

PROGRAMS

**NEW BISHOPS AND SPOUSES'
CONFERENCE**

JANUARY 17-21, 2011

New Bishops and Spouses' Conference Schedule*
January 17-21, 2011
Roslyn Conference Center – Richmond, VA

Monday 1/17	Tuesday 1/18	Wednesday 1/19	Thursday 1/20	Friday 1/21
	8:00 – 8:45 a.m. Breakfast <i>Dining Room</i>	8:00 – 8:45 a.m. Breakfast <i>Dining Room</i>	8:00 – 8:45 a.m. Breakfast <i>Dining Room</i>	8:00 – 8:45 a.m. Breakfast <i>Dining Room</i>
	9:00 – 9:30 a.m. Morning Worship <i>Chapel</i>	9:00 – 9:30 a.m. Morning Worship <i>Chapel</i>	9:00 – 9:30 a.m. Morning Worship <i>Chapel</i>	9:00 – 9:30 a.m. Morning Worship <i>Chapel</i>
	10:00 – 11:00 a.m. Session I Walker Assembly, Walker Lounge, Upper Gibson 1 & 2, Lower Gibson Small Group Work “Family Religious Life History”	10:00 – 11:00 a.m. Session VI Walker Assembly Plenary Session “Reflections on Transitions” (with Faculty)	10:00 – 11:00 a.m. Session XI <i>Walker Assembly</i> Plenary Conversation with ++Katharine and Dick	10:00 – 11:00 a.m. Closing Session & Evaluations <i>Walker Assembly</i> Couple Questions and taking the next steps
	11:00 – 11:15 a.m. Break	11:00 – 11:15 a.m. Break	11:00 – 11:15 a.m. Break	11:00 a.m. Departure (Boxed Lunches Available)
	11:15 – 12:15 p.m. Session II Walker Assembly Introduction to the Bishop Spouse/Partner Research Project by Woodi Sprinkel	11:15 – 12:15 p.m. Session VII Walker Assembly Introduction to the Kolb Inventory by Woodi Sprinkel	11:15 – 12:15 p.m. Session XII <i>Walker Assembly and Walker Lounge</i> Separate Sessions for Bishops and Spouses	
	12:30 – 1:00 p.m. Lunch <i>Dining Room</i>	12:30 – 1:00 p.m. Lunch <i>Dining Room</i>	12:30 – 1:00 p.m. Lunch <i>Dining Room</i>	
	1:30 – 3:00 p.m. Personal Time	1:30 – 3:00 p.m. Personal Time	1:30 – 3:00 p.m. Personal Time	

Monday 1/17	Tuesday 1/18	Wednesday 1/19	Thursday 1/20	Friday 1/21
Check In <i>Powers Hall</i>	3:00 – 4:00 p.m. Session III <i>Walker Assembly</i> Bishop Spouse/Partner Research Project (continued)	3:00 – 4:00 p.m. Session VIII <i>Walker Assembly</i> Adult Learning Exercise	3:00 – 4:30 p.m. Session XIII <i>Walker Assembly and Walker Lounge</i> Separate Sessions for Bishops and Spouses (continued)	
	4:00 – 4:15 p.m. Break	4:00 – 4:15 p.m. Break	4:30 – 4:45 p.m. Break	
	4:15 – 5:30 p.m. Session IV Bishop Spouse/Partner Research Project (continued)	4:15 – 5:15 p.m. Session IX Couple Conversations	4:45 – 5:30 p.m. Eucharist <i>Chapel</i>	
5:30 – 6:00 p.m. Reception <i>Dining Room</i>	5:30 – 6:00 p.m. Hospitality <i>Dining Room</i>	5:15 – 6:15 p.m. Reception hosted by the Diocese of Virginia <i>Dining Room</i>	5:30 – 6:00 p.m. Hospitality <i>Dining Room</i>	
6:00 – 7:00 p.m. Dinner <i>Dining Room</i>	6:00 – 7:00 p.m. Dinner <i>Dining Room</i>	6:15 – 7:00 p.m. Dinner <i>Dining Room</i>	6:00 – 7:00 p.m. Dinner <i>Dining Room</i>	
7:30 – 8:30 p.m. Opening Session <i>Walker Assembly</i> Welcome and Introductions Overview of the Week	7:30 – 8:30 p.m. Session V <i>Walker Assembly and Walker Lounge</i> Separate Sessions for Bishops and Spouses	7:30 – 8:30 p.m. Session X <i>Walker Assembly and Walker Lounge</i> Separate Sessions for Bishops and Spouses	7:30 p.m. Free Evening (Movie Optional)	
Compline Chapel	Compline Chapel	Compline Chapel		
Refreshments Available <i>Dining Room</i>	Refreshments Available <i>Dining Room</i>	Refreshments Available <i>Dining Room</i>	Refreshments Available <i>Dining Room</i>	

Evaluation - Quantitative Summary
2011 New Bishops' and Spouses' Conference
January 17-21, 2011 - Roslyn

Scores are based on a scale of 1-7. 1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number Responding</u>	<u>Section Average</u>
1. Opening Session (Monday evening)				
a. The opening session (introductions and expectations) was helpful.	6.50	0.52	12	
b. At the opening session, I was able to meet and get acquainted (or reacquainted) with other participants.	6.42	0.51	12	
c. The opening session helped me to understand expectations for the conference.	6.25	0.87	12	6.39
2. Small Group Work Sessions (Tuesday morning)				
a. The Family Religious History small-group work session was beneficial.	6.08	0.67	12	
b. The Family Religious History session helped me gain insight into how my family background may have helped shape my spiritual sensibilities.	5.50	1.00	12	
c. The small-group sharing in the Family Religious History session was helpful to get to know others better.	6.33	0.89	12	5.97
3. Bishop Spouse/Partner Research Project Sessions (Tuesday morning and afternoon)				
a. The introductory session on the research project's findings was helpful.	6.14	0.66	14	
b. The couple small-group discussions on spouse/partner roles and strategies and coping were beneficial.	5.93	1.21	14	6.04
4. Reflections on Transition with Faculty (Wednesday morning)				
a. The Reflections on Transition session with faculty was helpful.	6.21	0.89	14	
b. I benefited from hearing from those who have already been through a new bishop/spouse transition.	6.21	1.05	14	6.21
5. Adult Learning Exercise and Discussion Sessions Wednesday morning and afternoon)				
a. The Adult Learning Exercise session led by Woodi Sprinkel were beneficial.	6.00	1.04	14	
b. The Kolb Learning Styles inventory was a valuable instrument.	6.14	0.86	14	
c. I now have a better understanding of my learning style, strengths and challenges.	6.08	1.12	13	
d. I plan to use what I learned in the Adult Learning Exercise session when I return home.	5.85	1.46	13	6.02
6. Bishop's Case Studies and Spouses' Discussion Sessions				
a. (For bishops only) The case studies on transition issues and experiences were helpful.	5.86	0.69	7	
b. (For bishops only) The "Reflection Method" used to clarify, analyze and evaluate the case studies was beneficial.	5.86	0.69	7	
c. (For spouses only) The spouses' discussion and work sessions were helpful.	7.00	0.00	5	
d. (For spouses only) The materials provided for the spouses' discussion sessions were beneficial.	6.17	1.17	6	
e. I gained more awareness of the issues and challenges associated with the transition to a new role.	6.33	0.78	12	6.24

7. Conference Sessions with the Presiding Bishop and Spouse

a. The plenary sessions with Bishop Katharine and Dick on Thursday morning were beneficial.	5.64	1.15	14	
b. (For bishops only) The bishops' discussion and work session with Bishop Katharine was helpful.	6.38	0.52	8	
c. (For spouses only) The spouses' discussion session with Dick Schori was helpful.	5.17	1.94	6	5.73

8. Conference Purpose and Goals

a. The conference provided me with an opportunity for reflection with other the new bishops (elect) [spouses] during my transition to a new ministry, a new role and new experiences.	6.43	0.65	14	
b. The conference provided me with a “time out” to step back from stresses and interact with the other new bishops (elect) [spouses].	6.43	0.65	14	
c. The conference provided me with an opportunity to gain support from my “classmates” [the other spouses] and to build relationships with them.	6.64	0.50	14	
d. I had sufficient time and space for quiet time to catch up with my spouse or with myself.	5.57	1.65	14	
e. Hearing the personal experiences of the peer faculty facilitators helped me gained insight into our common life together as bishops (elect) [spouses].	6.50	0.52	14	
f. At the conference, I was able to share my thoughts and feelings with the other new bishops (elect) [spouses].	6.57	0.51	14	
g. At the conference, I was able to share my questions and concerns with the other new bishops (elect) [spouses].	6.50	0.52	14	6.38

9. Conference Process, Structure and Program Elements

a. The conference environment felt safe and nonjudgmental.	6.57	0.65	14	
b. There were opportunities to collaborate, share and learn from each other.	6.43	0.65	14	
c. Scheduled time and personal time were provided in a balanced way.	5.71	1.73	14	
d. Pre-conference planning and communication processes were handled in an effective way.	6.29	0.83	14	
e. The conference schedule provided a useful structure for organizing my conference experience.	6.21	0.80	14	
f. The free evening on Thursday provided an opportunity to continue forming relationships with my classmates in a relaxed environment.	6.08	0.86	13	
g. Peer faculty facilitators were accessible, interested and supportive.	6.79	0.43	14	
h. Conference administrator was well prepared and materials were organized.	6.93	0.27	14	
i. The worship sessions were beneficial.	6.79	0.43	14	
j. Worship was meaningful.	6.79	0.43	14	
k. The Roslyn Conference Center served as an effective site for the conference.	6.93	0.27	14	6.50

Conference Average:

6.16

**College for Bishops
2011 New Bishops' and Spouses' Conference
Summary of Qualitative Comments**

Note: Comments listed below include all comments/notes provided on the evaluations.

