

From Interview to Evaluation

East Central Region ACPE Spring Conference

Plenary Session 1

Beth Newton Watson

2/20/15

My name is Beth Newton Watson, and I currently serve as the Director of Spiritual Care and Chaplaincy Services at the Academic Health Center of Indiana University Health in Indianapolis, IN.

Thank you for your willingness to listen to me today. My hope is that we will all learn something together. My apologies also to the Indianapolis Area Supervisory Education Students, who have already heard a portion of this presentation.

When I was moving through the Certification process back in the mid-1980's, one great privilege was the invitation to write an Integration Paper, in which my theories of personality and education could be accompanied by my evolving theology with illustrations from my practice of Clinical Pastoral Education supervision. I LOVED that assignment. As an INTJ moving to INFJ, I had spent quite a bit of time comparing myself and others to an ideal I had developed in reading and watching others and experiencing the challenges of my relatively young life (I am 59 now, and wrote my Integration Paper the first time in 1984). I had taken as a call Robert Frost's stanza from the poem Two Tramps in Mudtime.

But yield who will to their separation,

My object in living is to unite

My avocation and my vocation

As my two eyes make one in sight.

Only where love and need are one,

And the work is play for mortal stakes,

Is the deed ever really done

For Heaven and the future's sakes.

This effort to be a whole supervisor, one who integrates who I am, what I believe, and the practice of my ministry, as my two eyes are one in sight, has made my career both more challenging and infinitely easier. More challenging because of the constant self-supervision, and the unpleasant truth that even when I am being true to myself and my beliefs in my actions, I am not always excellent at any of it. I am

limited by my emotional and spiritual and mental health, my cognitive abilities, and the fact that I am someone with a certain IQ, who gets physically tired, and may be temperamentally unsuited to a particular job at a particular time in life. More challenging also because in working to be more true to myself, my God, my call to ministry, I am sometimes inattentive to and then regularly saddened by the fact that in all of who I am there are parts of me others cannot love and of which they do not approve.

In seminary Professor Perry LeFevre asked us all to develop a vision statement over which I agonized. Eventually, after testing and tasting every word, my statement evolved to this:

"I am becoming a center of freedom and love in the world."

The **becoming** part was essential, because of an ever present sense of the gap between who I am and who I am called to be. The **center** part was essential because there is some fragile peace possible at the center of a spinning top, and because it is when I am scattered or unbalanced that I am least good for others, because integration of who I am, what I believe, and the practice of my ministry, makes healing, fruitful, and educational relationship with others possible. The **freedom** part is essential, because of an awareness of the ways my own cultural, physical, intellectual and emotional limits can both imprison me AND provide substance for relationship with others. I have experienced **love** and Love, and recognize the wild excitement and calm contentment and passionate engagement and prophetic challenge of them. I want more. And because I am an introvert, stretched regularly to the max in my extroverted world, the claiming of the **world** is also my choice.

The truest thing about God in my life is God's commitment to enduring relationship, invitation to wholeness in relationship, a willingness to learn and be understood in relationship, and the fact that God is greater than anything I am able to conceive. This is how I understand the Love that will not let me go.

It has also been the case that working towards integration in everything I do is also remarkably freeing. If I am doing my best to be practicing what I preach, I sleep with peace and awake with hope for the new day. While I am honing my practice and hewing to my principles, I pray and hope I will become a clarifying instrument for others.

In making this presentation, it is my hope that you will see one ACPE Certified Clinical Pastoral Educator working to make sense of her professional practice, and the extent to which that practice has become an organizing principle in my life and work. (And I just heard Marcos say, "Keep it light.")

My plan is to share with you a CPE Journey, from the Interview to the Final Evaluation, and some thoughts along the way. Again, please remember, I was trained many moons ago, trained well enough for a relatively successful lifelong career in this ministry, and at this point, some of the things I have learned I own without memory of its originator. Sometimes I tell myself this is unconscious competence.

