

The General Board of Examining Chaplains

MEMBERSHIP

Bishops

- The Rt. Rev. Robert M. Anderson, Minneapolis, Minn. (1988)
- The Rt. Rev. Richard F. Grein, *Chair*, Topeka, Kan. (1988)
- The Rt. Rev. C. FitzSimons Allison, Charleston, S.C. (1991)
- The Rt. Rev. J. Mark Dyer, Bethlehem, Pa. (1991)

Clergy with Pastoral Responsibilities

- The Rev. John D. Lane, Staunton, Va. (1988)
- The Rev. Herman Page, Topeka, Kan. (1988)
- The Rev. Canon Frederick Williams, New York, N.Y. (1988)
- The Rev. M. Barbara Akin, Ph.D., Grove City, Pa. (1991)
- The Rev. William H. Baar, Venice, Italy (1991)
- The Rev. Richard R. Cook, Dallas, Tex. (1991)

Members of Faculties

- The Rev. John Booty, Ph.D., Sewanee, Tenn. (1988)
- The Rev. Holt Graham, Th.D., Deer River, Minn. (1988)
- The Rev. William B. Green, Phil.D., Austin, Tex. (1988)
- The Rev. Louis, Weil, S.T.D., Nashotah, Wis. (1988)
- The Very Rev. Robert E. Giannini, Ph.D., Sewanee, Tenn. (1991)
- The Very Rev. William H. Petersen, Ph.D., Rochester, N.Y. (1991)
- Timothy F. Sedgwick, Ph.D., Evanston, Ill. (1991)

Lay Persons

- Dr. Ann H. Diemer, *Vice Chair*, Pontiac, Mich. (1988)
- Dr. Thomas Matthews, Tulsa, Okla. (1988)
- Mrs. Barbara Wolf, Falmouth, Me. (1988)
- Dr. Thomas A. Bartlett, University, Ala. (1991)
- Dr. Warren Ramshaw, Hamilton, N.Y. (1991)
- Mrs. Evelyn Shipman, Freeland, Wash. (1991)

All members of the Board concur in the following report.

Representatives of the Board at General Convention

- The Rt. Rev. Richard F. Grein, House of Bishops, and the Rev. M. Barbara Akin, Ph.D., House of Deputies, are authorized by the Board to receive non-substantive amendments to the report.

SUMMARY OF THE BOARD'S WORK

During the triennium, the General Board of Examining Chaplains:

1. Convened at the College of Preachers in each of the three years to prepare an annual General Ordination Examination and arranged for these examinations to be administered to between 288 and 322 candidates each year, in about 38 locations each year, including one or two outside of the United States.

2. Participated annually in overseeing the work of 144 to 164 persons, clerical and lay, from 59-61 dioceses, convened in seven or eight locations, to read the examinations and write evaluations of them.
3. Reported examination results and recommendations to all candidates, and their bishops and Commissions on Ministry, and made the required canonical report to seminary deans.
4. Through its chairman, participated in the Strategic Planning Committee of the Board for Theological Education in June, 1987.
5. Through its members, visited several seminaries, dioceses and parishes to interpret the work of the General Board of Examining Chaplains, the administrator doing similar interpreting by mail and by telephone.
6. Through its elected Planning Committee (new in 1984), reviewed the Board's work, evaluated the examinations and the processes of administering them, and in that way prepared for the next Annual Meeting where the subsequent examination is composed.
7. Through subcommittees and individual members, revised directions for parts of the GOE process, composed an informational brochure for Commissions on Ministry to distribute to GOE candidates, and tried to develop statistics on the results of the GOE and methods for the random distribution of GOEs to the readers (see Appendix).
8. Replaced the machine-scored Multiple-Choice Test in 1986 with a Short-Answer Test with a similar purpose: to test what candidates have by way of information available for instant recall.
9. Collaborated with other agencies which are accountable for the education and development of the ordained ministry of the Church—such as the Board for Theological Education and the Council of Seminary Deans. The Board received from the Board for Theological Education the reactions gathered by the BTE to the Guidelines for Theological Education as submitted to the General Convention of 1985, and the revision of the Guidelines submitted for approval to this Convention of 1988 is the result of comments and criticisms and further thought thereon. At the call of the BTE, representatives of the Board met with representatives of the BTE and the Council of Seminary Deans in an effort to share concerns about the disruption which the GOE causes in the last year of seminary and the purpose of the GOE (diagnostic or qualifying?), and to ask for direction from the House of Bishops about these matters.
10. Through its administrator, committed ten years of evaluations of General Ordination Examinations (1972-1981) to the Episcopal Church Archives in Austin, Texas, for safekeeping, with strict limitations on access to this sensitive material.
11. Reported through its chairman, or through bishops who are Board members, to the interim meetings of the House of Bishops at San Antonio and Chicago, as required by canon.