1. Opening Session (Monday evening)

Comments:

- 3. Did not make Monday evening session.
- 11. I encourage you to provide this evaluation form at the beginning to get fresher feedback. Honestly, by now, I remember less than I'd hope for giving good feedback.
- 14. Golly, my defenses were high Monday night and even Tuesday...

2. Small-Group Work Sessions (Tuesday morning)

Comments:

- 2. I felt very rushed in this session – give it another 30 min.
- 3. Did not make Tuesday morning session.
- 8. Would have appreciated an additional 90 minutes for this session.
- 14. This session had an excellent “moderator”. I think that made a huge difference – compared to not using forms. Really needed to keep to topic. Ours did and we had insight into variety/diversity of participants.

3. Bishop Spouse/Partner Research Project Sessions (Tuesday morning and afternoon)

Comments:

- 2. It will take some time and experience to digest and incorporate this information.
- 10. Always good to have fun as a group.
- 14. It would be helpful for me to be given time in large group to fill in 1 or 2 areas of worksheets (quiet room/reflection time) at the end of an information session followed by break then discussion. Sometimes when tired or a lot of information – better for quick 1-2 word/phrases thoughts jotted down before I leave then when I get into discussion I remember where I was and what I was thinking in order to discuss.

4. Reflections on Transition with Faculty (Wednesday morning)

Comments:

- 2. Absolutely excellent!
- 8. Would have appreciated hearing more positive experiences – tone was more negative than positive.
- 14. Throughout, Woodi's guidance was gentle, strong, subtle, loving, informed, understanding, inclusive – it must have been exhausting, but I only felt good energy.

5. Adult Learning Exercise and Discussion Sessions (Wednesday morning and afternoon)

Comments:

- 2. Though it is still a bit confusing (lots of moving parts) it was helpful and fun.
- 7. Largely repetitive of material I've covered before.
- 8. I have used the Kolb before this conference in another setting.
- 11. It might be helpful in the introduction of Kolb to discuss more fully how it relates to work as a Bishop/Bishop Spouse.
- 14. Loved this. Great response and thought *self *congregations *churches/diocese *peers also regarding as a learner and as a teacher! Good reflections – and much fun in sharing group identity.

6. Bishops' Case Studies and Spouses' Discussion Sessions

Comments:

- 1. I would love to have had more time to do some focused reflection – yet time may not be available.
- 9. I don't like case studies.

14. Materials: helpful if we could date them (Tues 18, Wed 19) and note on sheet when “due” or if option for later with spouse. I got confused later when I went through – “What was this for? Are we supposed to do this now?” – or color code: yellow = use now, blue = home for reference, pink = do with spouse. Martha’s sharing was filled with wisdom.

7. Conference Sessions with the Presiding Bishop and Spouse

Comments:

1. Helpful to get to know Dick.
2. We covered a great deal in a short period of time.
14. (a) Hearing Bishop Katharine and Dick gave body to who they were and the commonalities of transitions. Also, questions answered helped with that community bond.

8. Conference Purposes and Goals

Comments:

1. (d) Time was tight.
2. The level of trust and interpersonal reliance between bishops and spouses grew quickly. The only thing that hampered it in any way was the staggered arrival time for some of the participants and faculty – though understandably unavoidable.
11. The 1 ½ hours of personal time is wonderful and yet could have used more as we consider time alone, time together and with other clergy & spouses. The time did not match the pre-conference information.
13. The balance of active group work and quiet time for personal reflection and joint spouse time seemed a very good balance.
14. Sometimes on first/second day it felt very public to ask questions aloud – by the end it was fine. May send sheet in packet – page to jot down questions/puzzles to bring with us. To use as a reminder. Very hard to remember – like going to doctor: “How are you?” “Fine!”

9. Conference Process, Structure and Program Elements

Comments:

2. The conference schedule was the best. Integration of conference components was splendid. Frank Wade was FANTASTIC.
6. The conference has given me a lot to think about. I have met what I hope will be lifelong friends.
7. Personal time was just a little too little. Consider having the evening off at the mid-point versus the end.
11. (c) Could have used more personal time. To have time to grow personally through quiet time and have time for couple growth, I feel more time is needed.
13. Maybe those chairs could be replaced? Thank you to the faculty for your time, patience and care.
14. (a) It became safer! Note – I found myself feeling uncomfortable on Tues with 3 sessions on spouse’s role and so many new bishops without spouses. For 3rd session or at some point could they opt to go to a break-out session addressing?? Maybe bishop’s challenges/opportunities without a spouse? ☺ Clay runs a comfortable conference. You know what, where, when. It feels smooth and you don’t feel you have to now! Frank Wade was a gift. Each day he gave me a new picture/snapshot of God’s view.

Please indicate whether you are a new bishop or a spouse:

1. Spouse
2. New bishop
3. New bishop
4. New bishop
5. New bishop
6. Spouse
7. New bishop
8. New bishop
9. New bishop
10. Spouse
11. Spouse

12. New bishop
13. Spouse
14. Spouse

10. What are the three most important things that you are taking away from this conference?

1. New relationships; Hope & realization that things will change; It will be a challenge & a journey – enjoy it.
2. Collaborative relationships; New friendships; Greater role clarity.
3. Relationships; Support; Insights.
4. Time with peers; Time with spouse; Time management ideas.
5. Bonding with other Bishops in class; Growing into Holy Bishop; Much valuable information.
6. Friendships; Better understanding of the life of bishop/spouse; A need to remember the couple we are and make that a priority.
7. Relationships; Camaraderie; Clearer expectations.
8. I have support from my fellow bishops; I have a deeper understanding of my new role; I have a fulfilling future with friends along the way.
10. New relationships; Insights on what it is like to be a bishop's spouse – that I can be free to be myself.
11. Friendship; Calendaring; Self-care balance.
12. Relationships; Self-awareness; HOPE
13. The common issues we all share, in transition issues, learning time management for family, calendar, vacation, travel. We are all in a wonderful new place, exciting, fun and challenging.
14. Relationships that can be counted on; Insight from faculty on “how-to's” practical/warm/trusting – identification of land mines; A profile of a spouse wide enough to fit me, but with parameters for safety of both myself and my spouse (loose lips sink ships!)

11. What are the “next steps” that you will take as a result of participating in this conference?

1. Begin to balance family, work and health.
2. Review of my conference notes to determine a schedule for implementation.
3. Remember some practical tips in daily life as a bishop.
4. Revisit visitation plan; Work with executive secretary on clergy contact.
5. Meeting with Church Pension Group senior vice president on my finances; Working out financial details of contract with diocese; Practicalities of move and consecration.
6. First I need to get moved.
7. Start a class Facebook page; Use my peers as sounding boards; Make sure my wife is not a shadow.
8. Connect with my wife; Reflect on my schedule.
9. Work with spouse on our relationship.
11. Staying connected to class and others; Schedule more “fun” with spouse.
12. Begin to balance – health, spiritual like, family, job.
13. Action and reflection. We plan to work on our long range schedules. I feel right now that I just don't know what else I don't know.
14. Reflect and write; More focused specific spouse discussions now I have an expanded vocabulary! Schedule planning together.

12. Are there others whom you will tell about the conference? Whom and what will you tell?

1. For those who knew I was coming, I will share that it was a helpful learning experience where I made some very special new friends.
2. Members of my staff – about the ways in which the conference helped me to deepen my understanding of my new identity.
3. ?
4. Staff – positive feedback.
5. Will speak in detail with my wife who could not attend; Will tell leadership of my diocese; Will discuss with other clergy colleagues.
6. I am not sure on this question yet.
7. Not sure now.
8. I will report to my standing committee and staff about the conference. I will tell them about the community of Bishops.
10. Yes.
11. The personal growth, KOLB.
12. It's been a beneficial time both personally and professionally. Those in the diocese.

13. My family is also still processing all this new information about “their parents”. I also think the Kolb would be useful for our adult children and grandchildren.
14. Not sure. Will get in touch with Amy and Carmela.

13. As you reflect on your transition to a new ministry or role, what are your greatest hopes or dreams?

1. That we can find a balance and enrichment of our marriage and ministry and have fun along the way.
2. That in an enhanced way, my staff and I will be able to enhance the positive impact upon our chaplains and the people whom they serve through the continual development of professionalism in Federal ministry.
3. Being effective.
5. A fulfilling ministry; XXX the Spirit and helping diocese; Passing diocese on to my successor in good shape.
6. That at the end we will have left something special behind, A strong and vibrant group of people.
7. To bring a vision of God’s mission for my diocese.
8. That I will live fully into being a faithful and effective bishop and that I will help to lead my diocese to greater fulfillment of God’s mission. And that in doing this I will stay connected with my wife.
10. That we can make a difference to the people in our diocese and bring them together as a family in Christ.
11. To share Jesus with others; Listen; Begin to connect the diocese.
12. That my life is balanced (family, spiritual, job) and that I have control of that not the system.
13. To be able to travel and be a companion and helper to my spouse.
14. To get through it alive!

14. As you reflect on your transition to a new ministry or role, what are your greatest concerns or fears?

1. Scheduling – could be a real challenge.
2. Few if any.
3. Being effective.
5. Setting up new rhythm of life; Adjusting to commuting marriage; Protecting balanced life style.
6. Up to this my concerns have been about moving and just getting to our new home.
7. Personal concern about selling a home.
8. That I will not develop the skills that I will need in the future quickly enough.
11. Scheduling.
12. Loss of spontaneity.
13. Balance of time apart and away from family.
14. The how of our unique situation (as each is). That when we stumble, we can get up, that we don’t isolate ourselves and that God’s trust in us is not in vain!