Assessment in Interviewing, Before, During and After

I have different ways of assessing folks for their readiness for Clinical Pastoral Education, as I imagine we all do. In general, when I interview I am looking for people of faith, called to the ministry, capable of learning from what they do, and from consultation and supervision, and able to care for others. That isn't too much to ask, is it?

In one of my previous jobs, as an itinerant CPE Supervisor, I tried to balance the need of the satellite centers for spiritual care assistance from CPE Students, with our own program's need for the income from the satellite programs, with my own commitment upon hiring to supervise four units a year, with assessment of students for their potential learning and pastoral skills. Sometimes, I fretted, if I don't take this incredibly wounded person, the program would not go, the chaplain would not have any help, the mother ship would not have a satellite, and I would not be earning my salary.

I have been interested in this topic from a variety of perspectives through the years. In one hospital I served we interviewed prospective employees in ways that would tell us whether they had relationship skills, or common values for sharing, or shared experiences that would enable them to participate in a Sanctuary of Healing for themselves and others. Certain kinds of people seem to make better caregivers, and we can assess some potential for that in the interview.

I have been following issues of assessment in other professional education settings. The Relationship Centered Care and Relational Coordination efforts of recent years have worked to change the interview process for medical schools, so that people with potential for empathy, integrity, capacity for healing relationship, a willingness to participate in life-long learning, and a commitment to communication, are accepted into the education programs. Certain kinds of people make better learners of the human skills and characteristics we value. We can assess some potential for that in an interview.

Now, looking for shared values in an interview does raise some questions for me. It rubs against my commitment to diversity sometimes, and makes me worry that we will all end up looking and acting alike. Nevertheless, I believe that CPE is itself an experience of multiculturalism, in which we discover all the ways we are alike and sometimes different, and still valuable. Nevertheless, within that experience, and with the sometimes painful process of my own education, I have learned that I do not intend to work with students who are without conscience, who have no ego strength, who are without a tolerance for conversation between cultures. Those are some of the values which must be shared, in my opinion.

Literature reminds us that some people believe faith develops from an Intuitive level of understanding of the Holy, to a Literal and Mythic understanding, to a Sympathetic and Conventional understanding, to an Individuative and Reflective understanding, to a Universalizing perspective (Fowler). Using this scale, I decided CPE students had to be out of the Sympathetic / Conventional stage of conformity in their faith if they were going to survive the theodicy questions arising in hospital care. Angst and struggle in the Individuative / Reflective stage were acceptable, and even better was an ability to tolerate the paradox and awareness of the transcendent in the Conjunctive stage. I wasn't so sure about the students who

were already enlightened in the Universalizing stage. Would they even be able to experience the internal tension that (in my opinion) moves people along the learning spiral?

I think about people who are Concrete / Active learners, and how CPE caters to them somewhat in the hands-on clinical method of learning. Clearly the Concrete / Reflective learners also were supported in their learning style by the Verbatim Seminars. Didactic seminars run with plenty of student participation and discussion were designed to educate those preferring the Abstract / Active style of learning, and in plenty of ways, those who learn best in an Abstract / Reflective fashion could be helped to enjoy *Individual Supervision*. (Felder)

I recall the students who had had no trustworthy caregiver, who experienced betrayal by people in authority, and how I had to spend the unit with them proving I was not a betraying abuser, while keeping before them their own tendencies to betray and abuse (Object Relations). Yikes! What resulted for them had not been excellent Clinical Pastoral Education.

Extroverts love talking to lots of people, and have to be helped to be still sometimes and reflect alone on their learning in ministry, while Introverts may become exhausted by all the contact with others the program expects, and need to develop muscles for leaving the office. I love Intuitive students, and feel God's presence with me when they demonstrate their understanding of their parishioners, but I need Sensors to keep me grounded and aware of the life all around me. Combinations provide a delicious diversity of awareness. I can remember a few Judges who needed nudging towards understanding the gift of discernment and the sin of hypocrisy, and the Perceivers who needed help ending visits, internal processing and assessing situations. (Meyers Briggs).