Note: The administration of the Board's work is in the hands of the Rev. Richard T. Loring, D.Th., of Chelsea, Mass.; he manages the work of the GBEC out of an office in downtown Boston, with a secretary, Marcia Koopman, who is engaged full-time for five months of each year.

FINANCIAL REPORT

	<i>1986 Actual</i>	<i>1987 Projected</i>	<i>1988 Budget</i>	<i>1986-88 Total</i>
Expenses				
Board expense	\$36,139.61	\$39,341.70	\$42,673.00	\$118,154.31
Meetings				
Administration				
Secretarial assistance				
Reading expenses	42,343.68 (8)	38,113.29 (7)	40,770.00 (8)	121,226.97
Conferences				
Other expenses	14,442.36	12,270.74	16,307.00 *	43,020.10
Office				
Printing				
Copying				
Postage				
Total expense	\$92,925.65	\$89,725.73	\$99,750.00	\$282,401.38
Funding				
Examination fees	\$64,400.00 (322 @ \$200)	\$60,470.00 (288 @ \$210)	\$65,250.00 (290 @ \$225)	\$190,120.00
General Convention				
Budget	28,525.65	29,255.73	34,500.00	92,281.38
Total funding	\$92,925.65	\$89,725.73	\$99,750.00	\$282,401.38

*Our computer equipment is aging, and replacement of it is planned, together with other computer equipment owned by the national Church. Costs and financing for this are not clear at this time, but are to be covered by a one-time capital grant, we are informed; so no money is in this report for that purpose.

SPECIAL RESOLUTIONS PROPOSED BY THE BOARD

Subject: Approval request on revised Guidelines for Theological Education prepared by the General Board of Examining Chaplains.

Resolution #A063

Whereas, the Guidelines for Theological Education prepared by the General Board of Examining Chaplains, with the assistance of an Advisory Committee, were received by the 68th General Convention of this Church and commended to the Church for use and evaluation during the triennium 1985-1988; and

Whereas, the Board for Theological Education received responses to the Guidelines from bishops, theological seminaries, Commissions on Ministry, and other interested parties, and shared them with the General Board of Examining Chaplains; and

Whereas, the General Board of Examining Chaplains, with the assistance of members of the original Advisory Committee, and others, has revised the Guidelines; therefore be it

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, **That the Guidelines for Theological Education, as revised, be approved by the 69th General Convention of this Church.**

[The revised Guidelines will be found in a supplemental report in the Blue Book.]

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR THE COMING TRIENNIUM

In Title III, Canon 30 (1985 Canons), the responsibilities of the GBEC are clearly stated: to develop annually a General Ordination Examination; to administer said

THE BLUE BOOK

examination to certified candidates; to evaluate the results of the examination and to report the results to the candidates, their bishops and Commissions on Ministry, and the deans of their seminaries. The objectives during the 1989-1991 triennium will be to continue to carry out the same tasks in ways that are balanced, responsible, and to the benefit of the candidates and their bishops, as well as to the Church at large. The Guidelines for Theological Education (if approved by this Convention) will be made available to all concerned parties and further revised if necessary. The Board's Planning Committee will continue to evaluate the Board's work and to suggest improvements and economies. (One such economy has been the dropping of the readers' cash honorarium; another has been the mailing of examination results in one package to the seminaries.)

