pastors are seldom invited to the table.

Part of the responsibility of preparing pastors for leadership roles in their communities falls on the members of local churches. Pastors need to be seen by their congregations as having a role to play as a custodian of the soul of the city, and they should receive encouragement, support, and challenge from their members to fulfill this role.

The popular understanding of the role of the church has changed. Churches increasingly operate from a consumer or marketing model, with a business framework of planning and implementation. Something unique and important about the overall mission and role of the church has been lost.

Perhaps as a result, seminarians and pastors are less aware of the public role of the church. Where do pastors learn the skills needed to lead congregations on community issues?

Leading on community issues does not mean that pastors have to be the sole voices of their congregations in the community. Rather, pastors can play a pivotal role in empowering people in their churches to take action. As a result, it is important for seminarians to understand the reality of power, how power is used both within and beyond the walls of the congregation, and how to work with and serve as leaders with other powerful people in churches and communities.

Theological educators and seminaries can assist in helping people conduct social analysis of their particular context. There are individuals who feel the call to ministry but come from no particular theological context themselves and have no understanding of the context of the community in which they will be working. The challenge before theological educators is to begin having conversations with other organizations, including funders, to talk about how best to prepare these students as they leave seminary and enter particular congregational and community contexts.

Theological education is laden with theology and preaching courses in which students are trained to teach and preach. Students also should have the opportunity to take multiple classes focusing on social analysis, social, racial, and economic equity, and community ministry. One course is simply not enough.

In developing courses for aspiring pastors, theological educators should strive to help their students gain practice at identifying and building relationships with potential allies and partners with whom their congregation can work. Aspiring pastors need to be able to do social mapping and relationship mapping in the community.

Theological educators also can play a critical role in helping seminarians understand the importance of developing healthy boundaries as they enter congregations. Students need to learn that pastors can’t do everything, and that learning how to set boundaries can sustain and energize the pastoral life.

In tension with this call for reforming theological education is the reality that many professors are concerned about securing tenure. Many of the teaching methods that may most effectively equip pastors to work in local communities – working with local community leaders and team teaching – may not be the best methods to put or keep educators on the tenure track.

Moreover, educators ask: How do you teach everything that you have to teach in six semesters? How do you teach things that pastors only can learn when they’re in the line of fire? Any efforts to change theological education must take seriously the conflicting demands and questions of faculty members and must create support structures and incentives that allow faculty members to take good, creative risks.

Participants:

Dr. Robert Franklin, Emory University; Atlanta, Georgia
Rev. Donna Gaycomb, Duke University; Durham, North Carolina
Fred Perrella, Raskob Foundation for Catholic Activities, Inc.; Wilmington, Delaware
Melissa Snar, Vanderbilt University; Nashville, Tennessee
Randy Keesler, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops; Washington, D.C.
Jeannie Appleman, Interfaith Funders; Syosset, New York
Dr. David Oxon, Center for Congregational Health; Winston-Salem, North Carolina
Rev. Prince Rivers, Wesley Grove United Church of Christ; Newport News, Virginia
Dr. George Thompson, The Interdenominational Theological Center; Atlanta, Georgia
Much more discussion occurs these days, as opposed to the last 20 years, regarding what churches and faith-based organizations can or should do in addressing our major social problems. Though I am a student of this issue, I occasionally have trouble sorting things out; therefore, I assume those less familiar with the issue must at least have equal difficulty. Let me briefly retrace my footsteps from the last two decades to provide a context for understanding today’s increased religious involvement in social service provision. Then let me suggest a list of steps that community and congregational leaders might want to consider before using the marvelous resources of the religious community.

Some people presume that faith-based social services have only recently emerged on the scene. In fact, religious congregations’ involvement in social services and the expansion of faith-based social service organizations have developed gradually and are best understood through the relationships they share with public and nonsectarian providers in local systems of social services.