15. What suggestions do you have to improve this conference for future participants?

1. The sessions to include some good sharing – with the schedule so tight, some were cut off in their sharing and some did not have the opportunity to share – esp. in our couple group on Wed p.m. – There was some confusion regarding time.
3. A little less in-between-meal-snacks!
4. More time for quiet and reflection. Felt a lot go, go, go...
5. One additional eucharist.
6. None at this time.
7. A bit less structure.
8. If psychological terms are used they should be fully explained. If Myers-Briggs typology is references, then the references should be correct. MB typology is not scale-based – a person is not more extroverted than another extrovert according to type theory. And extrovert is an extrovert and an introvert is an introvert. If a person scores a 30 on the extrovert core line, that person is not more extroverted than the person who scores a 2.
9. None come to mind.
11. Prayer partners class to class.
12. Things are run on a tight schedule and more flexibility would be helpful to accomplish tasks. The Kolb Learning was done quickly and not much time to reflect.
13. This was one of the best conferences I have attended. I felt that everyone was trying so hard to meet our needs. Great job!!
14. Bring or be provided with a night light – prevents the face racket for nighttime bathroom visits! To include the response of the call/election on both sides of the fence – B & BS; Post-it Notes for PB questions, write a question on post it and stick it to blank page – more private and easier to rearrange.

16. If you were to write a welcome note to participants of the 2012 New Bishops and Spouses' Conference, what would you say? (Responses will be shared at the 2012 conference and will remain anonymous.)

1. Please come and meet others who are sharing this time of transition. You will meet interesting, warm individuals with much to share. You are all on a journey and this is a surprising and fun beginning. P.S. ALL white gloves are forbidden!
2. Emphasis should be placed upon the fun people will experience as they build the class relationships.
3. Would need a few days to create a statement.
4. The competition is over. Now is a moment in time to appreciate the gifts within the gifts of others and especially the gift of the ones who know and love you most.
5. This conference proved to be the key event in my transition to new ministry.
6. Just breathe!
7. This will be one of the best parts of your transition. The relationships you begin this week will be important and life-giving to your ministry.
8. Enjoy it, relax and learn, open yourself up – you are in for a warm, good, supportive experience.
9. Be open to the process – the results are great!
11. Relax – there is no right or wrong. I hope you can look forward to what will be revealed to you.
12. Take the time to build relationships and reflect on and process what is being said and what you experience during the week.
13. I'm an introvert. Just "Hi and welcome to a wonderful new world. You will have great friends here waiting to get to know you."
14. As you step into the unknown grab a parachute from the NB&S's C. You may still be falling into the unknown but you'll see where you are going, do it with companionship, float and smile as you go – safety guaranteed!

17. Other comments:

1. Thank you for your hard work, encouraging words and a warm welcome.
8. You could show the movie on the screen instead of a tv. Play the dvd with computer and output it with the LCD projector, attach speakers to the computer. Also – thanks so much for the conference. I think that there is a missing piece - it feels like the conference just ends without something that ties it all together.
12. Thank you for your time and commitment in making our transition easier.
13. Thank you so much!
14. Thank you – Each of you also risked, as we did. In honesty there was anxiety, feeling vulnerable – but you brought us through and let us help each other.

**MARCH 2011
SHORT COURSE**



March 23-24 Title IV Short Course Agenda

Facilitated by
The Church Pension Fund and The Nathan Network

Day 1 - Wednesday, March 23

8:00 a.m.	Breakfast	<i>Dining Room</i>
9:00 a.m.	Welcome, introductions, covenant and housekeeping <i>Clay Matthews</i>	<i>Balthis Building</i>
9:15 a.m.	David and Bathsheba <i>Donna Marie Todd</i>	
10:15 a.m.	Break	
10:30 a.m.	Thinking broadly about Title IV <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some thoughts about jurisprudence <i>Sally Johnson</i>• “Ecclesiastical” discipline <i>Randall Warren</i>• Values underlying new Title IV <i>Steve Hutchinson</i>	
12:30 p.m.	Lunch	<i>Dining Room</i>
2:00 p.m.	“Law and Grace: Bishops Unit”: The Process	<i>Balthis Building</i>
3:30 p.m.	Break	
3:45 p.m.	Con’t	
5:30 p.m.	Break	
6:00 p.m.	Dinner	<i>Dining Room</i>
7:00 p.m.	Psychological issues, pornography and addiction <i>Dr. Melissa Perrin</i>	<i>Balthis Building</i>
9:00 p.m.	Compline/Adjourn	
9:00 p.m.	Reception	<i>Johnson Fireplace Lounge</i>

Day 2 - Thursday, March 24

8:00 a.m.	Breakfast	<i>Dining Room</i>
9:00 a.m.	Housekeeping etc. <i>Clay Matthews</i>	<i>Balthis Building</i>
9:15 a.m.	David and Bathsheba <i>Donna Marie Todd</i>	
10:15 a.m.	Break	
10:30 a.m.	Accords, Agreements for Discipline and Orders	
11:30 a.m.	Restoration	
12:30 p.m.	Lunch	<i>Dining Room</i>
2:00 p.m.	Discipline of Bishops <i>David Booth Beers and Clay Matthews</i>	<i>Balthis Building</i>
3:30 p.m.	Break	
3:45 p.m.	“Parking Lot” issues and Resources	
5:15 p.m.	Evaluation	
5:30 p.m.	Adjourn	
5:30 p.m.	Reception	<i>Johnson Fireplace Lounge</i>
6:00 p.m.	Dinner	<i>Dining Room</i>

March 23-24, 2011 College for Bishops Title IV Short Course
Facilitated by
The Church Pension Fund, The Nathan Network, Title IV Task Force #2 on Education

Evaluation Summary

Quantitative Results (1 = poor, 5 = excellent)

Structure of the presentation	4.0
Order in which information was presented	4.1
Resources provided	4.2
Information gained from the workshop	4.2
Overall	4.1

Qualitative Comments

1. Did the story telling of David and Bathsheba enhance or enrich the training for you or not? Please comment?

1. It was entertaining, but not particularly enriching.
2. A very helpful experiential way to consider the depths and multiple dimensions and perspectives to any story.
4. I found it helpful especially in giving me an experience of how a story differs depending on the perspective from which it is told.
5. It enhanced the training only a very slight amount. Not worth the time commitment.
6. Helped somewhat. Too long. The group discussion table added nothing.
7. Wonderfully presented; first day I lost the connection with Nathan's perspective (but I am a left brainer.)
8. Made me aware of significance of point of view.
9. Yes, one presentation would have been enough.
10. Yes – helped to illuminate most parts of one segment of the process – yet, it could have been better connected to the following parts of the presentation.
11. Yes, I enjoyed the story and appreciated the example of a story told from different points of view. I'm not sure that was worth the time it took. I did not enjoy or benefit from the breathing and semi-hypnotic imagining.
12. It offered new way of examining issues of authority and power.
13. Not at all. The story could've been told well in 15 minutes on the first morning and then 15 minutes of table discussion.
14. IT was entertaining but not very applicable.
15. Yes, somewhat, but it went too long and too many repetitions on the breath work.
16. No.
17. The story telling both enhanced and enriched the training. While I differed with a few details of Donna Marie's retelling, on the whole I greatly enjoyed the experience and her expertise.
18. Not really. Being left brain I find it very hard to bring myself into such an exercise. It might have fit better had the incident before the court been more related to the story.

19. I'm afraid not much. While it was interesting, different and moving, it would have been helpful to discuss the experience in light of the work we are doing. I can infer some connections but would have appreciated hearing the connections others made.
20. Yes, It enriched the experience though I honestly didn't expect it to. While I am definitely more analytical than visual, my ability to (??) the story was enhanced.
21. Yes, it was very helpful, spiritually enriching, relaxing, and a good centering in the Word.
22. It was helpful to see need to look at other perspectives and use all sensory means. A little lengthy.
23. No. It did not aid my knowledge or understanding of Title IV.
24. Yes, and I am not usually a touchy-feely kind of guy. The different point of view point was excellent.
25. A bit. I would have used less time on that to make the point of different stories and views.
26. Nice to get into right brain, good to have Biblical grounding.
27. It was helpful in hearing aspects of the story. However, it was much too long a (??).
28. No, it was too long. It did not look at the story, from the perspective of Nathan. It was repetitive from Day 1 to Day 2. Day 1 was ok, but still too long. Day 2 was not educational or experientially helpful. Morning prayer would have been better.
29. It was a nice (??) into the story even for one who is right brain challenged.
30. The story telling itself was excellent. The exercises and visioning was not particularly helpful. The different perspectives were helpful.
31. I did not find the story telling helpful or relevant to our subject matter.
32. No real help here.
33. And we could have not included this aspect – it took a lot of time and was interesting.
34. No, great story and pertinent. Tiresome presentation.
35. The physical warm-up/exercise was very helpful. Wednesday's story was a bit too emotive – but Thursday's was more muted and therefore more accessible. The table conversation was very good.
36. Yes, very much. Particularly second telling.
37. It could have been ½ the time. The story was too long. Also one day on that one story was enough.
38. Very much. Helped open up issues and bring them to mind. Good prep for listening to both complaints and respondents.
39. Yes – not easy to work with, but helpful regarding script and stories around Title IV.
40. Not at all! Perhaps I'm too much of a left brain person, but I can use my right brain in appropriate circumstances; this wasn't appropriate to this situation.
41. It did not. I very much appreciate story telling and even the power of what was offered. In this particular context, however, it felt like an intrusion on the agenda. FYI – we did not get a version of the story from Nathan's perspective, but that did not happen.
42. Not really. The intro's got in the way of the story.
43. Ambivalent. In some ways yes, good exploration of various dimensions of the story; good exegesis. In other ways, no – the theatrics often detracted from the story – seemed contrived rather than powerful at times. Overall: B-
44. Not.
45. Yes, value of hearing stories for multiple points of view.