We continue to be concerned with rising costs of travel, and yet can see no way to economize on travel without sacrificing the benefits of collegiality of readers, or the benefits of wide representation of readers from around the Church. Even more crucial than these benefits is the critical role of dialogue between chaplains and readers in the process of producing good evaluations. We have considered operation of the reading system by mail, but aside from the sacrifice of collegiality, the increasing uncertainty, delay and failure of mail delivery make such an alternative impossible. Having fewer readers reading more examinations per pair would be a return to something tried in the 1970s and found wanting: In general, readers of more than four papers produced results too hasty and superficial to be satisfactory in the time available. We will continue to analyze the results of the GOEs statistically and will continue the distribution of examinations to reading stations at random. Some results of this work thus far appear in the Appendix.

PROPOSED BUDGET FOR THE TRIENNIUM

	1989	1990	1991	1989-91 Total
Expenses				
Board expense	\$ 46,058	\$ 49,502	\$52,891	\$148,451
Meetings				
Administration				
Secretarial assistance				
Reading expenses				
Conferences	46,970	49,102	51,238	147,310
Other expenses	17,372	18,036	19,711	55,119
Office				
Printing				
Copying				
Postage				
Total expense	\$110,400	\$116,640	\$123,840	\$350,880
Funding				
Examination fees				
(assuming 320 candidates)	\$ 73,600	\$ 77,760	\$ 82,560	\$233,920
	(@ \$230)	(@ \$243)	(@ \$258)	
Convention Budget*	36,800	38,880	41,280	116,960
Total funding	\$110,400	\$116,640	\$123,840	\$350,880

*The Program, Budget and Finance Committee directed in 1983 that the Convention Budget will fund the GBEC up to one-third, that being the proportion representing Board and office expenses. The portion representing reading expenses was to be funded from GOE fees. As will be seen above, that proportion no longer holds, and the ratio is, we understand, being reconsidered.

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS FOR BUDGET APPROPRIATION

Resolution #A064

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, **That the following amount be appropriated from the General Convention Assessment Budget for the General Board of Examining Chaplains:**

\$36,800 for 1989

38,880 for 1990

41,280 for 1991

\$116,960 for the triennium.

Resolution #A065

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, **That the authorization for the General Board of Examining Chaplains to charge a fee, not exceeding \$260 per candidate for the General Ordination Examinations, be continued for the next triennium, with the provision that candidates for whom the fee is not paid, but who otherwise are qualified, shall also be examined.**

APPENDIX

The General Board of Examining Chaplains is agreed that at this time we view the GOE as an exercise integrative of all fields of theological education, in all of the questions asked. We ask questions that we expect people to be able to answer, and the examination is composed with two and a half years of seminary education, or its equivalent, in mind as the educational background expected in the student.

We view the examination as diagnostic and remedial, to help Commissions on Ministry prepare students for continuing education in diaconal and early-priesthood years.

We also, at the beginning of each part of the examination, remind students that we are looking for theological substance in the responses.

We continually seek direction from the House of Bishops in the above matters since we are created by and responsible to the House of Bishops.

Statistical analysis of GOE results.

A member of the GBEC with expertise in statistics has materially aided the GBEC in two matters.

1. Reduction of differences between examination results at the several reading stations.

For the first time in 1987, examinations were distributed to reading stations entirely at random (rather than being sent to the station most distant from where they were written).

Short-answer test results at all stations in 1987 were well within a point of the overall national averages in each of the subjects tested and in the total scores. Thus reading stations did not differ widely from each other in short-answer results.

In terms of students passing all seven areas, the results at seven reading stations in 1986 vary considerably, from 26% to 63%. With random distribution of examinations in 1987, the spread of percentages was much less, from 43% to 55%, indicating a significant reduction of differences previously observed between the stations.