In the early and mid-1980s, President Reagan made changes in social policy that reduced the welfare rolls and increased eligibility requirements for participation in other federal programs. His policies would not have seemed so dramatic at the time if they had occurred in isolation. But three new social problems materialized, catching unsuspecting social service providers completely off guard:

1. The AIDS crisis grew more rapidly than expected.
2. People with severe and chronic mental illnesses were moving from costly state institutions into communities that were in no way prepared for them.
3. Changes in the housing market eliminated much of the low-cost housing in urban areas, causing extreme stress on individuals providing social services.

In addition, a deep recession contributed to unemployment, long lines at food pantries, and personal and family problems often attributed to a person losing a job.

You’re doing what you’re doing for the people…
the thankfulness of the people who have so little but fix you a beautiful dinner because they are so thankful. What keeps you in the ministry and gives you strength and makes you realize that it’s worthwhile is the people who every day pray with you and thank you and believe that God has called you.

Maria Teresa Palmer

Equipping Communities

“Congregations and faith-based organizations are limited but essential partners in a broader community of care.”

Recommendations for Addressing Social Services through Faith Communities

By BOB WINEBURG
Jefferson Pilot Excellence Professor
Department of Social Work
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
The combination of adjustments in social policy, new social problems, and a severe recession led to vast changes in local social service delivery systems, including churches' increased efforts in community ministry. Having completed my Master's in Social Work training in "community organization," a small branch of social work that focuses on helping to find ways to change agencies and organizations so they can serve the needs of the poor most effectively, I often was asked to work with various community planning bodies to locate shelter for the homeless, to provide food for the hungry, to develop services for the severely and chronically mentally ill, and to build a system of services for AIDS patients. I made two important observations: churches hosted many of the meetings, and the religious community demonstrated remarkable generosity, as shown through its willingness to fill in the gaps of services that public agencies could not perform.

In 1988, I began an academic study of Greensboro, North Carolina's religious congregations, in collaboration with Greensboro Urban Ministry, a small, faith-based organization comprised of about 10 employees and 50 supporting churches. Like many similar organizations in other communities, Urban Ministry provided food, clothing, and shelter for the poor and relied heavily upon the religious community for its funds, volunteers, and space. (Today it is a multi-service agency with more than 50 employees and more than 200 supporting churches.) My study examined how changes in national, state, and local policy affect the level of social services the religious community provides. Over the years, other similar studies have substantiated my findings.

So, what do we now know about our nation's congregations and their social services?

Congregations and faith-based organizations, such as Greensboro Urban Ministry, are limited but essential partners in a broader community of care. Virtually all of the academic research suggests that they are only ingredients in a complex formula of local services. A community's social services without religious providers would be sorely lacking, but a community would be hard-pressed to meet the spectrum of social needs with only religious providers.

Congregations are first and foremost places of worship. While worship is primary, congregational members often are intricately involved in the provision of a range of social services. What confuses the public is the lack of clear distinction between faith-based organizations that provide social services and service provision coming from congregations. Catholics, Lutherans, Baptists, Jews, Methodists and Salvationists boast vast networks of social service organizations in communities throughout this country (Catholic Charities, Lutheran Social Services, Salvation Army, to name a few). Such organizations have professional staffs and obtain their funds from multiple sources including the government. Yet, they also tap into congregations for volunteers, money, and sometimes space, making it difficult to distinguish between the congregation and the denomination's community-based organization. Academic literature calls organizations such as these "mediating structures" because they stand between the poor who need help and the members of congregations who serve in such organizations as representatives of their congregations.

Congregants want to help, but they often cannot volunteer the time, donate the money, or make the commitment to "do it all" on the organizational scale required to harness the spirit most effectively. The average church congregation in the United States has fewer than 200 members and a budget of $100,000. Most are too small to become even small service agencies, so they provide in other ways. Greensboro Urban Ministry, for example, encourages some congregations to work at the soup kitchen, others to help staff the night shelter, and still others to donate clothes for emergency assistance. Urban Ministry takes care of all the organizational matters that might otherwise overwhelm a congregation with limited resources. The congregations serve in this venue. Greensboro Urban Ministry also helps the poor by providing a central location for them to meet one or more of their needs — be it food, clothing, shelter or spiritual guidance.