46. It did nothing for me.
47. Not particularly.
48. I would rather have done morning prayer each day.
49. I understand the importance of placing ourselves as best we can in the context of Biblical story, HOWEVER, I think the story telling process we experienced here was overkill and distracting. I did not find it helpful. We got very little for the time and money spent.
50. Very helpful – certainly more engaging, but very helpful in accessing my own feelings, experiences, and judgments as I prepare to be a dispenser of discipline.
51. Yes, but only after the second presentation. Maybe some reflection on Bathsheba’s point of view would have helped.
52. No.
53. The story, yes – very effectively presented. The prep, no. Much too much time – consuming and “leading”. I particularly object to the shifting and heart cradling, exhaling, etc. – pure snake oil.
54. Dealing with the right brain – always good. Hard for most of us to take it serious when we have different ideas of the details of the story.
55. Enhances... exposure to something new to me, grounded the overall topic in the Bible in a way supportive of and reflective of solid use of the serepluries (?) to inform life.
56. No.
57. No, it did not enrich the training. I think the problem with the story telling was that it was too long. The story the first, with some reflection on approaching Title IV cases would have been sufficient. Valuable time was lost by not spending more time on the Title IV.
58. Absolutely not. Not only did this waste valuable time, I found it manipulative and patronizing. Bible study – serious Bible study of this passage could have been helpful, but being told to stand up and pat my heart is silly. The time could have been much better used.
59. It enhanced it. I especially felt that the Thursday morning presentation was very helpful.
60. I enjoyed the presentation and Ms. Todd is brilliant. I did not find it particularly helpful to this process.
61. Very engaging and positive way to present the scripture story. I enjoyed it and learned new insights. I feel this was a better way to use scripture than a more traditional group study.
62. No, I thought it was largely disconnected from the rest of the training and the points which were made were largely tangential.
63. I found it engaging but not helpful and a distraction – a waste of time.
64. Sadly, no. While I understand perhaps why it was included, it took a lot of time and felt tedious.
65. I liked it, but would have drastically cut the visioning exercises and given her 30 minutes each day. She’s very talented.
66. Great- but not helpful
67. Enrich- will remind me to help the reference panel prepare to hear the stories of L’s and R’s
68. Somewhat, but for me seemed more of a distraction from the work on Title IV than is expected.
69. Not sure how this was connected.
70. Not. The performance was a bit much for me. The insights re Bathsheba were excellent, but the visioning/reflection part was out of the norm for this kind of

event. We are Anglicans formed by the Daily Office in our spirituality; group Bible study would have been better IMO.

71. It enhanced the training, although it went on a bit long and the “centering” exercise was a bit long.
72. Yes! But...to much/long with exercising ourselves to “get into” the story: holding the heart, etc.
73. Overall, it did. The presenter was a bit “over the top” dramatically.
74. Maybe not; maybe only one telling. Though I did get some new story-telling ideas. I thought the Rape of Tamar at Hambith was stronger.
75. Yes. However I would have liked to see it dramatized.

2. Would you recommend the use of role playing for Title IV training to others? Why or why not?

1. In a limited way, perhaps. The problem is that it only addresses only one situation and one part of the process. The benefit is that it engages us in the dynamic and raises questions.
2. It was effective in this setting.
3. How do accords need to part of this?
4. A mixture of lecture and role play speaks to a variety of learning styles and is a good idea.
5. Yes, it was helpful!
6. OK, but ?? a clean discussion and use a flow chart.
7. It would be helpful to trace a complaint all the way through without so much “playing”.
8. Not by participants but by panel with Q&A. Bernard Barreli: “To get an idea across, wrap it in a person.” I found this presentation helpful in this way.
9. Yes, it was helpful to see the process walked through.
10. Yes, but be very careful. Vet the script – vet the script – vet the script.
11. Yes, it’s a good way to approach the learning, by applying. I wish we’d done several different cases, more briefly.
12. This is a helpful way in communicating the procedural structure. Many people tend to learn better through audio/visual method.
13. Yes, but some parts were overly structured while others like the conference panel went on way too long.
14. Yes, but too long.
15. Yes, helps others grasp the breadth of possibilities, the value of having different voices and points of view.
16. Yes, however I recommended using a simpler fact pattern and following through the process.
17. Yes, as long as sample cases are carefully chose (and ultimately appropriate!).
18. Yes, it helps to show how less complicated the process is than most want to make it.
19. Yes, the role play with the conference panel was very helpful. And the other role plays helped provide illustrations to make (??) of the charts.
20. Yes, I found it very helpful – especially for the conference panel, which was not so clear to me before.
21. Yes, but I think it needs to proceed with less comment and narrative and a chance to see the process unfold.
22. Yes. It gives a common experience to respond to. It also grounds discussion and presentation in a possible event.

23. Helps to see the process enacted.
24. If you have time, yes. Nice change of pace, puts real meat on bones of rules.
25. Yes, I would do an overview of the priests first so it is clear where in the process the role play fits.
26. Yes, very effective was to convey the feelings of Title IV. Will try to adapt for Prov. I.
27. Yes, however the case should be well selected.
28. Yes, it was an effective teaching tool.
29. Yes, but shorten it maybe to 25 minute video with partial not full segments.
30. Yes. Especially until we have experience with this Title IV, it is a quick way to get an introductory feel for the process.
31. The role playing could have been helpful... A simple misconduct scenario would have worked better; there were multiple GACs (?) in demonstrating the process.
32. Yes, to see how process acted out was a good learning tool.
33. Yes at tables in small groups with a limit to 5/10 minutes. The session was too long.
34. Yes, helps make concrete a process with many details.
35. Yes, it provided another way to present the material and respond to it.
36. Yes, helpful if plodding. Put real flesh on the bones.
37. Yes, it creates a visual – some time light between to deal with difficult and painful.
38. Yes, but be careful about use of time and scenes. I really needed more about transitions between the scenes.
39. Yes – conference panel role play was especially helpful in seeing what is important.
40. Yes, but please use sufficient players to show the most correct way to put Title IV to use.
41. Yes, I found that grounding the issue of Title IV in the role playing allowed other questions to come forth. It is also helpful to face serious content with some playfulness.
42. I liked the role-playing. Gives an idea of how process may be seen.
43. Yes, because of the visible representation of the process. The last session was too long.
44. Yes, but shorter.
45. Yes, good practice in seeing Title IV at work.
46. Sure, but needs to be done with fewer interruptions. It lost its flow.
47. Brief vignettes but nothing too long. IT is helpful to visualize the proceeding.
48. Yes, kept me from falling asleep. Could visualize the process.
49. The team did a nice job role playing and was informative, but I'm not sure if it is the most efficient way of presenting the information.
50. Yes – though a but stifled, it was like verbatim how CPE – helped me imagine words that I would use.
51. I thought the “big picture overview” could have been done in a different way. This, I'm not sure I could recommend role playing.
52. No.
53. Yes. More interesting, connects to real life.
54. Yes. Well done. Could have been tighter as a training event.
55. Yes, if you mean the use of the well-purposed actors. The actors' provided context, presented subtle aspects and brought the process to life. The acting and script were good enough to be engaging in and of themselves.

56. Yes it provided an accessible way to enter into the conversation and discuss the process.
57. Yes, but only in limited ways. I think too much time was lost by role playing the entire conference panel.
58. This was much better than I thought it could be. The fact that the actors were so well versed in their roles and canonized definitions really helped me to visualize the process as it might well play out in my diocese.
59. It was helpful, although I found the afternoon session went on too long, given the premise of the 'can.'
60. Yes, I think its helpful to role play the conference panel. I also think a quick role play of how a case works through the whole process might be helpful.
61. Yes, this was a helpful example.
62. The role playing, I thought, was somewhat helpful. However, I found the extensive "for instance" questioning which interrupted the role playing was disruptive and distracting. The role playing was aimed at providing an overview.
63. It was interesting, well done, but did not teach well and I would not repeat it.
64. Yes – while it was not always accurate, it prompted good conversation.
65. Yes- but it went 2 times as long as needed. It was helpful to see what a panel would look like.
66. Yes.
67. Absolutely. We were able to visualize a process.
68. Yes- it was very effective.
69. Yes, though I would add, corrections should immediately follow. As a new bishop, having seen an accurate role-play would have been helpful.
70. It was okay. We will not use role playing in our training because the participants got too hooked into the story and it takes too much time to play out.
71. Yes, but not as long as we experienced in the Conference Panel. That said the focus on the Conference Panel was appropriate as the new piece.
72. Yes; makes internalizing the process faster.
73. Yes- it helps to see the day run.
74. I thought the panel skit was helpful.
75. It is helpful to incarnate the work, not simply use words. The drama really drew folks in much better than lecture.

3. In what ways was the time spent the first day on the broad view of the Title IV (jurisprudence, ecclesiastical nature of the process and major values) useful or not useful?

1. It was effective in defining terms, issues, and contexts, and it brought up elements of the process that were worth pursuing as we went along.
2. Very – again, helping clarify that the Church is engaged in a different enterprise.
4. Very useful especially the values piece.
5. It was very helpful.
6. Useful.
7. Very helpful.
8. Useful but somewhat troubling. The value of holiness as repressed by sec. 1. (Preamble to Title IV) but it may move us in practice to a more law driven (even if grace/reconciliation preferred) outcome as narrative for TEC.
9. It was helpful.
10. Without that broad review, we would not have has a chance to grasp the intricacies of Title IV.
11. Useful to me to gain a better understanding of the terms in use.