Remember the struggle to learn in people who do not trust themselves or others, who are too ashamed to function autonomously, who cannot initiate and accomplish the tasks at hand? I have had students who couldn't decide who they were, and so could not remember how to be with others, and a few who could form barely temporarily effective relationships with me or their peers. We have all had students who despaired and gave up, and perhaps many these days who were merely jumping through hoops. Questions about the concerns they may have or rumors they may have heard about CPE begins a conversation, and working to establish preliminary understanding of learning needs is very helpful. I can remember one applicant who finally lit up and moved into relationship when I said, "You can't think of any learning needs? What would your wife think you might need to work on?" He laughed and began reflecting in a completely new way.

It helps to have students with a variety of learning styles. Those who learn more visually need me to write more on the board. The aural learners need me to talk through the handbook. The folks who learned physically experienced greater relief after shadowing. The ones who learned socially found Covenant Group a transformative experience and could talk about it at the end of the seminar, while others need to take their new learning back to their caves and process it in solitary fashion.

Some students operate out of their need to avoid punishment, and want to get everything right and be obedient. There is often anger lurking in that relationship. Some students are focused completely on

their own self-interest. Some will go any way the group or the authority person leads. Others are deeply committed to the maintenance of certain social orders, even in their interpretations of their parishioners' concerns. Some students can develop their own codes of conduct in relationship to a culture established within the group. Others can examine the relationships from an ethical perspective based on "universal" principles. (Kohlberg)

I have been supervising since 1982. Once upon a time I could choose students who formed a group of three men and women, of three or four different colors, with three different sexual interests, of at least two different political persuasions and two sometimes three different faiths. The formation of a working community became a core task for us. At other times, I have taken all who applied, and just prayed that I could find ways to begin with students wherever they started, and bring enough diversity to the conversation so folks came alive with curiosity.

Here are some actual details of the initial assessment process:

- 1) I wonder if students can give me a coherent life history in the application. People whose lives don't make sense to them at this time sometimes have difficulty helping others to make sense of their own life issues. If we are to assist others in the search for meaning, our own skills for understanding are vitally important.
- 2) I look in the written materials for the student's sense of responsibility: has the student only been "done to?" or has the student an awareness of the power and responsibility s/he has exercised in life? Has s/he struggled with that which is impossible for human beings and for which God has sole responsibility?
- 3) Is there a sense in what is written that the student knows there is good and bad within the student's self, and in others? Can the student see redemption or meaning in any of the suffering described? Does the student recount any learning from life's errors? Can the student enjoy the paradoxes of life? How much ambiguity and grey areas of discussion will the student be able to tolerate in the interview (and in pastoral conversations)?

Interviewing

In an interview I hope to hear of or observe the student's anxiety, curiosity, integrity and hospitality. Can the student manage his/her own anxiety? How much help from me is required?

What happens when I listen quietly to the student? Does s/he need more from me than I can easily give? Does the interview become spiritual care? Is the student curious about my quietness? Is there any appreciation for careful listening, when I reflect back the feelings I have heard? I am trying to discern whether the student will value careful listening in his/her own ministry.

I compliment what I can about the application and listen carefully to the student's response. Does s/he want more? Is the compliment rejected? Does the person wonder about my intention? Is there simple appreciation for kindness offered?

I offer what I think of as a small challenge about something disclosed in the written application or during the interview. How does the student respond? With defensiveness at first? Is there any curiosity? Can the student sit with the challenge and reflect, showing me how s/he learns in the moment? If the student wants to argue at length about a small challenge, how much energy will be required, how much courage must I muster, how much faithfulness will need to be demonstrated before learning can be accomplished later?

I almost always ask, "What kind of supervisor is best for you?" I get a sense of the student's history of supervision. Has there EVER been someone who was helpful? Does the student come with issues of abuse by authority? This is one pretty sure indicator that there will be issues with others' authority and the student's own sense of authority. Such issues are not necessarily reasons refusing an applicant, but I must do so with open eyes from that point forward.

I often ask, "How will I know if you are angry with me?" I learn about levels of denial of anger, about habits of passive aggression, about knowledge of healthy assertiveness, and I have often said in response, "So I'll have to be paying close attention to even know when you are mad?" and see how the student can supervise him/herself with that slight challenge.