Congregations also use their energy, spirit, and money to provide "in house" social services, such as when members visit sick or homebound congregants or residents in the surrounding neighborhood. They may offer onsite childcare or after-school care for members or neighborhood residents, or they may allow others to use their space to provide it. Congregations may house an Alcoholics Anonymous program, provide a site for senior citizens to enjoy a meal, host a blood drive, shelter the homeless on a regular or emergency basis, or produce a team of volunteers to work at a soup kitchen. These same congregations may work with others to build a house through Habitat for Humanity, help flood victims or resettle refugees. Larger congregations may provide space for a nonprofit organization and even donate small grants to community-based organizations.

Research shows that congregations each maintain about four such social service programs. In addition, these congregations are spawning ponds for new community organizations, which address problems spanning the life cycle from teen pregnancy to hospice care. In Greensboro, 18 percent of nonprofit agencies spawned from congregational efforts.

Nationwide, there are approximately 2,000 community development corporations that have been generated by and are intricately tied to African-American congregations and, in increasing numbers, Latino churches. In many cases, organizations such as these resemble the common, secular nonprofit organization: they formed a corporation, legally separate from the church. Like secular nonprofits they don't display religious symbols and there is nothing overtly religious in the programs they operate. In other cases, the distinctions are not so clear: the organization may be housed at the founding church or use property owned or leased by the church; staff may include clergy and church members; church members may sit on the board of directors; or the organization may enjoy special access to the founding church's resources.

“As policymakers lean toward shifting public money to churches, they typically do so without increasing the total outlay of funds. Faith-based organizations increasingly are funded not as a supplement to existing social service provision, but as a substitute.”
As policymakers lean toward shifting public money to churches, they typically do so without increasing the total outlay of public funds for human services. Faith-based organizations increasingly are funded not as a supplement to existing social service provision, but as a substitute. I fear, as do others, that policymakers do not fully understand that the religious community’s spirit is not housed in a vacuum.

President Bush’s Faith Based Initiative involves multiple strategies that allow more money to move into churches and congregations.

1. Changing the grant rules makes it easier for churches to receive endowments directly.
2. Running grant workshops teaches churches how to obtain government grants and contracts.
3. Giving grants to an intermediary, such as Greensboro Urban Ministry, which in turn oversees the use of the money and provides mentoring, aids those churches too small to have anyone on staff with skills at writing grants, planning programs, or managing grants once they receive them.

Those who planned President Bush’s initiative, I believe, recognize that religious providers are part of an intricate system of services staffed heavily by volunteers and fueled by an unyielding faith. Giving money to them directly and providing mentoring for those entities unprepared for handling the work seems to be a strategy for increasing church involvement in providing services. I am less certain, however, that policymakers understand the other side of the issue: that the volunteer spirit works in tandem with, and is often inseparable from, the professional service efforts of other faith-based, private nonprofit, and government agencies.

Consider a Red Cross blood drive at a local congregation on a weekend morning. It is likely that members of the local clergy sit on the Red Cross board, building connections between the nonprofit and faith communities. It is likely that the congregation publicized the blood drive and volunteers recruited donors and provided space for the blood drive. This public health activity would be significantly less successful without the partnership with the congregation, but it is not an activity that the congregation can conduct without the presence of the nonprofit.

Or consider an after-school reading program operating out of a church, supporting and reinforcing the work of the public schools. With an increasing number of impoverished children suffering from learning disabilities, it would be wise for the schools to train tutors to help students with learning disabilities read better. Otherwise, a volunteer’s good intentions could quickly spoil when less than satisfactory results occur.