12. It is important to lay out the principles and core values in any new (?). The thought process or informing is drafters is critical in authenticating the usefulness of the cause.
13. It helped me understand the foundational assumptions which then made the changes more intelligible.
14. Not clearly found.
15. Values – glad you emphasized history not so helpful (of 2 task forces) and too long.
16. It was helpful in explaining the paradigm shift from discipline to repentance, reconciliation and restoration.
17. Useful precisely in presenting a broad view.
18. Very helpful. It helps to frame what is and is not a “trial” or civil event.
19. I appreciated the emphasis on discernment and pastoral considerations as well as the discussion of the theology and values at the hearty Title IV. This said, I thought the time spent on both was too much.
20. It was helpful to me in terms of how I could talk about Title IV to other clergy – I was already convinced the new Title IV was a good idea.
21. It was helpful to clarify what’s in the canon and how it could be implemented.
22. It was very helpful to see the canons as different from legal civil law.
23. It is very helpful to see the big picture, broad scope, before looking at details.
24. I liked the presentation of the points of basic difference in philosophy, but went on too long. Need to get into process quicker.
25. The ecclesiastical nature was very helpful – all was useful.
26. Good to have theological grounding, clear, well presented, thorough, well-timed and enough time for questions. It will help with development and training of folks back home. The handout will be helpful in training.
27. Very useful, clear and helpful.
28. Useful for some basic grounding.
29. I think emphasizing Canon I of Title IV is necessary.
30. Probably for those who had never heard this it was very helpful. It was appropriate for this event.
31. It would have been helpful to begin with correlation of what was the same and similar to previous canons and more into (?) – some comment about terminology up front would have been helpful.
32. Helpful to clarify language issues.
33. Useful for the background. Looking at one (??) points of are implementation would have been helpful.
34. Getting a view from a (??) (??) with some very basic notions concerned is helpful.
35. Sally and Steve were very clear and informative.
36. Randall Warren presentation’s most helpful. All useful.
37. I was on board – so I was bored.
38. Provides a context.
39. Good reminders and overview.
40. Very useful; cause excellent conversation between bishop and canon.
41. Very helpful. The main reason for the anxieties around Title IV in my own diocese has to do with people assuming a criminal type process. Naming that was very helpful and gave me a good way of responding.
42. As one not knowing a great deal about law, I found this most helpful.
43. Very useful in reminding us of the threadlike and balanced of fairness, justice, and creating a safe church.
44. Very useful.

45. Mode clear the bases for how change in the Title.
47. Very helpful in focusing on the specifics the operating system.
48. I liked the juris prudence sheet.
50. Very important to set the tone – claim the intention of new IV. In the name of the Canon 1 values, we proceed.
51. Very useful.
52. Useful somewhat.
53. For me, not very, since that has been covered in our local diocese.
54. Very helpful.
55. The most significant awareness was the lack of some commonly expected the process protections and the reason for this. Also, most of this requires a different mindset and this time helped make the shift. 5
56. The context and values, particularly how it parallels and differs with legal process.
57. Useful. Again, analyzing the areas, would have allowed more time for discussion.
58. This could have been tightened up a bit, and then touched on as the role play/section by section explanation played out over the conference.
59. For what feels like a broad subject, I thought the presentation was good. My anxiety level about the topic is still pretty high, but I am reassured by the anxiety of others.
60. I loved Randall’s stuff about this being a Diocesan process, the history of getting here was too long.
61. It is useful to have the broad – theological and philosophical view – as well as the introduction to law, i.e., the consequences chart.
62. Yes, by and large. The use of pinpointed highlights – with PowerPoint and handouts – is very helpful. The notebook is a very good resource. The highly specific questioning – about unique circumstances – was not helpful.
63. That was somewhat helpful, but could have been brief and still got the point across.
65. Not useful!!! (Sorry)
66. Yes.
67. Good to hear the pastoral goals of the process. We got right and left brain materials- story and law.
68. Overview of ecclesiastical vs. jurisprudence was helpful. History of Title IV not helpful, even though Hugh did an excellent job.
69. Useful for general info.
70. Hmm. I’m not sure.
71. Yes, especially the focus on values.
72. It would have been helpful to have Q & A expanses.
73. It helped frame the more detailed aspect.
74. Helpful to get us started and started getting used to new jargon.
75. Drew us into the “Resjudica”.

4. Would you recommend that this broad view be included in the Title IV training?

1. Yes.
2. Yes!
4. Yes.
5. Yes.
6. Yes.
7. Yes.

8. It is necessary if it is the preservation, even if somewhat problematic.
9. Yes.
10. Yes –it was tedious, but necessary.
11. Yes.
12. Any strategy that proves helpful as the one we have examined also proves beneficial.
13. Yes.
14. With no modifications.
16. Yes.
17. Yes, and add a brief summary (bullet points) of major changes.
18. Yes.
19. Yes, but more briefly.
20. I think it depends on the audience. I think clergy in my diocese merely want to know what will happen to them if they do get in trouble, I do think that many clergy think that losing priesthood is different or more serious than losing a medical license in terms of their identity so more work might need to be done in that small consequence part.
21. Yes, with some editing.
22. Yes, it seems (??) to understanding this canon.
23. Yes.
24. Yes, but 20 minutes at most.
25. Yes.
26. Yes.
27. Yes.
28. In a shortened form, yes.
29. Yes.
30. Yes. Context is crucial. The point was well and rightly made that this is not merely a technical or mechanical process, but one of faithful discernment.
31. Yes, with comment above.
32. Yes, but simplified.
33. Yes.
35. Yes.
36. Yes.
37. Yes, but more simply.
38. Yes, but perhaps more summarized.
39. Yes.
40. Yes; definitely.
41. Yes, the context is most helpful.
42. Yes – a great overview.
43. Yes!
44. Yes.
45. Yes.
47. Yes.
50. Yes.
51. Definitely.
52. Yes.
53. Perhaps info could be sent out in advance?
54. Yes.
55. Yes, I thought it especially important to remind people when questions/objectives were addressing long accepted practices.
56. Yes.

- 57. Yes, very limited.
- 58. See #3, but yes.
- 59. Yes.
- 60. Yes, but limit the history bit.
- 61. Yes.
- 62. Yes – conveying the essence, rather than nuanced specifics is all that could be reasonably expected or undertaken in a short course.
- 64. Yes.
- 65. NO!
- 66. Yes
- 67. Depends. The closer to implementation the more folks will need specific help to set up the structure and be washed of pitfalls.
- 68. The ecclesiastical vs. jurisprudence – yes. History of Title IV – No.
- 69. Yes, though perhaps be more concise than a full day.
- 71. Yes
- 72. Yes
- 73. Yes
- 74. Yes
- 75. Yes

5. What were you hoping from the training that you did not get?

- 2. Nothing!
- 4. More time to work with the actual Title IV document.
- 5. See below.
- 6. All OK.
- 7. No expectations that weren't met – conference raised expectations of diocese.
- 10. Not sure.
- 11. Clarity! Part of my learning is that so much of this has to be case by case, which necessarily means that clarity is limited.
- 12. Any information and guidelines was welcomed/appreciated.
- 13. More time with Dr. Perrin.
- 15. Greater case exposure – review or case studies or case presentations which would also do the work of some of the role plays.
- 16. A walk through the entire process from intake to the time to appeal.
- 20. Maybe some smaller forums (maybe divide up the experts present) so that very specific questions could be asked without taking whole group time.
- 21. More depth on cutting edge research on the pathologies associated with misconduct and betrayal of pastoral trust.
- 22. It is only beginning of education and understanding I understand this time.
- 23. Nothing.
- 24. The forms would be really helpful. Individual role summaries also would be helpful like to intake person guide.
- 25. Scope of Title IV – what behaviors in and what get discussed.
- 26. Role of communications person, secular press, etc. not canonical but practical. Responsibilities to reconcile pastoral care once clergyperson is deposed and a pariah. May a Bp report to intake officers or must s/he.
- 27. Possibly more Q&A would be helpful.
- 29. Greaten clarity.
- 31. A clear understanding of process.

32. Came with little expectations. Training helped – both with knowledge and confidence.
33. Various ways to implement are Title IV – several cons/patterns (3 at least) and how to share with other dioceses.
36. Detail on hearing process.
37. I got what I expected – an introduction and overview.
38. Can't think of anything at this print.
39. This was very helpful – always more questions.
41. I got what I hoped for.
42. Nothing.
43. What I didn't get, only I can do anything about.
45. God more than I expected.
47. No expectations other than gaining more knowledge.
50. Suggestions how to education/train back in diocese.
51. A little more linear design would have been more useful to me.
52. More time for questions and just Title IV material.
53. More detail on the hearing process and mediation. The psychological lecture was extremely helpful. More would be better.
54. More examples could be good.
55. Exceeded expectations. Really wasn't sure what to expect.
56. More time discussing the process as outlined – I felt I renewed a good portion – just wanted more.
58. More examples, or mini-role play would have been helpful. More info about the Hearing Panel could also be helpful.
59. Nothing.
60. This training was only an introduction. I have carefully read the Title many times and would have preferred deeper conversations about, for example, models for conference panel proceedings. I realize, however, that most of the people needed this introduction.
62. Really, nothing. This was very helpful.
63. More slugging through details.
64. Better training documents.
65. A PowerPoint overview flow chart to use to train other groups.
66. More hand on in depth conversation- suggesting, "it's complex" or "read it, read it, read it" – not helpful
67. Not sure. I'm the intake officer and what I received was helpful
68. I wasn't sure what to expect, so did not have other expectations.
69. See #2 above. Accurate or canonically correct role playing was examples of this new title.
70. A walk through the process and into play with Hearing Panel.
73. Better sense of the materials that should influence the Intake Officer (and the Bishop) to go forward to Reference Panel.
74. Nothing that I can think of.
75. Don't know.