I regularly inquire, "What is the truest thing about God for you?" I get a sense of depth of faith with that question, and of the student's identification with the Ideal. Sometimes I can even make a spiritual assessment from the answer to that question. I want some idea about how many seekers and how many more fundamental thinkers I might fruitfully have in a group.

I look for areas of expertise in the student. CPE Units are much more rewarding if students teach me sometimes. It is a wonderful relief to discover there is so much expertise in the room I do not have to be the leader all the time. I have had several groups where many were leaders, and I have learned so much about myself and my supervision at those times. It can also be unnerving!

In closing, I always ask if the student has any questions about me. Sometimes they seem to have forgotten there is anyone else in the room! Sometimes they ask about my denomination. Sometimes they will ask, 'How did you come to be a hospital chaplain? Or a CPE Supervisor?' I talk a little, and watch how the student listens. Is the curiosity easily satisfied? Are there any follow up questions? Is there compassion in the response? Does the student seem to see me with different eyes? Will there be respect for my role as supervisor when my humanity is recognized?

I consult my gut. Am I uneasy after the interview? Does my head ache after being with the student? Am I eager to send him/her away? Do I linger in thought about the student? Will I be glad to see that person on the first day of the unit? Is my reaction based in any of the places where I am less than whole? Are my theories of learning and personality more suited to certain kinds of learners / faith stagers /levels of moral development than others?

Finally, and confessionally, there is a part of me that believes this: IF I am open to enough diversity of personality type, stage of faith, learning preference, denominational / faith perspective, ethnicity and

race, gender varieties, and moral decisionmaking ability, **AND** if the student is open enough to my differences from him/her and my differences from their idealized expectations of supervisors, **THEN** the two of us can start anywhere, with appropriate *learning* goals, and accomplish much. This has often proved true. I have also been wrong several times.

How hard do I want to work? I have been more and more careful about accepting people with extensive histories of abuse, and there are many of them. While CPE may feel initially healing for them, and even if by the grace of God I am capable of providing a safe- and nurturing- and mirroring- enough learning environment for them, the risk of narcissistic injury is so great it can hardly be avoided. And folks in the throes of their own experience of pain struggle to bring their authentic selves into relationship with the pain of others. They move in survival mode into false self ministry, and feel endangered when asked to examine that ministry for learning opportunities.

I strongly hope my students will be good for others. My ultimate goal is that their increasing integration of person, faith and practice will enable them to be remarkable healers with those who seek, suffer and pray, wherever the ministry is located.

Covenant Group: a Laboratory for Church, and Subsequent Seminars

“This is Covenant Group,” I say as I light the candle. “This is the place where we can practice speaking the truth in love, where we support one another in times of suffering, where we become seekers of new understanding together. This is the laboratory for church. This is where you can try new skills and get immediate feedback. This is the place for crucial conversations. Here you can say how you really are.”

In intern and resident Covenant Groups I have become accustomed to saying this every time I start the group. We all understand the meaning of the words differently when we hear them week after week. At a later point, I will invite someone else to begin the Covenant Group for us. Their words will help us create relationships of deepening intimacy and efficacy. With that invitation and frame, it is rare for there to be much silence. My sense is that this group can be the richest and most satisfying of the seminars. Here is true communion, where we become aware of the Holy, even to the point of discomfort. Here is redemption of error and anger with the gift of new meaning and new relationships. Here new life can begin, with lots of help from others. Here the loneliness can end.

And here transformative learning proceeds for students and supervisor. There is no better place, in my experience, for the transformation of frames of reference both individually and from the group’s perspective. Here we practice expressing and reflecting back emotions. Here we practice our attending skills and challenging. Here we learn how to survive and even thrive in the midst of challenge. Here we practice the forgiveness implicit in our sending out and our return. “What did I learn this time?” we ask. “What did you learn?” Critical reflection and discernment have space to come alive. Here we practice becoming a part of and apart from our cultural contexts.