The same picture emerges if all subject-units passed are considered. A student can pass a maximum of seven units. In 1986, the percentages of units passed varied from 62% to 85% at seven reading stations. In 1987, the variation was from 69.6% to

THE BLUE BOOK

82.8%. The range is clearly narrower in 1987, and in fact was reduced by 42%. Study of these facts will continue.

2. Analysis of short-answer results as compared with essay results.

Table 1 shows the relationship between short-answer results and essay success in the same subject, for selected reading stations in 1987.

For example, at Atlanta, of the 34 students who passed essay tests in Scripture, 76% of their short-answer (SA) results were above the SA mean. If the correlation were perfect, 100% of these students' SA results would be above the SA mean. In History, at Atlanta, of the 10 students who failed, 80% of their SA results were below the SA mean. If the correlation were perfect, 100% of the SA results for these students would be below the mean. The figures in Table 1 indicate that the SA results follow the same pattern as the essay results, and thus that nothing *new* is being learned from the SA test. The SA test is, however, our one objective, mathematical response to those who think that the essays are evaluated subjectively.

TABLE 1
1987 GOE

Relationship Between Short-Answer Area and Essay Success in the Same Subject, by Selected Reading Stations and Short-Answer(SA) Mean for the Area

Subject Area Pass/Not Pass in Essays	Scripture		History		Theology		Total	
	Pass	Not	Pass	Not	Pass	Not	Pass 7	Not*
Reading Stations								
Atlanta (40 candidates)								
Number Pass/Not Pass	34	6	30	10	30	10	22	18
Percent Above Mean(SA)	76%	50%	80%	20%	66%	10%	90%	33%
Percent Below Mean(SA)	24%	50%	20%	80%	34%	90%	10%	66%
Austin (44 candidates)								
Number Pass/Not Pass	38	6	36	8	33	11	23	21
Percent Above SA Mean	68%	34%	66%	38%	63%	42%	74%	38%
Percent Below SA Mean	32%	66%	33%	62%	37%	58%	26%	62%
Evanston (40 candidates)								
Number Pass/Not Pass	35	5	30	10	31	9	17	23
Percent Above SA Mean	58%	66%	63%	50%	61%	22%	64%	43%
Percent Below SA Mean	42%	33%	34%	50%	39%	77%	36%	57%
Santa Barbara (36 candidates)								
Number Pass/Not Pass	32	4	29	7	25	11	20	16
Percent Above SA Mean	65%	60%	65%	43%	52%	46%	52%	46%
Percent Below SA Mean	35%	40%	35%	57%	48%	54%	48%	54%

*Here the reference is to passing all seven canonical areas or passing fewer than seven of them.

Comparison of GOE results since the beginning.

Table 2 shows these results, from a search of the files in 1986-1987, in terms of percentage of candidates passing all seven areas, and overall percentage of units passed (where each candidate can pass a maximum of seven areas).

TABLE 2

Chart of Pass-Fail Statistics for the GOE 1972-1987 (from evaluations in the files, 1987)

Year	% Pass in All 7 Areas	% of Units Passed
1972	56	79.2
1973	56	81.9
1974	74	91.5
1975	63	85.5
1976	60	83.6
1977	64	86.0
1978	58	82.7
1979	55	82.6
1980	50	81.2
1981	57	85.9
1982	57	82.6
1983	54	80.9
1984	55	81.4
1985	46	74.8
1986	48	74.4
1987	49	76.3

The Board's statistician-member comments that "considering the vast numbers of candidates, readers and chaplains involved over the years, the statistical consistency is notable."

Finally, we wish to express our appreciation for the work and time of the several hundred readers who, through this triennium, have helped the Board and the candidates with their skills and energies. We wish also to thank the seminaries and other agencies which have helped to administer the examinations and have hosted the annual conferences of readers.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard F. Grein, *Chairperson*