6. Please share anything else you think would be helpful to those planning Title IV training whether for bishops, dioceses, Disciplinary Boards, clergy, etc.

2. There were lots of questions around conciliation versus mediation – who gets what information?
4. 1.) Very helpful to have our Chancellor present perhaps a joint gathering with chancellors. (2.) Gather again after having actually done a Title IV proceeding.

5. It might be helpful to have the group draw out the flow chart as the conference proceeds. This might enhance their direct learning.
6. Perhaps a brief introductory video on this.
7. As we become more familiar – the process and what is needed will become apparent.
8. Training conference needed for key players (eg. President of Hearing Panel of Conference Panel need some very subtle abilities within the Title IV context.) Or, for “Mediators”, if creative thinking is a desired possibility for those on the panels to achieve this needs technically creative leadership.
13. Deacons are ticking time bombs.
15. Another flow chart that is simple – see Western N.C. Diocese). Across Diocese sharing – or interest groups like choosing your board, how pastoral side works, etc.
18. The “Training Materials for Advisors” looks very helpful and similar documents for the Conference Board Panel and Hearing Panel would be helpful.
19. A glossary of terms in long usage beyond the canons. Attention paid to distinguishing some terms or panels from others which seem quite similar.
21. I think some streamlining the presentation and reducing the process to more accessible increments would be helpful.
24. Good handouts, but need the role summaries.
26. The role play was excellent, as was the spaciousness of time, did not feel rushed.
27. Clearer charting, step by step guide, and everyone should be (??) to (??) the new canon before attending.
29. A video of the role play would be helpful with a tight script. Playing all roles. Best practicers or College for Bishops website.
30. I am very concerned about providing the education and training across the church. It was noted several times how critical their education and training will be for the successful implementation of this Title IV.
31. There seem to be a great deal of confusion in the presentation – more definitive would be helpful. Repeated references were made to read the book with the cost of the seminar , maybe a book should be given to every participant.
33. More attention to the actual Title IV – “What it says!” and host practice for its unfolding.
35. To (??) this is a Biblical approach. Mediating and arbitration as opposed to judicial.
36. Distinction between criminal and civil ecclesiastical crucial.
38. Dr. Perrin offered a helpful perspective.
39. Have people in regions sit together at same table to share conversations and build relationships.
40. Use a role play that uses a more real situation like sexual misconduct or money issues (i.e. theft).
41. Drop the story telling piece and give double time to the psychological presentation which was excellent. It was too rushed, however, and needed more time.
42. Go back to formal breaks.
43. Make sure the microphones work!
44. “Parking lot questions” really helped move things along.
50. What if there were a sheet listing the major changes with citations – talking points for bishops/chancellors to take home for diocesan trainings.

51. Suggested order: 1. Background to Title IV – history. 2. Broadview of process. 3. Specific “hot points” discussion, then, 4. Role play (after linear process has been discussed fully.)
52. The first day was awfully long! I’d like to spread it out a bit and insert breaks.
54. Parking lot a good idea. Good to have a lot of voices presenting.
56. Dr. Perrins information is an important piece. She also was an excellent presenter.
57. Limit role playing, spend more time dialogue, excuse (?) the time for Dr. Melissa or whoever – to discuss behavioral issues, personality disorders, etc.
58. This was a very good conference – but I cannot stress enough how off-putting the storytelling of David and Bathsheba was. I might not come to another event if I know that will be a part of it.
60. Please make materials available electronically. I’d rather not have these notebooks. This is less about saving paper (although that matters), its more about having access to the materials as I travel.
62. I would very much like to see a Title IV listserv for all the folks involved in this work. The Chancellors’ listserv stays with the Chancellors. The Bishops’ listserv generally does not get beyond the Bishops’ stack of messages. That leaves those of us who do the retail work on Title IV out of important discussions.
65. The section on discipline of BP’s was not relevant to the canons and should have been done Friday. (“Let my people go.”) / I was concerned at the misinformation that was given out, then retracted, etc.
66. First night- “Dr. Melissa” – while interesting, not helpful
68. If more time could have been given to Dr. Perrin, it would have been very helpful.
69. Presenters might remember that some new bishops and others not familiar with expiring Title IV are not conversant in terms, processes, etc. Some “short-hand” terms were used frequently.
70. Don’t do an evening session. I had tired head.
71. Time spent on Conference Panel was good. 12 hours; 9-9 pm on 1st day was long. Psychological presentation was too rushed.
72. Another 10 minute break in afternoon: There is a lot of information to digest.
73. We are all on a magical mystery tour together, and we will learn the answer to this question together.

Position in your diocese:

1. Bishop
2. Bishop
3. Canon to the Ordinary
4. Bishop, Diocesan
6. Diocesan Bishop
7. Canon to the Ordinary
8. Bishop
9. Diocesan Bishop
10. Bishop
15. PRT Chair
16. Chancellor
17. Intake Officer
18. Intake
19. Canon to the Ordinary
20. Canon for Ministry/Intake Officer

21. Intake Officer
22. Canon to the Ordinary
24. Chancellor
25. Bishop's staff
26. C20
27. Bishop
28. Diocesan Bishop
29. Bishop
30. Bishop
31. Bishop
32. Bishop
33. Bishop
34. Bishop
35. Bishop
36. Bishop
37. Bishop
38. Bishop
39. Bishop
40. Bishop
41. Bishop
42. Bishop Diocesan
43. Bishop
44. Bishop
45. Bishop
46. Bishop
47. Bishop
48. Canon to Ordinary
49. Bishop
50. Idaho
51. Bishop
52. Assistant Bishop
53. Canon
54. Bishop
55. CFO
56. Canon to the Ordinary
57. CTO
58. Canon to the Ordinary
59. Canon to the Ordinary
60. Canon to the Ordinary
61. Canon to Ordinary
62. Canon to the Ordinary
63. Canon
64. Canon
65. Canon 2 Ord.
66. Bishop
67. Intake O.
68. Bishop
69. Bishop Diocesan
70. Canon to the Ordinary
71. Bishop
72. Bishop

- 73. Bishop
- 74. Bishop
- 75. Bishop

See spreadsheet for quantitative portion.

The most useful part of this workshop was:

1. Having bishops and intake officers and diocesan staff members involved together. Thursday afternoon discussion was very helpful – as the last part if any such course should be.
2. 1) Having many very knowledgeable presenters to help explain (2) The notebook! Great! (3) Repeated reference to the underlying values.
3. Role play followed by Q&A.
5. Psychologist, role play Grace and Law, question and answer session.
6. The march 24 sessions.
7. Sally's Juris prudence and Randell's pastor of comments, Steve's comments along the way.
8. Reminder that now we will hear your story. Better than now we'll hear the other side of the story. That is, honor each story before deciding outcomes.
9. Dr. Perrin's presentation.
10. (??) – great “actors” and very relevant and appropriate content.
11. Role playing the process through a complaint.
12. All aspects.
13. Dr. Perrin
15. Dr. Melissa and Randall's discernment frame.
16. Conference Panel Presentation
18. Discussions and role play.
19. The role play and the Q&A exchanges throughout the 2 days.
21. A chance to get into the details of the process and see it more holistically and increasingly.
22. All very useful.
23. Overview of process and looking at some details of Title IV.
24. Materials.
25. Role play's Q&A session.
26. Conversational nature, variety of pedagogies
27. Presentations.
28. The different panel for the different clusters needed for an implementation of Title IV.
29. The role playing session being able to visualize.
31. Q&A it is the only place we really got specific.
32. Role play demonstration.
34. The role playing.
35. Dr. Perrin's presentation and Sally Johnson's presentation.
36. Dramatic presentation.
37. The psychologist was superb! The law and grace unit – good. Accords, arguments and enders – good. Restorations – ok. David and Bathsheba – Ok.
38. Flow charts with discussion.
39. Conference panel role play and interactive Q&A.
40. Conference panel – but clean up the accuracy of the role playing and characters present.

41. Actual delving into the Canon and Q&A.
42. Guidelines and summaries. Charts in notebook.
44. Leadership of Clay, Sally, David; clinical psychologist presentation.
45. Panel discussion.
47. Step by step approach.
48. Role playing, and the flow charts
49. The opportunity to discuss and ask questions about Title IV.
50. "Thinking broadly..." helped me build a context upon which to receive the technical information.
51. Understanding roles of reference, conference and hearing panels.
52. Thursday afternoon.
53. Step by step exploration of the process.
54. Day 2 morning – good detail. Also, parking lot.
56. Handbook, Dr. Perrin, and discussion on orders/records, pastoral direction and restricted ministry.
57. The portions of discussion in between the various scenes. And Dr. Melissa – needed more time!
58. The Q&A between the participants and the wide variety of experts.
59. Wednesday evening's presentation was excellent, and very helpful.
60. Dr. Perrin's presentation gave me the most new and helpful information. She was excellent.
61. Panel and Q&A.
62. Overall information offered, written and oral. Dr. Perrin's presentation.
63. Thursday evening talk.
64. Role play and conversations.
65. The Facts about Title IV
66. Q & A, Parking Lot, Overview
67. Role playing, Q & A, Psychologist
68. Role play of process was helpful
69. Wed. night clinical presentation, expert panels, Q & A, parking lot questions (very helpful), role-playing to some extent.
71. Conference Panel
73. The workbook itself, and the presentation on pedophilia, pornography, etc.
74. Going thru canon by canon; with lots of Q & A. I thought the team was well prepared and worked hard.
75. Parking Lot.