In Covenant Group I am attentive to interactions of value: when students examine themselves and engage others with a fruitful goal, I want to assist and protect the engagement. With my behavior I aim

to model accurate empathy and intervene when something seems to be going off the rails. When a student begins to spiral into the pit, I will notice that. When distractors work to relieve the tension in the engagement, I will notice that. When I am or others are anxious in the midst of conflict, I will notice that, and slow things down.

I consider myself responsible in many ways for the creative and life-giving aspect of Covenant Group. Is the work toward clear understanding, truth speaking, reconciliation, insight, healthy conflict, self-respect? My aim is to guide as needed, to limit as necessary, to focus and refocus, to invite the reticent and still the hyperactive, to weave and reweave, to praise and to challenge, to invite disagreement first with me and practice conflict resolution for all to see. I see Covenant Group as a time for clergy to learn the difficult skills of caring for a group and using a group for the care of others, and for one's own clarity and learning.

My tendency is to weave in and out, to praise engagement, and to see who will work fruitfully with another. My prayer is to remain silent until discernment tells me the work has lost direction, or someone has crossed a boundary. At that point, I am willing to engage, deeply with one student if necessary, facilitating a conversation between two students as necessary, observing the group dynamic to praise good work in the early days, and to offer challenge later in the game.

I tell the group my hope is to work more in the beginning, and by mid-unit, to have them doing almost all of the work. My experience has been frequent that if groups begin well, and find a way to be authentic community by mid-unit, the work of the students is profound and productive, and the care offered to the clinical setting is rewarding for all concerned. This is the joy of covenant group. The sorrow comes when groups cannot choose what is healthy, what is growth producing, what leads to the excitement of empowerment, rather than the smug resentment of resistance.

The rhythm of units differs, of course, and there have been many groups where brokenness prevailed, either because I could not successfully limit the impact of one destructive member, or whether too many life circumstances interfered with group cohesiveness. Seeing the group as a whole through a 40 hour a week ten week unit requires one frame of mind. Holding in mind the 17 week unit as a whole is another task entirely. Bringing my own whole self to the group, and inviting, requesting, sometimes requiring time limited whole presence from the students makes the time transformative, and occasionally exhausting. And to this day I continue to ask, where is the midpoint of a six month SES curriculum? When students begin at different times and progress at different rates, how can there be a center of freedom and love in the world of this CPE experience? Wholeness has to happen in any given seminar. And the definition of wholeness must include unfinished business and prayer for understanding at some later point in time.

Throughout the unit, I continue to invite emotional and spiritual check-in during Covenant Group. I model respectful disagreement, by stating clearly and early, "I am going to disagree with you here," and asking, "Who disagrees with me and why?" I regularly ask, "Has anyone else had an experience like _____'s?" and "What still feels unfinished here?" I make connections with church and other ministry

dynamics often, in hopes that people will remember this is about use of self in ministry to others, and ask for others to bring experience from other settings as well. I attend to emotional exhaustion and to emotional hijacking, and pay particular attention to who shares the same story with the same kind of dynamics repeatedly. "Here it is again, I think," I say. "You are working hard on this issue." I think of myself as an organizing principle in some ways. When I invite others to lead, and when they claim the leadership, at the end I try to praise the organizing ability, the theme seeking and naming, the connection building work that they do.

Life Stories, Truest Thing about God, Learning Goal Development

My preference is to begin a group with Life Stories, and through the years I have learned to tell my story first. I encourage folks to tell what they would like others to know, to maintain their own preferred level of privacy, and to be aware of how difficult this is. "When we offer spiritual care, we do not always understand the work it is for folks to tell us who they are. Telling each other helps us understand the gift and cost of it." I also observe the ability of group members to listen for a substantial amount of time to stories of emotion and meaning. We reflect at the end of the day on connections made, and awareness of the challenges of a ministry of careful listening. We name common themes, and begin to become a working group pretty quickly.

