

Figure 2. Reflective Matrix: Spectrum of Reflective Practice in Seminary Teaching.

Less Reflective	→	→	→	More Reflective
Faculty talk of teaching only in disparaging ways	Teaching talk is generally nervous, critical, and for summative purposes	Teaching talk is tentative and informal, but there is faculty interest in it	Teaching talk begins to move across various boundaries and is formative in nature	Teaching talk is generative, shared, and energizing
Theology is key arbiter, closed canon forms basis of truth	Theological commitments are voiced only in terms of guild expertise	Theological frames are one among many but allowed into conversation	Theological commitments form center of curriculum and invite conversation	Theological commitments are key wellspring, supporting openness in learning and seeking transformation
Faculty are all powerful in the institution; students are perceived as a necessary evil	Faculty and students act independently and in isolation	Faculty and students collaborate informally, with faculty taking the lead	Faculty and students work in teams with each other and other constituencies	Structural roles blur as the same person can inhabit different roles in different learning projects
Student role is strictly defined as novice	Student role is subordinate to faculty, a learner who consumes information	Students may inhabit multiple roles—novice, skilled practitioner, researcher	Students have multiple roles, may be learning partners with faculty	Students are co-learners with faculty and other constituencies, may be pursuing degrees, continuing education, or simply learning for its own sake
No evaluation	End-of-course evaluation used only for summative procedures	Pre/during/post course evaluation, used occasionally for formative as well as summative procedures	CI reports, student involvement in formal assessment, primary emphasis on formative evaluation of teaching	Continual assessment by all participants, portfolio development for lifelong learning
Teaching is transmissive and didactic in format	Teaching is largely transmissive; teachers are content experts	Teaching may take several forms, and there is some team-teaching	Teaching is often inter-disciplinary and done in teams; teachers are the designers of learning environments in addition to being content experts	Teaching is aimed at student discovery; teachers take on the role of expert guides; much coursework is based on collaborative projects
Questions from students are pertinent only for purposes of clarification	Questions from students are allowed if they fall within clear parameters	Culture of competition; student questions must come from a critical perspective	Student and faculty questions arise as shared attempts to negotiate meaning and clarify truth	Energized, engaged context of deconstructive criticism

(Continued on Page #)

Less Reflective	→	→	→	More Reflective
Cultural contexts of students deemed problematic, too often leading to syncretism	Cultural contexts of students mostly irrelevant to learning	Cultural contexts of students important to take seriously in learning for effective outcomes	Cultural contextualization a key element of learning and teaching	Cultural contextualization is not only a key element of learning and teaching but thoroughly embedded in theological method and process