The least helpful part of this workshop was:

1. David and Bathsheba.
4. All useful.
5. Bible storytelling.
6. The March 23 evening session – tone not serious enough for a serious topic.
7. Not able to say what wasn't helpful.
8. Though very good, probably the story telling yet it did forward the process of reflection obligatory.
10. This may sound peculiar but the "David and Bathsheba" breathing exercises – Because of a particular physiological condition I have found this very distracting.
11. Visualizing a single grain of sand and being asked to pretend to remember a smell in ancient Jerusalem.
13. The story teller.
15. History of task forces.

16. Storytelling.
18. David and Bathsheba
19. The evening workshop with the psychologist – it was entertaining but lacked focus and organization. Also, its emphasis on diagnosing individuals was to me unhelpful if not dangerous. It would have been more helpful to talk about our internal restrictions, briefly, and then the implications for working through Title IV with each of these types.
20. The presentation on complaints against bishops was interesting to me personally, but less relevant, I thought, to the non-bishop/intake officers present.
21. I thought the presentation of psychology and character disorders was poorly organized and tried to cover too much ground.
23. The storytelling.
24. Bishop discipline. That could be done at HOB meeting.
25. Psychologist.
27. Storytelling/the length of sessions.
28. Storytelling.
29. Session on Thursday morning led by Bob Fitzpatrick.
31. Storytelling.
32. Storytelling and exercise.
34. Bathsheba.
35. Wednesday morning's David and Bathsheba presentation, but Thursday was very good.
36. Psychologist – too much, too late in the day.
38. Conversation between David and Sally on the 2nd day.
40. David & Bathsheba and discipline of Bishops.
41. The story telling.
42. Storytelling.
44. "David and Bathsheba"
47. Visualization exercises.
48. David and Bathsheba.
49. David and Bathsheba.
50. None for me – well, parking lot was almost more confusing, but is necessary here to highlight problem areas.
51. Role play, except the conference panel part.
52. As usual, Sally talked too much. Her bias' are very evident.
53. Overdose on storytelling prep.
54. The storytelling – keep working on finding a way to reach right brain stuff.
55. The EYE announcement that is to say it was all pretty helpful.
56. Storytelling.
57. Story telling on day 2 and role playing the entire conference panel.
58. The storytelling. Not just useless, but irritating.
59. The length of Tuesday afternoon's drama. Some of that time could have been usefully spent exploring parking lot issues.
62. David and Bathsheba.
63. Storytelling.
64. Storytelling.
65. The design seemed...mysterious.
66. Dr. Melissa. Story Teller.
68. Story Telling
69. Story-telling to start each day, the role playing that was not accurate in certain details.

70. Storytelling
71. Section on Bishops because it focused on current practice more than future.
72. Hugging/cuddling heart too many times
73. The disorganization of that presentation.

Please check any you are interested in: Make this script available for use with my own diocesan cast. Sponsor or participate in a regional or Provincial presentation of this program.

2. Sponsor or participate. I think we're participating in Province IV training.
4. Make script available and sponsor or participate. Joan Anthony 1551 10th Avenue E, Seattle, WA 98102. (206)325-4200 ext. 2040 janthony@ecww.org
7. Sponsor or participate. cdavis@episwtn.org.
11. Make this script available.
13. Sponsor or participate. Scott Benhase (you know how to find me).
16. Sponsor or participate. Bill Cathcart. bcathcart@cathcartdooley.com
20. Both, make this script available and sponsor or participate. Alicia Schuster Weltner, aschusterweltner@episcopalatlanta.org
22. Sponsor or participate. askew@etdiocese.net
24. Both; make this script available and sponsor or participate.
25. Make this script available; rurban@ctdiocese.org
26. Both; make script available and sponsor or participate. Mally Lloyd; mallyl@dimasj@org.
27. Sponsor or participate; Lprovenzann@dioceseli.org
29. Both; sponsor and make script available; Steven A. Miller, 804 E. Juneau Ave. Milwaukee, WI 53202
33. Sponsor or participate; bishopduncan@diocgo.org
34. Both – make this script available and sponsor or participate. WayneSmith, bishop@diocesemo.org. (314)231-1220 1210 Locust St, St. Louis, MO 63103
35. Make this script available.
36. Sponsor or participate; slane@episcopalmaine.org
41. Both; Skip Adams, Central NY; bishop@cny.anglican.org
42. Both; email bishop.wks@sbcglobal.net
43. Both; bishopusaldo@edusc.org
45. Sponsor or participate. cfbmt@qwestoffice.net
46. Make script available.
47. Both.
50. Sponsor or participate. Brian Thom; bthom@idahodiocese.org; 208-345-4440
52. Make script available.
56. Sponsor or participate. Alan James; ajames@dohio.org; 216-774-0449
59. Both; pfaft@diomil.org
60. Both; mhunn@eisdionc.org

Other comments or suggestions?

1. Many thanks.
6. Excellent overall.
8. Thanks for keeping time frame on target. Also, I thought the psychological presentation was energizing and in many ways brilliant, but it felt a bit shotgun in its approach.

9. Title IV is heavy on law; low on grace evident by the number of lawyers on the closing group addressing parking lot issues. I heard very little hop in reference to human brokenness. A lot of negative feeling (energy).
11. Thank you very much for doing this – good job!
18. Make this script available.
19. The visual/large screen was not helpful. I had a difficult time figuring out where the fit in with the oral presentations.
20. The psychological presentation on (Dr. Perrin) was the best presentation on that material I have heard. I hesitate to use the word entertaining because of the subject matter, but it was very engaging.
21. Frustrating that so much time was spent by leaders figuring out what the canon says/provides during the sessions. If you are confused, we really are!!
25. Thanks so much.
27. This was a terrific short course. Well managed, and useful. Thank you.
29. More time with the psychologist. Time for the daily office.
31. Resources, i.e. lots of forms were incomplete, as I understand it when they become available only chancellors will have access. There are a multitude of marginals on the Chancellor's Work (?) that would be helpful to Bishops however we have access.
40. More time for the psychological presentation.
44. Thank you!
45. Diet Coke.
50. Really, one of the best training I've been to in the House of Bishop.
51. Thanks for the extraordinary effort required to pull this off.
53. I very much appreciate the hard work of planning and the considerable expertise represented here. Thanks! It was great being at Kanuga.
58. Make PDFs of the material in the notebook available before (or at least during or after) the conference.
59. Thank you for the chance to participate in a well-run and useful meeting.
62. As noted above, Dr. Perrin's presentation was excellent. I could benefit from a full conference with her.
70. The cabins were substandard, right out of the 1940's. My knees hit the wall in the bathroom.
73. Keep on keepin'on!
74. I wrote the above before the open parking lot panel. The longer the panel went on and the more the members of the panel disagreed among themselves, the more unsettled I felt.

MARCH 2011
PEER COACHING EVALUATION
(PCE)

March 2011 Peer Coaching Evaluation - New Bishops' Qualitative Responses (13 total responses)

20. How long have you been engaged in this peer-coaching relationship?

Less than 1 year	3
1 year	6
2 years	1
3 years	3

21. How often do you have coaching sessions with your coach?

Once/month	5
Once/2 months	4
Several times/year	3
Other	1

Comment: Other – or as needed
Other – as needed

22. What is the average length of the coaching sessions with your coach?

15 minutes	1
30 minutes	
45 minutes	4
60 minutes	4
Other	4

Comment: Other – as needed

23. How often do you communicate with your coach outside of the coaching sessions?

Once a month	3
Every few months	4
Once a year	1
Other	5

Comments: Other – Occasionally
Other – We have decided to meet in person once each year outside of HOB meeting.
Other – Once in a while I would email him.
Other – Not necessary so far.
Other – as needed

24. If you could describe three things that you have gained through your relationship with your peer coach, what might they be?

1. Friendship; connections to the system; better understanding of the House of Bishops.
2. How to develop my understanding of my vocation to the episcopate; how to establish a relationship of accountability with Diocesan Clergy; how to examine the question behind the issue.
3. Perspective; encouragement; confidence.

5. Trust my instincts; procedural info around dealing with conflict in parishes; helpful suggestions around parish visitations; ways to enhance my relationship with parishioners.
6. Affirmation; intentionally seeing God in the issue at hand; prayerfulness and wisdom.
7. Ministry support resources; someone deeply grounded to turn to with questions or concerns; a sense that I am not in this alone, also a sense of accountability.
8. A collegial relationship of mutual respect and learning; someone whose focus is on me – who is in an entirely new context; depth, breadth, perspective.
10. Collegiality and friendship; a perspective from outside the system; someone I can call who supports me.
11. Insights re: terminal parishes and transition; confidence around difficult decisions; use of internet as evangelistic tool.
12. A place to ask questions safely; a place to hear new perspectives; a person willing to challenge me.

25. Discuss any goals that you have for yourself in the peer coaching program.

1. None
2. To be prepared for the Skype session with issues, topics, questions, areas of concern etc.; to review the session plan and the follow through; to note anything which needs further exploration in the light of follow through.
3. Each month I come away from our telephone meeting with new goals and “homework” to accomplish prior to the next monthly conversation.
5. Read more; learn about strategic planning process in a diocesan setting.
6. To grow into a leader who inspires vision and action; to become more prayerful in my discernment of solutions; to let go of negative energies.
8. Bishop Mark and I have a relationship that has history, and is mutually respectful. This, in itself, is supportive and nourishing. Mark is an incredibly caring person who is a gift to me and to the House of Bishops. My goal is to continue in close touch our ongoing conversation re: what we can contribute in the Church.
10. Would like to check in more regularly.
11. To grow in my understanding of unique nature of Episcopal ministry.
12. To continue to be present to the work; to find the time to deepen the relationship with visits; to use the coach as an aid to developing my skills.