Two subsequent but formative seminars are for the development of Group Covenant and the Group Exploration of each student's "Truest Thing about God." In group covenant development, I ask students what they would like from each other and from me in the group setting, and we discuss whether we can agree on those requests. I conclude by asking students what they pledge to the group and the group process. A covenant is not just how others treat me, it is also how I am willing to pledge to treat the others. We are able to discuss other ministry settings where implicit and explicit group covenants function.

The "Truest Thing about God" seminar could go along with a theological genogram by each student, in which students notice the "truths" that were taught in various generations of their family, and how those truths related to particular broken places. This is also the seminar in which I ask students to say what they believe is the truest thing about God, and how they hope to embody that characteristic about God in their own ministry. Sometimes they realize their theology is a correction for the brokenness of their lives. Sometimes they realize their theology is an expression of their transcendent experience. Sometimes they realize they have made God into their own image.

A seminar for group development of Individual Student Learning Goals helps all connect life histories, theology and opportunities for integration and skill development. I divide up the time equally between students, and assure them that this is a preliminary discussion. I ask for volunteers to go first, and suggest they choose a theme for their work, and make it a theological theme. With that theme, I encourage them to name a personal, interpersonal and professional goal, with method and measurement named for each. For example, if a student chose Forgiveness as a theme for professional education in ministry, a personal goal might be something like this: To examine the places where I have

been forgiven or refused forgiveness. An interpersonal goal to be worked on explicitly in the group setting might be: To listen for places where my peers have or have not forgiven, and also to notice when I forgive and when I do not, in the group setting. A professional goal might organize the verbatim presented: I will listen for themes of guilt and forgiveness in my spiritual care, and write 3 verbatim in which I tried to minister in those conversations. I will pay attention to what spiritual care interventions promote the experience of feeling forgiven, or of being forgiving.

Verbatim Seminars

At the heart of the clinical learning piece, I require only half the verbatim required of me in my early years of training. Ten verbatim per unit moves the practice of group consultation on ministry into a regular, practiced, even anticipated realm instead of the dreaded event to survive. I also allow for the possibility of Live Ministry, in which a student offers live and real spiritual care to a peer who has volunteered to share real spiritual care needs. Real time feedback from “parishioner” and observers sometimes provides the crucible for huge gains in learning. I then ask for a paragraph documenting learning from these kinds of clinical encounters.

In written Verbatim Seminars, I listen for the chaplain’s spiritual assessment of parishioner and spiritual intervention. While others are reading the verbatim out loud and beginning to offer feedback, I mark throughout the work the places where accurate empathy occurred, and where subjects were changed. I listen in the theological reflection for interpretations that bring life and the possibility of health to the exchange, the chaplain and the parishioner. I reread the document for ways in which the care proceeded in conflict with the theological reflection offered. If my observations are made by others, I do not need to offer them in public. The student may read confirmation in what I have written on the verbatim. If the points of concern I have noted are not made by peers, I will, at the end, go through the verbatim, line by line almost, the exchanges in which the patient was heard and acknowledged, and in which the patient was missed....as reported by the student’s account. Then I will reflect with the group about the spiritual assessment, and what kinds of meaning came through the theological reflection, and how those two things informed a spiritual intervention, or could have.

Invariably there is much to praise in the group process, whether or not there is much to praise in the individual piece of work. Even so, students receive my comments on their verbatim, make a copy and return it to me. At the end of the unit, I am able to say, “I am missing #7, could I get that back from you?” In the final evaluation I try to write about the learning done in each verbatim presentation.

It is also at the end that I remember the student’s learning trajectory, as well as my own. Who was s/he when we first met? How have we been changed in relationship with each other? A moment of stillness helps me gain clarity. Have I written what is true? Helpful? Prophetic? Have I done my best?

Theo/Didactic

There is so much material that should be shared in a CPE Unit: the skills of attending, empathy and challenge need didactics of their own; respecting boundaries is essential, perinatal loss is a subject all its

own, advance directives, interfaith ministry and personal integrity, professional charting, prevention of suicide, interdisciplinary care, administration of programs. I call all of these Theo/Dids to remind me to make the theological reflection connected throughout or at the end. These subjects can each invite us to reflection on our own beliefs and their embodiment. How I handle conflict, and how I administer a program may be connected theologically, and exploration of that connection helps me be more integrated.