Or consider the church mentoring program for ex-cons, which supports the work of the public parole office. An ex-con may arrive at the church with drug problems, may owe child support, and may have limited skills. It is unrealistic to expect untrained volunteers, no matter how committed to the work, to address the needs of a drug addict, to know how and when to refer him for help, or to assist a man who owes back child support but does not want to work because his small wages will be garnished.

Merely shifting money from nonprofits or government programs to faith-based programs can be disastrous. We must build, sustain, and enhance the public/private partnerships that successfully provide community services. Rather than moving from supporting public resources to supporting faith-based resources, we must cultivate stronger partnerships between the two, between the faith community and community agencies.

I foresee that the recent increase in poverty will compel churches to do more and their public partners to do more with less. I presume that most people would not approve of such a policy, so we must explore the situation more broadly and more creativity.

The first step in capturing the amazing spirit of local, faith-based providers lies in understanding that congregations and faith-based organizations play subsidiary roles in local delivery systems but could play major advocacy roles in shaping community policy. For instance, a church that offers an after-school reading program might wrestle with the following questions: (1) How many students cannot read at grade level in the broader community and in local schools where the children in the program attend? (2) How many youngsters are reading better as a result of this particular program, how many are not, and what are the reasons? (3) What needs exist in terms of volunteers, space, money, and training to operate the program so it works for everyone? (4) What kinds of partnerships develop among parents, congregation, and the school and how can these joint ventures be made more effective? (5) How might other congregations replicate these efforts?

With this baseline information, the religious community begins to develop the resources to think about systematic change.

Church leaders, parents, school officials, and community and family foundations should collaborate to embark on changing outcomes one issue at a time. With deliberation, accurate data, citizen support, expertise from public providers, the moral authority of an educated religious community, and the civic stature of community and family foundation leaders, we should be able to make progress in solving, managing, and even preventing problems far more effectively than we are presently doing.

Local religious leaders, funders and others may want to consider eight recommendations regarding local social services and the faith community:

“Rather than moving from supporting public resources to supporting faith-based resources, we must cultivate stronger partnerships between the two, between the faith community and community agencies.”
(1) We must strengthen existing partnerships locally and develop new ones among government service providers, private philanthropy, and the faith community.
(2) We must prepare initially with small informal discussions that lead to planning for organized community forums, which can prioritize and then address the range of community problems.
(3) We must work with media organizations to engage the community in ongoing discussions that address the nature and extent of the concerns as well as the level of progress made in achieving results.
(4) We need nonpartisan means to collect data on community problems, and we need updated technology to share information and new ideas—perhaps local nonpartisan “think tanks” to provide thoughtful analyses for community planning bodies.
(5) We need support for technical assistance to bring people with specific expertise to the discussion groups so the discourse clearly articulates the range of the community’s problems in a way that people understand.
(6) We must evaluate data from four perspectives: What problems does the community face? How successful are community organizations at addressing those problems? What do the community organizations require to be successful? What resources are available within the religious community?
(7) We must develop methods of matching the resources of the religious community with the needs of the larger community organizations in order for the religious community’s volunteer spirit to remain respected and cherished.
(8) Last but first, we must have continuing secretarial support to sustain the community planning process. Detailed records, clear agendas, and other information deemed important must be communicated to participants in a timely manner.

Communities must begin to manage their own service destiny. We need to rebuild community systems so they can respond to 21st Century problems with 21st Century solutions. Now is when communities should take the initiative to set matters straight. These eight, concrete steps can form the foundation for building partnerships that will genuinely make a difference over time.

TO LEARN MORE


LISTEN, PASTOR....
LISTEN, FUNDER....

During the Duke symposium on Pastoral Leadership & Community Ministry, pastors and funders met separately in small groups and contemplated the messages they would like to share with each other. From those discussions and the public sharing of the two groups, come these thoughts... from pastors to funders... and from funders to pastors.