26. What has been the most challenging aspect of the peer coaching?

1. Finding Time
2. To realize how my personal preferences are frequently not what my calling as a Bishop requires; to be diligent in follow through and maximize the learning.
3. As we began, I did not have a good or clear idea of what our relationship was supposed to be, over time this has self-solved, and we have evolved into a good working diad.
5. Find the time/scheduling our conversations.
6. None.
8. Only the usual: time and scheduling!
10. Scheduling.
11. Talking on phone – perhaps Skype or Oovo might be worth a look.
12. The scheduling of time to talk and to meet.
13. Time to connect.

27. What suggestions, if any, do you have for improving the peer coaching program?

1. More structure; clearer expectations; more coach training for coaches.
2. I feel I have been very fortunate in having Porter as my peer coach; I hope there are many more like him on the programme!
3. Perhaps more of an observation than a suggestion – I recognize that chemistry plays a central role in this coaching relationship. For some, it works and for others it does not work. In our case, Jim and I have been an excellent fit. I always look forward to our conversations because I know that the faculty of my ministry will be positively affected.

5. None – by in large it is a very well run program.
6. Some intentional resource sharing-like templates for unusual circumstances like Godly admonitions would be helpful.
7. **OTHER** (not related to question 27) – I have used Gordon as a spiritual director as well as coach during this time of transition.
8. Let the new Bishops have a “say” in who their coach is!
10. Working great.
11. I am extremely satisfied.

Peer Coaching Evaluation - Quantitative Summary
March 2011 New Bishops

Scores are based on a scale of 1-7. 1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number Responding</u>	<u>Section Average</u>
1. I believe the peer coaching program is very effective.	6.08	1.32	13	
2. I am very satisfied with the peer coaching program.	6.15	1.34	13	
3. The peer coaching program is well designed and administered.	5.92	1.32	13	
4. The peer coaching has helped me clarify my goals and follow through on important things.	6.08	1.32	13	
5. The relationship between my peer coach and me is very effective.	6.38	0.96	13	
6. I am very satisfied with the relationship my peer coach and I are developing.	6.38	1.39	13	
7. I utilize my peer coach effectively.	5.77	1.09	13	
8. Both my peer coach and I benefit from the peer-coach relationship.	6.08	1.16	12	
9. I learn a lot from the peer coaching relationship.	6.08	1.26	13	
10. My peer coach helps me develop a new perspective on things.	6.00	1.22	13	
11. My peer coach and I are "co-learners" in our relationship.	6.17	1.11	12	
12. My peer coach is someone with whom I am satisfied.	6.54	0.97	13	
13. My peer coach has been effective in his/her role.	6.38	0.96	13	
14. My peer coach meets my needs.	6.46	0.97	13	
15. My peer coach is committed to developing an effective and productive coaching relationship.	6.75	0.45	12	
16. I feel that my peer coach has enough time to devote to our coaching relationship.	6.23	1.17	13	
17. My peer coach makes the development of our relationship a priority.	6.33	0.98	12	
18. My relationship with my peer coach has had a positive effect on who I am at work.	6.31	0.95	13	
19. I look forward to the coaching sessions with my coach.	6.75	0.45	12	

March 2011 Peer Coaching Evaluation - Coaches' Qualitative Responses (15 total responses)

17. How long have you been engaged in this peer-coaching relationship?

Less than 1 year	4
1 year	6
2 years	2
3 years	3

18. How often do you have coaching sessions with your new bishop?

Once/month	11
Once/2 months	3
Several times/year	1
Other	

Comments: By phone; visited Halifax once; he has not been able to come to Boston.

19. What is the average length of the coaching sessions with your new bishop?

15 minutes	
30 minutes	3
45 minutes	4
60 minutes	8
Other	

Comments:

20. How often do you communicate with your new bishop (e.g., by phone, email, etc.)?

Once a month	14
Every few months	1
Once a year	
Other	

Comments: (marked once a month – wrote in “ – 2 months”)

21. If you could describe three things that you have gained through your relationship with your new bishop, what might they be?

1. Broader insight into how other bishop suffragans do ministry; deep appreciation of his spirituality; how he meets challenges I don't have to deal with, especially with new bishops.
2. Deepened appreciation of the challenges a new bishop faces when relocating to a new diocese; enhancement of my own skills of observation, reflection, analysis; reinforcement of the collegial nature of episcopate.
3. Perspective on the challenges of my own work; empathy regarding another's work; mutual support.
4. Friendships; affirmation of my experience and perspective; knowledge of a very different system in Canada.
6. Different ways of thinking/doing.
7. New insights into the role of bishop in church and beyond; friendship; ability to test new situations as seen through the eyes of another bishop.

8. I am learning that it takes time for some folks to come into their own as bishops – this is something very beautiful and grace filled as folks bring their true selves into this vocation and the two are “married.”
9. We have been slow to start this work because of vacations and then HOB. So far Jim gained knowledge of new bishop.
10. I am finding my conversations with this new bishop a gift to me – low lying theological fruit.
11. Insight into a different diocese and culture; greater sensitivity to dynamics of a bishop from a different race and nationality; increasing appreciation of his courage, insight, spirituality, and creative leadership.
12. Insight into dynamics of Native American and Reservation culture; greater sensitivity to needs and challenges of a poor and large diocese; increasing appreciation of his wisdom in the midst of challenges.
13. Bishop Suffragan and Bishop Diocesan relationship insight; clergy pastoral care and leadership insights; fresh look at Episcopacy from another Province.
14. Awareness of complexity of Anglican Communion.
15. Appreciation for the wideness of church and complexity of this office; insight into my challenges; friendship.

22. What have been the most rewarding parts of being a peer coach for your new bishop?

1. Deepening friendships; continuing to learn how God can use us and work with us even though we come from different perspectives theologically, socially, and politically.
2. Chance to “smooth” the way for a new bishop; practicing “not being the expert” but rather companion.
3. Growing depth of relationship; ability to provide genuine support.
4. Follow up by new bishop on previous conversation; he is a very adept learner.
5. Relationship/friendship.
6. Relationship/friendship.
7. Supporting Jay to claim his role as a bishop of the Church.
8. Our emerging friendship.
9. Too soon to tell.
10. I think my response in #21 captures this.
11. Quality of conversation and relationship; enjoyment of his questions and probing mind; watching him mature as a bishop; observing the changes in the diocesan system.
12. Quality of conversation and relationship; mutual prayer support; watching John mature as a bishop; enjoying his questions and observations.
13. Learning; trip to Halifax – meeting with his staff, Diocese and clergy collegiality, dean.
14. I have learned a lot about Church of Ireland; made friendship.
15. Able to be of help and go into deep conversations; fun to witness the challenges of the office.

23. What have been the most challenging parts of being a peer coach?

1. Just keeping the commitment to meet and visit; time is always a challenge.
2. Developing a relationship of trust with someone who seems to know it all; distance (MI to UT).
3. Overcoming negative feelings about coachee’s previous relationship; finding time in coachee’s schedule.
4. In this case, being in two different Anglican Churches.
5. Time; different context.
6. Time.
7. Focusing the conversation in our sessions on the crucial issues of Jay’s emerging ministries and abilities.
8. Adapting to different styles of leadership and follow-through.
9. Getting new bishop’s attention.
10. I am a bit concerned this new bishop may be overconfident. I am not too sure he is listening to alternate voices and may teach those around him to not challenge him. Unsure how to help.
11. Staying alert to the dance between coach and mentor roles.
12. Staying alert to the dance between coach and mentor roles.
13. Not being face to face; not having him come to Boston; not having opportunity to meet as American Bishop or at HOB.
14. There is a cultural gap because our polity is so different.
15. Hard not to give advice.

24. What suggestions, if any, do you have for improving the peer coaching program?

2. No suggestions at this time; plan to focus on my own need to do a better job of staying in touch despite some resistance from new bishop.
3. None.
7. I have had the good fortune of working with bishops who want the peer coach relationship. It all depends on being willing to work together.
10. None.
13. Reexamine how effective TEC coaches are with Canadian Bishops – I feel my new bishops are not getting full value of the program – if I could travel more, I would love to.
14. More training for TEC Bishops about the differences in other Provinces of Anglican Communion.
15. Clarify expectations up front as a group instead of negotiating with coach.

Peer Coaching Evaluation - Quantitative Summary
March 2011 Peer Coaches

Scores are based on a scale of 1-7. 1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Number Responding</u>	<u>Section Average</u>
1. I believe the peer coaching program is very effective.	6.00	0.76	15	
2. I am very satisfied with the peer coaching program.	6.20	1.01	15	
3. The peer coaching program is well designed and administered.	6.40	0.51	15	
4. The relationship between my new bishop and me is very effective.	5.93	1.03	15	
5. I am very satisfied with the relationship my new bishop and I are developing.	6.07	0.80	15	
6. I believe my new bishop utilizes the coaching relationship effectively.	5.47	1.36	15	
7. Both my new bishop and I benefit from the peer-coach relationship.	6.13	0.83	15	
8. I learn a lot from the coaching relationship with my new bishop.	6.13	0.74	15	
9. The coaching relationship gives me new perspectives on many things.	6.00	0.85	15	
10. My new bishop and I are "co-learners" in our relationship.	6.07	0.88	15	
11. The coaching relationship supports my own professional development.	6.13	0.92	15	
12. I am committed to developing an effective and productive coaching relationship.	6.47	0.64	15	
13. I feel that I have enough time to devote to the coaching relationship.	5.93	1.03	15	
14. I make the development of a relationship with my new bishop a priority.	6.13	0.74	15	
15. My relationship with my new bishop is an important part of who I am at work.	5.67	1.05	15	
16. I look forward to the coaching sessions with my new bishop.	6.47	0.52	15	

6.08