Individual Supervision

In our first individual supervisory session, I work with a student to finalize the learning goals initially developed in the group setting. Often this is where the methods and measurements will be fleshed out, or if something has troubled the student, or remained out of focus, we will work to achieve the goals for an organized learning experience. I always tell folks they can change their goals if they find themselves working on something else compelling, but encourage them not to formally add to or revise them until midunits.

The Weekly Report form required for supervision includes a restatement of their learning goals, and their work on each one of them in the course of the week or since our last meeting. I ask for reflection on their work with peers, with me, and on their units, and close with an invitation to reflect theologically on it all. I find this form helps organize their thinking, our time together, and the process of writing final evaluations for both of us, for their learning is documented week by week. It is most often that the form helps me know where to ask more, whether it is about relationships in the peer group, or conflicts with me, or difficulties on the floors. That it is explicit on their Weekly Reflection form invites them to go ahead and bring it forward. They usually hand me their forms when they come, and I spend some time reading while they watch and settle. "Where would you like to begin?" I ask.

Evaluation

At the end of the unit, in order to write the final evaluation I carefully collate the student's Weekly Reflection forms, the MidUnit Evaluation (whether in outline or narrative form), the Verbatim, and the Final Evaluation. I compare the student's experience of his/her learning with my observation and understanding of it. I ask myself whether the student has given him/herself sufficient credit, or avoided including regular challenges faced. I comment on the student's progress toward each of the three learning goals and make note of the skill progress and learning from each of the presented verbatim. Finally, I do the outcomes. They serve as a check and balance to the previous evaluator work. At the end, I always pause to review. Have I maintained sufficient insight and objectivity? Have I seen the student with eyes loving enough to give credit where it is due? Have I failed to make note of a failure which is too much like one of mine? Have I managed to conclude with a meaningful blessing appropriate to the nature of our learning alliance and supervisory relationship?

When discussing the evaluation with a student, I ask them to tell me places in which they might disagree with me. There have been times when students have been able to remind me of moments of learning I

had forgotten, and I am willing to add that kind of commentary. If we cannot agree on the content, then I encourage the student to write an addendum to the evaluation.

Critical Purchase and Conclusions

In conclusion, I have presented to you my intention, hopes and goals in the supervision of a unit of Clinical Pastoral Education. I am aware that these beliefs have been developed over years, and have been revised when they didn't work, and though they are my intentions, it is a very good day when "my two eyes are one in sight."

I have peers, colleagues, co-committee members, direct reports, former bosses and students in this gathering. You have the ability to compare who I am with who I want to be. You are my Covenant Group. Thank you for your attention!

Resources

In no particular order

The Facilitating Partnership: A Winnicottian Approach for Social Workers and Other Helping Professionals, by Jeffrey S. Applegate and Jennifer M. Bonovitz, Jason Aronson, publisher.

The Lost Art of Listening, by Michael P. Nichols, The Guilford Press, publisher.

The Skilled Helper, by Gerard Egan, Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Learning as Transformation, by Jack Mezirow and Associates, Jossey-Bass, publisher.

Coping with Conflict, by William Mueller and Bill L. Kell, Appleton-Century-Crofts, publisher.

Essential Interviewing, by David R. Evans, Margaret T. Hearn, Max R. Uhlemann, Allen E. Ivey, Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy, by Irvin Yalom, Basic Books, Inc., publisher.

Process and Practice Groups, by Marianne Schneider Corey and Gerald Corey, Thomson Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Courageous Conversations, William R. Delong, ed., University Press of America.

Engaging the Powers, Walter Wink, Fortress Press.

Shared Wisdom, Pamela Cooper-White, Fortress Press.

The Supervisory Relationship, Mary Gail Frawley-O'Dea and Joan E. Sarnat, The Guilford Press.

The Leadership Challenge, James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner, John Wiley & Sons.