Listen, Pastor....

Real estate brokers will tell you there are three priorities: location, location, location. As funders, we want to share with you our three priorities:

Relationship, Relationship, Relationship.

We expect you to be in relationship with the people in your congregation and your community. But you also should be in relationship with us, the funders. Raising money to invest in people and communities, which is what we are talking about, is not about sales. It is about relationships.

You must understand what the funder – the foundation – is interested in, and then share what you are interested in, and see if there is a match. Perhaps only 10 percent of a church’s work aligns with what we want to fund and perhaps only about 10 percent of our interests align with what churches want to do. Only by talking can we identify those mutual interests.

We invite you to ask questions, to inquire about everything. Ask us how to complete applications. There are no stupid questions.

We often get things “cold,” that is, someone may download an application off of our web site and send it in, with no phone call or contact at all. For whatever reason, people seem afraid to talk with us. Don’t be afraid. There is technical assistance available to help you.

Listen, Funder....

As pastors, we need to build the expectations of our congregations toward community ministry and playing a public role in the life of the community. Pastors need to be seen by their congregations as having a role as a custodian of the soul of the city.

Funders, in determining what they will support financially, can influence greatly the priorities of a congregation.

We need to plant the idea in the minds of seminarians, as well as in the minds of pastors already at work, that churches have a critical role to play in strengthening the community beyond the church walls. Foundations can help by collecting and disseminating best practices of seminary training that introduces these concepts. Foundations can also hold us accountable for justice ministry.

Funders can help us by being clear what level of accountability they expect from us, particularly related to accountability of our day-to-day business activities and how we live up to the expectations of our investors. Show us good practices and models, particularly from elders in the field. Don’t sugar coat the stories – tell us the truth about how hard the work is, how much pain is involved, but how important the results of our work can be.

Teach us the basics: of leadership, community organizing, empowering people around us. Teach us volunteer management and staff performance management. Provide creative opportunities for continuing education: opportunities to learn about grant writing, social mobilization, how to create a vision for our congregation and articulate a vision for our congregations.

Help the younger pastors among us develop mentors – a relationship that offers sustained development and coaching, not simply a casual connection. Help us develop mentor relationships with funders: imagine what would happen if we had someone whom we knew well and could approach for advice and guidance on funding matters or questions of accountability.

Invest in programs that teach us social analysis. How do we understand the situation that we are in? How do we analyze our environment? How do we know how much capacity we have? How do we manage the projects that we have?

Support programs that help us manage our lives. How do we set boundaries in ministry? Ministry is a chaotic environment. How...
But please don’t mislead us. Don’t tell us that things are going well when they aren’t. Don’t pad the books. Don’t say the budget is larger than it is, in the hope you will get the money that you need. Honesty is key. Some people are conditioned to put a positive spin on things, but don’t spin so positively it is less than truthful. There has to be a level of trust; a recognition that we are in a partnership.

Finally: We want you to have courage.

Teach your vision and teach your dream, not only in your community but when you bring it to us. Celebrate wherever you are and the gifts that are in your community. Do not denigrate what you are doing because you are not like somebody else. Small congregations are not denigrated because they think they’re not as good as larger churches. Don’t fall into this trip. Have courage because they need to be better at managing that tension.

Don’t just talk with pastors – talk with staff. Especially in larger churches, much of the work will be delegated to administrators. What are their needs and what can you learn from them.

Finally, be courageous. Don’t just think about funding big, innovative things that you’ve always funded. Think more creatively. Consider a small upstart project that may have a visionary leader. Fund young pastors. Fund in different, more creative, ways. Be courageous.

do we stay focused? Is there funding for clergy to step away and focus on their spiritual life?

One of our greatest challenges, our greatest tensions comes in the struggle between the spiritual life and the business life – the spiritual life and the practical life that’s going on around us. We need for the spiritual life and the business life to be in tension with one another, but we need to be better at managing that tension.
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